

**BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC)
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: C. Bargar, J. Brazil, W. Brinsfield, G. Buckley, M. Guevara, A. Olson, D. Provence, D. Thoe, W. Brinsfield

MEMBERS ABSENT: S. Vanderlip

STAFF PRESENT: M. Jones, L. Low, B. Tietjen

Chair Dan Provence called the meeting to order at 5:47 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Committee members introduced themselves.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2017

Motion/Second: Brazil/Bargar

Ayes: Buckley, Olson, Provence, Thoe, Vanderlip

Absent: Brinsfield

BIKE PARKING MANAGEMENT UPDATE

Melissa Jones, Senior Planner, presented:

- Overview
 - Key Questions for the Project
- Recommended Approach to Managing Caltrain's Bike Parking System
 - Summary of Existing Bike Parking System Management Approach
 - What's the Problem for Caltrain Today?
 - Methodology on Management Approaches
 - Three Management Approaches to Future Bike Parking System and Improvements
 - Recommended Management Approach: Hybrid Approach
 - Estimated Costs of Hybrid Management Approach
 - Capital Improvements
- Next Steps
 - Draft Plan
 - What's Next

Chair Provence asked If San Mateo also manages their lockers.

Ms. Jones answered there are local cities and county agencies that do provide parking facilities as well. City of San Mateo manages the E-lockers at the San Mateo station.

Mr. Bargar noted that BART was starting to publicize their work with a company that has electronic bike racks that were integrated into Clipper. Mr. Bargar stated it could be interesting infrastructure for Caltrain to pursue depending on BART's results. He offered to send a link with more information to other members.

Mr. Brinsfield noted it's wonderful to see this phase of the plan coming to completion. He asked if in terms of the 500,000--since it's an increase and then hopefully a sustained program for many years--it includes any metrics for success, such as a before and after.

Ms. Jones replied that there's a section about goals and performance measures that incorporates feedback heard from last time, and that they are quantified metrics.

Vice Chair Olson asked whether or not the staff member, as both the internal and external point of contact, would also be the customer contact as well?

Ms. Jones replied that the long-term plan would have the third party bike specialist handling customers. In the short-term, the staff member could help with administration of the keyed lockers. But the person's primary focus would be on the funding question and getting the vendors on board.

Vice Chair Olson recommended that the staff member not be the point of contact for customer questions, and that the third party vendor should be responsible for that. Vice Chair Olson said he recommends that staff not deal directly with the customers as it can be frustrating to the customer if they call staff, who then must call the vendor and so on, while the customer awaits a response.

In terms of funding sources, Vice Chair Olson mentioned Measure B in Santa Clara County, which is spread over 30 years. He also mentioned city or agency climate action plans as another potential source of funds since motivating people to use bicycles may be included in those plans.

Mr. Brazil thanked Ms. Jones for her work on the bike parking study and asked if staff had the chance to talk with other agencies to learn about their experiences with cost and the different operating models.

Ms. Jones said the general trend is operational costs are covered by the agencies. But BART had a lot of success with grants for their parking facilities that they built or installed.

Mr. Brazil said he thought the \$500,000 seemed low. He encouraged the committee to think long-term because there could be big increases in their lifetime. Mr. Brazil noted that in Utrecht, the third or fourth biggest city in the Netherlands with the busiest train station—900 trains daily—that station alone has 30,000 bike parking spaces in and around the station. He mentioned they don't have bike share and their bike mode share is ten times ours, but he wants to encourage people to think big. Mr. Brazil said when he looks at \$300 million, and he pencils out e-lockers at approximately \$1600, he wonders if that gets a few bike stations or a mixture. Mr. Brazil noted it's a good start, but he hopes they can lobby for much better.

Ms. Thoe asked when the study looks at the primary responsibility of the third party vendor taking over administrative responsibilities for the Caltrain bike parking facilities, does it envision pulling in some of the local items, such as e-lockers, so there's one face for the consumers/riders?

Ms. Jones responded that they have considered that, and as the process continues to unfold and be implemented those conversations will continue. They've already started talking to San Mateo and they seemed open to this idea.

Ms. Thoe asked if Ms. Jones could expand a bit more on the decision to put the JPB bike staff position in the Rail Operations Department, and if there could be more of an explanation of what that department does and why this position would be there rather than in a traditional planning department.

Ms. Jones explained that Rail Operations includes operations planning which works on current service planning, which is different than the Caltrain Planning Group that works on long-term planning. Ms. Jones noted Rail Operations also includes engineering and staff involved with capital projects, so by placing this position in that department, the person would have better access to staff needed to see the responsibilities through. Ms. Jones added that the contracts and budgeting group is also within the rail division, so they could also assist with the funding and contract questions.

Mr Bargar noted that on the local side, a lot of the larger employers near the stations have bike programs and bike shuttle buses to stations. So they might be interested in supporting bike parking that their employees could benefit from.

Ms. Buckley asked if input was given from the bike coalitions.

Ms. Jones replied that they've been meeting with the bike coalitions quarterly and have been updating them on the status of the plan. Ms. Jones also noted that she is presenting on the plan to the Silicon Valley Bike Summit.

Chair Provence said he's looking forward to seeing the draft plan and appreciates all of Ms. Jones work on it. He asked Committee staff about next steps and mentioned the discussion about potentially moving the next Committee meeting to August.

Mr. Tietjen responded that a special meeting for the EMU bike samples would be discussed, and that Ms. Jones would be invited to present on the Bike Parking Management Plan.

ANNUAL PASSENGER COUNT

Catherine David, Principal Planner, presented:

- Purpose and Count Methodology
- 2017 Challenges
- 2017 Count Results
- Summary
- Next Steps

Chair Provence asked why in 2001 ridership was three times the amount it is to today?

Ms. David responded that it was during the dotcom boom, and after the bust there was a significant decline in ridership. Ms. David also noted that an additional lane was opened on Highway 101 sometime in the 2002/2003 timeframe, so people may have decided to drive instead; and that VTA had three express buses from Gilroy to around Mountain View, which was direct competition.

Chair Provence was curious if there had been a service reduction.

Ms. David noted that at one point there were four round-trip trains operating to Gilroy, but once they saw the decrease in ridership and the open lane on Highway 101, they reduced service to three operating trips.

Mr. Guevara said as he understood it, the survey was only performed over one weekend, and the results for bike ridership were very dramatic as compared to last year. Therefore, he suggested not reading too much into them since one data point might be biased due to external factors. He also asked if there were any bigger changes to respond to the increase in demand due to fast trains. Mr. Guevara said he was surprised by how much the bullet trains increase ridership significantly as opposed to the local trains, and he was wondering if there was a way to increase the number of bullet trains to cope with this demand. Mr. Guevara also asked why the counts are performed during the winter and if it continues to rain in future years, if staff will adjust the dates of the surveys?

Ms. David replied that Caltrain has a fixed number of trainsets that we try to utilize as best as possible, some are six car galleries and some are six car bombardiers and the rest are five car trainsets. Ms. David explained that the annual count data is used to help prioritize which trains will receive the six car trains. She added there isn't much flexibility due to those limitations, so it's mainly trying to prioritize the trains within these constraints.

In response to Mr. Guevara's question about bullet service, Ms. David said it's a long-term goal, especially with electrification. The thought might be to run more limited trains at a higher frequency. That could be a schedule staff works towards in the future, but Ms. David said as of right now the agency works to serve all the stations from an equity standpoint, as all the riders from non-bullet stations matter and staff wants to be conscious of that.

To address Mr. Guevara's question about the timing of the survey, Ms. David said the survey is typically done at the end of January timeframe because it's before special event service begins, such as Giants season. Staff looks at trends year over year, so although January and February might not be at the highest peak, there are trends that show ridership goes up as summer nears. The information gathered is used as a baseline. Ms. David noted that typically, living in California, rain hasn't been as much an issue as it has been recently. To help remedy that, and based on feedback received from the BAC last year, Ms. David said they are now monitoring three locations along

the corridor on a daily basis so they can trend how many days it rained. Ms. David stated that it rained 40% of the days when they performed the count.

Ms. Buckley asked if they ever looked at Tuesday through Thursday data since more people are telecommuting, and that perhaps there would be more people on Wednesday, but that could be averaged out across the week.

Ms. David said one of the challenges this year was the cost of these counts nearly doubled recently. Ms. David explained that adding six car trains over the past years meant the need for more surveyors. So in planning for future annual counts, Ms. David said they are considering how this increases their budget, with some suggesting less surveys in the future. Ms. David said there was also discussion about surveying just Tuesday through Thursdays, although that might skew the data. Ms. David noted that if the budget becomes an issue, they might have to make changes to their methodology.

Ms. Buckley said that they count the number of bikes denied during boarding and asked if the conductor tells the surveyor that bikes were denied.

Ms. David replied that the surveyor is watching to see if bikes are denied but they do not necessarily see if a bike rider gets on another bike car. Ms. David said they're told to multi-task (ons, offs, bikes, ADA/wheelchair riders, one person per door), but they can't see beyond their immediate view so that's what they report.

Ms. Buckley asked if they report if a train is significantly delayed when they're counting?

Ms. David responded that if there is a significant delay, they have to throw that count out and then re-survey on the same day the next week.

Mr. Bargar asked if the average trip length increased, is it possible we lost riders making shorter trips?

Ms. David said it's calculated by taking all the people on board the train at a certain time and dividing it by the running time. So it's not technically saying this person got off. It's utilizing the average of people onboard at each station.

Mr. Bargar said then it doesn't have individual data on people's trips.

Ms. David said they do have an origin and destination study, which MTC did in 2014, but only 5,000 people responded; so doing an O/D study where they track everyone is much more costly. Ms. David said they did have discussions prior to this year about having a piece of paper for the vendor to code where they stopped and started, but due to the challenges, they saw that it could be problematic with potential for delays if every card had to be scanned so from an operational standpoint we don't want that to happen. But there are discussion about in the future on the new EMUs having an automated passenger counter so that there is a better process than using people and they could do it more than a few times a year.

Vice Chair Olson said Ms. David had discussed why they didn't do a midsummer survey, but he would like to be on record as saying they are still very interested in pushing Caltrain to do a mid-year survey as well. Vice Chair Olson also said in terms of on and offs, it was part of the Bike Parking Management Survey that asked those questions, and wondered if there was some efficiency of scale. Vice Chair Olson suggested perhaps combining surveys with bike parking management to both inform the success of the bike parking program as well as inform about ridership in general. He also mentioned that there may be grant opportunities that support these programs at the same time.

Ms. David said that the underlying constraint is the budget. She also noted that during the summer with special events—and they have riders from April to October for special events—that to try and do a count would logistically create issues due to the crowds. Ms. David said it was important to have baseline data that she could compare to. She did talk to operations management staff, and based on limited staff and resources, they plan to do a monitoring of passenger counts at end of the line stations. Ms. David said she appreciates the feedback.

Vice Chair Olson said special events are important b/c when more people are on the train it bumps more bikes, so understanding that dynamic is important.

Chair Provence said with the Warriors coming it will create more complications for January/February. The Giants put their schedule out several months in advance and they're away for a week at a time. There could be a way to make it work with the Giants schedule, because we will be getting even more special events in the area.

Chair Provence suggested a way to use the data that's helpful to passengers is at the stations next to the schedule, list the top 10 busiest trains. Many people have flexible schedules and if they knew which trains were the busiest they might be able to adjust their schedules so they could get a seat, and if they knew which trains had more room they might choose to ride those instead.

Ms. Thoe said if any of the data were to be used to help with grant opportunities for bike parking and other items, she would encourage staff to flush out what the rain might have done to ridership, and to bike counts in particular. Ms. Thoe asked if there was any other way to pull in data from the highways or other travel opportunities. She noted it was interesting to hear that 40% of the days they were counting it was raining, and perhaps that could help drive home the point how much it impacts bike ridership.

Ms. David said they are trying to collect as much information as possible about the weather. One more additional effort over the last two years, is to be more conscience and know more about that. Ms. David said that while they may not be able to know how many decided not to ride their bike that day, she did note a correlation between that impact and overall bike ridership. Ms. David said they will be finalizing the report, but if anyone would like to read last year's it's available.

Mr. Brazil asked for clarification on the 8.8% of bike boardings--that's just people who bring bikes on board, correct?

Ms. David said she was just doing the math of the 5,000 bike riders compared to the 60,000 daily riders and not necessarily counting those who leave their bikes at the station.

Mr. Brazil encouraged the whole organization to make that point clear as some people might jump to the conclusion that out of all Caltrain riders only 8.8% use a bike; where it's probably even double or triple that number, as it doesn't count those that leave their bikes at the station.

Mr. Bargar noted that it does not include those who use bike share.

Mr. Brazil noted that Chair Provence made a point about busier trains. Mr. Brazil said if there were patterns that were consistent, it would be nice to know that on the web since people who plan in advance go online to look at the schedule. He also suggested that perhaps Caltrain JPB should consider pricing strategies and maybe it would be worthwhile to provide discounts for less busy trains to incentivize some balancing.

Ms. David said during the fare proposal study that had come up and that the fare study should provide more data.

Mr. Brazil asked if that's been more at the staff level or the board level.

Ms. David responded she believes a couple of the board members mentioned it not just in regard to the boarding but also the parking. Ms. David said in looking at other agencies, some do have different parking prices, so it's been brought up.

Mr. Brazil was wondering if there was any geocoded or smartphone data that would be economically accessible to Caltrain as an alternative count strategy. He said while it's not 100% representative or accurate data it could be helpful data to potentially get counts from people's phones when they're coming on and off the train. Mr. Brazil said maybe there's an economical way to get samples using people's phones because geocoding would allow you to see when and where people are getting off the train.

Ms. Thoe mentioned if there was wifi on the train than we could do it.

Mr. Brazil said the most analogous thing would be Wayz and that so much rich data could be collected.

Ms. Thoe said she wanted to clarify something Mr. Brazil asked about the 8.8% of riders that bring their bikes onboard. She noted that during the bike parking presentation it was said that 90% of Caltrain bicycle riders bring their bikes onboard. Ms. Thoe asked if that means less than 10% of people that bike to Caltrain are parking their bike?

Ms. Jones said yes, that's correct.

Ms. Thoe then asked if that gap actually isn't that large--of additional bikers to those that bring bikes onboard.

Ms. Jones clarified that the 90% comes from the MTC dataset, which is their richest dataset and it was done in 2014. Ms. Jones said that in that dataset, 17% of people were taking a bike to or from a station. Of that 17%, 90% were taking their bikes onboard, and it might actually have been 93% were taking bikes onboard, 6% were bike parking and 1% were using bike share. She believes this was done in May, so it was a different time of year.

Ms. Thoe then asked if the 8.8% was a current figure.

Ms. David confirmed that it was for the time period the annual count was conducted. Ms. David offered more figures, and said in 2016 it was about 8%, and in 2015 about 11%, and in 2014 it was 11%. Ms. David noted it shows a decline over the last few years.

Vice Chair Olson discussed the possible reasons for the decline in bikes on board and said these might include the weather, as well as an inability to sit or not being able to get their bike onboard. Vice Chair Olson noted there may be a number of people who decided not to ride the train due to these reasons and asked if Caltrain is trying to seek that information as well?

Ms. David answered that they compare ridership on a monthly basis, and to the month the year before. She noted they started to see a decline in ridership in August 2016, and they looked at jobs, employment, weather, and ticket types. Ms. David said the increase in 2016 may have curbed riders, but they also know riders may be frustrated due to their inability to find a seat. Ms. David said one of the biggest reasons ridership may have declined is probably due to over capacity on the busiest trains.

Mr. Bargar noted that for cyclists that don't bring bikes on the train, Motivate might have publicly available data on the usage of their bike stations. 4th and King might have been one of their busiest stations in the Bay Area, and Mr. Bargar said that might increase now that it's Ford GoBike and Diridon might also increase. Mr. Bargar said that might be a good way to get some frequent data. He also mentioned that 22nd Street might open one in the near future.

Ms. David said that if there was bike data on the corridor then it would definitely be useful.

Mr. Guevara mentioned that when he first saw the graph, he was looking at it from a systems capacity perspective, and he agreed that it probably indicates the system has reached its capacity and it's not going to break that ceiling soon unless there's a significant change. So he suggested to present that as a hypothesis in the report.

Mr. Guevara exited the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

CALMOD UPDATE

Lori Low, Government and Community Affairs Specialist, presented:

- PCEP Funding Update

- Electric Train Design
 - Outreach Tools
 - EMU Exterior Design
- Onboard Bike Storage
 - Review of Options
 - Security
 - Configuration
 - Timeline
 - Draft Samples
 - Outreach Events & Poll

Ms. Low asked the Committee if they thought it important to ask the public in the online poll if they would prefer the belt or the bungee for the stacking securing mechanism.

Ms. Thoe asked if it's in the poll, then would both the seat belts and bungees be on the samples?

Ms. Low responded that the samples will have the belts and staff can add the bungees.

Mr. Brazil noted that it's important in the poll for people to understand the capacity implications of the choices.

Chair Provence noted that since there may be more stops that might impact the bike car storage system--since right now with stacking there might be five or six stops but with electrification there might be 13 stops--it could get more complex and messy and suggested that information be communicated in outreach.

Ms. Low said there will be a robust public outreach effort in regards to the new schedule. She also noted the schedule could be looked at from a time perspective, so instead of 13 stops, the EMUs could go from San Francisco to San Jose in 45 minutes with five to six stops.

Ms. Thoe commented on the outreach schedule with the bike samples. She noted that boardings in the evenings are the highest, but perhaps we should do a morning event as people might not be in as much a hurry to get on a train as they are to get off. She encouraged that at 4th and King there be additional outreach. Also in viewing the other top five stations, Ms. Thoe noted there is significant drop off in the amount of cyclists after San Francisco and Palo Alto. She also suggested staff think about when people have time to interact with the samples versus when they're arriving at the station.

Ms. Low said they chose the afternoon/evening commute because they thought in the morning people would be rushing to work, but for 4th and King they could go there in the morning and evening.

Ms. Thoe noted that recently there have been a number of survey attempts on public transit when she's arriving at the station and she just wants to get on the train.

Mr. Brazil agreed that more people would be inclined to interact when deboarding than boarding.

Vice Chair Olson also agreed that people usually time getting to the station right on time for their train and wouldn't have extra time to try out the samples.

Mr. Brinsfield said BART did outreach on their new consists, and asked if staff had reached out to them. Mr. Brinsfield said perhaps staff could learn something from them regarding time of day and direction.

Ms. Low replied they spoke with VTA about their outreach and events around their new bike storage, which is one of the reasons staff mixed station outreach with community events that cyclists might attend. Ms. Low said she would reach out to BART as well.

Vice Chair Olson asked if staff intended to have one or two sample bikes there in case someone didn't have a bike that day.

Ms. Low said that was a great idea.

Ms. Thoe asked if there will be luggage capacity.

Ms. Low responded that there will be overhead storage and the seats would be cantilevered so it would be easier to store items underneath, but that there wouldn't be large, airport luggage areas.

Ms. Thoe asked if underneath the seat would be large enough to store a folding bicycle.

Ms. Low said staff can do measurements with the sample seats.

Mr. Bargar thanked Ms. Low for the presentation. He said he'd like clarity on how two bike cars is more efficient than three. He understood why it would be difficult to have bikes in all cars and that the gallery cars with only one door could take a long time for boarding/deboarding. But with two doors and more cyclists spread across cars, Mr. Bargar asked if that couldn't potentially help with deboarding time? He asked how the exact determination was made that two cars is more efficient than three. As an engineer, he questions assumptions.

Mr. Bargar also noted that SMART is demonstrating their trains and they have vertical hanging hooks and horizontal storage. Mr. Bargar asked if anyone has tried them out. He also noted ACE has storage similar to the stands and was wondering how well it works for them and if we spoke with them.

Ms. Low mentioned that while they looked into a number of different onboard storage options, the biggest difference between Caltrain and other systems is the number of bikes onboard. Ms. Low stated that the main issue is how we can fit the most bikes as possible.

Mr. Bargar said they are diagonal stands.

Ms. Low said they did look at metal diagonal stands but those transit systems had more space due to less bikes.

Mr. Bargar said the hybrid option might have some stands and asked if there was something that a person could lock their bike to with something like a U-lock?

Ms. Low said she can look into the bike locking option, but operationally we don't lock bikes to the train because it could cause delays.

Ms. Thoe asked in regards to two bike cars versus three, is it Caltrain's policy that you have to have a conductor assigned to the bike car?

Ms. Low No, but having one present helps with the boarding/deboarding process.

Ms. Thoe asked if a third conductor was added to the third car bike car bombardier trains?

Ms. Low said no they have not, but she has heard from Operations that it's made it very difficult on the conductor to provide the level of service needed.

Chair Provence said anecdotally it doesn't see it problematic to have three cars because generally it's the same people riding everyday.

Ms. Thoe asked if there was a way to develop some kind of dialogue with conductors to better understand why some have bike tags, and rules in the bike car. Ms. Thoe said it would be a good time to have a conversation and find out what is stressing them, and if there was one behavior that needs to stop that the BAC could help push out to help the conductors so that a third bike car might be more possible.

Ms. Low said figuring out how to work better with the conductors is a great idea.

Mr. Tietjen wanted to emphasize that for the three bike cars, the main problem is capacity--if we don't meet the capacity we don't get the funding, and that there would be more details on that in August.

Chair Provence said he's voiced his concerns about hooks and folding seats and wanted discuss the sign that would be posted by this area. He asked what would be on it, and noted that even though it's early in the process, it's important.

Ms. Low said that they would want the committee's input.

Mr. Brinsfield asked if any of the signs would be multilingual, and if there are there federal or state policies on that?

Ms. David, who is the acting Title VI administrator, said due to funding constraints they have put an emphasis on pictograms.

Ms. Low will look into their ability to have at least two languages or a translation number.

Ms. Thoe wants the Committee's thoughts on the fold up seats and hanging bikes. She said after talking with Mr. Bargar and Ms. Li from SFBC, she has real hesitation creating a conflict between ADA seats and bicycle riders. She said it has the potential to pit two groups that don't have any animosity against each other and that she hesitates supporting the installation of something like that.

Mr. Tietjen pointed out that the lavatory car will be lined up with the mini-highs, so those will be the cars first boarded by anyone in a wheelchair and that three other cars will be boarded with an ADA passenger first before the bike car.

Ms. Thoe noted that it might not be a person in a wheelchair, and if that person boards the bike car and there is a bike hanging, it could create conflict.

Chair Provence said it's problematic when the passenger's alternative is to go upstairs.

Mr. Brazil offered a scenario where a bike commuter is onboard with their bike in a vertical hook, and then an ADA passenger boards and needs the seat and the cyclist then gets bumped and said he could see how it could be challenging.

Ms. Low stated that the signage would say that if a person is using the hooks, then the cyclist would need to stay near that area. She also said they're still looking into possibilities, and hope to present more on that in August.

Mr. Brazil said it's a constructive thought exercise rather than a criticism.

Ms. Buckley asked if there are any other case studies that have that situation.

Mr. Brinsfield noted that there are buses that have a similar set up. If a passenger comes on and needs the space, then the bike needs to move; therefore, the bike would get bumped or moved to the front bike rack. Mr. Brinsfield noted he thought it would be easier to control on a bus.

Ms. Low said they would look into that and ask what conflicts may have occurred because of that set up.

Vice Chair Olson brought up the monitors, and thought they would be a good way to help instruct on etiquette on the train and how to bring a bike onboard.

Ms. Low said they are hoping that the monitors can have that capability. She also mentioned that staff should do an instructional video for the new EMUs on how to bring one's bike onboard.

Chair Provence led a discussion on determining the date of the special meeting and whether the meeting would replace the scheduled September meeting or be in addition to that meeting. Two dates were suggested: August 24 or September 7. It was determined that staff would follow up to determine member availability and number of meetings.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

No items.

STAFF REPORT – Brent Tietjen

Mr. Tietjen reported that Lori Low would be staffing the BAC moving forward.

Proposed Fare Changes

Chair Provence asked about the elasticity number and if they expect a 17% drop in ridership.

Mr. Tietjen said he would follow up and get clarification.

Tietjen will follow up (they selected a -.17 percentage points) and get clarification.

PCEP Construction Activities

Vice Chair Olson asked about the Los Gatos Creek Bridge.

Mr. Tietjen said it is a separate project not tied to electrification and that it is replacing the rail bridge.

Mr. Brazil said he could connect members to San Jose staff if they want more details.

Mr. Tietjen said there is a bike extension on the Los Gatos Creek Trail and the project has some funding to build a retaining wall to support that trail.

Bike Bump Report

Mr. Brinsfield noted that when someone reports an additional 25 he questions it. Mr. Brinsfield asked when something like this occurs, can staff check with the conductor to find out if anything happened that day?

Mr. Tietjen said if there's an anomaly we can follow up with rail staff, although we'd have to figure out a way to monitor it on a daily basis as conductors probably can't remember at a later date. Mr. Tietjen noted there would have to be some type of trigger that alerts staff to the info daily.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

The written correspondence packet was distributed.

Mr. Bargar noted that the negative experience written about of alcohol in the bike car on a game day triggered the memory of his water bottle holder being used as beer can holder. He suggested possibly limiting drinking to certain cars on game days and

that many commuters would appreciate it, although it would probably be difficult for conductors to enforce. Mr. Bargar reiterated he would appreciate it if the bike car was not a drinking car.

Ms. Buckley noted that bicyclists might like beer too.

Mr. Brazil asked if there are rules regarding not drinking at certain times?

Mr. Tietjen said there is no drinking on the train after 9:00 p.m. on game days.

COMMITTEE REQUESTS

Mr. Brazil thanked Brent Tietjen for his work on the BAC.

Mr. Brazil said Ford GoBike launched and that San Jose has 28 stations active, with 42 in the next month or so, and 84 in spring. He also noted that the Santa Clara Caltrain pedestrian undercrossing is open, which is a big deal for Avaya games and on July 29 there will be a special train where fans can take Caltrain free to the game.

Mr. Brinsfield discussed the Silicon Valley Bike Summit and said that VTA is working on cross county corridor information and is updating its bike maps.

Ms. Buckley said they will be conducting their bike and pedestrian count from September 12 to September 17 and they need volunteers—there are 35 different locations. Ms. Buckley said it's good data and she will send information about it to the Committee.

Chair Provence thanked Mr. Tietjen for his work with the Committee.

The Committee joined in, in thanking Mr. Tietjen.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:

To be determined . Staff will poll members for their availability for a special meeting in August or early September.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.