



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 5, 2018

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

CAC members present: Kian Alavi, Hala Hijazi, Becky Hogue, John Larson, Peter Sachs, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling, and Rachel Zack (8)

CAC Member Absent: Ablog (1)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Eric Cordoba, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Alberto Quintanilla, Mike Tan, and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that the Transportation Authority would be partnering with the Global Climate Action to host a clean transportation scavenger hunt on Monday, September 10. He said the scavenger hunt was social-media based and would showcase all of the ways San Francisco residents, workers, and visitors could get around in the city's green, multimodal system. He noted that the public could visit [sfcta.org](http://sfcta.org) to sign up for a scavenger hunt email notification and that prizes would be awarded.

Chair Larson thanked Edward Mason, member of the public, for raising the issue of sidewalk cracks on Nellie and 23<sup>rd</sup> streets during public comment at a prior meeting. He said Transportation Authority staff passed on his input to San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) and they expedited repairs at both locations. He mentioned SFPW was monitoring the repairs and would use the information to inform a plan of action with the contractor.

Chair Larson restated Peter Tannen's request to the Transportation Authority to have the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) attend a future CAC meeting to provide an update on Muni operational issues. He said Supervisor Brown had requested a hearing on the issues and the hearing was expected to be held at the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee. He said the hearing date was not yet known, but that the SFMTA was currently preparing for the hearing and had agreed to share any materials with the CAC at the same time they are made available to the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Larson announced that the next CAC meeting would be held September 26, 2018.

During public comment Edward Mason said the sidewalk cracks highlighted a bigger systemic issue with SFPW regarding structural problems, quality assurance and contract administration. He thanked the Transportation Authority for fast tracking his request. He urged the CAC to do their due diligence and monitor newly constructed sidewalks and curbs.

### Consent Agenda

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the July 25, 2018 Meeting – ACTION

#### 4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION

#### 5. Progress Report for Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION

Peter Tannen asked why the project had not progressed in terms of percent complete since the July CAC progress report. He noted that both the July and September progress reports stated that the project had progressed 1% from 26% to 27%.

Mike Tan, Administrative Engineer, said the project had been progressing about 1% per month and said there was typo in the September report that did not reflect the 1% percent increase from the previous month. He said the contractor and subcontractor were moving along with the project at a slow pace given the nature of the underground work.

Chair Larson said he understood that the delays were due to utilities and potholing and asked if there was a work plan to deal with those specific issues. He also asked if there would a jump in percentage complete once the utility work was completed.

Mr. Tan said the utility work would take about 2 years to complete. He said there was a lot of surface area to cover and that the contractor was only doing a few blocks at a time in order to keep the street open. He said the utility work made it difficult for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) portion of the project, in the median, to be worked on and that the median was currently being used as staging for materials or to divert traffic. Mr. Tan also confirmed that the percent complete measure would increase much more rapidly after the underground work is completed.

Peter Sachs said airport runways like roads similarly faced pothole issues which sometimes would require the airport to close the runway for a few days to fill severe potholes. He asked if an analysis had been done to close Van Ness Avenue for a few weeks to allow the work to get done a lot faster, noting that a short closure that accelerates work maybe better than 2 years of inconvenience.

Mr. Tan said the traffic management plan discussed diverting traffic to Franklin and Gough Streets but that there were currently no plans to shut down Van Ness. He said he understood that closing Van Ness would accelerate progress, but that it would affect businesses that are on the street.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said Peter Gabancho, Van Ness BRT Project Manager, was unable to attend the CAC meeting but she would request that he address the question at the next CAC meeting.

Mr. Tan said the BRT would be phased throughout the project and said contractor were currently working on the northeastern portion of Van Ness. He said construction would shift to the other side of the street once that area was reopened to traffic.

Kian Avian asked what was being done to get the project back on track and asked what was happening with the affected citizens who relied on Van Ness.

Mr. Tan said the SFMTA had community advisory and business advisory committees specific to the Van Ness BRT project that were performing public outreach.

Chris Waddling asked if the pace of the project would accelerate after utility and underground work was completed.

Mr. Tan replied in the affirmative.

Chris Waddling asked if the proposed finish date on the underground work was known.

Mr. Tan estimated that the utility and underground work would be completed by the end of 2019. He noted that the BRT would be phased in during construction and the project would be

completed by the end of 2020.

During public comment Roland Lebrun asked why potholing was necessary, when performing underground work, when ground penetrating radar (GPR) was available. He asked if SFPW used GPR.

Mr. Tan said SFMTA was using GPR but noted that it had limitations depending on the types of soils and did not always fully reveal structures and utility lines. He said potholing gave visual confirmation.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Kian Alavi.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog (1)

### **End of Consent Agenda**

#### **6. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$8,062,238 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Six Requests, with Conditions – ACTION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling asked about the Powell BART station modernization project, asking if BART's wayfinding had considered visually impaired passengers and what type of signage was provided to visually impaired passengers.

Michael Wong, project manager at BART, said in terms of what was done for the visually impaired, it was best to speak with the agency's access department and community relations. He said spaces were being opened at the station as part of the modernization project.

Chris Waddling asked what signage was made available for visually impaired passengers.

Mr. Wong said that some of the signage had braille but that the subject project was geared towards modernization with global wayfinding signage.

Rachel Zack requested that BART provide a memo to the CAC on what BART normally has done in regard to wayfinding for the visually impaired. She also asked what the riding public experience would be while the Powell Modernization Project was underway and asked if the construction would cause the station to shut down or if there would be rerouting.

Mr. Wong said the station would remain open during construction and there would be barriers set up to block portions of work being done. He said the fare gate banks could be closed off for a certain amount of time, when being worked on, but that access would continue.

Peter Tannen noted that the project description referenced the BART Powell station ceiling and lighting project that had been taking years to complete. He asked if there was a progress update.

Mr. Wong acknowledged that BART had some challenges with that project and cited the following: challenges due to internal BART process getting authorization to do the work; the need to receive approval from the San Francisco Fire Department for sprinklers which triggered the need for additional equipment requests, and required more time and more interagency coordination; and lighting design. He said BART was working towards getting the project completed as fast as they can.

Peter Tannen asked what the estimated completion date was for the ceiling and lighting project.

Mr. Wong said the estimated completion date would be Spring 2019.

Peter Tannen mentioned that funds for the Powell BART project were requested to be redirected from the 24<sup>th</sup> Street BART Station and asked why there was a lack of community support for the project at 24<sup>th</sup> Street BART Station.

Michael Wong said he was not involved in that project but would follow up with the CAC.

Kian Alavi asked how traffic calming was evaluated and monitored by the SFMTA. He referenced a block on Shotwell Street that worked well and another with calming via raised crosswalks at ends that slowed vehicles down at the entrance, but not effectively mid-block.

Casey Hildreth, Project Manager at the SFMTA, said the mentioned section on Shotwell Street was part of a home zone project and not part of the subject traffic calming program. He said the traffic calming program focused on mid-block speeding and occasionally installed raised crosswalks. He said the program looked at speed humps which were effective, cost effective and did not take away parking. He said various departments also review the program proposals like the San Francisco Fire Department.

John Larson asked about the Great Highway Permanent Restoration Project and about a recommendation from the SPUR plan that had called for the conversion of the lower portion to no vehicular traffic and turning it a bike and pedestrian trail. He asked if it was a long-term plan.

David Frohlich, Project Manager at SFPW, said the long-term plan was to close the Great Highway between Sloat and Skyline Boulevards. He said the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) had a project that would rebuild a tunnel that held sewer lines along the Great Highway and would divert traffic up Skyline and Sloat Boulevard to access the remaining segments of the Great Highway. He said PUC construction was estimated to start in 2023 and said there was also a trail and parking lot project being led by the Recreation and Parks Department which was estimated to start between 2019 - 2020. He said when the Great Highway closes, there would be an access road for PUC access and that the trail would remain open.

Peter Tannen asked if there were provisions for bicycles and pedestrians as part of the interim Great Highway Permanent Restoration Project.

Mr. Frohlich replied there were not provisions for bicycles and pedestrians and that the project was to restore the roadway from a previous storm.

Chris Waddling asked if there were plans for the eastern section of Sloat and Skyline Boulevard

Mr. Frohlich replied in the affirmative and said SFMTA and SFPW were working with a consultant on preliminary engineering. He said they hoped to have project completed before PUC closed the roadway in 2023.

Ms. LaForte said the improvements to Sloat and Skyline intersection were proposed in the 2019 5YPP item later on the agenda.

Mr. Frohlich said Caltrans had a project for the Sloat and Great Highway intersection which would happen after the road restoration project.

Kian Alavi asked if SFPW could follow up could on questions raised during Item 2's public comment regarding quality of installation of sidewalks and curbs.

Mr. Frohlich said SFPW had specs with all contractors and tested materials in a testing lab. He said SFPW was working on revising their standards plans around tree wells and curb ramps and

was considering adding rebar to the specs to help prevent cracking.

During public comment Jackie Sachs asked how the remodeling of the BART Powell Station would impact Third Street Light Rail that was coming into Union Square and if there would be any conflict.

Mr. Wong said there would be an opening at the east end of the Powell Station once Central Subway opens. He said he did not have the exact plans but did not believe there would be any conflict.

Mr. Mason asked about the Muni Forward and schools projects that would include sidewalk and curb work and mentioned that he recently saw new ramps that were marked up with paint to be dug up as part of an upcoming signal project. He asked if the projects were being done in a coordinated effort and being fiscally responsible.

Chris Waddling asked that the request for Powell Station Modernization be severed.

Peter Sachs moved to sever the request for Powell Station Modernization, seconded Hala Hijazi.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog (1)

Peter Sachs moved to approve the severed request for Powell Station Modernization, seconded by Becky Hogue.

The severed item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Zack (7)

Abstain: CAC Member Waddling (1)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog (1)

Chris Waddling moved to approve the underlying item, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog (1)

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Pennsylvania Alignment as the Preferred Alternative for Grade Separations at 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Mission Bay Drive on the Approach to the Caltrain Downtown Extension – ACTION**

Luis Zurinaga, Consultant, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson noted the decision to carry this item over was a unanimous decision of the CAC, stating that the members all had concerns to varying degrees and wanted more time to think about the item.

Peter Sachs appreciated the chair's remarks. He thanked staff for the additional information and explanations which he found helpful but noted that he still had concerns. For example, he asked why the city didn't just wait until Caltrain and California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) know what their needs are and then take an action on a comprehensive alternative. Mr. Sachs continued by saying if the alignment alternatives don't include the cost of yard relocation on top

of their already big price tags, it would not be good to find out several years from now that the cost must be increased even more to accommodate relocation of the yard.

Susan Gygi project manager for the RAB said that there are opportunities related to conversations that can be had about how to get Caltrain to the transit center and how to deliver service. She noted that a robust conversation can be had on what to do on the right-of-way after a preferred alternative is adopted. Ms. Gygi said that the RAB Study looked at worst case (relocation of the railyard) and that is what the report reflected. She stated that the yard might be able to stay where it is and a more robust conversation could happen once we know the needs from Caltrain and CHSRA. She acknowledged that this is a little like the cart before the horse, but San Francisco wanted to be out in front helping to steer the conversation. With respect to the cost of the yard relocation, Ms. Gygi confirmed that those costs were reflected in the cost estimate for the Pennsylvania and Third Street alignments.

Chris Waddling said that the original name of the study had I-280 Boulevard in its name and he knew that that part of the name was jettisoned fairly early in the process. However, he said railyard alternatives remained in the title and as such, it was disappointing to have no definitive recommendation on the railyard. Mr. Waddling commented that Caltrain has known about the need to do an operational assessment for years and it was a bit disconcerting to still be waiting for that information, as well.

Mr. Waddling noted that even if the yard does not have to move due to the alignment, it will eventually be moved because the current railyard is a very large and valuable piece of land given its location. He commented that the City of Brisbane doesn't want the yard and that means it could end up in the Bayview. Mr. Waddling said the city should be talking to people in the community and letting them know that this is being talked about even if it is just a possibility.

Adam Van Der Water, with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, provided an overview of the city's perspective. He mentioned the concerns with at grade crossings that would impair access to Mission Bay, an area that is growing and will have a significant portion of the city's affordable housing. He noted that depressing the city streets beneath the rail was akin to creating more "hairballs" in the City, which no one wanted. Mr. Van Der Water said that depressing the rail makes the most sense. With respect to the yard issue, he referenced Mr. Zurinaga's description of some of the options. He continued by acknowledging that the city would be very interested in transit-oriented development on the yard, but stressed that at only 5% design, no decisions are being made on the yard. With respect to rail alignments, he noted Pennsylvania looks much better, but there are many more questions to answer and that the city would move forward publicly to address those questions.

Chair Larson opined that most people would likely not support at grade crossings but would support grade separations. He said that the way the study information has been presented has raised concerns citing alternatives presented that factor in having to move the railyard, and then references that indicate maybe something else could be done with the railyard, but without fully studying other options like undergrounding. He said there ought to have been a better way to conceptually show the yard options without giving the locations away to the public. Chair Larson said that the Pennsylvania alignment in concept seems fine. He asked if RAB did public input on the yard issue and what was presented to the RAB community advisory group.

Mr. Zurinaga suggested that the difficulty may be that CAC members are assuming that the Pennsylvania alignment and railyard are tied at the hip. He said they are not, that the yard will most likely be moved sometime in the future – date unknown, and it needs to be further studied, and that the Pennsylvania alignment did not require yard relocation. He clarified that the issue of potential yard relocation also applied to the other alignments.

Mr. Van Der Water said that once the project team confirmed that I-280 element was independent of the rail alignment decision, the team tabled the I-280/boulevard scope to address later as part of a separate effort with the community and Caltrans. He said that potentially, the yard could remain where it is now on the surface or underground, be relocated south within or outside of San Francisco, or in some combination of all of the above.

Ms. Gygi acknowledged that the project name was not great. She said that the original scope had five elements, with the first being the alignment. She said they changed the name at the end to better reflect the final scope.

Mr. Waddling thanked Mr. Zurinaga for saying that regardless of the alignment, the railyard would probably move. He said that this hadn't been plainly stated before and that it cleared up his main sticking point in terms of the alignment decision.

Peter Tannen asked what the cost of relocating the railyard was assumed to be in the cost table shown in page 3 of the memo.

Ms. Gygi said she could provide that information after the meeting, but generally the estimates included programmatic costs based on examples from around the world, land costs, location considerations, and contingency.

Peter Tannen referenced the minutes from the last CAC meeting where Mr. Sachs had pointed to the RAB report where it said that the Pennsylvania alignment required relocation of the yard. He asked how this would be reconciled.

Ms. Gygi replied that yard relocation was assumed in the RAB Study for both the Pennsylvania and Third Street alignments to show the biggest impacts. She said the language in the report would be modified to reflect the CAC discussion and to be more in line with the memo in the agenda packet.

Chair Larson reported that he had received a phone call from Bob Feinbaum of Save Muni who could not attend but wanted the CAC to continue to table this item, noting he felt that the item as presented didn't fully illustrate that it was a two-part process between the tunnel, which he supported, and the alignment which he felt was a separate issue. Chair Larson apologized if he hadn't correctly conveyed the message.

Peter Straus, representing the Transit Riders Union and Friends of DTX, said they encourage this project to be built as soon as possible as it is next priority after Central Subway. He said choosing the preferred alignment is on the critical path and urged moving quickly rather than delaying the project further. Mr. Straus said the yard issue is not on the critical path and that like the CAC, he has urged the project team to be more public about yard relocation. He concluded by saying for various reasons, the Pennsylvania alignment is cheaper, faster to build and more cost effective and he urged the CAC to endorse it.

Roland Lebrun said that the major problem with all the alignments is that the train box (1543') and platforms (800') are not the same length. He spoke in favor of the 7<sup>th</sup> Street alignment. He said the focus should be on ensuring six 1400-foot platforms that will have the capacity of the current railyard and will connect the transit center to the East Bay. When that happens, Mr. Lebrun said the yard will move to the East Bay. He said Appendix B of the RAB report shows that six high rises will need to be demolished. He asked the CAC to review his response to the Pennsylvania alignment, that was forwarded to them before the start of the CAC meeting.

Jim Patrick, said the alignment was solid until 4<sup>th</sup> Street. He suggested 4<sup>th</sup> Street should be rethought along with the 7<sup>th</sup> Street tunnel that Mr. Lebrun mentioned, citing proximity to Giants and Warriors stadium and the ability to integrate with the T-line and bus terminals.

Ron Miguel said that he had the pleasure of chairing the RAB community working group. He said that he had questioned the title of the study at the very beginning and that by the second meeting, the group had eliminated the I-280 freeway as it had nothing to do with the alignment question. Mr. Miguel emphasized that what was important in this report is to get a concept alignment on the books. He ended by noting that he agreed that most likely the yard will move in the future.

There was no further public comment.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Tannen

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog (1)

## **8. 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan 5-Year Prioritization Program Update – INFORMATION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Sachs said that he loved that there was funding proposed for the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue/M Ocean View Subway. He asked if there was a way to make the funds available earlier, as it was important get the project started because it will inform other nearby projects on the West Side, including Park Merced. He also asked if the F-line extension proposal would include rehabilitating the Fort Mason tunnel. He said he had heard cost estimates of \$60 million for rehabilitating the tunnel and he was not convinced that was a good use of funds.

Peter Tannen asked where more detail could be found on the project proposals. Ms. LaForte said that Project Information Forms for all project proposals were available on the Transportation Authority website as an attachment to the CAC meeting materials by following the agenda link for the September 5, 2018 meeting.

Chris Waddling asked which districts had used their Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) funds and which had not. He asked what the Transportation Authority had learned regarding how to help Supervisors and the public use the funds. He asked whether the amount programmed to NTIP should increase in the 2019 5YPPs.

Ms. LaForte said that District 7, for example, had not used its NTIP Capital funds, but that the district had a robust participatory budgeting process that resulted in allocation of General Fund



funds to many of the small safety improvement projects that NTIP might otherwise have funded. She said there was always a need to do more, but NTIP seemed to be the right size. She pointed out that SFMTA's new Community Response Team program would make \$100,000 available per year similar to those funded by NTIP.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked whether street trees were only planted as part of capital projects. He said that capital funds should not be used to replace trees that had not been properly maintained by the City. He said that maintenance should be the responsibility of the operator, but the planting trees as part of a capital project like Masonic was okay.

Jackie Sachs said that she had worked on 5YPP updates when she was on the CAC. She reminded the CAC that Prop K would have to go before the voters for reauthorization. She said that while Prop K included funds for Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Geary Light Rail was not funded despite the fact that it was grandfathered into Prop K from Prop B. She said that Geary BRT was supposed to be light rail ready.

Chair Larson reiterated that CAC members should direct additional comments and questions to Transportation Authority staff.

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of a Support Position on Assembly Bill 1184 (Ting) – ACTION**

Michele Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Chair Larson said he was surprised that Uber, Lyft and the ride-hail companies were in support of the bill.

Ms. Beaulieu said the bill came out of negotiations between Supervisor Peskin and the Transportation Network Companies (TNCs). She said the bill was a compromise, which involved Supervisor Peskin removing his business gross receipts tax on TNCs from the November ballot.

Rachel Zack said that she understood that there was a conversation regarding not wanting to disincentive shared rides, but she asked why there was a reduction in the tax rate for shared rides given that their pricing is already discounted on the apps.

Ms. Beaulieu said reports on TNC congestion demonstrated the need to continue to incentivize shared rides but did not know how the specific tax percentages were reached.

Kian Alavi asked if taxing rides originating in San Francisco versus trips beginning and ending in San Francisco could be further explained.

Ms. Beaulieu said she was not part of the negotiations for the construction of the bill, but thought it was one of the most straightforward ways to collect this tax.

Kian Alavi asked if the revenue projections were known.

Ms. Beaulieu said she did not have that information.

Kian Alavi asked if there were provision to see where TNCs would be coming from or data to know how much to tax TNCs.

Ms. Beaulieu said most of the details had been left out of the bill and would be part of the work done by the City and County of San Francisco to develop the details of what would be placed on the ballot.

Kian Alavi asked why the Transportation Authority was seeking the CAC's support when the agency director had already sent out a letter of support on the bill.

Ms. Beaulieu said the Governor was looking at the bill and had 30 days to sign or veto the bill so

all support was helpful, especially since there was vocal opposition. She said the item would go in front of the Transportation Authority Board on September 11, 2018.

Chris Waddling asked who was the vocal opposition.

Ms. Beaulieu said the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers had opposed the bill. She said there was a long list of supporters of the bill online.

Ms. Lombardo said Waymo was the most vocal opposition.

Chris Waddling said given that the bill was on the Governor's desk and had passed both houses that it was a good first step. He said he would like to see rides originating from other parts of the state also being taxed.

Rachel Zack asked if the Transportation Authority was preparing to study the congestion impacts before and after the possible implementation of a ride-hailing tax.

Ms. Lombardo said the Transportation Authority would track the effects and noted that the TNC tax was not structured to be a pricing tax, but rather intended to tax TNCs for their "fair share" of funding transportation improvements. She said the Transportation Authority would have an update on congestion pricing thinking at a future CAC and Board meeting.

Rachel Zack said she would like to see data to show why shared rides should be taxed at a lower percentage.

Kian Alavi asked if the revenue generated from the tax would be given to the Transportation Authority.

Ms. Lombardo said getting the bill through the legislature once it was amended was tremendous work and that part of the way that it got approved was by drafting a simple bill that allows the details to be figured out at the local level. She said it was not known if the Transportation Authority would receive a portion of the revenues.

Chair Larson asked if the plan was to place the measure on the November 2018 ballot.

Ms. Beaulieu said the bill would be effective as of January 2019, if signed by the Governor, and so it would not be able to place a measure on the November 2018 ballot.

There was no public comment.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the item, seconded by Kian Alavi

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog (1)

## **10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Peter Sachs requested that when the item of Muni operational issues is calendared that the CAC concurrently calendar an action item to discuss whether to endorse SFMTA leadership or not.

Peter Tannen requested that the CAC consider an action item to rename Presidio Parkway on behalf of Michael Painter, who developed the parkway concept and recently passed away.

Rachel Zack requested an update on SFMTA's dockless bikeshare pilot program that had begun in April 2018.

Chair Larson requested an update on the Muni M Line given that it was on the 2019 Prop K strategic plan 5-year prioritization list of programs.

**11. Public Comment**

During general public comment Jackie Sachs stated that former CAC member Brian Larkin helped author Prop B and asked that he be recognized for his time on the CAC. She requested an update on the Other Nine to Five project and mentioned that Supervisor Tang had talked about bringing back public-school buses.

Ed Mason showed photos of idling commuter shuttle buses, buses with no license plates or no permits and additional violations. He stated that the 2017 status report would be presented at Muni CAC tomorrow night.

Peter Tanned reiterated the request to recognize former CAC member Brian Larkin.

There was no public comment.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.