SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT COMMISSION



September 23, 2014
Special Meeting
9:00 A.M.

Room 400 - City Hall #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place (400 Van Ness Avenue) City and County of San Francisco

EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

COMMISSIONERS

LARRY MAZZOLA

President

LINDA S. CRAYTON

Vice President

ELEANOR JOHNS

RICHARD J. GUGGENHIME

PETER A. STERN

JOHN L. MARTIN Airport Director

SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94128

Minutes of the Airport Commission Special Meeting of September 23, 2014

CALENDAR A	RESOLUTION NUMBER PAGE			
A.	ITEM	TITLE CALL TO ORDER:	HOWBER	4
B.		ROLL CALL:		4
C.		ADOPTION OF MINUTES: Special Meeting of September 9, 2014	14-0184	4
D.		ITEMS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS:		4
E.	1.	ITEMS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION, OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE: Award Professional Services Agreement, Contra 10005.41 - Project Management Support Servic for Taxilanes H & M Relocation - HNTB Corp.		4-5
	2.	Award Professional Services Agreement, Contra 10003.43, A & E Design Services for Temporary B & Security Screening Checkpoint - Corgan + L Joint Venture	B/A	5
	3.	Commence RFP Process for Two Retail Concession Leases in Terminal 3	14-0187 14-0188	6
F.	4.	CONSENT CALENDAR OF ROUTINE ADMINISTI MATTERS: Award Contract 50016 - Maintenance, Support, Integration Services for Physical Security Inform Manager Event Management System - Verint Vi Solutions, Inc.	& ation	6
	5.	Award Professional Services Contract 50021 - As-Needed CEQA Environmental Planning Serv - RS&H California, Inc.	ices 14-0190	6
	6.	Modification No. 2 to Contract 9073 - Siemens F Parcel, & Airport Logistics, LLC	Postal, 14-0191	7
	7.	Modification No. 1 to Contract 9189 - As-Needed Management Development Training Firm - Piras Group	-	7
	8.	Modification No. 2 to Contract 9344 - Hotel Development Consulting Services to Proceed w Phase 2 Scope of Services - Jones Lang LaSall Americas, Inc.		7

G.	9.	PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed Summary of Amendments to Sections 1 thru 14 of the Airport's Rules and Regulations	7-22
H.		NEW BUSINESS: Fines in proposed revisions to Rules and Regulations TNCs	23 23-24
l.		CORRESPONDENCE:	
J.		CLOSED SESSION:	
K.		ADJOURNMENT:	

AIRPORT COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES September 23, 2014

A. CALL TO ORDER:

The regular meeting of the Airport Commission was called to order at 9:00 AM in Room 400, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

* * *

B. ROLL CALL:

Present: Hon. Larry Mazzola, President

Hon. Linda S. Crayton, Vice President

Hon. Eleanor Johns

Hon. Richard J. Guggenhime

Hon. Peter A. Stern

* * *

C. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the special meeting of September 9, 2014 were adopted unanimously.

No. 14-0184

* * *

D. ITEMS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS:

There were no items initiated by Commissioners.

* * *

- E. ITEMS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION, OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE: Item No. 1 was moved by Commissioner Crayton and seconded by Commissioner Stern. The vote to approve was unanimous.
 - Award Professional Services Agreement for Contract 10005.41 Project <u>Management Support Services for Taxilanes H & M Relocation - HNTB</u> Corporation - \$2,250,000

No. 14-0185 Resolution awarding Professional Services

Agreement, Contract 10005.41, Project Management Support Services for Taxilanes H & M Relocation, to HNTB Corp., in an amount not to exceed \$2,250,000 and a duration of 28 months from Notice to Proceed.

Mr. Geoff Neumayr, Deputy, Design & Construction said this item awards Project Management Support Services for the Taxilane Relocations for the new Boarding Area B Project to HNTB in the amount not to exceed \$2.5 million for a duration of 28 months. HNTB was the sole proposer from the pool list. The other firms listed

on the pool list did not propose because they are waiting for other work that will be going out to the list down the road. HNTB was found to be responsive to this RFP. The scope of work provides Project Management Support Services for the realignment of the South field taxilanes. The LBE subcontracting goal for this contract was 20% and the Consultant has committed to achieving this goal. We recommend approval and I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

Item No. 2 was moved by Commissioner Crayton and seconded by Commissioner Guggenhime. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Award of Professional Services Agreement for Contract No. 10003.43
 Architecture & Engineering Design Services for Temporary Boarding Area B & Security Screening Checkpoint - Corgan + LDA Joint Venture - \$4,778,552

No. 14-0186

Resolution awarding Professional Services
Agreement, Contract No. 10003.43, Architecture &
Engineering Design Services for Temporary B/A B &
Security Screening Checkpoint to Corgan + LDA, JV,
in an amount not to exceed \$4,778,552 and for a
duration of 20 months from the Notice to Proceed.

Mr. Neumayr said this item awards a Professional Services Contract for the temporary Boarding Area B project in the amount of \$4.8 million to Corgan + LDA Architects, a Joint Venture. The scope of work provides architecture engineering services for the design of the temporary Boarding Area B project. This project will be in service for approximately four years while the permanent Boarding Area B is being constructed. The scope of services will include programming services, concept drawing preparations, design development, development of construction documents and construction administration. Nine proposals were submitted in response to this Request for Proposals. A Selection Panel was convened to rank and score both the technical qualifications and the oral interviews. Staff has determined that Corgan + LDA Architects JV was the highest qualified proposer with an LBE rating of 7.5%. Staff negotiated a lump sum amount of \$4.8 million with a duration of 20 months from the notice to proceed for the estimated construction cost of \$63 million. The fee for this contract is divided into five phases and include programming, design, design development, contract documents, and construction administration. CMD has approved a 25% LBE sub consultant participation goal and the Consultant has committed to achieving this goal. We recommend approval and I would glad to answer any questions you might have in regards to this.

Commissioner Crayton asked if we have done business with this firm in the past.

Mr. Neumayr replied that we have not done business with Corgan as an Architect.

Commissioner Crayton asked if they have had other projects of this size.

Mr. Neumayr replied they have. Recently they were one of the prime architects on the Sacramento International Airport terminal complex.

Item No. 3 was moved by Commissioner Crayton and seconded by Commissioner Guggenhime. The vote to approve was unanimous.

3. <u>Authorization to Commence Request for Proposals Process for Two Retail</u>
Concession Leases in Terminal 3

No. 14-0187 No. 14-0188 Resolutions approving the proposed minimum qualification requirements and lease specifications, and authorizing staff to issue a Request for Proposals and conduct an informational conference for two (2) Retail Concession Leases in Terminal 3.

Mr. Leo Fermin, Chief Business & Finance Officer said this item authorizes us to commence the selection process for two separate retail leases. One lease is for a specialty retail concept with two locations post security ... one at the gates near the entrance to Boarding Area E, and a second location in the F Hub. The second lease is for a bookstore at the entrance to Boarding Area F, however, construction plans for Terminal 3 are still being finalized and there is the possibility that we may have to move the bookstore to the F Hub where Mango Apparel and a newsstand are currently located. The lease for these two stores expires in December 2015, so if we have to go to this Plan B, we will return to you this December to authorize an RFP for this alternative location.

* * *

- F. CONSENT CALENDAR OF ROUTINE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS: Item No. 4 was removed from the calendar. Item Nos. 5 through 8 of the Consent Calendar were moved by Commissioner and seconded by Commissioner. The vote to approve was unanimous.
 - 4. Award Contract No. 50016 Maintenance, Support, and Integration Services for the Physical Security Information Manager (PSIM) Event Management System Verint Video Solutions, Inc. (VERINT) \$550,000

Resolution awarding Contract No. 50016 for Maintenance, Support, and Integration Services for the PSIM Event Management System to Verint Video Solutions, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$550,000 beginning Oct. 1, 2014 thru Oct. 31, 2018.

5. <u>Award of Professional Services Contract No. 50021 - As-Needed CEQA</u> Environmental Planning Services - RS&H California, Inc. - \$1,385,000

No. 14-0190

Resolution awarding Professional Services Contract 50021 to RS&H California, Inc. for As-Needed CEQA Environmental Planning Consulting Services in a total contract amount not-to-exceed \$1,385,000 for a five-year term.

6. <u>Modification No. 2 to Contract No. 9073 - Siemens Postal, Parcel, & Airport Logistics, LLC - \$83,938</u>

No. 14-0191

Resolution approving Modification No. 2 to Contract No. 9073 with Siemens Postal, Parcel & Airport Logistics, LLC for repairs to recently purchased Passenger Boarding Bridges in an amount not to exceed \$83,938, resulting in a new total contract amount not to exceed \$1,488,423.

7. <u>Modification No. 1 to Contract No. 9189 - As-Needed Management Development Training Firm - Piras Group - \$250,000</u>

No. 14-0192

Resolution approving Modification No. 1 to Contract 9189 to the Piras Group for As-Needed Management Development Training to Senior and Managerial staff in the amount of \$250,000, for a new total contract amount of \$400,000.

8. <u>Modification No. 2 to Contract No. 9344 - Hotel Development Consulting Services to Proceed with Phase 2 of the Scope of Services - Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.</u>

No. 14-0193

Resolution approving Modification No. 1 to Contract No. 9344 for Hotel Development Consulting Services with Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc. to proceed with Phase 2 of the Scope of Services. No additional funds are being requested.

* * *

G. PUBLIC HEARING:

The Public Hearing was called to order at 9:11AM. There being no further public comment, the Public Hearing was closed at 10:16 AM. Item No. 9 was put over to the meeting of October 7, 2014.

9. <u>Public Hearing to Receive Comments on the Proposed Summary of Amendments to Sections 1 through 14 of the Airport's Rules and Regulations and to Vote on Adoption of the Proposed Amendments</u>

Section 1 – Definitions

Section 2 – Violation, Severability and Interpretation

Section 3 - General

Section 4 - Operation of Motor Vehicles

Section 5 – Aircraft Operation

Section 6 - Fire and Safety

Section 7 – Airport Security

Section 8 – Airport Environmental Standards

Section 9 - Airport Permit, Lease or Agreement Requirement

Section 10- Trip Reduction Rule

Section 11 – Noise Abatement Regulation

Section 12 – Labor/Peace Card Check Rule and Model Card Check Agreement

Section 13 – Free Speech and Expressive Activities

Section 14 - General Fines

Resolution approving the summary of amendments to Sections 1 through 14 of the Airport's Rules and Regulations and adopt the proposed amendments.

Mr. Jeff Littlefield, Deputy Director, Operations & Security said that the Airport Commission last adopted changes to its Rules and Regulations in April 2011. Since that time, it has become necessary to revise the Airport's Rules and Regulations to include several very important updates. This includes incorporating all Airport Operations Bulletins that have been issued over the last three years into this revision. We plan to include SFO's newly developed Commercial Ground Transportation permit for the TNCs (Transportation Network Companies) in this revision as well. We also have included the Airport's Water Conservation Policy, along with various operational requirements. As SFO remains focused on Safety, and has Safety & Security as our Number One Core Value, we've included a number of Safety & Security related revisions. These revisions specifically address procedural compliance and proper maintenance and upkeep of ground support equipment operating on the Airfield. And they are also consistent with industry best practices around the system. We've included a revision to Rule 14 which clarifies accountability and consequences for poorly maintained equipment, or behaviors that jeopardize the safety of our employee population and the traveling public. A company or a permit holder and/or an individual may be subject to proportionate fines depending on whether a safety violation is attributable to improper equipment, maintenance, or unsafe behavior. Another noteworthy change that we have implemented and developed is called our GSESIP, which is an Acronym for our Ground Support Equipment Safety Inspection Program. This program outlines the Airport's safety compliance expectations and calls out various types of scheduled and random equipment audits that will be performed throughout the year to ensure that airlines and ground handlers are managing safe operations and reducing and/or eliminating preventable accidents and employee injuries on the Airfield. The Airport remains confident that these revisions are appropriate and in the very best interest of employees, employers and the Airport community as a whole, as well as in support of our vision and culture of safety at SFO. With that, I recommend adoption of the Amendments to Rules 1 thru 14 of the Rules and Regulations as set forth in Attachments A, B, and C. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Crayton noted that the definition of limousine changed.

Mr. Littlefield said the limousines have a very cursory inspection that takes place and that inspection process hasn't changed. The real focus of the revisions is on our Airfield side. That's where the planes are loaded and unloaded, and all the tractors and tugs operate.

Mr. Mark Gruberg, SF Taxi Workers Alliance, which is a new taxi driver organization. I have long been associated with United Taxicab Workers, one of the founding organizations of this new group. We will be merging fully into it overtime. The plan for the SF Taxi Workers Alliance is to join with the National Taxi Workers Alliance and AFL/CIO affiliated union. We have well over 400 members right now, and hundreds more pledge to join. My first issue is the lack notification. United Taxicab Workers has long been on your mailing list but we didn't get notice of this for some reason. Another taxi driver sent me a link to the materials here on Friday. Our group has not had an opportunity to look at this. I understand there aren't significant changes in the taxi rules, but we would still like an opportunity to look it over thoroughly. We ask that you not make a decision on this today. I see that you now have regulations pertaining to TNCs. I understand that none of the TNCs are authorized to operate at the Airport, yet they operate everyday by the hundreds, maybe by the thousands. Very little is being done to stop this. I can't see why you would permit companies that are acting so blatantly in violation of your rules and of the law and reward them by welcoming them into the Airport, and allowing them to get permits when they're acting in complete contempt and defiance of the law right now. If you told them to stay away for a year and convince us that you are going to be law abiding citizens, then we'll reconsider you. But if you let them in right now you'll just be giving them a clean slate and wiping away all of this illegal activity that's taken place. That is not the way it's suppose to work. As taxicab drivers we're suppose to adhere to the rules and if we don't, we get banned from the Airport, we could get fined by the Airport, we can have permits removed. It should be the same for everyone.

Mr. Tracy MacCorkell, said I'm speaking to Rule 5.27. I'm a aircraft mechanic and I work at the International Terminal. Rule 5.27 requires reflective clothing. The company provides us with our uniforms and we must wear uniforms provided by the company. The only piece of reflective clothing they have given me is this vest. Not one stitch of reflective material. So, I'm required by the Airport to wear reflective material, which is great. The more reflective the better. The problem is my company also requires me to remove this vest when I do certain jobs. It's a hazard and it's going to get me killed. Also, when handling static discharge. I can damage equipment. The fine for Rule 5.27 is \$750. I don't have a choice on what I wear. It's given to me by the company, but they also require me to take it off in certain instances. So who's rules do I follow? The Airport's new rule or my company's rule? And I want to protect myself. I've given you photographs that are going around that shows you the hazards, the reasons why I would take this off. There's safety CBT by my company that tells me to take this off in certain instances ... it can get snagged on any piece in there. The inside label of the vest says to remove it for static discharge.

Commissioner Mazzola asked Mr. MacCorkell if he has grieved this with the employer and told them about the safety issues.

Mr. MacCorkell replied that we told them when they were coming out with their new uniforms that we would like reflective material and this is what they gave us. This is an old coveralls that has reflective material everywhere but they tell us to take it off because it has the tulip on it. They make me wear this and I've already injured myself once because of this vest, so I wear my old coveralls now.

Commissioner Crayton asked Mr. MacCorkell how he was injured.

Mr. MacCorkell replied I'm an electronics technician. There's very small hole in the bottom of the airplane where we install our electronic boxes. I had a vest on as I was coming out. The ladder is about five feet tall that I'm coming down onto, and I got it caught. I didn't feel it because this thing is light and as I stepped down onto the ladder, it snagged me and sent me forward. Luckily, one foot caught the ladder. So, I don't wear this anymore. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Mazzola announced Katherine Cassey.

Ms. Katherine Traczyk (Kasi) ... I'm Kasi with Teamsters Local 986/856 and I work at SFO as an aircraft mechanic. I've also worked as a Ramper and in Baggage Maintenance. I think we can agree that people can't be held accountable for decisions they are not responsible for making. For example, I can make a decision to stop at a stop sign or not stop at a stop sign. As Tracy mentioned, I don't make a decision about my required uniform. I have to wear the required uniform. And, since I've worked as both a Ramper and Baggage Maintenance, there is one piece of equipment that could seriously harm people wearing that vest and that's a Cargo Loader. If you look outside an aircraft, that's the conveyor that's loading your baggage onto the plane. There are many conveyors, there are many moving machines at an Airport and CalOsha requires that when you're working around moving machines that can pull you in, you wear close fitting clothing. You have many levels of tenants ... you have large tenants, you have your small tenants. I would hope that you really look at some of the policies you're putting in place. I would like to applaud the Commission for working to make SFO a safer environment. All safety professionals caution that when creating policy. beware of unintended hazards that maybe created by new policies.

Commissioner Johns asked if the required uniforms are provided by the employer, or do you have to pay for them yourselves.

Ms. Kasi replied they're provided.

Commissioner Johns asked if the employer has provided opportunities to hear feedback about the quality, safety, etc. of what they're providing.

Ms. Kasi said we've given feedback that we need more reflective clothing and we've given feedback about the loose clothing, and the response was to take the vest off when you're working in certain areas. There's not just one tenant and it's the tenants that would be held liable if someone is injured. And I wouldn't want to put the Commission in a situation where you were liable because you mandated something without requiring the tenants to fulfill it in a way that allows people to work safely.

Mr. Ralph Ortiz said I've been a mechanic with United Airlines for 28 ½ years and I currently serve as the Safety Chairman for the Teamsters at the Airport. There has been a discussion of shared responsibility between employer and employees. What I want to point out is that if there was a fatality or injury or something serious that triggered an OSHA investigation, OSHA would investigate and most likely cite

the employer. The employer would then point that it is not their policy but the Airport's policy that was violated. OSHA could potentially cite the Airport and the Airport would be liable because it conflicted with the tenant or employer's policy. The Airport could then be potentially liable and get cited by OSHA.

Commissioner Crayton asked if the concerns that are being raised have been reported to your companies. Have you received any feedback?

Mr. Ortiz replied no, not yet.

Commissioner Crayton asked if the purpose for coming here today is to also make sure we are aware of those concerns.

Mr. Ortiz replied that's correct.

Commissioner Johns asked if there are specific rule changes that are before us that you folks feel don't address your concerns, or are in conflict.

Mr. Ortiz said well the a specific one, among many of them, is wearing the vest because the employer specifically says that you will remove the vest anytime that you do a certain type of work. CalOSHA also clearly says you cannot wear loose clothing. So there is a conflict between the employer and CalOSHA and the Airport Commission's idea of what they want. Again, safety is paramount. I understand the Commission wants safety.

Mr. John Martin, Airport Director said we're hearing one issue which is reflective clothing which is very important to us. We can hear from Jeff now if you want, or you can wait until the end for Jeff Littlefield to comment on this specific item.

Commissioner Mazzola said let's wait until the end and Jeff can pick it up then.

Mr. Fred Wood, Teamsters Grievance Coordinator, San Francisco International Airport, said I first found out about the Rules over a month ago. I had my business agents and my safety committee look at them because we found that we're going to start holding employees responsible in the same manner that we do the company. I agree that there are some safety violations that need to be addressed, but to charge the employee \$750 ... that's half a paycheck. I've asked eff Littlefield to find other solutions to sharing the responsibility. Sharing that responsibility would not only require the employee to attend training courses all over again, but to have that employee's manager sit next to him for two hours while he goes through that training session. One way to get to a company is to tie up their time because they will hide money in strange places and not report it. They'll hide a \$750 fine by saying we had a party for someone. If we cited an employee for not wearing his vest, or not wearing appropriate attire and sent him to training again with his Manager sitting at his side with his cell phone off for two hours and not receiving calls about his aircraft going out late, you're going to get a response. I ask the Commission to please give us time to make adjustments to these outrageous fines to working people and their families.

Mr. Richard Petrovsky, 43 year mechanic with United Airlines and San Francisco and LA Teamster Representative out of Teamster SFO Local 856 and 986. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. No one would argue that safety has got to be a primary purpose out on the airfield. The concerns that we have, and vou've heard many of them today, are the admonishments and how to resolve the issue and get to the core of the problem of why these violations are occurring. We call the airfield the wild, wild west, and that's exactly what it is. Everyone is in a hurry, aircraft need to be turned, the company is pushing all the time to take care of the work in all of the aspects ... food, ramp, aircraft repairs, all have to be done quickly to get the aircraft back out on time. We realize there's an issue between hurry up and safety. The biggest concern we have right now is that we don't want to see any of the employees hit with admonishments when it comes to a conflict between company policy and Airport policy. That needs to be handled between the company and the Airport so they can come to a resolution and determine how we can best take care of safety issues. We ask that any conflicts between company and Airport policies regarding admonishments be given to the company and not the individual employee as was stated earlier. The fines have gone up dramatically and I believe it can be better handled by the company being involved.

Mr. Norm Tin said I'm the Field Representative for SEIU Local 1021. I represent the public sector employees and at this point in time I want to give you a different perspective. It's important to see the entire story and the story goes like this ... imagine yourself leaving here and going off to the Airport and you see red and blue lights flashing behind you. What's the feeling you have? Well, I represent the Airfield Safety Officers who will issue the admonishments. Using the example of \$750, that might be 1/4 of someones monthly salary. Can you imagine how that person feels? And you're going to be seeing the same ASOs day after day because you're working at the same spot. Safety is number one. It's a core value, and we definitely agree to that. But these are the concerns of the 9212s and the 9220s, the ASOs and the Supervisors. It's about the training, it's about protection, it's about having a safe protocol. Often they're expected to be like the Police, but they aren't. They are expected to be like first responders, as in the Asiana crash where they were actually on the scene before the first responders. With that, training might be inclusive of how to use mace, how to deal with an angry, raging worker. Possibly the employer could have programs to train all of those employees. Perhaps zero tolerance in threatening an officer, similar to the SFPD and its legal protection against assaulting an officer. Can you imagine being an ASO and doing an admonishment and then going off to Target and that person recognizes you, what do you do? The best practice might be if an employee gets admonished or a fined, the Supervisor also needs to attend the training. That helps to change the culture. Thank you.

Ms. Romina Loreto, representing the Service Workers at the Airport under SEIU, United Service Workers West. AirServ is one of the largest passenger services at the Airport and we have been trying to work with them about a health hazard issue among cabin cleaners since early this year. The vans of the cabin cleaners are infested with cockroaches, ticks and bugs. We have raised this issue many times with the company because of reports from employees since early this year that they have been bitten many times. I've seen medical records, I've seen doctor's notes. There are a lot of things living in those vans. I have a night shift employee

from AirServ with me today. It's especially horrific for night shift people. The night shift crew does the deep cleaning and the overnight cleaning of aircraft. And the Airport's Policy and Procedures, especially 3.5, requires employers to provide a break area for employees. Because the location of the aircraft that they clean is far from the small break room that they provide the cabin cleaners, which is below Gate 97, the employees do not get to eat a warm meal, nor have a decent place to eat, so they have no choice but to eat inside the vans that are infested with bugs and cockroaches. On top of the infestation, the trash collected from the aircraft they have cleaned prior to their lunch break is also inside the van. We strongly believe that no employee deserves to be treated this way. It's inhumane and unsanitary. The same employees with the bites and rashes clean out aircraft at SFO, the very same aircraft where passengers, visitors, tourists, our own family members sit. We urge the Commission to look into this to avoid future issues, not only among the employees but the millions of passengers that pass through San Francisco International Airport.

Commissioner Crayton asked if that is an eight hour shift and they have no place to eat.

Ms. Loreto said the night shift starts at 10:00 PM and ends around 6:00 AM or 7:00 AM. Most of the aircraft that they clean is far out in the hangars. They don't have the time to get to the break room, they literally have to eat in the vans, especially during the winter when it's cold.

Commissioner Crayton asked if they can't take the van back to eat.

Ms. Loreto said according to them it takes time and they only get a 30 minute lunch break.

Commissioner Crayton ... so this has been brought up to the management and what has been the response?

Ms. Loreto said they told us in July that they would have the vans fumigated every six months. We were expecting a fumigation in August but it never happened. This has been going on for quite a while and we've been trying to address it, but we're not getting anywhere with the company.

Mr. Chuck Andrew said I am with Teamsters Local 665, Thank you for the opportunity to address you. Our Local represents the Rental Car shuttle drivers and service agents. The rental car companies are increasingly hiring non-union subcontracted vendors who are paid by the vehicles that they move. As such, they are driving unsafely, rolling through stop signs, speeding and putting the general public that rent cars and our workers at risk of injury. We're trying to address some of these issues through the collective bargaining grievance procedure. Perhaps stepping up police patrols might offer some assistance in the general safety of the workers.

Mr. John Fishbach, aircraft mechanic, said I work in the International area on day shift. When Tracy MacCorkell spoke earlier about safety concerns, I'm in the middle of it, right there. I'm deeply concerned over the idea of this meeting to

explore fines, to enforce safety, on SFO AOA. Fines are punishment and in this case fines at this level impose a hardship on workers who are often the lowest paid of the Airport community. They have the least amount of resources to fight back through the courts or other appeal systems. Often the same workers are encouraged to cut corners because of limited ground times, distance to travel, and gate congestion. These same workers often have no ability to address their safety concerns. Some of the established air carrier employees have unions to bring their safety concerns to, but non-union work groups have no advocacy, no protection and because of their at will employment, face discharge. Facing fines only increases hardships on already tight family budgets. This fining of workers moves the incentive from the groups who have the ability to affect change to the lowest level and the least able to affect change. Because of this inability to affect change, hazards will not be addressed in any effective way, increasing the chance of an accident. IKO addressed this at a conference. Self disclosure is important, reporting hazards is important. Effective change, working on hazards and removing them from the work area, involvement of local experts, those who work ground level, plane side. This is a statement from IKO: "Within the legal guidance of protection of information gathered from safety data, collection, and processing systems, clearly show that employees of carriers are contributors of safety related information and that the use of safety related information for other purposes, is inappropriate. Fining the lowest level person who has no ability to affect change in the workplace is inappropriate." Thank you.

Commissioner Guggenhime said I want someone to summarize ... there is the issue of unsafe equipment in accordance with Paragraph 5, is that correct? In other words, certain reflective uniforms are safe, but what you've been directed to wear, and I agree with that, can get you hurt.

Commissioner Mazzola said let's let Shelley finish, she's our last speaker.

Mr. Martin said I think Jeff would be an appropriate person to speak to 5.27.

Ms. Shelley Kessler, San Mateo Labor Council ... may I speak to what Commissioner Guggenhime just raised? The issue of reflective clothing is really important and it's not just United Airlines. They just happen to be the people who showed up today. But American or any airline that uses mechanical gear at which an employee who wears loose fitting clothing has a potential to be dragged into that conveyor is where we're concerned about the contradiction between being told that you are to wear, by virtue of the policy that you're looking at today, and a direct order by their manager to remove that reflective garment. That contradiction is why we're here.

Everyone who works at the Airport is very concerned about safety. We don't want to get injured anymore than the flying public wants to, or your own employees. Our folks are the front line workers. They're there everyday and we advocate for these safe conditions everyday. Imagine if you're not in a union and you don't have the ability and the power to be your own advocate and face disciplinary procedures should you challenge your employer. Safety is not just an external issue, but it lives in the daily lives of people who provide the goods and services that make SFO run. It would be great if we had been engaged in and had the

ability to be a part of the discussions as these policies were being reviewed and adjusted. We are now having meetings with Jeff, he's been very good. Mr. Littlefield has been meeting with us but we find that some of these issues still have some very big contradictions that need to be addressed. And even though he will tell you this is a living document and we are going to review these things, meanwhile people risk getting penalized up to the point of being disciplined or fired, and fined for activities that they are being directed to do by their own employers. So while you can talk about how we are going to review these, we're going to be disciplined, we're going to look at all of this stuff, we want accountability, some of our workers have no choice. They can't refuse a direct order that's given to them by an employer. So we took some time and we went through it and we submitted three different pages of these concerns that we have. There are occasions when people get directed and if they don't follow, they can be disciplined or discharged and especially in some of the other environments that don't have a union, we're concerned about that. We're also concerned about how the policies and procedures are going to be implemented and how the training is going to take place for the employee groups. Ninety plus pages were sent to us for review, to all the policies. Not all of which apply to us, however, an employer, a manager is going to have to tease out those issues that impact us and find a way to convey those issues and procedures to their employee groups on a 24/7 clock. All employers don't necessarily do this in a very cogent and effective way, but I can tell you not everybody has the skill set to do this. And as employers change, managers change and some of these issues get lost in the shuffle. In the meantime, employees are going to be the ones who are going to be disciplined as a result of the lack of enforcement. You heard Norm Tin talk about his officers who will be the ones to enforce these rules.

The procedure for filing complaints is not clear. While there is a noted procedure that will be taken up by the Airport Commission and Commission staff, we are not informed as to what this is, what are those steps, how do we find that out, was it written in English, Tagalog, Spanish, Chinese, how do we allow those employees who need to be able to report problems. There's nothing in the policy that says and to do so call this number, go to this place, do whatever. We really need to make sure that that opportunity is well known to every employee who may have an issue with this. Retaliation is a big issue. We're very concerned that employers, if their employee gets fined or disciplined, the employer who also gets fined might suggest that they fine or discipline the employee in addition to whatever the policy implementation results in. So if you get fined by an officer, you also might get penalized by your employer. If you pull a red tag off a tug on the airfield that doesn't have brakes or a leaky tank that's trying to fuel an aircraft. Director Martin said, and he's right, we will go CalOsha about these bugs, we will go to CalOsha about leaky fuel tanks, but we wanted to make sure that you all knew that our concerns were about implementation of policies so that you didn't get caught unaware when we report this. We do not do this because we think you're against the workers. We understand that you care about that, and we do too. But we want to make sure that you knew what our concerns were before we went to another outside governmental entity. We want you to be aware so that you can address some of these concerns. So let me give some of suggestions that came out of the group as we discussed it. Please don't impose penalties on workers until we have time to see how the implementation rolls out. We want to

see what the unintended consequences might be, make sure there are appropriate and accessible procedures for employees and they're available in the multiple languages of the people performing these duties. If fines are going to be imposed and we hope they aren't, set up a procedure that allows a payment process so workers are able to make payments that do not create undue hardships on their families, and revisit the level of penalties to be imposed. Have joint meetings with the employees and managers, make sure that people are side by side and that it's documented because they need to hear what we're hearing and we need to hear what they're hearing in order to move forward in how this is being implemented. Those people can be notified and make sure that the penalty on the company. If a worker's forced to comply, there has to be a process by which they can report this because sometimes there is no documentation, it's a verbal and direct order. If you call the employer and ask if an employee was told to drive a tug that doesn't have any brakes, do you think they're going to say, yes, we decided to violate the rule and we told our employee to do it? We don't have the ability sometimes to go above their heads without the fear of retaliation. So we want to know if there's going to be a process that you set in place. When those instances occur, and they do daily, you can hold the County or the company accountable for what they're trying to impose on the workforce. I really appreciate the extra time. I just want you to understand that this is serious for us and for you. Thank you.

Mr. Andrew Sun said Thank you very much, I am here to speak on the issue of TNCs a Rent-A-Ride car companies. I appreciate the Airport beginning to adopt regulations for the use of these vehicles in our airports. I'm fearful that while the regulations are sound and moving in the right direction, our ability to actually enforce or implement is going to be somewhat problematic. These companies and their attended independent contractors have shown a blatant disregard for providing any information that allows us essentially to monitor any of their activities. They continue to come to the Airport without regard for any safety regulations. Let me point out three specific areas. The regulations that cover taxicabs runs about 6 ½ pages to the extent that you require all taxicab drivers to have a working flashlight and ballpoint pens with blue or black ink in their possession when they go the Airport. The regulations that we have right now for the Rent-A-Ride companies that have sort of peered up, are relatively ½ a page, no more, no less. We have no way to essentially make sure that any of these vehicles are inspected in a timely manner. We don't have any way of requiring, as I think the intention is, these companies and their independent contractors to provide that information to the Airport or ways in which we can make sure that they are clearly identified as having a permit or that they used their color identities when they go to and from the Airport. Those are all areas that I think if you adopt these regulations you need to make certain that staff works with the companies to gather this information so that you can review at an appropriate time. We can't adopt regulations and then not have the ability to enforce. On behalf of Luxor and Yellow Cab, we follow all the rules, we're proud to be part of San Francisco for a long, long time, we're proud that all our mechanics are part of a union contract and we hope you will take this first step in moving in the right direction because we know we need to make certain that the proper regulations are followed. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Mazzola said Thank you for your testimony. Okay, we have no more written public comments. So Jeff you're here to solve every problem we've heard.

Mr. Littlefield said we've heard a lot of feedback and input. We've heard what the Airport is actually trying to accomplish. But I just want to be really, really clear that the Airport has no other motivation whatsoever other than to ensure that there's a safe operating area out on the ramp, out on the airfield, that the employees who are out there are complying with Rules and Regulations, best safe practices, and the employers themselves, are properly maintaining equipment that is potentially dangerous if not maintained properly. That is our sole motivation, there is absolutely nothing else hidden beneath the leaves here and I just want to convey that before I mention a couple of other points. I want to draw the distinction with this Rule and Regulation revision that the shared accountability piece of it draws upon equipment maintenance which is vastly different than behavior. Behavior, I think that the people who work out there need to fully understand that it's in their best interest to stop at stop signs, it's in their best interest to slow down, it's in their best interest to do user checks are ground equipment. The employer also needs to know that it's in their best interest to properly maintain equipment because that eliminates or reduces preventable accidents and injuries which ultimately costs money as well. Aircraft damage, employee injuries, people out of work for long periods of time, all of those things have adverse impact the employer bottom line, their reputation and individual employees who come to work and simply try to do their job. In terms of my background and experience, I worked for United Airlines for 21 years. A lot of that time I spent on the ramp, loading and unloading airplanes, I've martialed airplanes, receipt and dispatch. I've cleaned airplanes on midnight shift, I do understand everything that they're making reference to. I've de-iced airplanes, I've fueled airplanes. I just want you to understand that what we're after here is totally targeted toward the mutual benefit of all of us and the reputation of this Airport. There's nothing hidden. I just wanted to say that in terms of enforcement of the policy, the Airfield Safety Officers who I've met with a number of times, even before we started to establish this more aggressive fine structure, understand that when we move forward with this we're not going to just pull the trigger and come out. Every person that's going one mile an hour over the speed limit gets a ticket. Every person that does the slightest thing in deviation from the established Rules and Regulations, is going to be held accountable to the maximum financial extent possible. That's not the intent. The intent is to ensure that there is accountability in place. We're going to have a reasonable approach. The progressive admonishment and citation process allows for the Airfield Safety Officer to give the person a verbal warning on more than one occasion. They could do that three times if they want, they're going to use some discretion and I've insisted so far that they use discretion because we want the program to be successful. We don't want a backlash and while a lot of the issues that have been raised here are between the employee and the representation and the employer I have offered in the meetings that we've had to sit in on many meetings, on any meetings with employers, airlines, and ground handlers, which I've already done quite honestly, to ensure that the fine structure's understood, that what we're trying to accomplish is understood, and help facilitate that. But, in closing I would just say that this Rule and Regulation revision, especially as it pertains to safety, is not controversial. It's in the best interest of everyone out there and there's no hidden motivation whatsoever.

Commissioner Johns asked if the ASOs were the ones who enforce the rules and who employs them?

Mr. Littlefield replied that the ASOs issue admonishments and the Airport employs them. They report to me through a number of levels of managers.

Commissioner Johns asked if the Airport has the procedure for reviewing a fine that was issued.

Mr. Littlefield said yes. If you get an actual fine, if it gets to that point, beyond all the admonishments and warnings that are possible, then the employee has 30 days to pay the fine. They have 10 days from the date of issuance to appeal and that appeal comes directly to me. It's going to come directly to me for my review, initially, and the approach will be taken to determine whether or not something was done blatantly, irresponsibly, by accident, misunderstood the rules, all of that will take place prior to moving forward with any type of fine being imposed.

Commissioner Johns asked if the employer is involved in the process.

Mr. Littlefield said the employee actually submits the appeal. The employer is copied on the citation.

Mr. Martin said in many cases we've been told some employers will fire an employee for a driving violation. If we fine the employer, the employee will likely be fired. So we've kept the fines low ... \$50. For example, if an employee is driving a truck the company doesn't get the fine, the person driving the truck on the freeway gets the fine so the employee doesn't lose their job. In some ways we're trying to protect the employee as well.

Commissioner Johns asked about the type of problem with the vans not being clean. Is that a different sort of enforcement?

Mr. Littlefield said that pest control is a challenge at airports and we do have folks that address it. From time to time it's brought directly to my attention that there's a particular area that needs an exterminator or some focused attention in that regard. I feel that we're responsive to that. What was brought up here earlier today was infestation inside of vans or ground equipment that are owned by specific companies. The Airport does not exterminate for individual companies.

Mr. Martin said it's a CalOsha issue. I encourage employees to call CalOsha today. It's shocking that they're in that condition.

Commissioner Johns said it sounds like it's sort of a catch 22 because they're eating in the vans and putting trash in the vans, so it's going to attract bugs.

Mr. Littlefield said so what I would share in regards to that, and I'm speaking from my own experience having cleaned airplanes on the graveyard shift, is that their

lunch time, ideally, would start when they get back from cleaning the planes, not from the time they finished cleaning a plane. It takes 20 minutes to drive from the Superbay back over to the Terminal.

Mr. Martin said I think CalOsha requires some reasonable space for meals and breaks so I think CalOsha can step in. Commissioner Mazzola may have some thoughts on this.

Commissioner Guggenhime said that when I use to ride bikes, and I run a lot, I wear loose clothing. Section 5.27 is pretty clear to me. I wear tighter reflective clothes which are more reflective than the jacket you're wearing. Next, they have to turn it in at the end of their shift, and you don't know what size you're going to get on your next shift. Can't the employer and the employee, with the help of the Airport, understand that those things are dangerous. You can hook yourself on any number of pieces of equipment or a bicycle. It seems to me there ought to be a way that we could encourage employers to provide reflective gear to each individual employee.

Mr. Littlefield said I think you're right on track with that. If you look at the Rules and Regulations revision, we're just pointing out that reflective clothing is required. I'm not saying you have to wear a vest.

Commissioner Guggenhime said so what I'm saying is United gives him clothing that's unsafe.

Mr. Martin said this is something we'll go back and address. We will hold the item over, but this one item on reflective clothing sounds like something we need to go back and work on. All the fines are low to begin with for employees. It's not my intention to fine an employee \$750 for a one time infraction of not wearing reflective clothing. I can require all of the Airport tenants to provide the right kind of reflective clothing and if that doesn't meet United's current policy, tough luck. They're at our Airport, they follow our rules and they'll be required to do that.

Commissioner Guggenhime said and I have a problem with the language spot.

Commissioner Crayton said first of all, let me thank you for your communication with all of the tenants. John has adequately addressed the fact that they need to complain to CalOsha, but I think as an Airport we need to let them know it's not acceptable to have vermin and roaches in those vans. They can let the employer be fined, so that employees are not afraid to be fired by reporting it. I feel that it's inhumane. I know you have a team of people but you're dealing with a mountain load of issues. Some of them we have jurisdiction over, and some we don't. I feel that we cannot tell the employer that you have to do this, this, and this, however, there are certain things that as an Airport I feel we must maintain in terms of CalOsha. As far as I know, we've done that in prior years. Those bug bites that I see are not acceptable. That needs to be taken care of immediately.

Mr. Martin said and I encourage all the union reps to do that. If you see something, call CalOsha immediately. Don't feel you have to speak to the Airport first. If there's an unhealthy, unsafe condition for employees, deal with it

immediately.

Commissioner Mazzola said I'm glad to hear you're going to ask United to talk about reflective clothes and vests. This vest is so loose, it could fit me. But the truth is, they're dangerous and even the employer recognizes that. The employer says okay, when you're working around machinery or something that moves, take it off. Now if they take it off, they don't have anything else that's reflective. So they're out there without reflective clothing and an ASO can give them a ticket. It's a Catch 22. I'm glad to hear you're going to ask United to do that, and the other airlines.

Further, fines are not new, is that correct? So what compelled us to feel that we have to raise them.

Mr. Martin said this came directly from me. Because our fines were so low on vehicles that failed inspections, there was no incentive for companies to maintain their vehicles. They were just waiting for us to catch unsafe vehicles. Now, we're inspecting all vehicles. We need substantial fines to cause the companies to change their behavior. We have very few fines issued to employees. Usually, we write admonishments. We may ask that they be re-trained. But for an employee who lights a cigarette where they're not suppose to light a cigarette, runs right through a stop sign at 30 miles an hour on the airfield ... and we're dealing with a small number of employees who are not following the rules, who are not being safe ... but we need to have some teeth and \$50 fine is not that much compared to what someone would get for speeding on the freeway. It's a small fine, but they need to feel it. Many areas had no fines. There were no fines for vehicle violations.

Mr. Littlefield said that a driving issue would be a \$50.

Mr. Martin asked if there were fines for smoking in an unsafe area.

Mr. Littlefield said it probably didn't get exercised that frequently. There's littering, there's smoking, those types of things that are behavior related.

Commissioner Mazzola said that the employee then has 10 days to rebut the fine. And to rebut the fine and what is that process?

Mr. Littlefield said right now a citation is issued and on the back of the citation there's a place where you can write.

Commissioner Mazzola asked if we then contract the employee.

Mr. Littlefield said we take a look at it, consider all of the factors and then provide a response. That's an initial review, it's not really an appeal. If they're not satisfied with that, then there's another opportunity for a more objective and inclusive appeal process.

Mr. Martin said we are designating a hearing officer at the Airport for an appeal process.

Commissioner Mazzola asked if we had a hearing officer.

Mr. Martin replied no, we will be designating one.

Commissioner Mazzola said a speaker mentioned the TNCs. What are we doing to address the concerns of the gentleman about the TNCs? Is there anything in here we should look at again?

Mr. Littlefield said in the Rules and Regulations revision we really just make reference to the permit. The terms are identified within the permit itself.

Commissioner Mazzola said what concerns me, Jeff, was that he pointed out the rules for taxi drivers are three pages, and the rules for these new folks are ½ a page. Is it a level playing field?

Mr. Martin said the TNC permits are in a 60-page range too ... it doesn't show up in Rules and Regulations.

Commissioner Mazzola said so our Rules and Regulations refer to the 60-pages.

Mr. Martin said the fact is it's still under State Law and the City. Taxi drivers are subject to a lot more training requirements and regulations than TNC drivers.

Commissioner Crayton, referring to the \$750 fine, noted that it's half of someoness pay. What part of that does the employer pay?

Mr. Martin replied we're going to do away with that. We're not going to fine employees \$750 for not having a vest on. We're going to change that, if that's what it says.

Mr. Littlefield said there are categories that have dollar amounts associated with them. The category that John is referring to just happens to start with \$750. If we change the category it would, for instance, change to \$100.

Commissioner Crayton said it seems to me you need to be paid some more money, because you're dealing with all these issues, and this is huge. I don't even know how one person can handle this. I know that's your job but I also understand you're dealing with employers. It appears to me that they haven't heard a lot of this or if they've heard it, they turned the blind eye to it, especially regarding the infestations and things like that.

Mr. Littlefield said I meet with all of the airline managers over the course of a 12-month period, but I meet with United Airlines. I meet with the ground handlers when there's issues that surfaces. I have no issue hearing from the membership about certain things and sharing that when I do meet with these folks.

Commissioner Johns said I cannot imagine if any airline representative airline was here today and heard these safety issues about uniforms, that they would not immediately comply, given the liability that they are facing if, in fact, everything we've heard is accurate. It just makes no sense, so there's got to be some lack of

communication somewhere, or somebody has lost some marbles.

Mr. Littlefield said there's a requirement for airlines and ground handlers to conduct monthly safety meetings and those are optimal forums for this type of dialogue to take place.

Commissioner Johns said but some things are not getting communicated or this simple issue would be resolved.

Commissioner Crayton said I clearly understand you have a responsibility for the Airport because we would be fined if we're not making sure that they're doing what they're doing. There's a miscommunication with the employers I believe, and we've got to try to work on that. I thank you.

Commissioner Mazzola said to answer the Rep. from the Teamsters about the unrepresented people at the Rental Car place, do your folks also give tickets and fines to those people for speeding, or running red lights?

Mr. Littlefield said that's on the public side. I think you're referring to the Police. I want to be clear on your question ... if there's unsafe behavior at the Rental Car facility on the public's side?

Commissioner Mazzola replied well not the public. The employees of the Rental Car companies take cars for washing, or whatever they do, and they speed and they're a hazard. If they're a hazard, do our guys tag and fine them?

Mr. Martin said there's no Police enforcement within that Rental Car facility. I think where the Rental Car Shuttles may feel the pressure the most is many of the cars are stored five miles away on the weekends and I think the drivers may feel like they're rushed to drive 80 miles an hour on the freeway. That's where they face a risk.

Commissioner Mazzola said I'm not concerned about the freeway, I'm concerned about Airport property.

Mr. Martin said we're not ticketing within the Rental Car Center and there's a very short distance on Airport property. I'm not aware of Rental Car drivers being targeted on Airport property by the Police.

Commissioner Mazzola asked if we can look into this.

Mr. Martin replied yes.

Commissioner Mazzola said that we're going to put this over to our next meeting. We have a request not to take any action today, so it will be recessed for two weeks from now, and then we will have another Public Hearing, and we will act after that. Mr. Gruberg, I know you got that 92-page packet late and you requested time so we're going to offer you the time. You can talk next time if you get the packet.

* * *

H. NEW BUSINESS:

Discussion only. This is the "Public Comment" section of the calendar. Individuals may address the Commission on any topic within the jurisdiction of the Airport Commission for a period of up to three (3) minutes. Please fill out a "Request to Speak" form located on the table next to the speaker's microphone and submit it to the Commission Secretary.

Commissioner Mazzola asked Mr. Gruberg if he wanted to speak under New Business. That closes the hearing for today. It will be open again in two weeks.

Ms. Kessler said I'm going to let my colleague about the Rental Cars go first, and then I'll speak to some other issues.

Mr. Chuck Andrew, Teamsters Local 665. To answer or to clarify, the Rental Car Center, the non-union shuttlers are moving vehicles within the Rental Car Center and my understanding is that the Airport Police department patrols that area and may issue citations within that property. There are non-union vendors who bring vehicles from off-Airport into the Airport and are driving within that facility, so I believe it would be patrolled by Airport P.D..

Mr. Martin said if you let me know or let Shelley know if you learned of any of your employers who have received citations from SFPD within the Rental Car facility.

Mr. Andrew replied okay.

Ms. Shelley Kessler, San Mateo County Central Labor Council, Airport Laborer Coalition, VP State Labor Federation said first of all, this issue about the ability for someone to report an issue when it occurs is not always accessible or available, no matter what. If you're out in the middle of the field, if you're being told to drive an unsafe vehicle, Mr. Littlefield said that there is a process by which a complaint can be filed after the event has already occurred if you're penalized and want to appeal. You only have ten days and if that person doesn't respond in ten days, it stands. But there's nothing ... there's no phone number, there's nothing that says here are the steps until you get that citing on the back which is your appeal. There's nothing that is available right now for someone to call and say, the brakes don't work on this tug, my field tanker is leaking, I'm being told to drive and if I don't, I get in trouble. That's one of the contradictions. The second thing is that the fines and penalties may appear to be low but they can mount up, and the employer may add an additional discipline and there's nothing we can do, there's no place that people can go, regardless of whoever is doing it. It's not just United by the way. And Commissioner Johns is correct, it should be any entity. The fact is they knew two years ago when they created those new uniforms. The people who have to wear them told them they need to have reflective striping on the uniform for safety when they're out on the AOA. They were told this two years ago and ignored that admonishment until the Airport said you need to have reflective. These guys wanted reflective because there the ones out there that can get hit so they wanted to have it and it was ignored. The part of the complaint that we're lodging with you today is you have policies that you said you have some control over and some you don't. Where you don't have control, we suffer the result. It's not like United Airlines

doesn't have any money. They certainly could afford to implement your policies but choose not to, and they see the fines as the cost of doing business. So we just want you to understand the challenges between what you have the authority to do and what we're going to be stuck with because we don't have a way to address them appropriately.

Mr. Mark Gruberg said I just want to follow up on some remarks I was making earlier. The San Francisco Taxi Workers Alliance is currently going through a process of examining the issues of concern to taxi drivers and some of them do concern the Airport. We hope that we will have the opportunity to meet with staff and go over some of those matters. I don't want to anticipate them at this point, but we hope that we'll be able to have some productive discussions and possibly come to this Commission, if necessary, on some of those issues. The other thing I wanted to mention is about the TNCs ... I don't think you know what you're dealing with here. There was a meeting of the Mayor's Disability Council last Friday and a representative of Lyft said that their company has tens of thousands of vehicles serving the public in San Francisco alone and Lyft has reputed to be a smaller company than Uber. So we know from some exploration that you did here, something like 70 some odd percent of the vehicles that came out here to serve the Airport that were stopped and admonished did not have the proper trade dress, in other words had no markings on the vehicles that were actually providing this service. Now that doesn't reflect reality because the reality is that if they don't have the trade dress, the chances are you're not going to recognize them. So the vast, vast, vast majority of these vehicles coming out here, you don't even know that they're doing this. And to talk about one area of a level playing field, in the permitting process that you have for them, there is no requirement for an Airport inspection of these vehicles. All the taxis are inspected, all the limousines are inspected, every other type of ground transportation vehicle that serves the Airport on a commercial basis, is inspected. These guys are not inspected. We can't put a car on the road without an Airport sticker. You have no idea what these vehicles are like because, you're not even asserting the authority to inspect them. Many of these vehicles are full-time vehicles, they're providing as much service as taxis or any other. Uber has a plan where if you work over 40 hours/week, they give incentives and bonuses. Lyft has a plan where you buy a special vehicle and work 35 hours/week and there are incentives around that. So these are full-time commercial vehicles just like taxis and limos, and you're not inspecting them. Something is wrong here. Thank you.

* * *

I. CORRESPONDENCE:

There was no discussion by the Commission.

* * *

J. CLOSED SESSION:

There are no planned agenda items for a Closed Session for the current meeting.

In the event of any urgent matter requiring immediate action which has come to the attention of the Airport Commission after the agenda was issued and which is an item appropriately addressed in Closed Session, the Airport Commission may discuss and vote whether to conduct a Closed Session under Brown Act (California Government

Code Sections 54954.2(b)(2) and 54954.5) and Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.11).

If the Airport Commission enters Closed Session under such circumstances, the Airport Commission will discuss and vote whether to disclose action taken or discussions held in Closed Session under the Brown Act (California Government Code Section 54957.1) and Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.12).

* * *

K. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further calendared business before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 10:25 AM.

Jean Caramatti
Commission Secretary

Airserv cabin cleaner's vans are infested with cockroaches, bugs, ticks and God knows what else!!! Employees have reported this issue many, many times for a long time now. And Airserv has not paid any attention to this health hazard that has been going on with their employees. These are the employees who clean the aircrafts that you and your family members get on!!!











Made By

Personal Protective Equipment(FPE) ! WARNING

GARMENT USE

If properly worn and cared for, this garment will enhance your visibility under certain use and conditions. This garment will not protect you from all the hazards of working in or mar moving equipment. Use extreme care and common sense in visibility-restricted areas. This garment meets 16 CFR 1610 Class 1 (normal Flammability). However, it will not protect you from fix explosion or exposure to hazardous chemicals and is not intended for use in environments where star discharge may create a hazard. Maintain only in accordance with manufacturer's instructions failure to comply with these guidelines may result in serious injury or death.

CAUTION: This garment has quick release features, as evidenced by use of hook and loop connections. Inspect these regularly through the life of the garment to ensure proper release. Hook and loop areas should be kept clean and free of foreign materials. Always wear a properly sized and secured garment. Failure to comply with these guidelines may result in injury or death if garment is caught by equipment, protrusion or vehicle.

GARMENT LAUNDRY CARE & INSTRUCTIONS

This high visibility garment contains very specialized components designed to mantain color, integrity and retro-reflective qualities through repeated wear and washing. This garment should be launtred only when necessary as repeated washings will eventually compromise the integrity and retre-reflective qualities. To launder properly, turn garment inside out, use mild detergent it warm wast. 8 minute wash cycle, do not bleach. Do not wash with wool or nylon items. Hang or tumble dry low heat) and fold appropriately to minimize wrinkling. Do not wash or dry with sharp-edged item Do not dry clean. Do not industrial wash. Do not store in direct sunlight.









