



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL
Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Regular City Council Meeting on April 20, 2026**

1. CALL TO ORDER

A duly noticed meeting of the Burlingame City Council was held on the above date in person and via Zoom at 7:03 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Elaine Breeze during the Study Session.

3. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brownrigg, Colson, Pappajohn, Stevenson, Thayer

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

4. REPORT OF REMOTE PARTICIPATION

There were none.

5. REPORT OUT FROM CLOSED SESSION

- a. **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(d)(1))**
XIAOMING FANG AND TING TING LIU V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, ET AL., SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. 26-CIV-01790

Acting City Attorney Christie Crowl stated that no reportable action was taken.

6. UPCOMING EVENTS

Mayor Brownrigg reviewed upcoming events in the city.

7. PRESENTATIONS

a. CONNECT BAY AREA LOCAL INVESTMENT PLAN

SamTrans Government and Community Affairs Officer Charlise Chang began with an overview of SamTrans. She explained that SamTrans was established in 1976 to cover San Mateo County, parts of San Francisco, and the City of Palo Alto. She noted that SamTrans has 315 buses serving 76 bus routes, with ten million annual boardings. She reviewed some of the other services they provide including Redi-Wheels, RediCoast paratransit, Ride Plus on-demand rideshare, and shuttles.

Ms. Chang reviewed the typical SamTrans rider profile:

- 94% low income (68% extremely low income) based on San Mateo County affordable housing metrics
- Lowest household income among major Bay Area transit agencies
- 40% speak a language other than English at home
- Nearly 80% do not drive or own a car
- 98.8% of pre-pandemic ridership

Ms. Chang discussed some of the key issues facing SamTrans:

- Caltrain, BART, SFMTA, and AC Transit are facing deficits as post-pandemic fare revenue lags and operating costs rise
- Despite ridership gains and cost efficiency measures, expenses are outpacing revenues
- Federal and State support has declined
- These agencies need a stable, predictable source of funds to keep going

Ms. Chang discussed a potential measure for the November Ballot:

- 14 years – half cent sales tax in four counties (San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa) and full cent in San Francisco
- Would generate approximately \$980 million annually
- Includes accountability and oversight provisions
- 24% of San Mateo County sales tax to Caltrain, 27% to BART, 7% to Muni, 37% to SamTrans Local Investment Plan
- Approximately \$50 million annually for 14 years for public transit in San Mateo County
- Funds may be used for:
 - Public transit operations and capital
 - Public transit components of larger capital projects
 - Targeted pavement repairs on local roads served by fixed-route transit

Ms. Chang reviewed two previous measures: Measure A and Measure W:

- Measure A – generates \$120 million annually
 - 30% for transit
 - 27.5% for highways
 - 22.5% for local streets and transportation

- 15% for grade separation
- 3% for bicycle and pedestrian improvements
- 1% for alternative congestion relief
- 1% for administration
- Measure W – generates \$60 million annually for SamTrans local transit and \$60 million annually for SMCTA
 - 50% for county public transportation systems
 - 22.5% for countywide highway congestion relief improvements
 - 10% for local investment share
 - 10% for regional transit connections
 - 5% for bicycle and pedestrian improvements
 - 2.5% for grade separation

Ms. Chang discussed SamTrans' Financial Outlook for FY 2026-FY 2036:

- Operating deficit projected to begin in FY 2028
- Average annual deficit over next ten years of nearly \$30 million
- Increased labor, energy, and contract services costs
- Cost saving measures including no new positions approved, reducing consultant use, and cuts across all discretionary spending

Ms. Chang explained that SamTrans is looking for public input on how the potential measure funds should be utilized. She listed the following ten categories that SamTrans is asking the public to rank:

- Improve transit routes to reduce traffic on the most heavily traveled corridors
- Continue free and reduced fare programs to seniors, students, and people with disabilities
- Protect transit infrastructure against sea-level rise, flooding, and extreme weather
- Increase safety, cleanliness, and accessibility at bus stops
- Enhance bus service to be more efficient, faster, and more reliable
- Expand access to transit for communities that are currently underserved
- Make repairs and upgrades to aging paratransit vehicles to ensure reliable service
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality by transitioning to zero-emission buses
- Repair potholes and fix streets along bus routes
- Offer affordable ride-share and on-demand programs to more communities

Vice Mayor Pappajohn asked if she was correct that the \$50 million per year is San Mateo County's "return to source" portion. Ms. Chang replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn asked whether the SamTrans Board would lock in spending priorities for the \$50 million at its May/June meetings based on the survey results. Ms. Chang replied that the June meeting was the target to lock in priorities.

Councilmember Colson reviewed the discussions around transit funding that took place at the Progress Seminar. She raised concerns regarding:

- Lack of a coherent regional transit plan
- Insufficient accountability and clarity on how additional revenues would be used
- The need for more information on what agencies are doing right now to improve efficiency

Councilmember Colson questioned what exactly the voters would be asked to approve. She stated that she needed to better understand the total local burden and how funds would be allocated to the different agencies. Ms. Chang replied that the ballot measure would be a regional sales tax spread across the participating counties. She noted that the “return to source” allocations, including San Mateo County’s approximate \$50 million, are set out in the enabling legislation based on factors like:

- Ridership
- Degree of operating deficit
- Inter-agency agreements

Councilmember Stevenson voiced concern about prematurely asking for public input. He emphasized the need for transparent accountability and clear performance metrics for any new transit revenue.

Councilmember Thayer discussed three items that she believed were under-emphasized or missing from the ten categories:

- Better transit connections between SamTrans and other agencies
- More frequent service, particularly for routes other than El Camino Real, noting that infrequent weekend service is a major deterrent, and referencing how Caltrain’s increase to 30-minute service improved ridership
- A stronger focus on safe streets leading to transit stops

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment.

MTC Commissioner Gina Papan voiced concern about the proposed measure.

Zack Rozlen emphasized that public transportation is important to everyone, including non-riders, because many local workers depend on it.

Mayor Brownrigg closed public comment.

Mayor Brownrigg thanked Ms. Chang for her presentation.

b. PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY UPDATE

Peninsula Clean Energy (“PCE”) Director of Government Affairs Marc Hershman stated that PCE is a joint powers authority that serves all 20 cities in San Mateo County, unincorporated San Mateo County, and the

City of Los Banos in Merced County. He described PCE's mission as providing 100% clean electricity at a lower cost than PG&E, with local control over surplus revenues.

Mr. Hershman explained that PCE procures electricity (mainly from solar and wind) and that it is delivered through PG&E's poles and wires.

Mr. Hershman stated that PCE is celebrating its tenth anniversary. He explained that in Burlingame:

- The City's residents have seen \$11.4 million in bill savings, which is the equivalent of seven free days of electricity per year for each household
- PCE has provided \$2 million in community reinvestment including bill credits, solar system credits, customer rebates, and zero-interest loans
- PCE uses 100% clean energy sources
- PCE supported installation of 145 EV charging stations primarily at private multi-family properties plus 12 chargers at BHS and six at the Community Center
- PCE awarded the City \$540,000 in a member agency grant, which the City has used for its electric leaf blower incentive program and fleet electrification efforts

Mr. Hershman explained that the PCE Board approved a name change from "Peninsula Clean Energy" to "WestLight Energy". He stated that this name better reflects the services they provide as they have expanded beyond the Peninsula. He added that the new name will reduce confusion between PCE and PG&E.

Councilmember Colson voiced support for PCE and its name change. She emphasized the importance of inclusivity, noting that PCE serves Los Banos, a lower-income, more politically diverse community in the Central Valley. She praised PCE's collaborative model, noting that regardless of political differences, communities have common interests in:

- Clean energy
- Lower energy costs
- Better future for their children

Councilmember Thayer noted that the other community choice aggregators in California have changed their names as their territories expanded.

Mayor Brownrigg discussed the shift in federal policies around energy and asked if this was affecting PCE's ability to contract for new solar farms and develop new clean energy projects in California. Mr. Hershman replied that the change in federal policies has made things more challenging.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that many cities and counties would be willing to advocate for favorable federal policy if they knew how and where to be the most effective. He emphasized that wanting more clean energy does not require being "against" other energy sources.

Mayor Brownrigg opened up public comment. No one spoke.

Mayor Brownrigg thanked Mr. Hershman for his presentation.

c. UPDATE ON SUSTAINABILITY-RELATED REBATES AND INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

Sustainability Program Manager Michael stated that most of her work is focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel use. She added that each of the programs she would be discussing are tied to specific measures in the City's Climate Action Plan.

Ms. Michael discussed the City's Spin bike sharing program. She noted that the program is entering its third year and is jointly operated with the City of Millbrae. She added that to date, approximately 46,000 trips have been taken, totaling over 100,000 miles. The average trip distance is just over two miles, with an average duration of about 20 minutes.

Ms. Michael stated that the program initially received a \$200,000 grant from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority. These funds were used primarily for user subsidies and some new bike infrastructure. She explained that a second and final grant of \$200,000 has been awarded.

Ms. Michael discussed the City's Electric Leaf Blower Rebate Program, which is funded by a \$40,000 grant from PCE. She explained that 265 residents and 16 commercial landscaping businesses have received rebates. The rebate gives:

- \$100 per residential applicant
- \$500 per commercial landscaping business

Ms. Michael discussed building electrification. She explained that the City's induction cooktop lending program has helped to convince residents to consider switching to induction. She also noted the following programs:

- Zero permit fees for heat pumps – the City waives permit fees for heat pump installations
- PCE rebates for electrification - \$4,000 rebate for heat pump water heaters
- Solar program – expressed interest in PCE's planned solar plus battery product
- Reach Codes – a study session is forthcoming

Ms. Michael discussed mini grants for certified green businesses. She explained that the City has provided small grants, about \$1,000 each, to existing certified green businesses to help with energy or resource saving retrofits. She stated that both Broadway Grill and Fika Café have been recipients of these grants.

Ms. Michael discussed the Lawn Be Gone Program. She explained that the City offers up to \$500 per household to replace a water-intensive lawn with a water-efficient landscape.

Lastly, Ms. Michael discussed the City's Earth Day Poster Contest. She showed some of the entries and noted that the different posters would be displayed at the Community Center.

Mayor Brownrigg asked for a future discussion giving the Council an update on the transition to electric leaf blowers.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment.

Zack Rozlen voiced support for the Lawn Be Gone Program and for the subsidies to the Spin Bike Program.

Mayor Brownrigg closed public comment.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn thanked Ms. Michael for all her work and linking the programs to the City's Climate Action Plan.

d. UPDATE FROM CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON MEETING WITH HORIZON TREATMENT SERVICES, SAN MATEO COUNTY, AND BAYFRONT BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Mayor Brownrigg stated that this item was informational only. He explained that Horizon Treatment Services is a nonprofit provider of detox, rehab, and sobering services for the County. He noted that the County previously lost some of these services, including StarVista's sobering center in Burlingame, and is seeking assistance in replacing these services.

Mayor Brownrigg explained that Horizon received a \$25 million State grant to establish a new treatment facility. The grant requires that Horizon secure control of a property by late June, or the grant funds will be lost. He stated that Horizon and the County reportedly examined nine potential sites countywide. On December 17, Horizon publicly identified a property on El Camino Real in the City of San Mateo as its preferred location. That announcement led to multiple public hearings and significant debate in the City of San Mateo about siting the facility near homes and schools.

Mayor Brownrigg discussed Horizon's model. He noted that Horizon and State regulators prefer residential or mixed urban settings for such facilities. Horizon believes that it is better for clients to be integrated into the community rather than isolated, and the State grant criteria also appear to favor such locations.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that at their April 7 meeting, the Board of Supervisors meeting discussed relocating the facility from the City of San Mateo site and instead using a property in Burlingame on Mahler Road. He explained that in response to this discussion, the City organized a meeting on April 13 with the County Manager, former Supervisor Dave Pine, a representative from Horizon, and members of the Bayfront business and hotel community. He added that he and Councilmember Colson also attended. At this meeting, the Bayfront businesses raised significant concerns about placing the facility there and the potential impact it could have on tourism, safety, and economic development.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that Horizon's facility is designed as a voluntary program where:

- Clients voluntarily check in and check out
- Clients cannot simply walk out the door alone

- If they leave during treatment, they must leave with staff or another responsible person
- The proposed facility would be larger and more intensive than the former StarVista sobering center
- The proposal includes 69 beds for overnight sobering, detox stays of days to a couple of weeks, and residential treatment stays of 30, 60, and 90 days, with potential extensions up to 120 days

Mayor Brownrigg stated that the City of San Mateo held a meeting on April 16 that was well attended and lasted roughly three hours. He noted that members of the public and City officials testified both for and against the San Mateo location.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that the outcome is not a done deal, and it remains possible that the project could stay in the City of San Mateo.

Councilmember Colson stated that some of the relevant State and Federal laws limit the City's authority. She noted that she had compiled a list of questions from local police officers, Bayfront businesses, and other community members. These questions were forwarded to Horizon and the County, and responses are being gathered.

Councilmember Colson stated that the County could potentially purchase the Mahler property regardless of whether Horizon ultimately uses it because the County also has other potential uses for the site. She explained that the decision to grant or move the State funding lies with Horizon and not with the City. She added that the City will continue to seek information and raise concerns but recognizes that it does not control the final decision.

Councilmember Stevenson asked how the decision-making process will work going forward. City Manager Goldman replied that City staff is reviewing zoning and permitting issues for the Mahler Road site. She added that there is still an open question as to whether the State grant can legally be transferred from the San Mateo site to another site. She noted that the Board of Supervisors is expected to consider authorizing the purchase of the Mahler Road property at its May 5 meeting.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn asked whether only Horizon can petition the State to change the grant site. City Manager Goldman replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Colson stated that based on her conversation with Horizon staff, the \$25 million grant was site specific to the San Mateo site. She added that to move those funds, Horizon must obtain State approval and may need to secure a variance from rules that originally discouraged or prohibited industrial-proximate sites.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment.

Jeremy Lui, representing the Hilton Hotel, emphasized the economic importance of the Bayfront hotels to the City. He voiced concerns that the hotels were only recently made aware of the Horizon proposal.

Peter Banzhaf, a representative for King Bayshore Owner LLC, discussed their life science project on the west side of the Bayshore Highway. He voiced concern about the Horizon project.

Dr. Andrew Soss acknowledged the need for detox, substance abuse, and mental health treatment in San Mateo County.

Dr. Gregory Braverman discussed the work he did in mental health and substance abuse. He noted the need for these services in the community. He offered to assist the County.

Mayor Brownrigg closed public comment.

Councilmember Stevenson expressed concern about the tight grant deadline and suggested that the County should press the State for flexibility.

Councilmember Thayer stated that she watched the San Mateo City Council special meeting and noted that there had been misinformation and fear early on. However, she thought that Horizon's detailed presentation helped clarify operations and correct misunderstandings. She encouraged Burlingame residents to watch the meeting to get a better sense of how the program functions.

Mayor Brownrigg acknowledged the Bayfront businesses' request for a thoughtful process and said that the City shares that desire. He stated that if Mahler Road emerges as the likely choice, the City will look at conditions, safety measures, and potential mitigations. He added that the City would work with both the County and local businesses.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Steve Duncan voiced concern about traffic and pedestrian safety at the intersection near 1441 Bellevue.

9. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Brownrigg asked the Councilmembers and the public if they wished to remove any item from the Consent Calendar. Councilmember Thayer pulled 9a, and Mayor Brownrigg pulled 9d. No items were pulled by the public.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn made a motion to adopt the following items from the Consent Calendar: 9b, 9c, 9e, 9f, 9g, 9h, 9i, and 9j; seconded by Councilmember Thayer. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

a. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE MARCH 17, 2026 INTERVIEWS FOR MEASURE I OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Councilmember Thayer stated that Vice Mayor Pappajohn adjourned the meeting. City Clerk Hassel-Shearer thanked Councilmember Thayer for the correction.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item for public comment. No one spoke.

Mayor Brownrigg made a motion to approve of the City Council Meeting Minutes for the March 17, 2026, interviews for the Measure I Oversight Committee and the Planning Commission with the correction of Vice Mayor Pappajohn adjourning the meeting; seconded by Councilmember Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

b. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 6, 2026 STUDY SESSION

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the April 6, 2026, Study Session.

c. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 6, 2026 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the April 6, 2026, City Council Meeting.

d. SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL AND REPLACE CHAPTER 3.40 (PLANNING COMMISSION) OF TITLE 3 OF THE BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE, TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS, SELECT A VICE CHAIR, AND REVISE THE ROLE OF THE SECRETARY

Mayor Brownrigg stated that he pulled this item not to oppose it but to record his thoughts regarding the Planning Commission. He acknowledged that recent State housing laws have significantly limited Planning Commission discretion, particularly regarding housing approvals. He stated that over the years, the Planning Commission has:

- Improved many projects – both large mixed-use developments and small infill projects through design review and public hearings
- Brought invaluable local knowledge and lived experience to discussions that staff cannot fully replicate

Mayor Brownrigg expressed concern that the change from seven to five commissioners, coupled with State level constraints, might be wrongly interpreted as a diminution of the Commission's value. He wanted the record to reflect that Council continues to rely on and value the Commission's independent judgement.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment. No one spoke.

Mayor Brownrigg made a motion to adopt Ordinance Number 2048; seconded by Councilmember Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

- e. **ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE RENEWING THE BURLINGAME MILITARY EQUIPMENT USE POLICY AND AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15378, 15061(b)(3)**

City Attorney Guina and Police Chief Vaswani requested Council adopt Ordinance Number 2049.

- f. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE PRIOR SUBMITTAL OF AN APPLICATION TO THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FOR CITY OF BURLINGAME'S WASTEWATER NUTRIENT REMOVAL PROJECT, AND IF AWARDED, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ACCEPT GRANT FUNDS AND EXECUTE ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS**

DPW Lamm requested Council adopt Resolution Number 042-2026.

- g. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT TO PARAGRAPH 2.2 OF THE PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT REFLECTING THE NAME CHANGE TO PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY AUTHORITY TO WESTLIGHT ENERGY**

City Manager Goldman requested Council adopt Resolution Number 043-2026.

- h. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A \$186,600 PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH SCHAAF & WHEELER FOR THE SEWER MAIN CAPACITY AND GRAVITY MAIN IMPROVEMENTS, CITY PROJECT NOS. 87200 & 87210, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT**

DPW Lamm requested Council adopt Resolution Number 044-2026.

- i. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE ANIMAL CONTROL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO AND ALL CITIES WITHIN SAN MATEO COUNTY FOR A THREE-YEAR TERM BEGINNING JULY 1, 2026**

City Manager Goldman requested Council adopt Resolution Number 045-2026.

- j. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH THE BURLINGAME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO INCREASE THE NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT TO \$235,101.69 AND TO EXTEND THE TERM**

City Manager Goldman requested Council adopt Resolution Number 046-2026.

10. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

a. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TENTATIVE AND FINAL PARCEL MAP (PM 25-04) FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES, SUBDIVISION OF LOT 11, BLOCK 4, MAP OF EASTON ADDITION TO BURLINGAME SUBDIVISION AT 1113-1115 PALOMA AVENUE; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES 15303(b)**

DPW Lamm stated that staff is requesting Council approval of a tentative map and a final parcel map for a subdivision of Lot 11, Block 4, Map of Easton Addition to Burlingame Subdivision. He explained that in September 2025, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on a major design review and condominium permit for:

- Demolition of an existing two-unit duplex and
- Construction of a new three-unit residential condominium on the same parcel

DPW Lamm stated that the Planning Commission approved the major design review and the condominium permit. He added that the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the associated final map.

Councilmember Thayer asked about a note on the second page of the final parcel map that refers to (3)(b) and questioned whether it should be (2)(b). DPW Lamm confirmed that it should be (2)(b).

Mayor Brownrigg opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Thayer made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 047-2026 with the above-stated change of (3)(b) to (2)(b); seconded by Councilmember Colson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

11. STAFF REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

There were no staff reports.

12. COUNCIL COMMITTEE AND ACTIVITIES REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmembers reported on their various committees and activities.

13. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

14. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The agendas, packets, and meeting minutes for the Planning Commission, Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission, Beautification Commission, Parks & Recreation Commission, and Library Board of Trustees are available online at www.burlingame.org.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Brownrigg adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m. in memory of Patrick Kinsella.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer
City Clerk