



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL**  
**Unapproved Minutes**  
**City Council Study Session on February 2, 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 6:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

*\* Councilmember Stevenson appeared at the meeting remotely from Chalet Tacito House in Niseko, Abuta District, Hokkaido 048-1511, Japan. The location was posted on the agenda.*

**3. REQUEST FOR AB 2449 REMOTE PARTICIPATION**

There were no requests.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**5. STUDY SESSION**

**a. STUDY SESSION – VISION ZERO PROJECT UPDATE**

DPW Lamm stated that the purpose of the study session was to obtain feedback from the Council as the Vision Zero/Comprehensive Safety Action Plan enters the next phase. He introduced Dana Weissman, from Fehr & Peers, to deliver the presentation.

Ms. Weissman began with some background information about the project. She explained that the City received a Federal grant to develop a Comprehensive Safety Action Plan. She stated that the City and consultants split the project into five steps:

1. Identify community needs and examine crash trends

2. Understand why and where collisions occur
3. Develop the High Injury Network (“HIN”)
4. Prioritize infrastructure projects and supporting programs and policies
5. Develop an action plan with solutions and strategies.

Ms. Weissman stated that with the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan, the City is committing to the goal of eliminating traffic deaths and serious injuries by 2040. She explained that this plan reinforces the City’s ongoing commitment to safety, building on recently completed safety projects.

Ms. Weissman discussed the community’s engagement on the project:

- 1,500 website visits to the Vision Zero project page
- 100-plus members engaged at in-person events
- 650 contributions to the virtual map survey
- Five City and County departments were represented on the project task force
- 14 Community Advisory Committee members provided input throughout the project
- Five public presentations were given to the City Council and the Traffic Safety & Parking Commission

Ms. Weissman reviewed the feedback that staff received from the community:

- Two out of three comments expressed a desire for safer crossings for people walking or biking
- One out of four comments highlighted the need for fewer vehicles on the road
- One out of five comments emphasized school safety
- One out of five comments called for slower vehicle speeds

Ms. Weissman stated that speeding emerged as a top safety concern across the surveys, in-person engagement, advisory committees, and Council discussions. She explained that there is strong support for infrastructure upgrades and targeted enforcement to slow traffic and improve safety. She added that this aligns with the collision data, as fatal and serious injury collisions are associated with higher speeds and concentrated on higher-speed roadways.

Ms. Weissman stated that at the last Council presentation, she shared a draft HIN. She explained that the HIN has been further refined, and she displayed a map of the network. She noted that this serves as the foundation for the project prioritization process in the “Roadmap to Zero.” She added that the HIN does not include El Camino Real because it is a State highway, but El Camino Real accounts for 30% of citywide injury collisions.

Ms. Weissman discussed the “Roadmap to Zero”. She stated that the “Roadmap to Zero” translates the community input and data analysis into a set of actionable safety strategies for the City to focus on in the coming years. She noted that it is built around a Safe System approach, which recognizes that preventing serious and fatal collisions requires addressing all components of the transportation system. She reviewed the components:

- Safe Speeds
  - Comprehensive speed management plan

- American Public Works Association compliance
- Automated enforcement
- Safe Road Users
  - E-micromobility safety
  - Public safety campaign
  - Targeted enforcement
  - Safe routes to school program
- Safe Roads
  - Citywide lighting enhancements
  - Vision Zero program coordinator
  - Grant funding
  - Safety and complete streets checklist
  - Capital improvement program audit
  - Program evaluation framework
  - Residential traffic calming program
  - Vision Zero quick build toolkit
  - Construction detours
  - Safety impact assessments
  - Curbside management safety
- Safe Vehicles
  - AV readiness
  - City fleet safety enhancements
- Post Crash Care
  - Rapid response team
  - Crash and roadway data
  - Job rotations
  - Data linkage

Ms. Weissman stated that the City would focus first on three of these strategies as they represent near-term, high-impact opportunities:

- Comprehensive speed management plan
- E-micromobility safety
- Citywide lighting enhancements

### **Comprehensive Speed Management Plan**

Ms. Weissman stated that AB 43 gives the City greater flexibility to set speed limits based on safety context like roadway characteristics, land uses, and the presence of vulnerable road users. She explained that using this framework, the City examined 40 road segments and identified potential near-term opportunities for speed limit reductions. She noted that these potential reductions are currently being explored through ongoing coordination with the Police Department. The list of potential streets with speed reductions:

<b>Study Roadway</b>	<b>From Street</b>	<b>To Street</b>	<b>Recommended Posted Speed Limit</b>	<b>Recommended Change in Posted Speed Limit</b>
Adeline Drive	El Camino Real	Alvarado Avenue	20	-5
Adrian Road	David Road	Millbrae City Limit	30	-5
Airport Boulevard	Bayshore Highway	Lang Road	30	-5
Barroilhet Avenue	El Camino Real	Elm Avenue	20	-5
Bayshore Highway	Airport Boulevard	Millbrae City Limit	30	-5
Bayswater Avenue	California Drive	Humboldt Road	20	-5
Bernal Avenue	Adeline Drive	Devereux Drive	20	-5
Bloomfield Road	Peninsula Avenue	Rollins Road	20	-5
Broadway	Balboa Avenue	Vancouver Avenue	20	-5
California Drive	Peninsula Avenue	Burlingame Avenue	25	0
California Drive	Burlingame Avenue	Broadway	25	-10
California Drive	Broadway	Murchison Drive	30	-5
Carmelita Avenue	California Drive	El Camino Real	20	-5
Carmelita Avenue	El Camino Real	Vancouver Avenue	20	-5
Carolan Avenue	Oak Grove Avenue	Broadway	30	-5
Chapin Avenue	El Camino Real	Primrose Road	20	-5
Cypress Avenue	El Camino Real	Barroilhet Avenue	20	-5
Easton Drive	El Camino Real	Alvarado Avenue	20	-5
Floribunda Avenue	California Drive	El Camino Real	20	-5
Grove Avenue	El Camino Real	California Drive	20	-5
Hillside Drive	El Camino Real	Alvarado Avenue	25	-5
Howard Avenue	Humboldt Road	California Drive	20	-5
Howard Avenue	El Camino Real	Occidental Avenue	20	-5
Lincoln Avenue	El Camino Real	California Drive	20	-5
Marco Polo Way	Trousdale Drive	Davis Drive	20	-5
Mills Avenue	El Camino Real	California Drive	20	-5
Murchison Drive	El Camino Real	Sequoia Avenue	20	-5
North Carolan Avenue	Rollins Road	Edwards Road	20	-5
Oak Grove Avenue	El Camino Real	California Drive	20	-5
Oak Grove Avenue	California Drive	Rollins Road	20	-5
Occidental Avenue	Barroilhet Avenue	Bellevue Avenue	20	-5
Peninsula Avenue	El Camino Real	California Drive	25	-5
Peninsula Avenue	California Drive	Humboldt Road	30	-5
Quesada Way	Trousdale Drive	Davis Drive	20	-5
Ralston Avenue	El Camino Real	Hillsborough	20	-5
Rollins Road	San Mateo City Limits	Broadway	30	-5

Rollins Road	Broadway	Millbrae City Limit	30	-5
Rosedale Avenue	El Camino Real	California Drive	20	-5
Trousdale Drive	Skyline Boulevard	El Camino Real	30	-5
Vancouver Avenue	Broadway	Adeline Drive	20	-5

**E-micromobility Safety**

Ms. Weissman stated that there is a range of policy options the City could consider to support e-micromobility safety. However, she noted that it’s important to remember that the California Vehicle Code regulates e-micromobility use and may limit what is within the City’s control. She explained that some options that are available to the City are straightforward municipal code adjustments that the City can implement locally, like clarifying and consolidating existing code provisions or refining rules around trail use and parking. She added that C/CAG is researching and developing a sample ordinance related to e-bikes.

Ms. Weissman stated that some policy options, like the implementation of age restrictions for higher classification e-bikes, would require state legislation for Burlingame to legally enforce. Pilot programs for this type of legislation are currently underway in Marin County and San Diego County. She added that on top of policy changes for e-micromobility, infrastructure and programmatic strategies are important to enhancing safety.

**Citywide Lighting Enhancements**

Ms. Weissman stated that the third strategy that they would focus on is enhanced lighting. She stated that their team assessed how street lighting influences nighttime safety. They found that injury collisions at night are happening on arterials and collector streets with some level of existing lighting. She stated that this presents an opportunity for the City to better align current roadway lighting practices with industry best practices and emerging safety standards.

Ms. Weissman stated that one more critical element of the “Roadmap to Zero” is the identification of priority safety infrastructure projects. She stated that staff developed a prioritization framework that helped identify locations across the city that present the greatest opportunity for safety improvements. She explained that the prioritization framework incorporated collision data, roadway factors like vehicle speeds and volumes. She noted that the framework also includes safety priorities that were identified through engagement and data analysis like school zones, downtown commercial areas, and other locations of community concern.

Ms. Weissman reviewed the next steps of the project:

- February/March 2026: Meet with the Task Force, Community Advisory Committee, and the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission
- Spring 2026: Public review of full draft plan, including the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission meeting

- Summer 2026: Incorporate input from Council, stakeholders, and community to develop final plan
- Summer 2026: Bring final Comprehensive Safety Action Plan to the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission and City Council for adoption

Councilmember Thayer asked whether the table listing streets for possible speed reductions is comprehensive or only highlighted a subset. Ms. Weissman stated that the 40 streets in the table were those with recent official speed data, which is a necessary baseline for certain types of speed-limit changes. She added that they started with these segments because the data was already available. However, she noted that other streets, including those on the HIN or in the priority project list, are identified as strong candidates for the next wave of data collection.

Councilmember Colson noted that Burlingame Avenue was not listed among the candidate streets, though it experiences a significant amount of fast traffic. She raised concerns about several border streets. She suggested that Burlingame coordinate with other neighboring cities such as Hillsborough and San Mateo regarding shared streets. Public Works Assistant Director Okada replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn raised concerns about the upcoming public review of the plan. She anticipated that many residents might react by saying that their own street is unsafe and should be added. She asked how feedback would be solicited and handled, and whether the City should limit or otherwise manage location-specific suggestions.

Mayor Brownrigg asked whether it would be possible to designate standard speed limits for defined residential neighborhood areas, so that streets of similar character share the same limit, rather than evaluating each street individually. DPW Lamm replied that as part of the final plan adoption, the City could establish a process to receive, analyze, and evaluate requests about specific streets, including changes over time as traffic patterns shift. He noted that changing speeds on one street may divert traffic to another. He added that formalizing a process would allow flexibility to add streets or adjust strategies even if a particular street is not explicitly listed in the adopted plan.

Councilmember Stevenson discussed attending a Local Roadway Safety Plan presentation by the City of San Mateo. He asked if the data and methodology used for the HIN captured not just locations but also nuanced factors such as:

- turn movements
- whether intersections have protected or free turns
- whether controls rely heavily on driver judgment.

Ms. Weissman replied that the HIN includes both corridors and intersections with high concentrations of serious/fatal collision. She added that HIN identifies where the problems are, not the detailed causal mechanics.

Mayor Brownrigg asked for confirmation that solutions could include new traffic signals at problem intersections. Ms. Weissman replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn discussed the importance of traffic calming projects as speed reduction alone doesn't fix problems. Ms. Weissman replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Stevenson asked if the collision data identifies e-bikes versus traditional bikes. Ms. Weissman replied that current local collision datasets do not reliably distinguish e-bikes and e-scooters from regular bicycles. She stated that the analysis includes pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, and motorcycles, but does not have an e-bike category. She added that research is underway, including by academic and regional bodies, to better understand safety outcomes for e-bikes versus higher-powered devices such as e-motos (electric motorbike-style vehicles).

Councilmember Stevenson suggested it may be valuable to look at data from healthcare entities that see the aftermath of e-bike related injuries. Ms. Weissman replied that C/CAG will soon start a study that includes a San Mateo County - specific investigation of e-bike safety outcomes. She indicated that this research might fill some gaps but still must contend with incomplete data, even at the state level.

DPW Lamm stated that the Mineta Institute and other state-level actors acknowledge that available data on e-bikes are incomplete, and efforts are ongoing to improve data quality.

Councilmember Colson stated that Burlingame has implemented several of the policy and infrastructure items listed in Ms. Weissman's presentation including trail use management and school-based education.

Councilmember Thayer stated that she attended e-bike forums held by Senator Becker and Assemblymember Pappan that included presentations from Mineta Institute researchers. She explained that the Mineta Institute's findings that many Class 2 e-bikes are in fact illegal higher-speed devices due to modified or non-compliant throttles, allowing them to exceed their intended regulated speeds. She suggested linking e-micromobility policy with speed reduction strategy.

Mayor Brownrigg reported that at his recent community meet-up, several attendees raised concerns about dim or inadequate lighting in their neighborhood. He asked how residents should report concerns about dark streets and whether the plan could present a survey of modern lighting technologies that effectively illuminate streets and sidewalks.

Councilmember Colson suggested including education for pedestrians and cyclists about self-lighting at night including wearing reflective vests and using personal lights.

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

Councilmember Stevenson expressed overall support for the comprehensive nature of the plan and the work by staff and the consultant. He emphasized the importance of adding local nuance and integrating broader regional efforts.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn discussed moving on early action projects to achieve quick wins such as educational campaigns, signage, or initial enforcement steps.

Councilmember Colson expressed strong support for the work and thanked staff for their efforts.

Councilmember Thayer voiced support for focusing on speed reduction, lighting, and e-micromobility. She urged the City to be more proactive in applying AB 43 authority in downtown areas and around schools.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that he found the 2040 target for zero fatalities somewhat problematic, partially because it was too far in the future from a messaging standpoint. He suggested revisiting the way the goal is framed and emphasizing action “as soon as possible” instead of at a fixed distant year.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that Burlingame will not have enough police officers to enforce every speed and stop sign violation that residents might raise. He recommended the plan include a survey of enforcement technologies including automated speed enforcement, stop-sign compliance technologies, and other automated tools.

Mayor Brownrigg emphasized that the highest concerns often involve areas where cars and pedestrians are in frequent proximity, including downtown districts, school zones, and driveway/parking lot access points.

Mayor Brownrigg asked how Burlingame compares with other cities regarding Vision Zero efforts. DPW Lamm discussed a Washington Post article that stated that many U.S. cities with Vision Zero Plans saw little reductions in fatalities. However, he explained that this was due to cities not fully implementing measures they adopted because of cost and political pressure. He added that in contrast, San Francisco recently reported a 40% reduction in fatalities and serious injuries attributed to focused investment on its high injury network.

Mayor Brownrigg thanked staff and asked about next steps. DPW Lamm replied that staff will return to committees and commissions later in the spring with similar focused questions. He added that staff aims to have a draft plan ready in the spring.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Brownrigg adjourned the study session at 6:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer  
City Clerk