



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL
Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Regular City Council Meeting on May 4, 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 Ross Bruce.

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 REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS

AGENCY NEGOTIATOR: CITY MANAGER LISA K. GOLDMAN, CITY ATTORNEY MICHAEL GUINA

NEGOTIATING PARTIES: CITY OF BURLINGAME; GOLDEN 1 CREDIT UNION, A CALIFORNIA NOT FOR PROFIT CORPORATION

UNDER NEGOTIATION: PRICE AND TERMS

City Attorney Guina stated that no reportable action was taken.

6. UPCOMING EVENTS

Mayor Brownrigg reviewed upcoming events in the city.

7. PRESENTATIONS

There were none.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

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 item 9f, and Mayor Brownrigg pulled item 9j. No item was pulled by a member of the public.

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

a. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 20, 2026 CLOSED SESSION

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the April 20, 2026 Closed Session.

b. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 20, 2026 STUDY SESSION

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the April 20, 2026 Study Session.

c. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE April 20, 2026 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the April 20, 2026 City Council Meeting.

d. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS FOR BUILDING CONTRACT SERVICES FOR AMENDMENT NO. 4 WITH BUREAU VERITAS NORTH AMERICA, INC., TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$500,000, FOR A TOTAL COMPENSATION OF \$4,076,000; AND AMENDMENT NO. 3 WITH TRUE NORTH COMPLIANCE SERVICES, INC., TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$500,000, FOR A TOTAL COMPENSATION OF \$2,140,000, FOR FISCAL YEARS 2025-2026 AND 2026-2027

CDD Zayer requested Council approve Resolution Number 048-2026 and Resolution Number 049-2026.

e. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE 2025 SIDEWALK REPAIR PROGRAM, CITY PROJECT NO. 87010, BY VILLALOBOS & ASSOCIATES, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$953,528**

DPW Lamm requested Council approve Resolution Number 050-2026.

f. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A \$2,004,650 PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH CSWST2 FOR THE OLD BAYSHORE HIGHWAY STREETScape PROJECT, CITY PROJECT NO. 85221, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT**

Councilmember Thayer stated that she strongly supports the Old Bayshore Highway Streetscape Project. She asked that in the design work, the team consider pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to the Rosalie O'Mahony Pedestrian bridge, even if it lies slightly outside the project limits. She explained that improved connections there would significantly improve bicycle safety and utility.

Mayor Brownrigg concurred.

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

Councilmember Thayer made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 051-2026; seconded by Vice Mayor Pappajohn. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

g. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS INITIATING PROCEEDINGS TO RENEW THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE DOWNTOWN BURLINGAME AVENUE STREETScape IMPROVEMENT PROJECT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-27; APPROVING THE ANNUAL ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-27; AND DECLARING THE INTENTION TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-27 AND SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 18, 2026, AT 7:00 P.M. AT 501 PRIMROSE ROAD, BURLINGAME, CA**

DPW Lamm requested Council adopt Resolution Number 052-2026, Resolution Number 053-2026, and Resolution Number 054-2026.

h. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AWARDING A \$453,256 CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT TO REDGWICK CONSTRUCTION CO., FOR THE MURCHISON, TROUSDALE, AND DAVIS BIKE LANE PROJECT, CITY PROJECT NO. 86500; AND APPROVING A REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF MILLBRAE FOR THE IMPROVEMENTS ALONG MURCHISON DRIVE**

DPW Lamm requested Council adopt Resolution Number 055-2026 and Resolution Number 056-2026.

i. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION REJECTING ALL BIDS RECEIVED FOR THE EAST BURLINGAME TERRACE SUBDIVISION WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT PROJECT, CITY PROJECT NO. 86441, AND THE VALVE REPLACEMENT PROJECT, PHASE III, CITY PROJECT NO. 85260, AND AUTHORIZING STAFF TO REVISE THE BID DOCUMENTS AND RE-ADVERTISE THE PROJECT**

DPW Lamm requested Council adopt Resolution Number 058-2026.

- j. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION ORDERING AND CALLING FOR THE NOVEMBER 3, 2026, GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO FILL THREE (FULL TERM) CITY COUNCIL VACANCIES IN COUNCIL DISTRICTS 1, 3, AND 5; REQUESTING CONSOLIDATION OF ELECTIONS, AND SPECIFYING CERTAIN PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSOLIDATED ELECTION; REQUIRING PAYMENT OF PRORATED COSTS OF CANDIDATES' STATEMENTS; AND PROVIDING FOR GIVING NOTICE OF ELECTION**

Mayor Brownrigg stated that he pulled this item to announce that 2026 would be his last year on Council. He noted that his seat would be an open race on the November 3, 2026, ballot.

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

Mayor Brownrigg made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 057-2026; seconded by Councilmember Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

10. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. **PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING AND LEVYING BROADWAY BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-27**

Finance Director Yu-Scott stated that this is an annual action to approve the levy and collection of business improvement assessments on businesses in the Broadway Business Improvement District. She asked the City Clerk whether she received any protests.

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer replied in the negative.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Colson made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 059-2026; seconded by Councilmember Thayer. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

- b. **PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND LEVYING THE DOWNTOWN BURLINGAME AVENUE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-27**

Finance Director Yu-Scott stated that historically, the Downtown Burlingame Avenue Business Improvement District ("DBID") levies assessments in September. However, this year it was synchronized with the City's fiscal year through the adoption of an ordinance changing the DBID's fiscal year. She explained that downtown businesses will see their DBID assessments included on their business license renewal notices sent in mid-May.

Finance Director Yu-Scott asked the City Clerk if there had been any protests. City Clerk Hassel-Shearer replied in the negative.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Stevenson made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 060-2026; seconded by Vice Mayor Pappajohn. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

c. PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY OF BURLINGAME MASTER FEE SCHEDULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-27

Finance Director Yu-Scott stated that this was the second time the proposed updated Master Fee Schedule was before Council.

Councilmember Thayer stated that the schedule includes 4% increases to Central County Fire Department's fees. She explained that these increases are due to rising staffing costs following a recently signed collective bargaining agreement, which included cost-of-living adjustments and pay increases for fire personnel.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Thayer made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 061-2026; seconded by Councilmember Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

11. STAFF REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

a. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE BAYFRONT SPECIFIC PLAN

CDD Zayer explained that in December 2025, the Council approved a contract with Raimi and Associates to prepare a Bayfront Specific Plan. The Raimi and Associates consultant team is composed of approximately 20 members across six firms.

CDD Zayer stated that the Bayfront Specific Plan will establish a long-term vision for the next ten to 20 years for the area and guide future development.

CDD Zayer introduced Chris Sensenig, a principal at Raimi and Associates, to give the Council an update on the Bayfront Specific Plan.

Mr. Sensenig began by discussing what a specific plan is:

- Planning tool for a small area within a city
- Establishes the vision and guiding principles for the area

- Sets standards to guide future development
- Identifies streetscape, infrastructure, and public space improvements

Mr. Sensenig reviewed the makeup of the team assisting the City with the Bayfront Specific Plan:

- Raimi and Associates – project management, land use planning, development standards, specific plan design, and community engagement
- CMG – streetscape, public realm, and sea level rise adaptation
- Economic and Planning Systems – market and economic analysis
- David J. Powers & Associates – environmental review
- Hexagon – multi-modal transportation
- BKF Engineers – civil engineering and utilities

Mr. Sensenig discussed the project’s timeline. He stated that the team has outlined a nearly three-year process as outlined below:

2026

- **Background analysis and visioning** – includes visioning and goals and existing conditions reports and summary presentation
- **Develop and analyze options for the plan area** – includes placemaking and land use, transportation and mobility, and economic analysis of alternatives/strategies

2027

- **Pick a preferred option and prepare the plan** – includes review and select a preferred option (alternative) and prepare and review draft specific plan

2028

- **Environmental analysis and plan adoption** – includes environmental impact report (“EIR”) development and review, final specific plan, and adoption public hearings

Mr. Sensenig reviewed the proposed engagement strategy for each of the phases listed above:

- **Background analysis and visioning**
 - Stakeholder and property owner meetings
 - Meeting #1 with Community Advisory Committee (“CAC”) – April 27
 - City Council Study Session – May 4
 - Community Meeting #1 – June 10
- **Develop and analyze options for the plan area**
 - CAC Meeting #2
 - Stakeholder and property owner meetings
 - City Council Study Session

- Community Meeting #2
- Community Survey #1

- **Pick a preferred option and prepare the plan**
 - CAC Meeting #3
 - Stakeholder and property owner meetings
 - Joint Planning Commission and City Council Study Session
 - City Council Study Session

- **Environmental analysis and plan adoption**
 - Community Open House
 - Planning Commission adoption hearing
 - City Council adoption hearing

Mr. Sensenig reviewed the plan area. He stated that it is largely divided into two pieces:

- Bayfront North – focused around Old Bayshore Highway and includes the inner Bayshore industrial area to the west and a strip of commercial development between the street and the Bay
- Bayfront South – focused around Airport Boulevard and involves municipal facilities, Bayside Park, and a mix of offices and hotels

Mr. Sensenig stated that the General Plan has two principal districts in the area: Bayfront Commercial and Innovation Industrial.

Mr. Sensenig discussed the Bayfront Commercial district. He noted that in the General Plan and Zoning Code, it is described as creating a welcoming environment for Burlingame residents and tourists alike to visit, shop, eat, bike, walk, and enjoy nature. He explained that this zone provides opportunities for office and research development, as well as both local and tourist commercial uses that take advantage of the views of and access to the Bay.

Mr. Sensenig discussed the Innovation Industrial district. He stated that this district is very different; it includes a lot of industrial uses and business-to-business uses. He noted that the General Plan describes this district as a place for light industrial and logistic centers, with complementary commercial businesses.

Mr. Sensenig discussed recent State laws that have the potential of changing the character and land uses in the Bayfront plan area:

- SB 6 (2022)
 - Allows residential in commercial zones
 - Prevailing wage requirement
 - Skilled and trained workforce requirement
 - Minimum density of 30 du/a
- AB 2011 (2022)
 - Allows 100% affordable projects in commercial zones

- Mixed-income residential allowed on commercial corridors; excludes parcels within innovation industrial districts
- Prevailing wage requirements
- Minimum density of 30-40 du/a

Mr. Sensenig reviewed the constraints of the plan area:

- Sea level rise and flooding
- Vehicle access
- Pedestrian/bicyclist access and facilities

Mr. Sensenig discussed opportunities in the plan area:

- Transit access – proximity to regional transit services
- Planned Old Bayshore Highway improvements
 - Reduce number of lanes
 - Improved bike facilities
 - Widened sidewalks
 - Improved crossings
 - Improved bus shelters
 - Consistent tree planting
 - Enhanced access points to Bay Trail
- Existing land uses and development pipeline

Mr. Sensenig stated that the Bayfront is a very important piece of Burlingame's economy as it holds approximately 50% of the city's jobs. He noted that the area has diversified employment:

- 50% specialized business services
- 24% hotels, restaurants, and retail industry
- 12% professional, scientific, and technical services
- 8% logistics (transportation and warehousing)

Mr. Sensenig discussed how the plan area has strong commercial real estate potential:

- Recent commercial projects in the Bayfront area demonstrate a demand for new workspaces
- Regional hotel occupancy remains below pre-pandemic levels, but recreation and leisure uses could buoy hospitality and restaurants
- Industrial uses remain a key economic use, but market conditions are softening
- Retail on the Bayfront is limited and narrowly concentrated in sit-down restaurants

Mr. Sensenig discussed the potential for housing on the Bayfront:

- The Peninsula multi-family market remains strong, supported by sustained demand and continued developer interest despite a cyclical slowdown
- Limited retail, restaurants, and amenities is a market challenge for new housing projects

Mr. Sensenig reviewed the questions for Council to consider:

- If you could design the ideal Bayfront, what would you envision?
- What land uses would you like to see?
- What would you like to keep/protect?
- What would you like to see change?
- What would you like to see included in this planning process?
- Are there specific results you would like to see in the plan?

Mayor Brownrigg stated that the 2019 General Plan and the existing zoning changes prompted significant development such as Meta and Peninsula Crossing. He asked why, given that the system seems to be working, the City should now adopt a specific plan. CDD Zayer replied that under the 2019 General Plan, many office/research and development projects were entitled, and some were built. She added that about half of the entitled square footage has been built, and the other half is on hold, largely for market reasons. She distinguished between a General Plan, which opens up floor area and land use opportunities, and a specific plan, which deals with urban design, public realm design, open space network, connectivity, and infrastructure.

CDD Zayer stated that the General Plan is high-level and policy oriented, while the specific plan is site and area specific.

Councilmember Colson stated that she is in support of the innovative industrial uses emerging such as:

- Light manufacturing
- Office and administrative work on site
- Research and development in one location

She voiced concerns about certain non-industrial uses that are near or in the Innovation Industrial district such as:

- A high school facility
- A new tennis center
- The Yaseen Foundation

Councilmember Colson asked about ensuring the safety of children and families using those facilities and how to manage their coexistence.

Councilmember Colson discussed the County's ownership of 6.75 acres in the Bayfront, which are using primarily for storage, and the County's decision to purchase an additional two acres. She expressed concern that such a large public ownership for low intensity uses takes land off the tax rolls, limits the possibility for future industrial or commercial redevelopment, and could lead to a large portion of this valuable area becoming relatively static.

Councilmember Colson asked how the specific plan can manage and integrate these varied uses (industrial, community/recreational, county storage) over time. She asked whether and how the City can steer the

Innovation Industrial zone toward higher-value industrial and innovation uses while still allowing some community-serving uses. Mr. Sensenig replied by explaining that one way to shape the area is to revise the use table:

- Clarify which uses are permitted by right
- Which are conditionally permitted, and
- Which may be prohibited or discouraged

CDD Zayer added that currently the Innovation Industrial zone is quite broad and permissive, allowing a wide variety of uses. She explained that if the Council wants to treat industrial as the primary use, the City can:

- Re-tier the use table so that industrial uses are clearly primary
- Move others (such as certain indoor recreation and large storage uses) into conditional use status or limit their intensities

She emphasized that the specific plan gives the City an opportunity to reorganize and refine the Innovation Industrial zone to better reflect a prioritized vision.

Councilmember Colson discussed the State Lands parcel on the Bayfront. She asked whether the State could, by virtue of its ownership, place housing on that site regardless of local zoning. CDD Zayer replied that under various State housing and Surplus Land Act laws, the State can pursue housing projects in locations where State law authorizes residential use. She confirmed that the State could potentially pursue housing on that site.

Councilmember Stevenson asked how specific the City can be in tailoring the Innovation Industrial zone to promote certain types of businesses. CDD Zayer replied that the City can be very specific.

Councilmember Thayer discussed the goal of attracting creative and design-related businesses. She noted that the General Plan language encourages such uses, but she does not see many currently operating in the Bayfront area. She added that North Rollins is an area where the City intentionally allows creative uses. She asked whether similar design, creative, and studio-type uses might also be appropriate in parts on the Innovation Industrial zone. CDD Zayer replied that the North Rollins Specific Plan explicitly calls out certain creative and design uses. She added that if Council wants the Bayfront to also accommodate that category, staff can mirror or adapt these definitions, identify sub-areas in the Bayfront for these uses, and ensure compatibility with industrial or Bayfront commercial neighbors.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn asked about recreation and open space opportunities. She stated that she is especially interested in:

- How the specific plan can support indoor recreation facilities like climbing gyms or sport centers
- How the outdoor public realm along the Bay Trail can be improved

Vice Mayor Pappajohn discussed how some of the new projects in the Bayfront provided public plazas and community benefits that include publicly accessible open space. She asked whether the consultant sees

the best opportunities for open space in the Bayfront and how these opportunities might align with hotel, office, and sports uses. Mr. Sensenig replied that the Bay Trail and waterfront are central to the plan and offer the chance to create a world-class Bayfront. He explained that the idea is to transform the waterfront from a narrow, inconsistent path into a continuous high-quality public realm. He pointed to Meta and Peninsula Crossing as examples of privately developed projects that nevertheless provide public open spaces, view corridors, and direct waterfront access. He added that much of the public open space strategy will involve improving the Bay Trail corridor and adding nodes and activity zones along the trail.

CDD Zayer stated that if you slice the Bayfront roughly at Broadway, the southern portion has:

- Topgolf
- Murray Field and Bayside Park
- Woolley Park/State parkland around the lagoon
- Existing walking trails and Bay Trail segments

She added that the northern portion has far fewer open space nodes.

CDD Zayer noted that the feedback from stakeholders, hoteliers, and the CAC is that the City should:

- Create more seating areas
- Provide small plazas, overlooks, and dining terraces along the Bay Trail
- Add drinking fountains, rest spots, and public art
- Treat the Bay Trail as a spine with multiple experiences, not just a linear narrow path

CDD Zayer emphasized the synergy with OneShoreline; as the City works with the agency on levee and shoreline protection, it should ensure the top of the levee can host:

- A wider Bay Trail
- Public access nodes
- Integrated open spaces and viewing areas

Councilmember Stevenson stated that in his personal experience, there are more gaps and substandard segments along the Bay Trail than the single map might suggest. He requested that the existing conditions report explicitly identify all functional gaps and constrained segments, not just where the line is missing on the map.

Councilmember Stevenson referenced experiences in places like Brooklyn's waterfront in New York City where:

- Former industrial waterfront has been converted into multi-use promenades
- Historic buildings have been adapted for new uses while preserving original facades
- Public art and programming make the area a destination

Councilmember Stevenson asked whether the consultant would be looking beyond Burlingame for precedents and best practices in waterfront redevelopment, public art, and adaptive reuse. CDD Zayer

replied in the affirmative. She explained that many successful waterfronts and urban spaces share a common set of ingredients, such as:

- Public art
- High-quality seating and gathering areas
- Wide promenades or plazas
- Active ground floor uses or adjacent uses that activate the space
- Good landscaping and wayfinding

Mayor Brownrigg stated that one of the City's strengths is that most residents can walk to a neighborhood school. He explained that if the City allows significant new housing on the Bayfront, the Council must consider where those residents would go to schools and grocery stores, how to provide police and fire coverage, and how to handle traffic and transit.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that it might be better for the specific plan to answer the housing question early in the process because many other decisions will flow from that decision.

Councilmember Colson expressed caution about introducing housing in the Bayfront, particularly large amounts of family-oriented, low-income housing, which would be more difficult to serve with schools and daily services. She suggested that the City already has significant housing opportunities in the North El Camino Real and North Rollins Road areas. She stated that it might be preferable to concentrate housing growth in those transit-proximate, existing corridors before opening a new neighborhood on the Bayfront.

Councilmember Colson stated that if the City eventually considers Bayfront housing, her vision would be to build residential above hotel or commercial properties.

Councilmember Thayer stated that she bikes the Bayfront and she sees particular nodes where people gather such as at coffee shops and at benches across from the wastewater treatment plant. She explained that she would like to see this pattern of small gathering spaces replicated along the Bayfront.

Councilmember Thayer stated that the Bayfront is only served by one SamTrans bus line, with few or poor-quality bus stops. She suggested that the City explore:

- Better bus stop infrastructure
- Improved frequency on that bus line
- Integration with Millbrae BART and Burlingame Caltrain

Councilmember Stevenson discussed his vision for the Bayfront:

- High variety and mixed-use
- Focused on people working, playing, eating, shopping, and recreation
- Limited or no traditional housing

CDD Zayer stated that Council's comments give staff a clear direction to prepare alternatives that:

- Emphasize a non-residential mixed-use Bayfront

- Protect and refine the Innovation Industrial Base
- Strengthen the hotel and conference/event niche
- Create continuous high-quality Bay Trail and waterfront nodes
- Incorporate recreation
- Coordinate closely with One-Shoreline on a levee/trail system

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

Mayor Brownrigg thanked staff and the consultant for the presentation.

12. COUNCIL COMMITTEE AND ACTIVITIES REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmembers reported on their various committees and activities.

13. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Councilmember Colson asked for a standing agenda item regarding the Mahler property and the potential relocation of Horizon. Council agreed to agendize this item.

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 8:45 p.m. in memory of Nancy Magee and Daniel Cyrus Novak.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer
City Clerk