



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL
Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Regular City Council Meeting on November 3, 2025**

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 7:00 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Tony Brown.

3. ROLL CALL

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

4. REQUEST FOR AB 2249 REMOTE PARTICIPATION

There were no requests.

5. REPORT OUT FROM CLOSED SESSION

- a. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - REAL PROPERTY NEOGITATIONS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.8
PROPERTY: 1440 CHAPIN AVENUE BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA
AGENCY NEGOTIATORS: CITY MANAGER LISA K. GOLDMAN AND CITY ATTORNEY MICHAEL GUINA
NEGOTIATING PARTIES: CITY OF BURLINGAME AND CENTRAL COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT
UNDER NEGOTIATIONS: PRICE AND TERMS

City Attorney Guina stated that direction was given, but no reportable action was taken.

- b. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(d)(1)
1.1 MICHAEL MITCHELL, ET AL. V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, ET AL., SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 22-CIV-01964

- 1.2 CHENGGUO, DONG, ET AL., V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, ET AL., SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 21-CIV-05900
- 1.3 ETZEL WILLIAMS, III ET AL., V. PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY, AKA CALTRAIN, CITY OF BURLINGAME ET AL., SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 22-CIV-03763
- 1.4 BOURI V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 24-CIV-06602
- 1.5 BRIAN PATRICK WYNN V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, ET AL., SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 25-CIV-01144
- 1.6 NEVILLE, STEPHEN V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 25-CIV-05067
- 1.7 ANA ALVAREZ DE BARAHONA V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 25-CIV-07084
- 1.8 PAPERS & PETALS V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 24-CIV-08273
- 1.9 JON CHISM V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBER 24-CIV-06705
- 1.10 HECTOR POLVO V. CITY OF BURLINGAME, SAN MATEO COUNTY SMALL CLAIMS COURT, CASE NUMBER 25-SCS-01061
- 1.11 DOMINICK J. CRISAFI, ET AL., V. JAMES P. SARGEN, CITY OF BURLINGAME ET AL., SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, CASE NUMBERS 355462 AND 341895

City Attorney Guina reported that direction was given, but no reportable action was taken.

- c. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(d)(2)
 - 2.1 CLAIM OF WAWANESA INSURANCE BU-1651
 - 2.2 CLAIM OF CHAD KRAKOW BU-1652/BU-1654
 - 2.3 CLAIM OF FRANCISCO BATARO BU-1653
 - 2.4 CLAIM OF JOHN DASHBACH BU-1655
 - 2.5 CLAIM OF GUS MILIONIS BU-1656
 - 2.6 CLAIM OF JULIE BUCKMASTER
 - 2.7 CLAIM OF SHOWCHIA HO BU-1650
 - 2.8 CLAIM OF BALFOUR BEATTY INFRASTRUCTURE, INC. BU-1611
 - 2.9 CLAIM OF LEXINGTON INSURANCE COMPANY BU-1612

City Attorney Guina reported that direction was given, but no reportable action was taken.

6. UPCOMING EVENTS

Mayor Stevenson reviewed upcoming events in the city.

7. PRESENTATIONS

a. THE ANNUAL BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION LANDSCAPE AWARDS

Beautification Commissioner Kirchner presented the Annual Beautification Commission Landscape Awards.

Commissioner Kirchner stated that the Business Landscape Award recognizes the efforts of businesses to beautify the city and to encourage attractive landscaping improvements in the community. The recipient was Penflora Designs at 1243 Howard Avenue. Congratulations!

Commissioner Kirchner stated that the Residential Sustainable Landscape Award recognizes exceptional residential landscape design that exemplifies both drought-tolerant landscapes and strategies for reducing potable water use. The recipients were Chris McGill and Camille Watson of 2508 Easton Drive. Congratulations!

Commissioner Kirchner stated that the Multi-Family Residential Facilities Landscape Award recognizes exceptional landscaping solutions surrounding multi-family residential facilities. The recipient was North Park Apartments at 1080 Carolan Avenue.

Following in the great tradition of Dale Perkins, Councilmember Colson presented Penflora with a painting of their business.

The Council thanked all the recipients and discussed the positive environmental message associated with these annual awards.

b. EL CAMINO REAL RENEWAL PROJECT CONSTRUCTION UPDATE BY CALTRANS

Caltrans representatives Romell Pardo and Gary Lai provided the Council and community with an update on the El Camino Real Renewal Project.

Caltrans Project Manager Pardo began by stating that the project covers three miles of El Camino Real through Burlingame, San Mateo, Millbrae, and Hillsborough. He reviewed the scope of the project:

- Repair of failing roadway sections
- Upgrades to sidewalks consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”)
- Drainage improvements to address flooding
- Enhanced driver and pedestrian visibility
- Removal of hazardous trees

He noted that the project is slated to start in either December 2025 or January 2026, with the project’s completion anticipated in autumn 2029. He added that PG&E’s work to underground the powerlines may affect the schedule.

Caltrans Construction Manager Lai reviewed the staging of the project. He detailed that there would be six major stages covering various parts of the corridor, each with specific infrastructure focuses and estimated dates. He explained that the first stage would involve tree removal in the northbound direction and drainage work in the southbound lanes. He stated that 136 large trees would be removed in two-block segments, which would require detours and some full road closures. He emphasized that traffic management plans were in place and that Caltrans would coordinate closely with the City and emergency services.

Caltrans Public Information Officer Jeneane Crawford reviewed the project's outreach strategies including:

- Sending mailers to residents along the corridor
- Providing frequent updates on the project website and social media
- Maintaining an email advisory list for upcoming closures or detours

Ms. Crawford recommended that the public subscribe to updates on the project website. She added that Caltrans and the City would hold weekly meetings during construction to facilitate ongoing coordination and ensure that the public stays informed.

Councilmember Thayer asked about the frequency of email updates regarding closures or other disruptions. Ms. Crawford replied that while there is no set schedule; updates are sent out as needed according to project activity, and she encouraged residents to subscribe if interested.

DPW Murtuza stated that all directly impacted properties would be contacted in advance by an on-site team.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg suggested that Caltrans use additional local networks such as Nextdoor and the San Mateo County Association of Realtors ("SAMCAR") to increase outreach. He also suggested that banners and sandwich boards be used.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg stressed the importance of managing regional traffic by directing it to detour around Burlingame using prominent arterials. DPW Murtuza replied that freeway signage would be used where possible and that impacts would be reassessed as necessary.

Councilmember Pappajohn asked whether any of the construction would be conducted at night. Mr. Lai replied that all work would be performed during regular daytime hours, but that some closures may persist overnight due to the nature of construction activities.

Councilmember Colson expressed her appreciation for all the members of the multi-agency team involved in the long-term planning and implementation of the project.

Mayor Stevenson asked how long each two-block closure would last. Mr. Lai replied that each closure was estimated to last approximately one month, with closures separated so that traffic could continue to flow in intervening segments.

Mayor Stevenson asked about the coordination with emergency services. DPW Murtuza replied that the City's emergency contacts were regularly updated and that direct communication would be maintained, especially with police and fire.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg noted that while the project was removing many of the large trees, the project was also planting more trees than what was being removed.

Mayor Stevenson opened the item up for public comment.

Jennifer Pfaff stated that as part of the project, some of the trees would be turned into benches, a sidewalk time capsule would be created, and that the route would include commemorative plaques.

Mayor Stevenson closed public comment.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

9. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Stevenson asked the Councilmembers and the public if they wished to remove any item from the Consent Calendar. No items were removed.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg made a motion to adopt the Consent Calendar; seconded by Councilmember Thayer. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

a. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 20, 2025 CLOSED SESSION

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the October 20, 2025 Closed Session.

b. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 20, 2025 REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the October 20, 2025 Regular City Council Meeting.

c. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 22, 2025 SPECIAL MEETING

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the October 22, 2025 Special Meeting

d. SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCES

AMENDING CHAPTER 17.04 OF CHAPTER 17, "FIRE," OF THE BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE WITH LOCAL AMENDMENTS; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES 15378, 15061(b)(3)

AMENDING CHAPTERS 18.05, 18.06, 18.07, 18.08, 18.09, 18.10, 18.11, 18.12, 18.13, 18.16, 18.22, 18.30, AND 18.31 OF TITLE 18, "BUILDING CONSTRUCTION," OF THE BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE WITH LOCAL AMENDMENTS; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES 15378, 15061(b)(3)

ADOPTING A NEW TITLE 19 TO ADOPT THE 2025 CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODE WITH LOCAL AMENDMENTS; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES 15378, 15061(b)(3)

Chief Building Official Glenn requested Council adopt Ordinance Number 2041, Ordinance Number 2042, and Ordinance Number 2043.

e. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A THREE-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH ALARM PROGRAM SYSTEM, LLC FOR ALARM PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION SERVICES WITH THE OPTION TO RENEW SERVICES ANNUALLY THEREAFTER; AND INCREASING THE GENERAL FUND BUDGET APPROPRIATION FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BY \$16,000

Finance Director Yu-Scott requested Council adopt Resolution Number 122-2025.

f. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH LWP CLAIMS SOLUTION FOR A FIVE-YEAR PERIOD FOR THIRD-PARTY ADMINISTRATION OF THE CITY'S SELF-INSURED WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAM

HR Director Saguisag-Sid requested Council adopt Resolution Number 123-2025.

g. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION REJECTING ALL BIDES RECEIVED FOR THE BURLINGAME CITY PARKS 2025 ASPHALT PATH REPAIR PROJECT, AND AUTHORIZING STAFF TO REVISE THE BID DOCUMENTS AND RE-ADVERTISE THE PROJECT

Parks and Recreation Director Glomstad requested Council adopt Resolution Number 124-2025.

h. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF FIELD LIGHTING FROM MUSCO SPORTS LIGHTING, LLC, FOR THE LIGHTING RETROFIT AT BAYSIDE FIELDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$491,298.06, CITY PROJECT NO. 87270

Parks and Recreation Director Glomstad requested Council adopt Resolution Number 125-2025.

i. OPEN NOMINATION PERIOD TO FILL A VACANCY (BURLINGAME REPRESENTATIVE) ON THE SAN MATEO COUNTY MOSQUITO AND VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

City Manager Goldman requested Council open the nomination period to fill a vacancy (Burlingame Representative) on the San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District Board of Trustees.

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. CALL FOR REVIEW OF PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR'S DECISION CONCERNING ENCROACHMENT PERMIT AT 1151 ROSEDALE AVENUE PURSUANT TO BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 12.10.060

City Attorney Guina explained that Assistant City Attorney Tamar Burke would be advising the City Council on this matter. ACA Burke took City Attorney Guina's seat on the dais.

Mayor Stevenson stated that the Council was considering the appeal of the Public Works Director's decision regarding an encroachment permit application at 1151 Rosedale Avenue. He noted that it was 7:57 p.m. He explained that the property owners at 1151 Rosedale applied for an encroachment permit, seeking authorization for two stone pillars constructed along the Rosedale Avenue frontage of their home and a solid wooden fence, landscaping, and pavers along the Westmoor Road frontage. The Public Works Director approved the application as to the encroachments along the Rosedale Avenue frontage for a period of five years and denied the application as to all encroachments along the Westmoor Road frontage. The property owners appealed the Public Works Director's decision to the City Council.

Mayor Stevenson stated that the hearing would proceed in the following manner:

1. Property owners or their representatives had ten minutes to present to the Council
2. City staff had ten minutes to present to the City Council

He asked that Councilmembers hold their questions for each party until the end of their respective presentation.

3. Public comment from any member of the public not party to this hearing
4. Property owners or their representatives had five minutes to address the Council and present any rebuttal or final testimony
5. City staff had five minutes to provide their rebuttal and/or final testimony
6. Councilmembers ask any final questions

The Council noted that while they visited the site, there were no ex-parte communications.

Property owner Priya Takiar stated that she and her husband (Dhruv Batura) moved to Burlingame in 2023. They decided to build a fence around their corner lot to give their children a safe place to play. She explained that she was first informed that there was an issue when the City showed up at their door. She

noted that they believed that they were building the fence in a reasonable location based on the location of their neighbors' fences.

Ms. Takiar stated that when they found out about the issue, the fence on Westmoor Road was completed, while the fence on Rosedale Avenue was under construction. She explained that the Rosedale fence was moved inwards. She added that when they found out that the City wanted the Westmoor fence moved in five to six feet, they tried to work with the City on a compromise.

Ms. Takiar stated that she felt targeted as most of the houses on Westmoor have fences in the same location as the fence they installed.

The applicants' attorney Dan Siegel stated that if his clients are granted an encroachment permit, it could be revoked at any time. He added that the City also wrote an indemnity clause that would cover the City for any claims arising from the encroachments. He stated that this isn't a gift of public funds because there is no transfer, nor does it run with the property. He also noted that the City's code authorizes special encroachment permits for fences.

Mr. Siegel reviewed two options for the Council to consider. He noted that both options put the sewer cleanout outside of the fence. He also displayed photographs that showed that the fence lines up with the neighbors' fences.

Councilmember Brownrigg stated that in the original application, the proposed fence was on the property line. He asked why this changed. Mr. Siegel replied that his clients believed that they owned the land in front of the fence.

Mr. Low, the attorney for the City, stated that in 2023, the applicants applied for a building permit for landscaping improvements at 1151 Rosedale. He displayed the applicants' plans for the property that showed that all landscaping improvements would be within the property line, and the fence itself would be built on the property line. He noted that in April 2024, before construction was completed, the applicants submitted a proposal for the construction of a fence and two stone columns in the Rosedale right-of-way. He added that the fence on the Westmoor side of the property was built with a door that swung outwards and blocked the sidewalk. The fence also enclosed a City-owned sewer cleanout.

Mr. Low stated that the stone columns and fence on the Rosedale side of the property encroached on City property by two feet, eleven inches. He added that the fence on the Westmoor side of the property encroached on City property by five feet, seven inches.

Mr. Low explained that after a series of letters, emails, and meetings, the applicants submitted an application for a special encroachment permit. This application proposed a one-foot setback or a four-foot setback around the sewer cleanout. He noted that under both proposals, the majority of the fence on the Westmoor side would remain in place. He explained that on January 29, 2025, DPW Murtuza granted the special encroachment permit with respect to the Rosedale frontage for a period of five years. With respect

to the Westmoor frontage, DPW Murtuza denied the application, stating that the encroachments were: a public nuisance, require a gift of City property for private enjoyment, and expose the City to significant liability.

Mr. Low stated that since then, the applicants have installed additional landscaping elements in the City right-of-way.

Mr. Low reviewed the Council's options. He stated that the Council has grounds to deny all encroachments for the following reasons:

- Public nuisance is anything that obstructs free use of property; obstructs free passage on the street; or presents risk of injury to health or safety.
 - The fence is a public nuisance because it obstructs the City's use and access to its public property.
 - The fence door obstructs safe passage on the sidewalk. Wheelchairs and strollers are forced into the street. These are safety risks to persons and property.
- Unlawful gift of public property – Article XVI, Section 6 of the California Constitution prohibits any gift of public money, property, or thing of value.
 - The fence and patio occupy the City's valuable real property. The City's property is enclosed for the private use and enjoyment of the applicants.
 - The applicants' lot is enlarged and made more valuable at the expense of the City and the public.
- Insufficient access and clearance for the sewer cleanout – sewer cleanouts connect home plumbing to the City's sewer main.
 - Free and clear access to the sewer cleanout is essential for regular maintenance and emergency work.
 - The proposed alternative setbacks of one foot and four feet around the sewer cleanout do not provide sufficient space for access and equipment staging.
 - Even with the one-foot or four-foot setback, the sewer cleanout remains too close to the fence and other landscape elements.
 - There is a possibility that staff may damage the fence and landscape elements when staff accesses and works on the sewer cleanout.
 - If staff damages any of the applicants' property, the applicants could submit a claim for money and damages against the City.
 - Staff also requires unobstructed access to the sewer cleanout to respond to emergencies like backups, blockages, and overflow.
 - Any obstruction or delay in access during emergencies could result in sewer overflow and contamination with risks to health, damage to property, and violation of water quality regulations.
 - To prevent this type of delay and catastrophic damage, there should be no encroachments in the City's right-of-way, especially around the sewer cleanout.

- Staff requests Council deny the application for the two stone columns in view of the applicants' misrepresentations in their landscaping plan, their refusal to acknowledge the City's authority over its property, and continued defiance of the permit process.

Mr. Low stated that alternatively, the City Council could:

- Grant a special encroachment permit for the two stone columns in the City's right-of-way for a period of five years and subject to DPW Murtuza's other conditions.
- Deny the application for the Westmoor frontage with respect to the fence, concrete patio, and other landscaping elements.

Councilmember Colson asked about the neighboring properties' fences and if those encroach on City property. ACA Burke stated that the subject up for discussion at the meeting was 1151 Rosedale Avenue.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg asked about DPW Murtuza's approval of a five-year special encroachment permit for the columns on the Rosedale side of the property. DPW Murtuza replied that this decision was based on assisting the applicants with the economic hardship of removing the pillars.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg asked if he was correct that a special encroachment permit is always revocable. ACA Burke replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Colson asked if even with indemnification, if someone were to trip on the stone pillar, could the City be sued. ACA Burke replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Colson asked how often an individual builds on the City's property in violation of their approved plans. DPW Murtuza replied that it is a rare occasion.

Councilmember Colson asked if it is possible that an individual installs a new fence without a permit. DPW Murtuza replied in the affirmative. He noted that the City isn't actively seeking enforcement but will investigate upon complaint.

Councilmember Thayer asked if the applicants submitted any documents prior to the construction of the fence that showed them moving the fence off the property line. Mr. Low replied in the negative.

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

Mayor Stevenson gave the applicant and City five minutes for their final statements.

Mr. Siegel stated that he believed there were encroachments throughout the neighborhood. He noted that if this was important to Council, then this item should be paused while the Council reviews how other neighbors have installed their fences. He reviewed option 2, which moves the sewer cleanout from behind the fence.

Ms. Takiar stated that the diagrams that they had from the previous property owner didn't have the exact property lines, therefore they thought where they were building the fence was the property line.

Mr. Siegel stated that the applicants are willing to move the gate or have it swing inward.

Mr. Low stated that other encroachments are not up for consideration at the meeting. He noted that the appeal is focused solely on the encroachments at 1151 Rosedale Avenue. He discussed how the applicants can't indemnify the City completely against liability arising from the sewer cleanout being within the fence. He added that the City should be able to access its own right-of-way.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg asked if he was correct that a liability is created on other properties where landscaping extends into the right-of-way. Mr. Low replied in the affirmative. He noted that other residents and encroachments aren't up for discussion at this hearing.

Mayor Stevenson closed the public hearing and asked his colleagues for their thoughts. He noted that pursuant to BMC 12.10.060, the Council may take any of the following actions related to the Public Works Director's decision on the encroachment permit application:

1. Deny the appeal, upholding the Public Works Director's decision
2. Modify the Public Works Director's decision
3. Grant the appeal, reversing the Public Works Director's decision

Councilmember Colson stated that she believed this matter was a fairness issue for people who build in the city in the future. She discussed her concerns that this would set a terrible precedent if the City allowed this and her concerns around gifts of public funds.

Councilmember Colson stated that she thought the Council should deny the appeal. She added that she would be in favor of allowing the applicants to keep their landscaping in the right-of-way as long as it isn't encroaching on the fire hydrant or the drainage.

ACA Burke stated that the decision for the Council tonight is the two pillars and the encroachments along Westmoor. She noted that the Council isn't considering the landscaping.

Councilmember Pappajohn discussed her concerns around safety and the City having access to the sewer cleanout.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg discussed the landscaping and stated that he wasn't worried about the softscape on public land. He noted his appreciation of DPW Murtuza granting the stone pillars and stated that he liked the look of them. However, he voiced concern about the fence on Westmoor. He thought this should be moved back to the property line.

Councilmember Thayer noted that she was sympathetic, but there was a difference between what was submitted in the application versus what was built. She explained that the City needs access for public land. She voiced support for allowing the stone pillars to remain.

Mayor Stevenson stated that he was in favor of allowing the stone pillars to remain but requiring the applicant to move the fence on the Westmoor side of the property.

Councilmember Pappajohn voiced support for denying the appeal and upholding the Public Works Director's decision in regard to the two stone pillars.

Councilmember Colson expressed concern about the City's future liability that could arise from allowing the two stone pillars to remain. She asked if the City could require indemnity insurance for the pillars. ACA Burke replied that she would look into this for the Council.

Councilmember Colson made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 126-2025; seconded by Mayor Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

11. STAFF REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

a. UPDATE ON CITY THREAD'S ACCELERATED MOBILITY PLAYBOOK TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (AMP)

DPW Murtuza stated that City Thread is a national nonprofit technical consulting organization dedicated to accelerating projects that enable people to move safely, efficiently, and equitably within their communities. He explained that the City Thread Accelerated Mobility Playbook ("AMP") Technical Assistance Grant Program helps U.S. cities expedite the implementation of mobility networks.

DPW Murtuza stated that in August 2024, former TSP Commissioner Arleen Cauchi approached the Mayor and City Manager regarding her research into City Thread and its potential to help communities implement mobility network plans. Sara Studdard from City Thread met with Mayor Stevenson, City Manager Goldman, and himself regarding the AMP program. The AMP program involves forming a dedicated collaborative community coalition group that operates independently and is not associated with the City in any capacity. He noted that this was separate from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

DPW Murtuza stated that the City applied for an AMP grant and was successful. As part of the grant, the City Thread team assessed the City's mobility infrastructure, including recently completed bicycle and pedestrian projects, as well as existing City programs such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Ms. Studdard began by stating that mobility infrastructure helps solve the problems that cities all share:

- Population growth
- Traffic congestion
- Housing affordability

- Climate change
- Job access
- Street safety
- Air quality
- Public health

Ms. Studdard reviewed the challenges of implementing new mobility infrastructure:

- Projects take too long to implement
- Completed projects are small in scale, disconnected, and incomplete.
- Poor messaging creates fear, distrust, and empowers a vocal minority of opposition
- Leaders lack the persuasive communication tools needed to sustain momentum

Ms. Studdard discussed that AMP can overcome these challenges and accelerate the completion of place-based infrastructure by:

- Redefining partnerships among key stakeholders
- Diversifying our base of support and spokespeople
- Changing how we talk infrastructure and its benefits
- Acting with consistency and predictability

Ms. Studdard reviewed the Accelerated Mobility Playbook:

1. Establish a Shared Goal
 - A defined short-term implementation strategy is needed to build momentum among stakeholder groups and focus efforts towards concrete results.
 - A clear plan, budget, and timeline establishes a policy foundation and fosters public support to achieve an ambitious mobility goal.
 - A strong community of stakeholders including neighborhood groups, anchor institutions, businesses, and philanthropy work together to support the City's mobility programs.
2. Align Partnerships
 - Collaboration, coordination, and communication among three primary partner groups is critical for success.
 - Philanthropy provides resources and support to ensure that the other three groups can effectively and productively participate.
3. Resourcing Partners
 - Building trust and cooperation in partnerships is easier when everyone has access to resources needed to accomplish their roles.
4. Build the Network, Fast
 - A media and communications campaign builds broad support for infrastructure changes, highlighting the benefits of mobility networks for everyone.
 - Local community partners tap into resident support, neighborhood events, and local grant-making to promote project delivery timelines and processes.

- Elected leaders and City staff lead public engagement, planning, design, and construction activities identified in their short-term AMP implementation plan.
- Successful implementation requires careful coordination among partners, consistent engagement practices, and predictable project delivery methods.

Ms. Studdard next reviewed City Thread's recommended action plan for Burlingame:

1. Establish a Shared Goal – accelerate the planning, design, and construction of 10 miles of projects from its Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan by 2028.
2. Align Partnerships – launch an expansive, non-partisan coalition with thoughtful recruitment from outside the bicycle community. An organized coalition is key to turning out support at the time and in the way that is most helpful to City staff and elected leaders.
3. Resource Partners – executing the AMP requires funding, and much of it can't – and shouldn't – come from the municipal coffers. City Thread estimates that local philanthropic and business interests have the capacity to provide up to \$2.5 million over three years to support community-based activities.
4. Build the Network, Fast – create and test new methods of project delivery where urgent safety improvements are most needed. These methods should redefine public engagement, interdepartmental collaboration, and partnerships with community supporters.

Ms. Studdard explained that once the action plan is established, the next step is to initiate the project. She stated that this involves fund development, City readiness, coalition development, and audience research. She noted that during the initiation phase, the City has three options:

1. City of Burlingame and local partners lead and manage the initiation phase of the action plan
2. City of Burlingame and local partners lead fund development for this phase and then hire City Thread to manage strategy and tactics
3. City Thread is hired to lead fund development efforts and utilize the funding to deliver on the initiation phase activities and outcomes

DPW Murtuza stated that staff is looking for Council feedback and which option the City should pursue.

Mayor Stevenson stated that two of the constant messages that the Council hears from the community are around safety and mobility. He thought that this approach would allow more community engagement. He discussed private/public partnerships and how this might be an approach that the City could use with these types of projects.

Councilmember Colson thanked City Thread for the presentation. She thought this aligned well with the City's Vision Zero Project. She noted that while adding another \$500,000 to \$600,000 to the City's budget isn't feasible, she would be interested in creating public/private partnerships.

Councilmember Thayer stated that her hope is that this is synergistic with the Vision Zero Project. She discussed the City's Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan and how the projects are being done in pieces. She hoped this playbook would help to build-out bike paths and complete projects.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg asked if TSPC reviewed the presentation. DPW Murtuza replied that TSP Commissioners have been a part of this project. He noted that a presentation is being scheduled for a future TPSC meeting.

TSP Commissioner Jennifer Johnson voiced her support for this project. She discussed how City Thread does a great job with messaging by tying projects together and keeping focus on the end goal.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg discussed his experience with the California Drive project and the canceled Trousdale project. He stated that he was in favor of working with City Thread and stated he would like to have a community group focus on which projects to pursue.

DPW Murtuza stated that City Thread will help to get more community input and streamline the projects that the City chooses to move forward. He noted that the City would be the first to try this approach on the Peninsula.

Councilmember Colson stated that this feels like the early days of Home for All. She noted that it helped to bring the community together and identify what projects are important.

Mayor Stevenson thanked City Thread and looked forward to working with them.

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 Stevenson adjourned the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer

City Clerk