



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL**  
**Unapproved Minutes**  
**Regular Meeting on September 03, 2019**

**STUDY SESSION**

**a. STUDY SESSION TO CONSIDER POTENTIAL MODIFICATION OF THE DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW LIMITED GROUND FLOOR AND BELOW-GROUND OFFICE USES**

A study session was held in Conference Room A concerning the potential modification of the Downtown Specific Plan and Zoning Ordinance to allow limited ground floor and below-ground office uses.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

A duly noticed meeting of the Burlingame City Council was held on the above date in the City Hall Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

The pledge of allegiance was led by Liam Metskis.

**3. ROLL CALL**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Beach, Brownrigg, Colson, Keighran, Ortiz

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**4. REPORT OUT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

There was no closed session.

**5. UPCOMING EVENTS**

Mayor Colson reviewed the upcoming events taking place in the city.

6. **PRESENTATIONS**

a. **LYON HOAG AND ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOODS TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT UPDATE**

Transportation Engineer Michael Tsai explained that the City began with three main goals for Lyon Hoag's Traffic Calming Project:

1. Engage with residents to understand concerns
2. Identify and study traffic-related issues
3. Develop effective strategies to address concerns

Mr. Tsai noted that in reference to the first goal, the City formed a Citizen Advisory Panel composed of three members of the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission and three residents to serve as a steering committee.

Mr. Tsai explained that in May 2018, staff conducted a town hall meeting in Lyon Hoag to hear from the public about their concerns. As a result of the meeting, the City retained the services of TJKM to review the traffic and parking-related issues in Lyon Hoag and adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Tsai explained that staff performed extensive community outreach through direct mailers, social media, and the eNews. Additionally, staff conducted an online survey and received 118 responses regarding traffic-related concerns in Lyon Hoag.

Mr. Tsai stated that staff has held two community workshops in order to hear from the residents of Lyon Hoag about their concerns. He explained at the workshops, a community feedback board was set up, and the public was asked to place a red, yellow, and green sticker under their top three priorities. Red represented their top priority, yellow second, and green was their third priority. The different categories that the public was asked to prioritize were: speeding, congestion, beautification, safety, cut through traffic, pedestrian & bicycle connectivity, and parking. Speeding, cut through traffic, and parking were the top three categories selected by the community.

Mayor Colson noted that the slide of a community feedback board had no stickers under pedestrian & bicycle connectivity. She asked if this was common at the workshops. Mr. Tsai replied in the affirmative. DPW Murtuza added that the town hall meeting arose because of residents' concerns over cut through traffic and San Mateo's Peninsula Interchange Project.

Mr. Tsai explained that TJKM collected the following data:

- Speed surveys
- Origin and destination studies to determine cut-through traffic patterns
- Examined intersections for improvements
- Evaluated pedestrian safety concerns
- Explored preliminary concepts to address concerns raised by the community

Mr. Tsai stated that at the end of the first phase, a needs assessment map was developed.

Councilmember Brownrigg noted that the purple lines on the map were areas of high vehicular speed. He asked what the speeds were. Mr. Tsai replied that it was around 29 to 33 mph.

Mr. Tsai stated that staff utilized the assessment map in the second Community Workshop. At the second workshop, the participants discussed potential solutions. He noted that the solutions included: rapid rectangular flashing beacons, mini traffic circles, trial road humps, radar feedback signs, enhanced crosswalks, bulb-outs, median islands, and edge lines.

Mr. Tsai stated that the staff and consultants utilized the feedback from the second workshop and arrived at a set of preliminary solutions. He displayed a map that outlined the location of solutions and the type of solutions being considered.

Mr. Tsai discussed the intersection of Dwight and Clarendon. He noted that the current intersection appears to be a small traffic circle but doesn't slow down traffic like a traffic circle. Therefore, the consultants suggested increasing the size of the traffic circle to assist in slowing down vehicles.

Mr. Tsai next discussed Bloomfield. He noted that the street is wide, and there is parking on both sides. He explained that the proposal is to introduce an edge line feature that would narrow the street and therefore decrease speeds.

Mr. Tsai reviewed the next steps:

- Citizen Advisory Panel Meeting – September 4
- Final Community Workshop – October 2
- Finalize Traffic Calming Solutions
- Develop Cost Estimates
- Develop Phased Implementation Plan
- Present Draft Report

Councilmember Keighran asked what time the Community Workshop on October 2 would be held. Mr. Tsai stated that it would most likely be at 6:30 p.m.

Vice Mayor Beach asked if there would be additional recommendations beyond the traffic circle at Dwight and Clarendon and the edge lines on Bloomfield. Mr. Tsai replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Beach explained that people think safety vehicles have issues with road humps. She asked if this was true and why the City was now considering the humps. Mr. Tsai explained that staff talked with other cities that have successfully utilized the road humps. He added that staff would work with the safety departments to ensure that the road humps wouldn't be an issue.

Councilmember Keighran asked if the Phased Implementation Plan would prioritize the timeline of projects. Mr. Tsai replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if staff took into consideration how the opening of Facebook's new offices may impact traffic in the Lyon Hoag neighborhood. Mr. Tsai stated that staff focused on existing traffic issues, with a consideration to future impacts.

Councilmember Brownrigg asked if the notion is that if the City cuts down on speeding, it will also decrease cut-through traffic. Mr. Tsai stated that he believed the two issues overlapped.

Councilmember Brownrigg asked if bulb outs would be used. Mr. Tsai replied in the affirmative.

Mayor Colson opened the item up for public comment.

Burlingame resident Jennifer Pfaff thanked the Council for undertaking this project. She discussed her concerns with the crosswalks from the Lyon Hoag community into the City of San Mateo. She asked how the two cities work together to repair and improve these crosswalks.

Mr. Tsai stated that staff has been working with San Mateo on the Peninsula Avenue crosswalks.

Burlingame resident Daryl Thomas voiced concern that the streets where traffic calming measures are not implemented would see an increase in traffic.

DPW Murtuza discussed how traffic calming is a continuous process with efforts reviewed as things change.

Mayor Colson closed public comment.

## **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Committee for Green Foothills representative Helen Wolter, BHS student Verona Teo, and San Mateo resident Laura discussed the State Lands Commission parcel on the Bayfront. They voiced their support for utilizing the parcel as an open space public park.

Citizens Environmental Council representative Doug Silverstein discussed CEC's October 17 event at the Burlingame Public Library entitled: "New Technology That Can Save Water, Energy, and Money."

## **8. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Mayor Colson asked the Councilmembers and the public if they wished to remove any item from the Consent Calendar. Councilmember Brownrigg pulled 8b and 8c. Mayor Colson pulled 8j.

Councilmember Brownrigg made a motion to adopt 8a, 8d, 8e, 8f, 8g, 8h, 8i, 8k, and 8l; seconded by Councilmember Keighran. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, 5-0.

a. **ADOPTION OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 19, 2019**

Vice Mayor Beach requested an amendment to the Meeting Minutes. On page 12, Vice Mayor Beach's statement was edited in italics as follows:

Vice Mayor Beach explained that she would like for the Stakeholders Group to continue exploring the employee incentive program, *specifically subsidized Clipper cards so downtown retail, restaurant, and service workers could more conveniently and affordably use Caltrain and SamTrans buses.*

b. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO PROCURE GREENFIELDS, INC. FITNESS EQUIPMENT, CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS, ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING, AND SITE AMENITIES; AND TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH BAY AREA PAVING CO., INC. TO INSTALL CONCRETE PADS FOR THE BAY TRAIL FITNESS EQUIPMENT PROJECT, CITY PROJECT NO: 85440**

Councilmember Brownrigg asked that in the future, staff include the dollar amount of a contract in the title of staff reports. He explained that he believed that this would increase transparency. City Manager Goldman replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Brownrigg asked the Parks and Recreation Department to discuss the Bay Trail Fitness Equipment project. Parks Supervisor Rich Holtz and Recreation Coordinator Nicole Rath gave a presentation on the project.

Mr. Holtz stated that staff has been working with BCDC (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission) to obtain approval to install four areas of fitness equipment on the Bay Trail.

Mayor Colson thanked the Burlingame Parks and Recreation Foundation for their assistance in this project. She explained that the Foundation met with hotels and businesses on the Bayfront to garner their support and funding. She stated that this project would be great for hotel guests, the community, and parents watching their children's games and practices.

Mr. Holtz stated that he and Ms. Rath reviewed different areas of the city to install fitness equipment. He explained that staff wanted to minimize disturbance from construction and therefore picked the following locations for these fitness equipment clusters: parking lot across from Bayside Park, before Anza Boulevard on Airport Boulevard, backside of Murray Park facing the lagoon, and behind Field Number 2 by the dog park.

Ms. Rath stated that the loop is under a mile, and there will be signage to direct users to the next cluster of equipment. She noted that the clusters are all approximately a quarter of a mile apart from each other.

Mr. Holtz stated that each cluster would focus on different muscle groups. He noted that staff consulted with fitness experts on what equipment to purchase.

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

Councilmember Keighran thanked the Crowne Plaza Hotel and the Doubletree for their financial contributions to the project. She noted that the project is a great example of how the City can work with the hotels.

Councilmember Keighran asked about the construction timeline for the project. Mr. Holtz replied that the construction would be completed by December 2019. He added that the sponsorships from the hotels was being used to upgrade the surfacing of the locations of the four clusters.

Mayor Colson asked if the clusters were ADA accessible. Mr. Holtz responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ortiz made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 100-2019; seconded by Vice Mayor Beach. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

c. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SEND A LETTER OF OPPOSITION REGARDING SB 266, PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM: DISALLOWED COMPENSATION: BENEFIT ADJUSTMENTS**

Councilmember Brownrigg asked HR Director Morrison to review the background on staff's recommendation for the Mayor to send a letter of opposition regarding SB 266.

HR Director Morrison stated that currently when a public employee retires, their pension is based on their pensionable compensation. Pensionable compensation is an employee's highest year of earning including their base rate and any special compensations, also known as differentials. She explained that CalPERS calculates an individual's pension using their earnings, years employed, and CalPERS pension formula.

HR Director Morrison stated that what is and isn't considered special compensation is outlined very clearly in the California Code of Regulations. Any form of payment that is not specifically outlined in the law as special compensation is considered disallowed compensation. Disallowed compensation is not included in the pension formula. She explained that CalPERS is solely responsible for deciding what is and isn't included in an employee's final compensation for pension purposes.

HR Director Morrison stated that staff works with the labor unions to capture what the City believes is special compensation within each union's MOU. The MOU and the City and labor union's understanding of what is deemed special compensation is then given to CalPERS.

HR Director Morrison explained that mistakes in determining correctly what is special compensation have occurred in the past, by the City, during negotiations, and by CalPERS. She stated that it is CalPERS' responsibility to accurately calculate an individual's pension at the time of retirement, and during any future audits they do, no matter if the City or bargaining unit has incorrectly interpreted and applied the Code in the past.

HR Director Morrison stated that by law, when CalPERS discovers that an individual has been receiving an overpayment in pension compensation, it is CalPERS' responsibility to collect the money, and the City's responsibility to stop the overpayment.

HR Director Morrison explained that SB 266 absolves CalPERS of any responsibility. Therefore, if a mistake is discovered, under the proposed legislation, the City would now be responsible for repaying the discrepancy to CalPERS and making the employee or beneficiary whole.

Councilmember Brownrigg stated his agreement with HR Director Morrison that SB 266 was bad for cities. He explained that he researched the background of SB 266 in order to understand what issue arose that prompted the legislation. He stated that the proposed bill was prompted by a beneficiary being asked to repay overpayments to CalPERS. He voiced his disappointment that CalPERS, an organization that employs hundreds of pension experts, is pushing a pension analysis problem on the cities. He stated that CALPERS was shirking its duty.

Councilmember Brownrigg stated that he believed that the letter should be more direct and speak to the labor problems that would be created by the legislation. He explained that by shifting the responsibility to the cities, labor negotiations will become solely focused on salary negotiations in order to avoid special compensation discrepancies. He asked that the letter be rewritten to discuss these issues.

Councilmember Brownrigg added that he didn't believe the employee or the employee's beneficiary should be on the hook for overpayments. Instead, he believed it was the responsibility of CalPERS to figure out how to make the overpayments up.

HR Director Morrison stated her agreement with Councilmember Brownrigg. She explained that staff works diligently with labor partners and CalPERS to ensure that they are accurately reporting and categorizing special compensation. She added that CalPERS must take responsibility for the guidance and advice that it gives cities.

Councilmember Keighran voiced her agreement that the letter needed to be stronger.

Councilmember Ortiz stated that he shared his colleagues' outrage over the proposed bill.

City Manager Goldman explained that the state legislature's staff would be looking at the totality of letters that they received on SB 266 and not necessarily the substance of the letters.

Mayor Colson stated that while she agreed with the City Manager, she thought it was important to add language to the letter because of the potential impact on labor negotiations. She noted that the letter should also discuss that the City isn't in favor of claw-backs (having employees or their beneficiaries pay back the overpayments).

Councilmember Ortiz asked if currently the practice is to claw-back, or if the payment is just changed moving forward. HR Director Morrison stated that if CalPERS does an audit and finds that there is an issue, CalPERS will send the individual a bill. She stated that the claw-back is the existing law.

City Attorney Kane noted that CalPERS recently moved the goal post a few times on deciding retroactively what counted under special compensations. She stated that the resolution attached to the staff report approves of sending a letter and not specifically the letter attached to the staff report. Therefore, given the timeliness of this matter, she suggested the Council vest discretion with the Mayor, HR Director, and City Manager to draft the letter.

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

Mayor Colson stated that she did believe the letter should be edited to discuss how SB 266 would deter the City from negotiating with labor on special compensations. She noted that the letter should additionally address that the City doesn't support individuals being forced to pay back funds that were the mistake of CalPERS.

Councilmember Brownrigg agreed with Mayor Colson.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if he was correct that SB 266 doesn't talk about the claw-back but instead discusses moving responsibility from CalPERS to the cities. HR Director Morrison replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Ortiz stated that he didn't feel the letter should include discussion of the claw-back as it is the existing law. Instead, the City should focus on how SB 266 moves responsibility from CalPERS to the cities.

Councilmember Brownrigg disagreed, stating that the genesis of SB 266 arises from determining who is responsible for overpayments.

Councilmember Ortiz stated that whether the responsibility fell on the City or CalPERS, the individual would still be responsible for paying the money back.

HR Director Morrison stated that under SB 266, the City would become responsible for paying the overpayment, and the individual would continue to be compensated at the higher rate.

Councilmember Ortiz made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 101-2019 and allow the Mayor, HR Director, and City Manager to work on editing the letter; seconded by Councilmember Brownrigg. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, 5-0.



- d. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DELETION OF ONE VACANT OFFICE ASSISTANT II AND THE ADDITION OF ONE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I**

HR Director Morrison requested Council adopt Resolution Number 102-2019.

- e. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH WILSEY HAM FOR THE BURLINGAME AND GLENWOOD PARK SUBDIVISION AND NEIGHBORHOOD WATER MAIN IMPROVEMENTS, CITY PROJECT NO. 84891, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT**

DPW Murtuza requested Council adopt Resolution Number 103-2019.

- f. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION AWARDED A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT TO EPS, INC. DBA EXPRESS PLUMBING FOR THE EASTON DRIVE DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, CITY PROJECT NO. 85610**

DPW Murtuza requested Council adopt Resolution Number 104-2019.

- g. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CITY COUNCIL'S AUGUST 19, 2019 ACTION REGARDING AN APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S ACTION OF AN APPLICATION FOR A DESIGN REVIEW AMENDMENT TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PROJECT AT 25 ARUNDEL ROAD**

CDD Gardiner requested Council adopt Resolution Number 105-2019.

- h. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH CIRCLEPOINT TO PERFORM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW SERVICES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW 150-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING AT 1055 ROLLINS ROAD**

CDD Gardiner requested Council adopt Resolution Number 106-2019.

- i. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED AGREEMENT WITH THE SAN MATEO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THE BURLINGAME AQUATIC CENTER**

City Manager Goldman requested Council adopt Resolution Number 107-2019.

j. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY'S PARTICIPATION IN UNITED AGAINST HATE WEEK**

Mayor Colson explained that she and City Manager Goldman attended the North County Mayors' lunch at Youtube. At the luncheon, they were given a presentation concerning "United Against Hate Week," an initiative from the Berkeley Mayor. She stated that United Against Hate Week is November 17 through November 23, 2019. She explained that United Against Hate calls for local civic action by people in every Bay Area community to stop the "hate and the implicit biases that are a threat to the safety and civility of our neighborhoods, towns, and cities." She noted that she reached out to BHS about participating in events that week.

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

Vice Mayor Beach made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 108-2019; seconded by Councilmember Keighran. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, 5-0.

k. **OPEN NOMINATION PERIOD TO FILL TWO VACANCIES ON THE BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION**

City Manager Goldman requested Council open the nomination period to fill two vacancies on the Beautification Commission.

l. **OPEN NOMINATION PERIOD TO FILL THREE VACANCIES ON THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION**

City Manager Goldman requested Council open the nomination period to fill three vacancies on the Parks and Recreation Commission.

9. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

a. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTING THE BURLINGAME 2030 CLIMATE ACTION PLAN, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, AND ADDENDUM TO THE GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)**

Sustainability Fellow Andrea Pappajohn stated that in April, staff presented the 2030 Climate Action Plan ("CAP") draft at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting. Since that meeting, staff has conducted public outreach and updated the draft.

Ms. Pappajohn gave a brief overview of the 2030 CAP. She explained that the 2030 CAP update:

- is based on growth and development projections in the Envision Burlingame General Plan
- provides an updated roadmap for sustaining greenhouse gas ("GHG") emission reductions
- is a program-level evaluation that could streamline environmental review

Ms. Pappajohn explained that the 2030 CAP GHG Reduction Strategy is driven by the General Plan's emphasis on sustainability and health. She noted that the CAP is looking for 20 GHG emission reduction measures across 5 key sectors:

1. Built Environment and Transportation – 10 GHG emission reduction
2. Energy – 5 GHG emission reduction
3. Water/Wastewater – 2 GHG emission reduction
4. Waste – 1 GHG emission reduction
5. Municipal – 2 GHG emission reduction

Ms. Pappajohn stated that the purpose of the CAP is to reduce greenhouse gases in the City and community as measured in MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. She reviewed a table that depicted GHG emission scenarios over the next 30 years.

<b>GHG Emission Scenario</b>	<b>Annual GHG Emission Reductions (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e)</b>			
	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>
<b>Adjusted Business As Usual (BAU) GHG Emission Forecast</b>	233,646	180,493	189,690	166,534
<b>2030 CAP Update GHG Emission Target (state targets)</b>	216,916	130,150	86,766	43,383
<b>City GHG Emissions with CAP Reductions</b>	213,249	128,581	124,222	119,802
<b>GHG Emission Target Achieved</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Ms. Pappajohn explained that as seen in the above chart, while the proposed 2030 CAP will assist the City in meeting the 2020 and 2030 targets, the City won't meet the 2040 and 2050 targets. She stated that this is common. However, she explained that as the City makes progress on GHG reductions and new technologies come online, staff is confident that the City will meet the 2040 and 2050 targets.

Ms. Pappajohn introduced MIG consultant Chris Dugan.

Mr. Dugan explained that development of the 2030 CAP began with the General Plan outreach and community engagement. He stated that the outreach informed policies that went into the General Plan that formed the backbone of the 2030 CAP.

Mr. Dugan stated that after the 2030 CAP was prepared, staff sent the plan out for review. He stated that it has been available for public review for four months. He reviewed the public outreach that has been done for the draft plan:

- April 27, 2019 overview presentation to City Council and Planning Commission
- May 8, 2019 presentation to the Citizens Environmental Council (“CEC”)
- June 19 to July 3, 2019 Notice of Availability of Addendum to the General Plan EIR
- July 3, 2019 comments from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“BAAQMD”)
- July 17, 2019 follow-up discussion with the CEC
- August 12, 2019 Planning Commission meeting

Mr. Dugan noted the City received eight comment letters and approximately 50 comments on the 2030 CAP update.

Mr. Dugan reviewed some of the comments that the City received from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“BAAQMD”) and the CEC. He explained that in general, BAAQMD’s comments were supportive.

Mr. Dugan stated that BAAQMD asked that the City consider strong policies to change people’s behavior when it comes to driving. He stated that in his opinion, the CAP has very strong policies to try to change behavior. He noted that if the CAP’s measures are successfully implemented, it should achieve a 21% reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (“VMT”) in 2030, or approximately 60 million miles reduction. He stated that the State Office of Planning and Research recently recommended a 15% reduction in VMT as a CEQA significance threshold.

Mr. Dugan stated that the 21% reduction in VMT will reduce GHG emissions by 22%. He explained that Plan Bay Area is targeting a 19% reduction by 2035, and therefore the City’s CAP sets a more aggressive target and timeline.

Mr. Dugan stated that BAAQMD asked that the City consider strong policies for energy efficiency and retrofitting natural gas equipment and appliances. He explained that the CAP measures are intended to improve energy efficiency, with an estimated 4.4% reduction in electricity consumption and 14.7% reduction in natural gas consumption in 2030.

Mr. Dugan reviewed the CEC’s comments. He stated that the CEC asked the City to be more aggressive in its GHG emission reduction targets. The CEC suggested an 80% reduction in emissions by 2030 instead of 2050. He explained that staff considered this request but decided to retain the GHG emission reduction goals set by the CAP for three reasons:

1. Because the CAP aligns with the EIR, the City can adopt the CAP under an addendum to the EIR. If the City pursues more aggressive reduction targets, the City may need to undergo a more robust CEQA review. This would lengthen the overall timeline for adopting the CAP update.
2. The comment underestimates the ambitiousness of the State’s GHG emission goals. The State currently doesn’t have a concrete plan for how to reduce GHG emissions by 80% in 2050.

3. Staff made a conscious decision to set realistic goals with realistic timelines.

Mr. Dugan reviewed other comments from the CEC including:

- Request for faster implementation of plans (e.g. Electric Vehicle Strategic Plan) and code updates (e.g. TDM Code) by 2021, and
- More mandatory requirements, such as mandated City electric vehicles and all electric buildings.

Mr. Dugan discussed changes that staff made based on the CEC's comments including:

- Added specific requirements to trip reduction measures
- Encouraging/emphasizing gray water systems
- Preparation of a Community Zero Waste Plan

Mr. Dugan reviewed implementation of the 2030 CAP. He explained that the goals and targets set by the CAP aren't meant to be ceilings but instead are floors. He stated that documents were built into the CAP in order to make it a dynamic document, including:

- Implementation and Monitoring Program – specific actions, outcomes, timelines, and responsibilities
- CAP Consistency Checklist – to be completed by project proponents as part of application submittal
- Annual sustainability reports
- Annual emissions reports (through San Mateo Regional Climate Action Planning Suite)

Mr. Dugan explained that staff also envisions periodically updating the CAP to modify existing strategies and identify new strategies.

Councilmember Keighran asked if the goals in the CAP update are realistic for the City. Mr. Dugan replied in the affirmative and added that the City is on track for 2020.

Councilmember Keighran asked if the City undertakes the improvements in the CAP update, will the City meet the 2030 targets. Mr. Dugan replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Keighran stated that the Council will obtain yearly progress reports and asked if the Council can decide to change the City's goals in the future to more aggressive reductions. Mr. Dugan replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Keighran asked if the City does decide to change the targets, would it require a CEQA review. Mr. Dugan replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Brownrigg stated that the CAP focuses on VMT as a proxy for GHG emissions. He asked if all vehicles were electric and all electricity was renewable, would the City care about VMT. Mr. Dugan replied that it would help the GHG emission estimates as that sector would become an emissions free sector.

Vice Mayor Beach discussed the other implications of VMT including cars on the road, traffic impacts, roadway maintenance impacts, etc.

Vice Mayor Beach stated that the Council wants the City to be as aggressive as possible in setting targets that are reachable but uncomfortable. She noted that the goals in the CAP are aggressive.

Vice Mayor Beach stated that the Bay Area has a particularly important responsibility to be more aggressive when it comes to VMT than the rest of California. She discussed the transportation options that surround the Bay Area.

Vice Mayor Beach voiced support for including language in the CAP that specifies that the outlined targets are the floor and not the ceiling. She suggested including language that the targets align with the City's General Plan, but that the City will pursue higher targets. She asked if stretch goals could be included in the CAP. Mr. Dugan stated that this is something that can be considered. He noted that language changes that don't commit the City to achieving a higher goal can be added easily without a CEQA review.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if the City converts 50% of households to PCE's ECO100 (100% renewable energy), what would that do to the City's targets. Mr. Dugan stated that this assumption is integral to meeting the 2030 goals.

Mayor Colson stated that PCE's baseline product mix is getting greener and greener. Therefore, houses wouldn't need to opt up.

Councilmember Keighran discussed Exhibit A of the Resolution adopting the 2030 Climate Action Plan and Amendment to the Burlingame General Plan. She stated that Exhibit A outlined amendments to the 2040 General Plan including:

- Electrification of yard and garden equipment
- Construction best management practices
- Alternatively-powered residential water heaters
- Increasing the public street tree population

She asked if these were incorporated into the 2030 CAP requirements. Mr. Dugan replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Keighran asked about the timeline for the above listed amendments. Mr. Dugan replied that the Implementation and Monitoring Program outlines specific actions and by when they must be completed.

Councilmember Keighran stated that developers may not know what is available. She explained that it would be good for the Planning Department to have a list of available products and techniques for the developer. Mr. Dugan replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Beach stated that some communities have set more aggressive targets. She noted that San Francisco and Palo Alto want to exceed the State standards. She asked what these cities are doing from a policy standpoint to make their targets possible. Mr. Dugan stated that the key differences are that these cities started earlier, own their utilities, and have additional resources available.

Vice Mayor Beach asked about the timeline for implementing reach codes and if it should relate to the Rollins Road Specific Plan. CDD Gardiner stated that reach codes would be brought to Council this fall for review.

Vice Mayor Beach stated that the TDM strategy to reduce vehicle miles traveled in the transportation sector has to be a main focus. She asked if staff has given any consideration to creating a TDM manager position to tackle this issue. City Manager Goldman replied in the negative and discussed the current space constraints in City Hall. She noted that staff could look into creating a part-time TDM manager position.

Mayor Colson stated that on page 52, the report discusses electric vehicle infrastructure and initiatives stating:

Single- and multi-family homes (less than or equal to 20 units) shall be constructed such that each home/unit has at least one dedicated parking space with electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) installed.

She noted that the above requirement would be difficult if SB 50 or something similar passes. She stated that PCE learned that a majority of people charge their cars overnight at their homes. Therefore, if pursuant to SB 50, multi-unit developments aren't required to have parking spaces, then individuals are more likely to park on the street and purchase combustion engine vehicles.

Mayor Colson opened the hearing for public comment.

CEC President Mike McCord discussed the process of reviewing and updating the City's CAP. He voiced his support for the document and stated that he agreed it was a floor not a ceiling.

Burlingame resident Doug Silverstein discussed the process and the constraints at the local level to take more aggressive steps. He stated that the major learning for him is to leverage the County or an entity such as PCE to assist in making progress.

Burlingame resident Elaine Breeze discussed the need to ensure that the targets are obtainable for developers in order to ensure the success of the CAP.

Burlingame resident Christine Yballa urged the Council to adopt the CAP and work hard to implement the specific actions in the plan.

Mayor Colson closed the hearing

Councilmember Brownrigg thanked the CEC for thoroughly reviewing the CAP. He discussed how the State has set a target that by 2045, California should be zero carbon energy. He stated that the problem with this is that if the State doesn't know if it can get to zero carbon energy by 2045, then the rest of the country doesn't get there until 2075, and developing countries won't be there until the 2100s. He explained that the City must do better. He noted that Iceland has announced that there will be no combustion engines licensed after 2030. He stated that the State needs to make big decisions soon.

Councilmember Ortiz voiced his support for Mr. Silverstein's suggestion to leverage the County to increase progress. He stated that he wants to see the City aim higher than the floor. He explained that it is important that the City commit to do its part and send a message to the State to do better.

Councilmember Keighran thanked everyone that was involved in putting this document together. She stated that she believed the City was doing a good job in moving forward.

Vice Mayor Beach concurred with Councilmember Brownrigg that the State and Federal governments must make climate action a priority. She stated that if there is an opportunity to add additional language about aspiring to more than the baseline, she would like it included in the CAP.

Vice Mayor Beach discussed working with the school districts on getting automobiles off the road. She also suggested that the specific plan for Rollins Road make it a green neighborhood.

Mayor Colson stated that the City will be working with the Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District and Sea Change Burlingame.

City Attorney Kane stated if the Council wants to add language, she would suggest doing so in Resolution Number 110-2019, that adopts the Climate Action Plan. She explained that the language in the plan was circulated for public comment, and the resolution is part of the legislative history.

City Attorney Kane suggested adding a new bullet point "C" on the last page of Resolution Number 110-2019. The new bullet point would state that "The City Council further affirms the City's intent to exceed the goals set forth in the Climate Action Plan by any available means."

Councilmember Brownrigg made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 110 with the inclusion of the City Attorney's above specified language; seconded by Councilmember Ortiz. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Vice Mayor Beach made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 109-2019; seconded by Councilmember Keighran. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, 5-0.

## **10. STAFF REPORTS**

### **a. CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION REGARDING A PILOT PROJECT FOR DYNAMIC WAYFINDING SIGNAGE FOR PARKING AVAILABILITY**

DPW Murtuza stated that staff is proposing that a 12-month pilot program be conducted for dynamic wayfinding signage for parking availability in Parking Lots C and Y. He explained that if the program is successful, the City could expand to additional lots.



DPW Murtuza explained that staff reviewed multiple proposals from firms that provide technology and communication systems to enhance the parking experience. After reviewing the proposals and interviewing several firms, staff selected Streetline of Foster City for a pilot project. He explained that Streetline's technology appears to be well suited to meet Burlingame's needs. He added that Streetline is offering to provide free services worth approximately \$56,000 to implement the pilot project.

DPW Murtuza stated that the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission reviewed Streetline's proposal at its May 2019 meeting. The Commissioners expressed support for the program and expressed interest in expanding it to other lots in the Broadway Area. Staff suggested that the technology should first be tested in Parking Lots C and Y prior to expanding the program to additional lots.

DPW Murtuza introduced Streetline Vice President Taso Zografos.

Mr. Zografos stated that Streetline has been around for 10 years. He discussed some of Streetline's clients including City of Los Angeles with 6,000 sensors, City of Oakland, San Mateo, Redwood City, Apple Park with 10,000 sensors, and Facebook with 6,000 sensors.

Mr. Zografos reviewed Streetline's proposed project for the City. He stated that the company would use its technology to provide parking availability information to the public. He explained that it would be a 12-month pilot which includes three months of set up and calibration.

Mr. Zografos stated that Streetline takes in camera or sensor data through a mesh wireless network. That information is then pushed through a cellular network to the signage (which can be solar powered). He noted that this information could also be pushed to mobile applications.

Mr. Zografos stated that Streetline chose two off-street lots in each of the downtown areas: Lot Y in the Broadway Commercial District and Lot C in the Burlingame Avenue Downtown District.

Mr. Zografos reviewed Streetline's Lot Y proposal. He stated that there would be 36 spaces with sensors. He showed examples of what the sensors would look like. He explained that the sensors would be core drilled into the pavement so that the sensors are flush mount with the parking spaces. He stated that signage would be put on the two entry points to Lot Y to alert the public of availability. He added that the City has the option to add wayfinding signage on Broadway Avenue to better alert the public of parking availability.

Mr. Zografos reviewed Streetline's Lot C proposal. He stated that Lot C has 80 spaces, and Streetline is proposing to use six cameras to cover the spaces. He discussed signage for Lot C that could be provided not only at the entrances to the lot but also on Burlingame Avenue.

Mr. Zografos discussed cost sharing for the pilot project. He stated that the cost for Lot Y includes a one-time activation fee of \$10,800 and a monthly recurring fee for the nine months of \$800. This is a total cost of \$45,400, with Streetline paying \$27,400 and the City paying \$18,000.

Mr. Zografos stated that the cost for Lot C includes a onetime activation fee of \$10,800 and a monthly recurring fee for the nine months of \$900. This is a total cost of \$47,400, with Streetline paying \$28,500 and the City paying \$18,900.

Councilmember Keighran discussed the Village at Burlingame project on Lots F and N. She suggested that because of the shortage of parking during construction on Lots F and N, it might be beneficial to choose two lots in Burlingame Downtown Area and add Broadway at a later date. DPW Murtuza explained that staff would need to review which additional lot should be included and what the cost would be. He noted that the reason Broadway was selected was because there was an interest last year from the Broadway Commercial District in utilizing wayfinding.

Councilmember Ortiz stated that he supported the project. He discussed the future parking structure on Lot N and asked staff for more information on the costs associated with putting sensors in that facility.

Vice Mayor Beach stated that she was excited about the project. She asked what the average cost is to build a parking space. DPW Murtuza stated that it is about \$50,000.

Vice Mayor Beach stated that this project would assist the City in experimenting with how the City can utilize infrastructure that already exists. She discussed how the City would then be able to weigh the benefits of creating more parking versus innovative technology that assists the public in finding parking.

Vice Mayor Beach asked what City funds would be utilized for the project. DPW Murtuza stated that staff recommends using Parking Enterprise funds. He explained that these funds are generated from meter revenues and parking tickets. He stated that the funds are collected to improve the parking in the downtown areas.

Vice Mayor Beach asked if it would be useful to consider the Donnelly Library Garage. She explained that she understood the top lot would be valet parking during the construction on Lots F and N but wondered if sensors could be used on the lower lot. DPW Murtuza stated that portions of the lower lot would be used for City employees, and therefore it would be better to study a different lot.

Vice Mayor Beach suggested that the City expand the pilot project to three lots (two in the Burlingame Avenue Business District and one in the Broadway Commercial District). She asked what the cost would be to add a third lot. DPW Murtuza stated that staff would need to review the locations.

City Manager Goldman stated that the two proposed lots are close in cost. Therefore, an estimate could be made using that information. She cautioned the Council against removing Lot Y from the pilot program because of Broadway's desire to utilize wayfinding technology. She suggested adding Lot W as the third lot in the pilot project.

Vice Mayor Beach agreed that Lot W was a good suggestion.

Mayor Colson opened the item up for public comment.

Burlingame residents Doug Silverstein, Jennifer Pfaff, and Traffic, Safety & Parking Commissioner Jeff Londer voiced their support for the project.

Mayor Colson closed public comment.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if the City was to add another lot, would the cost be proportional to the other lots. Mr. Zografos replied in the affirmative.

Mayor Colson stated that she liked the idea of adding a third lot. She asked if the City would be able to obtain data about the usage of the EV charging stations in Lot Y from the pilot program. Mr. Zografos replied that Streetline had not planned on adding sensors to the EV charging stations but could if the Council asked.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if the City added sensors to the EV charging stations, would the number of available charging stations be displayed on the wayfinding signage. Mr. Zografos replied in the affirmative.

DPW Murtuza stated that staff's proposal was to consider adding sensors to the EV charging stations after the pilot project.

City Attorney Kane stated that if the City Council decides to request a third lot, then Council should amend the language of the resolution to \$60,000 to include the costs of an additional lot.

Councilmember Brownrigg asked if Streetline stores the camera feeds. Mr. Zografos replied in the negative. He explained that Streetline doesn't store the camera feeds or any records associated with the vehicle such as license plate numbers. Instead, he stated that the cameras take snap shots every few minutes to see if the spaces are open.

Councilmember Brownrigg agreed that a third lot should be added to the pilot program. He stated that the City needed to come up with a different way of identifying the lots for the community. He asked that the City rename the lots so that people could clearly find the different lots.

Mayor Colson suggested renaming the lots based on their locations. DPW Murtuza stated that staff would review this suggestion.

Councilmember Ortiz made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 111-2019 with the amendment that a third lot be added to the pilot program and therefore an increase of funds to \$60,000; seconded by Vice Mayor Beach. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, 5-0.

**b. AUTHORIZATION TO THE CITY MANAGER TO SUBMIT A LETTER OF INTEREST TO BAY AREA METRO TO AMEND THE DESIGNATED PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) IN THE CITY OF BURLINGAME**

CDD Gardiner stated that Priority Development Areas (“PDAs”) are defined as locations within existing Bay Area communities that present infill development opportunities and are easily accessible to transit, jobs, shopping, and services. He explained that the City’s current PDA was established in 2007 by Council resolution in coordination with the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (“C/CAG”). The City’s PDA was amended in 2009 to include the boundaries of the Downtown Specific Plan.

CDD Gardiner stated that in general, PDAs conform to a quarter mile from each side of El Camino Real.

CDD Gardiner stated that staff proposes to make a minor addition to the City’s PDA to include the boundaries of the North Rollins Road Mixed Use District consistent with the General Plan.

CDD Gardiner reviewed the implications of PDAS including:

- Access regional funding available only to PDAs to fund capital projects and planning (OBAG grants, etc.)
- Access state funding tied to Sustainable Communities Strategies

CDD Gardiner stated that the staff report outlined other designations such as Priority Conservation Area and Priority Production Area that could be requested from Bay Area Metro. However, he noted that the PDA aligned the most to the City’s General Plan.

CDD Gardiner stated that staff is asking Council to authorize the City Manager to submit a Letter of Interest to Bay Area Metro to amend the boundaries of the PDA to include the North Rollins Road Mixed Use Area.

Mayor Colson opened the item up for public comment.

Burlingame resident Jennifer Pfaff voiced her support for the amendment to the PDA map.

Mayor Colson closed public comment.

Vice Mayor Beach discussed grant opportunities as a result of the amended PDA map. She questioned whether a pecking order for grant funds would be established based on the type of designation a City requested.

Councilmember Brownrigg made a motion to authorize the City Manager to submit a Letter of Interest to Bay Area Metro to amend the boundaries of the PDA to include the North Rollins Road Mixed Use Area; seconded by Councilmember Keighran. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, 5-0.

**11. COUNCIL COMMITTEE AND ACTIVITIES REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**a. MAYOR COLSON'S COMMITTEE REPORT**

**b. VICE MAYOR BEACH'S COMMITTEE REPORT**

**12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no future agenda items.

**13. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Colson adjourned meeting at 10:03 p.m. in memory of Beatrice Boland.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer  
City Clerk