



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL
Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Regular City Council Meeting on December 1, 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 7:01 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Burlingame Youth Baseball Association.

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 LABOR NEGOTIATORS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54957.6
EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS: BURLINGAME POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, BURLINGAME POLICE
SERGEANTS ASSOCIATION, ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ADMINISTRATORS, AND TEAMSTERS 856**

City Attorney Guina stated that no reportable action was taken.

6. UPCOMING EVENTS

Mayor Stevenson reviewed upcoming events in the city.

7. PRESENTATIONS

- a. **RECOGNITION OF BURLINGAME YOUTH BASEBALL ASSOCIATION**

Mayor Stevenson congratulated the Burlingame Youth Baseball Association on their upcoming participation in the Cooperstown Tournament in New York. He presented each player with a certificate.

Congratulations to Nolan Lish, Dashiel Jangla, Matthew Wong, Santino Tuuhetoka, Dominic DiFranco, Coulter Rampel, Dylan Wilson, Jake Prock, James Osumi, Alden Pellet, Landon Swisher, and Dan Gutknecht.

b. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE FROM ASSEMBLYMEMBER DIANE PAPAN

Assemblymember Diane Papan thanked the Council for their commitment to good governance and described the cooperation she observed in Burlingame compared to other jurisdictions.

Assemblymember Papan provided a legislative update regarding:

- State budget realities since 2022 – record surpluses ended, persistent deficits, and uncertainties due to dependency on fluctuating tax sources
- Highlights and challenges in the Vehicle License Fee (“VLF”) allocations
- Legislative victories including: elimination of dangerous chemicals from consumer products, advances in public health, bills for paratransit recertification, proposals to allow Caltrain to receive financial credit for providing electricity to the power grid, and reforms for efficiency in housing element review and feedback
- Challenges in advancing water policies for data center accountability and the State’s need to plan better around infrastructure for climate resilience
- Significance of Proposition 4 including ensuring area median income rather than state median income was used for determining grant qualification

Vice Mayor Brownrigg discussed the importance of the Bayfront and the threat sea level rise poses to City revenue. He asked for Assemblymember Papan’s assistance in obtaining grants to protect against sea level rise. Assemblymember Papan replied in the affirmative. She discussed the political realities in Sacramento regarding housing and budget committee priorities but agreed to advocate on matters regarding resilience and housing element reform.

The Council discussed other concerns such as grant competitiveness for recycled water and climate projects, technical feedback processes for housing, the consultant “logjam” in compliance, and district election requirements for small cities.

The Council thanked Assemblymember Papan for her hard work on behalf of the community.

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

c. BURLINGAME-MILLBRAE SEA LEVEL RISE SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECT UPDATE BY ONESHORELINE

OneShoreline CEO Len Materman gave an update on the Burlingame-Millbrae sea level rise project. He began by reviewing OneShoreline's FY 2025-26 priorities:

- Advance projects that align long-term resilience for developed, natural, and recreational areas across jurisdictions, and economic resilience for property owners and renters
- Alert people to and reduce the impacts of today's extreme storms made worse by rising tides
- Plan land use, private development, and public infrastructure for climate-driven conditions and with regional resilience projects and adaptation plans
- Develop ongoing local funding streams to sustain three efforts long-term and to continue to leverage external funding opportunities

Mr. Materman outlined the growing regional risk from climate-fueled atmospheric rivers and their effect on flood mitigation, infrastructure insurance costs, and economic security. He reviewed OneShoreline's coordination with SFO, municipalities, and other regional infrastructure owners. He displayed slides and maps that illustrated the key assets, flood plains, and the interlocking fate of properties.

Mr. Materman stressed the countywide significance of the zoning ordinance first adopted by Burlingame. He praised it as a model for integrated development and resilience requirements and described the ongoing outreach to encourage other cities to adopt similar regulatory approaches.

Mr. Materman reviewed the project's history and next steps:

- 2022-2023
 - Data collection
 - Early alternatives
 - Notice of Preparation
 - Community outreach
- 2024
 - Analyze feedback
 - Engagement plan
 - Additional alternatives
 - Community engagement
- 2025
 - Continue to analyze feedback
 - Refine alternatives
 - Early LEDPA analysis
 - Community engagement
- 2026
 - Draft EIR (spring)
 - Community and regulatory agency engagement
 - Phasing and financing plan

Mr. Materman discussed the public and partner outreach that OneShoreline has undertaken including:

- Outreach started in October 2023 with the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of an EIR to initiate the CEQA process
- Fall 2024 community engagement on draft alternatives including: ten project vetting partner meetings, two in-person community meetings, and two walking tours
- February 2025 intercept outreach conducted along the waterfront trail
- In September 2025, OneShoreline hosted a Nature Based Solutions workshop with regulatory agencies and experts

Mr. Materman reviewed the refinement to the alternatives that was accomplished in 2025:

- Align project objectives with new State RSAP guidelines
- Analyze detailed site constraints for design
- Remove features including offshore tunnels, pump stations, and 10:1 horizontal levees
- Incorporate Nature Based Solutions consistent with SFO wildlife hazard guidance
- For every waterfront parcel, tailor flood protection measures and footprints in the context of opportunities created by Burlingame’s 2021 Zoning Code Update

Mr. Materman reviewed the technical, funding, and policy work that would take OneShoreline into June 2026:

- Discussions with SFO and regulatory agencies on approaches to shoreline infrastructure and nature-based measures
- Discussions with regulatory agencies on Bay fill for habitat and mitigation
- Analysis of impacts in draft EIR
- Initiate phasing/financing discussions
- Property owner discussions
- Seek funding to complete Final EIR, design, and RSAP-compliant plan
- Integrate OneShoreline’s project plan, development proposals, and Burlingame’s upcoming Bayfront Specific Plan

Mayor Stevenson and the Council discussed the financial magnitude of the problem, the need for clarity and communication, and support for leveraging developer participation.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg urged staff to retain big picture solutions and not to settle for a lowest common denominator approach. He explained that a simpler unified project is often easier to fund.

The Council discussed the value of phased but ambitious solutions and the need to avoid project paralysis through bureaucratic over-analysis.

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

d. RECYCLED WATER PROJECT UPDATE

Carollo Engineers consultant Patrick Hassett presented the Council with options for increasing the City's water resilience and meeting new State-mandated nutrient discharge reductions. He noted that the goal of this project is two-fold:

- Reduce drought vulnerability and supplement water supply via water reuse
- Improve environment and achieve compliance by reducing nutrient discharge to San Francisco Bay by 40%

Mr. Hassett gave an overview on different approaches to nutrient removal:

- Wastewater Treatment Process Optimization/Densification
 - Modify existing treatment processes to increase denitrification
 - May not be sufficient to meet requirements
- Membrane Bioreactor ("MBR")
 - Biologically active membranes filter out and break down solids
 - More expensive, would meet nutrient requirements
- Nutrient Removal Credit Exchange
 - Pay other Bay Area Clean Water Agencies ("BACWA") members for extra nutrient removal "credits" beyond the requirements
 - Details of exchange program, such as costs and availability, are unknown
- Other Treatment Options
 - Membrane Aerated Bioreactor, Biological Aerated Filter + Denitrification Filters

Mr. Hassett reviewed the development of the different alternatives:

- Public outreach meetings were scheduled with several potential project partners including: SFPUC, Millbrae, OneShoreline, San Bruno, San Mateo, BAWSCA, SVCW, Cal Water, and Poplar Creek Golf Course
- Twenty potential project scenarios were considered including ten recycled water scenarios, four indirect potable reuse scenarios, and three direct potable reuse scenarios
- Alternatives were ruled out based on feasibility, cost effectiveness, and interest of project partners
- Reduced to short-list of four alternatives

Mr. Hassett reviewed the four alternatives:

1. Cloth Filtration Purple Pipe Recycled Water

- Treatment involves tertiary cloth filtration/disinfection at Burlingame Wastewater Treatment Facility
- Infrastructure required is new recycled water distribution system in east side of the city
- Potentially partner with Millbrae
- Pros: low cost and operationally simple

- Cons: there is only a seasonal water supply benefit and this alternative requires additional wastewater treatment facility optimization/densification
- Total project cost between \$76 million and \$152 million

2. MBR Purple Pipe Recycled Water

- Treatment involves MBR/disinfection at Burlingame Wastewater Treatment Facility
- Infrastructure required is new recycled water distribution system in east side of city
- Potentially partner with Millbrae
- Pro: this alternative fully satisfies the Regional Water Quality Board (“RWQCB”) nutrient removal requirements
- Cons: added costs/operational complexity, and there is only a seasonal water supply benefit
- Total project cost between \$250 million and \$500 million

3. Direct Potable Reuse (“DPR”) Pure Water Peninsula Add-on

- Treatment involves shared DPR treatment at Silicon Valley Clean Water
- Infrastructure required is new wastewater force main to San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Project partners are PureWater Peninsula Partners
- Pros: accomplish nutrient compliance in short term and PureWater Peninsula is a mature project with momentum
- Cons: the project is reliant on several agencies’ timelines to receive water supply benefits, and there are bureaucratic challenges of a project with more than seven partners
- Total project cost between \$104 million and \$208 million

4. DPR with Burlingame and San Mateo

- Treatment involves shared DPR treatment at San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Infrastructure required is new wastewater force main to San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Project partners are San Mateo and Cal Water
- Pros: more control over implementation timeline, avoids costly conveyance from San Mateo to SVCW, and SFPUC showed interest
- Cons: requires a larger capital investment and larger operating expenses
- Total project cost is between \$140 million and \$280 million

Mr. Hassett reviewed the next steps:

- Awaiting treatment capacity analysis from San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Monitor BACWA Nutrient Credit trading program developments
- Further refine candidate alternatives
- Select three alternatives to take forward
- Prepare Feasibility Study and develop detailed cost estimates

The City Council asked about fiscal benefits of the different alternatives, alignment of incentives/credits with neighboring agencies, and whether “lowest cost” interim steps could provide real, near-term benefits.

Mr. Hassett explained that while near-term irrigation-only solutions provide partial benefit, State and regional mandates require a more robust infrastructure build-out.

The Council directed staff to ensure the options analysis reflects both financial and compliance perspectives.

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

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. Vice Mayor Brownrigg pulled item 9h.

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

a. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 3, 2025 REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the November 3, 2025 Regular City Council Meeting.

b. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 12, 2025 CLOSED SESSION

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the November 12, 2025 Closed Session.

c. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 17, 2025 CLOSED SESSION

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the November 17, 2025 Closed Session.

d. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 17, 2025 REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the November 17, 2025 Regular City Council Meeting.

e. **APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE NOVEMBER 18, 2025 PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION INTERVIEWS**

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the November 18, 2025 Parks and Recreation Commission and Beautification Commission Interviews.

f. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE PUBLIC WORKS CORPORATION YARD ROOF RETROFIT PROJECT BY STATE ROOFING SYSTEMS, INC., CITY PROJECT NO. 86061 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$907,160**

DPW Murtuza requested Council adopt Resolution Number 134-2025.

g. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTIONS AWARDDING A \$2,639,780 CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT TO CORCUS CONSTRUCTION, INC. FOR THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY HEADWORKS CONCRETE CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, CITY PROJECT NO. 86830, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT, AND APPROVING A \$397,323 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH CAROLLO ENGINEERS FOR CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION AND ENGINEERING SUPPORT SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT**

DPW Murtuza requested Council adopt Resolution Number 135-2025 and Resolution Number 136-2025.

h. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF IMPACT FEES COLLECTED AS OF JUNE 30, 2025, PURSUANT TO THE MITIGATION FEE ACT (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66000 ET SEQ.)**

Vice Mayor Brownrigg asked if the affordable housing linkage fees were subject to “use it or lose it” rules. CDD Zayer replied in the negative.

City Attorney Guina added that while there is no automatic forfeiture, a risk of litigation exists if funds are never used for their intended purpose.

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

Vice Mayor Brownrigg made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 137-2025; seconded by Councilmember Pappajohn. The motion was passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

- i. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A TWELFTH AMENDMENT OF THE CITY MANAGER'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT; A THIRD AMENDMENT OF THE CITY ATTORNEY'S EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT; AND APPROVING THE CITY OF BURLINGAME PAY RATES AND RANGES (SALARY SCHEDULES)**

HR Director Saguisag-Sid requested Council adopt Resolution Number 138-2025.

- j. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH BERGDAVIS PUBLIC AFFAIRS TO PROVIDE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SERVICES RELATED TO 501 PRIMROSE ROAD, TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF SERVICES AND INCREASE THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT BY \$50,000, FOR A TOTAL OF \$124,250, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS**

Deputy City Manager Kirshner requested Council adopt Resolution Number 139-2025.

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. **PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TENTATIVE AND FINAL PARCEL MAPS (PM 25-05), SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 3, 9, AND PORTION OF LOT 2, BLOCK 3, BURLINGAME HILLS SUBDIVISION AT 1385 HILLSIDE CIRCLE; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES 15303**

DPW Murtuza stated that staff recommends approval of the tentative and final parcel map for the subdivision of lots 3, 9, and a portion of lot 2, block 3, of the Burlingame Hills Subdivision. He noted that the tentative and final maps are identical.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg stated that the space is very constrained and discussed the neighbors' concerns regarding the extremely narrow width of the street and heavy traffic during school drop-off/pickup for Hoover Elementary. He explained that a construction project could cause a lot of congestion. He added that neighbors were also concerned about additional crowding on this street with the creation of multiple lots.

Councilmember Colson expressed appreciation for the developer's lot split approach and noted the general necessity and inevitability of construction-related traffic.

Mayor Stevenson discussed the need for single-family housing stock and the process management to protect existing residents during construction.

Mayor Stevenson opened the public hearing.

Jen Faber voiced support for the redevelopment and noted that she did have traffic and safety concerns during the construction.

Mayor Stevenson closed public comment.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 140-2025; seconded by Mayor Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

b. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING OF AN ORDINANCE ADDING CHAPTER 13.45 “ELECTRIC VEHICLE PARKING AND CHARGING SPACES”, TO TITLE 13 OF THE BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC, CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15378, 15601(b)(3) AND 15301

ACA Burke explained that California Vehicle Code (“CVC”) Sections 22511 and 22511.1 authorize local jurisdictions to regulate parking in spaces designated for EV charging and to enforce restrictions against unauthorized vehicles occupying those spaces. However, she noted that to effectuate these provisions, a local agency must first adopt an ordinance consistent with the CVC and post adequate signage.

ACA Burke stated that the proposed ordinance provides the Burlingame Police Department with sufficient authority to enforce EV parking regulations. The proposed ordinance does the following:

1. Creates Chapter 13.45 of the Burlingame Municipal Code
2. Authorizes the Public Works Director (or designee) to designate and mark EV charging spaces on public streets or within City-controlled off-street public parking facilities, for the restricted use of charging EVs.
3. Require proper signage consistent with CVC Section 22511 and 22511.1, including warning that violating vehicles may be towed, and a local law enforcement contact number.
4. Prohibit parking of any vehicle in a designated EV charging space unless the vehicle is an EV connected for charging during a charging event.
5. By adopting this ordinance, the City is authorized to engage in enforcement, including citation and towing, consistent with CVC Sections 22511 and 22511.1.

Traffic Division Sergeant Orloff stated that he has received numerous complaints that vehicles have been parking in EV charging station spaces that are not EVs, or at times, EVs are parking in such spaces, but not for engaging in a charging event, thereby obstructing the use of the EV charging stations for their intended use.

Councilmember Colson asked if the ordinance would allow the City to ticket non-EV vehicles that are parked in EV reserved spots in private parking lots. ACA Burke replied that the private lot would need to first post signage that cars would be towed if they parked in EV reserved spaces and weren’t an EV vehicle.

Mayor Stevenson opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Colson made a motion to bring the ordinance back for a second reading; seconded by Vice Mayor Brownrigg. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

11. STAFF REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

a. CONSIDERATION OF THREE APPOINTMENTS TO THE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

There are three vacancies on the Parks & Recreation Commission due to the expiring terms of Cherie Yu, Ian Milne, and Teresa Curtis. The vacancies were published, and the City received seven applications by the deadline. The City Council interviewed Cherie Yu, Illana Mandelbaum, Todd Weller, Trevor Tileston, Charles Chavez, Scott Sayegh, and Elizabeth Ward Francesconi.

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

Deputy City Manager Kirshner collected the ballots and read the votes.

Congratulations to Cherie Yu, Todd Weller, and Elizabeth Ward Francisconi on their appointments to Parks & Recreation Commission.

b. CONSIDERATION OF TWO APPOINTMENTS TO THE BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION

There are two vacancies on the Beautification Commission due to the expiring terms of Carol Batte and Marcia Bauer. The vacancies were published and the City received three applications as of the deadline. One applicant, Sophia Markoulakis, withdrew her application before the interviews. The City Council interviewed Carol Batte and Marcia Bauer.

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

Deputy City Manager Kirshner collected the ballots and read the votes.

Congratulations to Carol Batte and Marcia Bauer on their reappointments to the Beautification Commission.

c. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,500,000 WITH RAIMI AND ASSOCIATES FOR THE PREPARATION OF A BAYFRONT SPECIFIC PLAN, AND CONSIDERATION OF THE CREATION OF A SUBCOMMITTEE FOR THE BAYFRONT SPECIFIC PLAN

CDD Zayer explained that in 2015, the City undertook a multi-year process to update the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. She stated that the zoning update spurred high development interest in the Bayfront. She noted that Burlingame's Bayfront comprises roughly 2.5 linear miles along the San Francisco Bay and

serves as a major economic hub, containing 11 hotels, regional office facilities, and various industrial and logistics businesses.

CDD Zayer stated that in light of these factors, the need for a Bayfront Specific Plan to establish a long-term vision for the next ten to 20 years for the area and to guide future development was discussed at the Joint Council and Planning Commission Meeting in April 2025. She explained that the City sought proposals from qualified consulting teams to assist with the preparation of a specific plan.

CDD Zayer stated that after interviews were conducted, staff selected Raimi and Associates due to their substantial Bay Area experience, technical breadth, and relevant subconsultants.

CDD Zayer stated that the Bayfront Specific Plan will include:

- Integration of OneShoreline’s technical work and policies (particularly as they pertain to sea level rise, adaptation, and district resilience)
- Updated parcel-specific development standards, economic/fiscal analysis, infrastructure plans, and environmental review

She added that there would be a comprehensive, multi-stage public engagement for the development of this plan.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg and Mayor Stevenson emphasized the project’s critical importance to Burlingame’s economic future, and urged a process with direct, regular involvement of all five Councilmembers.

Vice Mayor Brownrigg discussed the necessity of strong Council input to balance economic, housing, environmental, and infrastructure needs. He noted that standard consultant outreach would not suffice due to the complexity of this plan.

Councilmember Colson suggested that due to their knowledge and previous work on this matter, she and Vice Mayor Brownrigg could lead the efforts on this project. She added that she supported public study sessions to allow broad Council participation at milestones.

The Council discussed the role of the Community Advisory Committee and the importance of ensuring that its membership is diverse and representative of the business and local community. They noted the need for the Committee to include developers with track records (regardless of whether they have a current Bayfront project), leaders from the hotel industry and business community, technical experts (fire and police), and possibly alumni of the Planning Commission, Traffic Safety & Parking Commission, and Beautification Commission.

The Council agreed to discuss the makeup of the Community Advisory Committee at a future meeting.

CDD Zayer concurred with Council that the process of developing the Bayfront Specific Plan should be flexible and include regular Council study sessions. She noted that this would be a discussion at the Joint Council and Planning Commission Meeting in 2026.

Councilmember Colson made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 141-2025; seconded by Councilmember Pappajohn. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

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 10:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer
City Clerk