



"The City With a Heart"

Rico E. Medina, Mayor  
Sandy Alvarez, Vice Mayor  
Tom Hamilton, Councilmember, District 2  
Michael Salazar, Councilmember, District 3  
Marty Medina, Councilmember, District 4

**AGENDA**  
**SAN BRUNO CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING**  
**April 14, 2026**  
**5:30 PM**

<p><b>IN PERSON* MEETING LOCATION</b></p> <p>San Bruno Recreation and Aquatic Center, Community Room 251 City Park Way San Bruno, CA 94066</p> <p>*Please turn off all electronic devices before the start of the meeting to prevent disruptions*</p>	<p><b>**Zoom Link</b> <a href="https://sanbruno-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/81643549334?pwd=FJt5l8qbekJLNjtQbKM6ZAfNrhFQKh.1">https://sanbruno-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/81643549334?pwd=FJt5l8qbekJLNjtQbKM6ZAfNrhFQKh.1</a> <b>Phone Line:</b> 1-646-558-8656 <b>Webinar ID:</b> 816 4354 9334 <b>Webinar Password:</b> 868676</p> <p>*Broadcast of the meeting is offered via Zoom as a courtesy to the public. **No public comment accepted via Zoom.</p>
---	---

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** In person attendees who want to provide public comment, will be asked to fill out a speaker card and turn it into the City Clerk. Public comment may also be emailed to [CityClerk@sanbruno.ca.gov](mailto:CityClerk@sanbruno.ca.gov). Comments received via email will not be read aloud during the meeting.

**ACCESSIBILITY:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals requiring special accommodations or modifications to participate in this meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office 48 hours prior to the meeting at (650) 616-7061 or [CityClerk@sanbruno.ca.gov](mailto:CityClerk@sanbruno.ca.gov).

\*Any disclosable public writings related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the City to at least a majority of the City Council less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the City Clerk's Office at City Hall located at 567 El Camino Real, San Bruno, California during normal business hours. In addition, the City may also post such documents on the City's Website at [sanbruno.ca.gov/AgendaCenter](http://sanbruno.ca.gov/AgendaCenter).

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. ROLL CALL**

**3. CLOSED SESSION**

*Public comment will be requested after each topic in this section*

**a. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL—EXISTING LITIGATION**  
(Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9)

Name of case: San Bruno v. California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, et al. (San Mateo County Superior Court Case No. 23-CIV-05021)

**b. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS**

Agency designated representatives: City Manager  
Employee Organizations: Teamsters Local 856, IBT Police; Teamsters Local 856, IBT Public Safety Mid-Management

4. **STUDY SESSION**

*Public comment will be requested after each topic in this section*

- a. Safe San Bruno Council Initiative - Traffic Safety and Crime Hotspot Improvement Program

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – The next Regular City Council Meeting will be held on April 14, 2026 at 7:00 pm.

POSTING: I declare a copy of this agenda was posted at City Hall, 567 El Camino Real, San Bruno, among other locations in the city limits of San Bruno, on April 9, 2026, by 8:00 pm.

  
Lupita Huerta, City Clerk



## City Council Agenda Item Staff Report

CITY OF SAN BRUNO

---

**DATE:** April 14, 2026

**TO:** Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

**FROM:** Alex D. McIntyre, City Manager

**PREPARED BY:** Matthew Lethin, Police Chief

**SUBJECT:** Safe San Bruno Council Initiative - Traffic Safety and Crime Hotspot Improvement Program

### **BACKGROUND:**

The San Bruno City Council has identified the Safe San Bruno Council Initiative – Traffic Safety and Crime Hotspot Improvement Program as a desired FY 2026-27 City Council initiative. As currently conceived, the initiative is intended to respond to community concerns related to roadway safety, particularly speeding and unsafe traffic conditions, as well as concerns regarding crime and quality-of-life issues occurring at recurring locations throughout the City.

Although these concerns are both rooted in public safety, they are not identical in nature and do not rely on the same operational tools. Traffic safety improvements are generally addressed through roadway engineering, education, and traffic enforcement, while crime hotspot reduction requires a different approach that relies on crime analysis, environmental design, place-based interventions, and targeted enforcement. For that reason, this study session is intended not only to provide background information, but also to help clarify the scope of the proposed initiative and the level of service Council would like staff to pursue as part of the FY 2026-27 budget and priority-setting process.

Staff's perspective is that improving roadway safety and reducing crime at hotspot locations should be approached through a coordinated and data-informed model that integrates engineering, education, and enforcement. At the same time, staff believe it is important to clearly define the intended outcomes of this initiative before committing substantial resources. In its current form, the concept reflects a broad policy interest, but additional direction is needed to determine whether the City's goal is to accelerate existing work, establish a new coordinated safety program, or pursue more targeted improvements in selected locations.

With respect to crime hotspots, such locations may involve property crime, violent crime, nuisance activity, or other quality-of-life issues. These locations may occur on City property, private property, or land controlled by outside agencies such as Caltrans or Caltrain. The nature of the location affects both the tools available to the City and the complexity of implementing improvements. Best practice in this area generally combines education, environmental design, and enforcement. Engineering responses are often guided by Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which focuses on improving visibility, natural surveillance, territoriality, and access control to reduce opportunities for crime. While lighting may be a

possible improvement, it is not always the most effective or appropriate intervention, depending on the specific conditions at a site.

With respect to traffic safety, the City's work is already guided by the established framework of engineering, enforcement, and education. This framework recognizes that traffic safety outcomes are shaped both by the built environment and by driver, bicyclist, and pedestrian behavior. The City has already adopted a Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP), which prioritizes roadways and intersections based on severe and fatal collision history and identifies improvement strategies intended to reduce risk. Public Works has also continued to process neighborhood traffic calming requests and implement corridor and intersection improvements as funding and staffing capacity allow. Currently, staff prioritize implementing improvements on the high-injury roadway segments and intersections in the LRSP to maximize the reduction in fatal and severe injury collisions. Traffic engineering staff time is also reserved to respond to other traffic concerns.

As reflected in the staff report, staff have completed and advanced several meaningful projects that support traffic safety objectives. Completed or ongoing efforts include the San Bruno Avenue and Cherry Avenue Intersection Improvements Project, the Huntington Avenue–San Antonio Avenue Bicycle Corridor Project, improvements under the San Bruno Avenue Transit Corridor program, red curbing adjustments, signal timing modifications, the Huntington Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project Segment 2 cycle track installation, the Bayhill Drive and El Camino Real Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project, Safe Routes to School high-priority improvements, and additional improvements associated with the Bay to Trail gap closure.

These efforts demonstrate that the City already has active traffic safety work underway; however, they also highlight that the City is operating within an existing workload and staffing structure that limits how quickly additional requests and new program elements can be delivered.

The purpose of this study session is therefore to provide Council with a clearer framework for decision-making. Specifically, staff seek direction regarding the intended scope of the initiative, the balance between traffic safety and crime hotspot work, the City's desired level of service, and whether Council wishes staff to develop a phased or comprehensive implementation approach for FY 2026-27.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### Problem Definition

The principal issue before the City Council is not whether traffic safety and crime hotspot concerns are important, as they clearly are. The issue is how the City should structure a realistic, outcome-oriented initiative that aligns community expectations with available staffing, funding, and implementation capacity.

At present, the City addresses traffic safety concerns through existing efforts by the Public Works and Police Departments, including the implementation of the LRSP, Safe Routes to School Plan, and Traffic Calming Program, targeted enforcement, staffing of the Complete Streets Committee, and public outreach. Similarly, the Police Department responds to crime hotspots through crime analysis, patrol operations, enforcement activity, and coordination with other departments or outside property owners when place-based conditions contribute to

recurring problems. However, these efforts are not currently organized under a single formal initiative with dedicated staffing, defined performance metrics, or a common prioritization framework that incorporates both data and community input.

As a result, the City is not starting from zero but is operating in a largely reactive manner constrained by available staff time. Staff is at capacity and meaningful expansion of services will require additional resources. If Council wishes to accelerate traffic safety improvements, improve responsiveness to neighborhood concerns, deploy and maintain new equipment, conduct more formal crime hotspot analysis, and establish a stronger public-facing safety program, those expectations will require additional staffing and operational support. Equipment alone will not produce the intended results unless the City also has capacity to deploy it strategically, maintain it, analyze the resulting information, and adjust operations over time.

For that reason, staff believe the initiative should be understood as a service level and capacity decision. The City can continue its current pace of work and supplement it with additional support and equipment, but that approach will yield only incremental changes. If Council desires a more visible, coordinated, and outcome-driven program, then additional staffing and ongoing program management will be needed.

#### Approach

Staff believe it is important to establish clearer expectations for what this initiative is intended to accomplish. In the staff's view, a refined FY 2026-27 initiative should aim to achieve four core outcomes. First, the City should establish a transparent prioritization process that incorporates both objective data and community input in determining where safety interventions should occur. Second, the City should identify and monitor a set of priority traffic safety corridors, intersections, and crime hotspots to ensure that resources are directed where the need is greatest. Third, the City should define performance measures that allow Council and the public to evaluate whether the initiative is producing results over time. Finally, the City should align the initiative's scope with realistic staffing and funding assumptions to sustain the program beyond a single fiscal year.

In practical terms, those outcomes could include better tracking of traffic calming requests, clearer public visibility into LRSP implementation progress, a more systematic process for hotspot identification and CPTED-based review, improved coordination between Public Works and Police, and more strategic deployment of speed feedback signs, message boards, lighting trailers, or surveillance equipment where appropriate. Depending on the Council's direction, the City could also establish regular reporting on implementation status and results as part of future work plans or budget updates.

#### Options

To help frame the Council's decision, staff have organized the initiative into three possible implementation approaches.

##### Option 1 – Comprehensive Education, Engineering, and Enforcement Program

Under this option, the City would establish a comprehensive, multi-year public safety program designed to accelerate traffic safety improvements, improve responsiveness to neighborhood concerns, and create dedicated capacity to address crime hotspots through education, engineering, and enforcement.

For traffic safety, this option would fund full implementation of San Bruno's 2023 Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) and provide staffing to advance related efforts such as the Traffic Calming Program and Safe Routes to School improvements. Rather than continuing to implement these programs incrementally as staffing and funding allow, this option would create a more proactive and coordinated delivery model. To support implementation, this option would include a \$15 million capital budget over a multi-year effort to construct improvements identified in the LRSP, along with a limited-term Project Manager for two to three years to lead implementation of the LRSP and related traffic safety programs. This position would coordinate priority safety projects, track implementation progress, align work across departments and consultants, and support delivery of Council-prioritized traffic safety improvements. This option would also include an additional \$500,000 annually to support the installation of traffic-calming measures, such as speed humps, on up to four streets per year and to deliver other traffic-calming improvements in a more predictable, programmatic manner.

This option would also add a Management Analyst to support traffic safety outreach, data analysis, community engagement, performance tracking, and interdepartmental coordination. This position would help establish a more formal, transparent, and measurable safety program and would support public communication regarding implementation progress, neighborhood concerns, and prioritization of efforts.

For the crime hotspot initiative, this option would include the Police Department staffing and equipment identified in the staff report, including a dedicated Traffic and Crime Prevention Officer and equipment such as lighting trailers, surveillance cameras, variable message boards, and other deployable public safety tools. These resources would support targeted enforcement, hotspot response, public education, and coordination of safety interventions. Unlike a more limited equipment-only approach, this option would provide the staffing capacity needed to deploy and manage those tools effectively.

The Management Analyst would also support the crime hotspot component by working with Police, Public Works, and other departments to review data, identify recurring hotspot locations, evaluate contributing site conditions, and support development of a coordinated response strategy. That work may include outreach, operational changes, CPTED-based assessments, and coordination with property owners or partner agencies when site-specific conditions contribute to recurring issues. This option would not assume that lighting alone is the appropriate solution in every case. Instead, hotspot locations would be evaluated using a broader problem-solving framework to determine the most appropriate intervention based on the type of activity, property ownership, and environmental conditions. If those assessments identify built-environment improvements on City property, or City participation in such improvements, staff would return to the City Council with recommendations, scope, and funding needs for consideration.

The management analyst would also work with a consultant to implement an online dashboard to track the city's efforts in traffic safety and crime prevention. There will be a one-time implementation cost of \$50,000.

Overall, this option would move the City from a largely reactive and capacity-constrained model to a coordinated implementation program with dedicated staff, ongoing funding, and clearer public safety outcomes. It is the most robust option and the one best positioned to deliver

visible, measurable progress on both traffic safety and crime-hotspot concerns. The total cost of this option would include the \$15 million capital budget for LRSP improvements, the limited-term Project Manager, the Management Analyst (\$180,000 ongoing), the ongoing \$500,000 annual traffic calming allocation, the Police Department position (\$262,000 ongoing), and approximately \$150,000 in equipment. Final staffing and operating costs would need to be refined through the FY 2026-27 budget process. Total estimates are presented in the table below.

#### Option 2 – Enhanced Evaluation Program

Under this option, the City would establish an intermediate public safety program that advances the same overall initiative framework as Option 1, but without accelerated delivery of the capital improvement projects identified in San Bruno's 2023 Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP), nor an increase in the Traffic Calming Program budget or staffing. This option would continue to support traffic safety and crime hotspot work through additional staffing, ongoing traffic-calming funding, and Police Department resources and equipment, but it would do so within the City's existing pace of capital project delivery.

For traffic safety, this option would continue implementation of the LRSP, the Traffic Calming Program, and Safe Routes to School improvements using existing capital planning and delivery capacity. Unlike Option 1, this option would not include dedicated additional capital funding to accelerate construction of LRSP improvements, nor would it include the limited-term Project Manager proposed to lead that accelerated work. As a result, priority traffic safety capital projects would continue to compete with other Public Works priorities and available staffing resources, limiting the City's ability to expedite the delivery of LRSP recommendations. This option would, however, retain the proposed Management Analyst to support traffic safety outreach, data analysis, community engagement, performance tracking, and interdepartmental coordination. This position would help formalize the program, improve transparency, and support the development of a clearer and more measurable traffic safety work program.

For the crime hotspot initiative, this option would include either a full-time or part-time Community Services Officer (CSO), depending on Council direction and preference, rather than a dedicated full-time sworn Traffic and Crime Prevention Officer. The full-time CSO, compared with the part-time position, would create additional capacity to conduct related efforts. The CSO would support hotspot response, public education, coordination with Public Works and other departments, and deployment of equipment such as lighting trailers, surveillance cameras, variable message boards, and other deployable public safety tools. This approach would provide added support beyond current capacity, but it would be more limited than Option 1 because a CSO would not provide the same level of dedicated enforcement or sustained operational coverage as a full-time sworn position.

The Management Analyst would also support the crime hotspot component by working with the police and other departments to review data, identify recurring hotspot locations, evaluate contributing site conditions, and support the development of a coordinated response strategy. That work may include outreach, operational changes, CPTED-based assessments, and coordination with property owners or partner agencies when site-specific conditions contribute to recurring issues. This option would not assume that lighting alone is the appropriate solution in every case. If assessments identify needed built-environment improvements on City property,

or City participation in such improvements, staff would return to the City Council with recommendations, scope, and funding needs for consideration.

Overall, this option would provide a meaningful expansion of the City's traffic safety and crime hotspot initiative by adding program support, annual traffic-calming funding, and limited police support capacity, but it would stop short of accelerating major LRSP capital improvements or providing a full-time, dedicated enforcement position. As a result, the City would gain better coordination, outreach, analysis, and neighborhood-level implementation capacity, while continuing to face limitations in expediting larger traffic safety capital projects and sustaining hotspot response at the level available under Option 1.

The total cost of this option would include the Management Analyst (\$180,000 ongoing), the CSO (full-time at \$140,000 or part-time at \$42,000 ongoing), and approximately \$150,000 in equipment. Final staffing and operating costs would need to be refined through the FY 2026-27 budget process.

### Option 3 – Limited Enhancements

Under Option 3, the City would purchase additional traffic safety and crime prevention equipment but would not add new staff. Existing Public Works and Police staff would continue to coordinate and implement work as time permits. This approach would likely yield incremental benefit, particularly where equipment can be deployed to raise awareness or address specific conditions. However, because no new staffing capacity would be added, this option would not materially change the City's ability to analyze hotspots, accelerate project delivery, sustain public engagement, or manage an expanded program on an ongoing basis. In effect, this option would maintain the City's current service model with additional tools, but without the organizational capacity needed to transform those tools into a comprehensive program. Option 3 will include developing a traffic safety dashboard. There would be a one-time \$50,000 cost in implementing the dashboard.

### Summary

Option 1 is estimated at \$16.2 million for one-time capital and equipment expenses and includes adding two new full-time staff members: a management analyst and a sworn officer.

Option 2 is estimated at \$422,000-\$520,000 (depending on Council's decision for the CSO position) for one-time equipment costs and includes one new management analyst and a CSO.

Option 3 is estimated at \$200,000 and includes equipment only.

While these figures provide a reasonable starting point for policy discussion, staff notes that final costs would need to be refined through the FY 2026-27 budget development process, including any assumptions related to personnel classification, training, deployment model, and whether consultant support may be needed for specialized crime analysis, CPTED review, or program development.

From a policy perspective, staff believe the strongest direction Council can provide is not simply which option appears most attractive, but what level of outcome Council expects from this initiative. If the Council's objective is to create a visible, coordinated, and measurable public safety initiative, staff would need direction to develop a program with dedicated capacity,

defined performance measures, and a structured implementation plan. If Council’s objective is instead to make targeted improvements within existing operational limits, staff can refine a narrower initiative focused on transparency, the deployment of selected equipment, and continued progress under the LRSP and existing Police operations.

A summary of the three options, costs, and cost components of the options is provided below.  
 Table 1 – Summary of Options, Costs, and Cost Components

Option	Description	Cost	Cost Components
1	Comprehensive Education, Engineering, and Enforcement Program	\$16.2M  (\$15.2M one-time and \$1M on-going)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Accelerated Implementation of LRSP (3-year Term Limited Project Manager paid for by projects) - \$15,000,000 (One-time)</li> <li>· Increased Traffic Calming - \$500,000 (On-going)</li> <li>· Management Analyst - \$180,000 (On-going)</li> <li>· Traffic and Crime Prevention Officer - \$262,000 (On-going)</li> <li>· Equipment - \$150,000 (One time)</li> <li>· Online Dashboard - \$50,000 (One time)</li> </ul>
2	Enhanced Outreach, Dashboard and Equipment Program	\$422,000-\$520,000 (\$200,000 one-time and \$222,000-\$320,000 on-going)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Management Analyst - \$180,000 (On-going)</li> <li>· Either:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full-Time CSO - \$140,000 (On-going)</li> <li>- Or Part-time CSO - \$42,000 (On-going)</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Equipment - \$150,000 (One time)</li> <li>· Online Dashboard - \$50,000 (One time)</li> </ul>
3	Dashboard and Equipment	\$200,000 (one-time)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Equipment - \$150,000 (One time)</li> <li>· Online Dashboard - \$50,000 (One time)</li> </ul>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The total cost for this program is dependent on direction from City Council, and it would require dedicated funding in the involved departments’ budgets.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:**

The action is not a project subject to CEQA.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Receive the presentation and provide direction to staff regarding the preferred scope and approach for the Safe San Bruno Council Initiative so that staff may refine it for consideration as part of the FY2027 City Council priority setting and budget preparation process.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Provide alternative direction regarding the scope or priorities of the proposed Safe San Bruno Council Initiative.
2. Direct staff to explore a more limited initiative focused solely on traffic improvements or solely on crime hotspot reduction strategies.
3. Decline to pursue the initiatives as a FY 2026-27 City Council priority.