

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 22, 2017, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1. Introduction / Roll Call

Chair Cihacek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and at his request, Public Works Director Marc Culver called the roll.

Present: Chair Brian Cihacek; Vice Chair Joe Wozniak; and Members Thomas Trainor, John Heimerl, Nancy Misra and Kody Thurnau

Absent: Member Duane Seigler

Guests: Planning Commission Members: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Members Sharon Brown, James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble, and Peter Sparby

Staff Present: Public Works Director Marc Culver and City Engineer Jesse Freihammer;

2. Public Comments

3. Approval of July 25, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by PWETC commissioners prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions incorporated into the draft presented in meeting materials.

Motion

Member Wozniak moved, Member Thurnau seconded, approval of the July 25, 2017 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

Public Works Director Culver requested Planning Commission Members say their name before speaking because they do not have a secretary present taking minutes.

Mr. Culver provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated August 22, 2017. He stated Victoria Street will be closed for several days, beginning on Monday, August 28. Work will be done on the railroad crossing at Victoria, just north of County Road C, as well as the installation of a sidewalk segment. He also noted work has stopped on Snelling Avenue in order to get all the lanes open for the fair. It is mostly complete, with some finishing work left to do.

5. PWET Commission/Planning Commission Joint Meeting

Mr. Culver commented the intent of the joint meeting is to discuss various items with the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to transportation.

Scott Mareck, WSB Senior Transportation Planner, directed Members to the meeting packet, which includes highlights of the Transportation Plan, the 2040 draft Future Land Use, and transportation goals and policies for the City. He reported County Road C and County Road B2 have been identified by the Metropolitan Council as significant freight bottleneck areas and there is a lack of east/west continuity with transit service.

Mr. Mareck went over the meetings the PWET Commission has had, and the next steps in the process. They will be updating the 2007 Transportation Plan with what is required by the Metropolitan Council, but will also detail what the City's future needs are.

In response to Chair Cihacek, Mr. Mareck explained they look at how Roseville's regional network roadways, transit system, and bike/pedestrian system fits into the broader context of the region and communities adjacent to Roseville. They will lay out how to coordinate with the County and Mn/DOT on projects that involve multiple jurisdictions. There is flexibility to provide a local footprint on the overall plan, but there are specific requirements that communities must meet in order to be eligible for Federal transportation funds from the Metropolitan Council. There is also an amendment process to go through on things they do not agree with that the Metropolitan Council requires.

Chair Cihacek inquired if they should be more specific in their plan in order to receive funding approval.

Mr. Mareck agreed, and stated it is important they still provide specific recommendations to the Metropolitan Council even though they do not have the final say in what actually gets done. It helps them make decisions on modal elements.

Mr. Mareck continued his report by highlighting the meetings and public engagement events that have already taken place. He reported the Public Works Commission is working on a separate master plan that is not required by the Metropolitan Council, and it details project identification and prioritization of City pathways. They hope to have the plan approved by the City Council in mid-December.

Mr. Mareck referred to page 21 of the meeting packet, and asked the group what does and does not work well with the City of Roseville transportation system.

Member Bull inquired if the intersection of Interstate 35 and Highway 36 are in the purview of the City or Mn/DOT.

Mr. Mareck responded the Interstate system is owned and managed by Mn/DOT, and they decide when and where improvements take place. However, they are required to coordinate with the Counties and Cities those roadways pass through. This Transportation Plan helps Mn/DOT and the County understand what the City's needs are. At times, financial resources are shared on projects when State or County roadways intersect with City's roadways. The City also has its own Capital Improvement Program on projects and will reach out to the County or Mn/DOT as needed.

Planning Commission Chair Murphy commented Mn/DOT, the County, and the City worked together on the improvements for Twin Lakes Parkway/Cleveland Avenue/Northbound 35W/County Road C exit.

Member Kimble inquired what the projects are in the near future for Highway 36.

Mr. Mareck responded Mn/DOT is in the planning stages of developing a MnPASS feasibility study for Highway 36. They will be looking at commuting patterns, traffic levels, and the right of way blueprint to see if there is room to add a MnPASS lane and determine if it is something the community wants. It is difficult to build out of congestion, because if another lane is added, it will become congested again with growth in the region. Most of the major expansion projects are in the past, and Mn/DOT will be very critical on when and where they are done in the future. In order to mitigate the congestion concern, Mn/DOT is trying to coordinate with the Metropolitan Council to emphasize transit, bike and pedestrian modality, MnPASS, staggered work hours, and ride sharing.

Member Sparby inquired what kind of control the City has over roads that back up onto Highway 36, like Fairview Avenue.

Mr. Mareck responded they are looking for input on and working with staff as part of the overall transportation network. They will identify congested corridors and determine the ability of staff to do more detailed studies in those areas. He referred to a document on page 30 in the packet, provided by the Metropolitan

Council. It summarizes where the congested areas are in the City. Highway 36, Lexington Avenue, Snelling Avenue, Interstate 35, and Rice Street have all been identified as being at or near congested. As resources are available, they will recommend the City coordinate with Mn/DOT and the County to take a closer look at these roadways.

Chair Cihacek clarified none of the roadways just described are within the City's jurisdiction and it is hard for them to do congestion mitigation in those areas. The only way to address it is to change where people are traveling to and how they are getting there. The residential streets, which are in the City's jurisdiction, are in good condition. As businesses and retail are being brought in, it is important for the Planning Commission to know where it is sited, how are people going to get there, and what it means for congestion.

Member Wozniak commented they are looking out 20 years with this plan, but he has not seen anything about how future technology might affect transportation, congestion, and development. He inquired if the Planning Commission has discussed how self-driving cars might affect the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Mareck responded it is a common question and valid observation. Self-driving cars and other technologies are being discussed in the media, but it is hard to quantify how that technology is going to impact the transportation system. It is important to acknowledge it is out there and reflect in the plan they do not know where it is going to take them.

Chair Cihacek inquired how it is reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Daire commented it sounds like even though they know the technology is out there, they need to forecast based on what they know is here now.

Mr. Mareck responded they have a travel demand forecast provided by the Metropolitan Council that is developed based on history of demographic trends and the direction they want to take with transit, with an emphasis on denser land use and future transit use. There is a leaning toward transit and trying to get people out of the cars, but there is nothing to show that they have considered self-driving cars. It is too difficult to have any credible assumptions to show that self-driving cars will have any certain impact on the growth of the region.

Member Daire referred to transportation goals and policies on page 23 of the meeting packet, specifically items 3.1 and 3.2. He stated these items indicate a more efficient use of the transportation system by encouraging transit use and channeling traffic onto collector streets. Traffic congestion then is not a Mn/DOT issue, and the expense is passed onto another jurisdiction.

Mr. Mareck commented this policy addresses the City, County, and State system. Sometimes they complement each other, and other times they contradict each

other. All of them play a role and work with each other to move the traffic through the region.

Chair Cihacek commented Twin Lakes Parkway, which is a City road, was created with certain design elements to help relieve traffic on Cleveland Avenue, Fairview Avenue, and County Road C, which are County roads.

Member Daire commented they need to determine what the City can do. If someone wants a path along a County road, who pays for it? When it comes to County, State, or Federal facilities, the City can make a request, but ultimately it is up to them to decide if they want to spend the money. Traffic on collector streets directed from Highway 36 affects local residents and businesses and they should develop a strategy for some of the collector roads.

Chair Cihacek stated the plan is not focused on a specific roadway or outlet, but does look at the macro level. He agrees they do need to be clear they are concerned about traffic mitigation on roads coming into Roseville and traffic moving through Roseville. The roads are already congested and they need to consider what they can do in the next 10 years to address that issue.

Member Daire commented he was thinking about the possibility of higher density housing on the remote parking areas around Rosedale. However, this will have implications for County Road B2, Highway 36, Snelling Avenue, and Fairview Avenue.

Member Bull commented it is hard to define traffic in community mixed use areas because the commercial and residential areas are going to be the same.

Member Kimble stated she understands they have to look at this as a macro, but they have to build up from what is happening on the ground. One of the City's key attributes is its centrality in the region and if people cannot get here or get out of here, it becomes an issue.

Member Kimble inquired where the PWET Commission was in the Comprehensive Plan process.

Chair Cihacek responded this is their second meeting on pathways.

Member Kimble inquired if they have considered the high number of seniors in Roseville when discussing transportation strategy, specifically from a multi-modal perspective and having aging drivers on the road.

Mr. Mareck responded they have heard frequently from the public the concern of accommodating the aging population of Roseville and making sure they have a transportation system to accommodate them in the future. This will include

having a strong para-transit system and a bicycle/pedestrian system that connects to it.

Mr. Mareck then addressed the synergy between land use and transportation, and how they could best work together. They should make sure the concentration of future housing densities fit well into what they envision future transit to be. This also includes making sure they have safe and mobile access to the areas where they see future economic development. He provided an analogy comparing the roadway system with a matrix of pipes. The largest roads will have the most traffic and the least amount of access, whereas the smaller roads will have less traffic and the most access. The control they have over traffic has to do with the number of lanes and amount of access. The roads that have the least access are going to have the most traffic, such as Highway 35W. The roads with the most access and the fewest lanes are going to have the least amount of traffic because they are accommodating traffic to the adjacent land versus providing mobility. Access creates safety concerns as well. The roads that have the most access and large traffic volumes typically have the most issues with safety. The roads that have been identified by the Metropolitan Council as having large freight concerns have significant traffic volumes, a fair amount of at grade signalized access, and large numbers of trucks.

Mr. Mareck stated funding is the largest constraint that prevents them from doing most of the things they would like to do. This sometimes means they cannot provide the ultimate fix in an area, but there are other less expensive options that can be helpful. The ultimate goal of this process will simplify some of the complications so they will know where the major problem areas are and the opportunities for future improvement.

Member Bull expressed concern that there were no congestion indicators on County Roads B, B2, or C on the map provided in the packet.

Mr. Mareck explained the forecast they are using is developed by the Metropolitan Council and the Regional Travel Demand Model. It is a constrained capacity model. This means that as it assigns traffic to the roadway network and sees a roadway is reaching capacity, it will look for and divert traffic to alternative routes that have the capacity to take on the extra traffic. There is also a slight leaning in this model to favor multi-modal types of transportation.

Member Kimble inquired if any information from the Interstate 94 corridor study is feeding into this model.

Mr. Mareck responded they do not have any regional improvements identified other than an improvement on Snelling.

Chair Cihacek explained the constrained model shows what traffic would be like if they did nothing. There are some flexibilities as they look at land use and public

works projects. They will continue to try and push transit options and the Planning Commission should continue to look at land use, density, future economic growth and how it impacts the current congestion model. If they make changes, it will become adaptive in the next round, but it is not currently present.

Member Kimble inquired if this was an iterative model that will come back for consideration in the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Mareck explained they will provide an analysis that uses the Land Use Plan to show the Metropolitan Council how the output of growth compares to the regional allocation for Roseville. If there is a deviation from that, there has to be a justifying explanation from the City.

Chair Cihacek commented this model is not iterative. If they make changes in the next five years, it will reflect itself in that same time span. They will make changes in the next travel demand model, but that will not happen for another five years.

Planning Commission Chair Murphy inquired if this plan reflects growth in neighboring communities regarding transportation needs for people going through Roseville.

Chair Cihacek commented they will continue to push for better transit options and try to make it clear they are underserved. It is the best congestion mitigation they can make.

Member Bull commented there is a lot of transit technology out there worldwide they should look at to know how to plan for the next 20 years.

Chair Cihacek suggested the policy include a position that states it is their goal to incorporate advancing transit technology to fit the goals of the Transportation Plan. It could be a broad statement to allow for the plan to be changed if needed.

Chair Cihacek thanked the Planning Commission for coming suggested they meet again after they discuss the City's pathway plan, and annually after that.

6. Pathway Master Plan – Scoring Criteria

Chair Cihacek noted they did receive public comment that will be part of the packet at the next meeting from a resident commending them for their new approach, and asking several questions on improvements, specifically in Villa Park. This will be added to the September PWET Commission packet.

Andy Hingeveld, WSB and Associates, reported they came up with more standard metrics and consolidated ranking criteria from the previous plan. He reviewed the 10 criteria that were part of the previous list and provided an updated consolidated list for consideration. This list includes the following:

Connects multiple destinations.

In order to put some metrics to this, they used land use and looked at what it is connecting to. They worked with staff to come up with the scoring and worked with institutional uses as a different type of destination, parks and open spaces, public facilities, and employment facilities.

Mr. Freihammer explained the term “public facility” was removed from the first bullet point because it appears on the third bullet point. It defines public space as places such as a library or City Hall, and is only used once in the totals. He stated the red areas on the handout are the areas they made changes on after they ran a scenario with the pathway plan. If a pathway connects to multiple parks, it receives multiple points.

Chair Cihacek inquired why connecting to multiple parks gets multiple points, but connecting to multiple employment centers only gets one point.

Mr. Freihammer responded they did it this way because one of the ways of their methodology is counting by parcels of businesses. There is another criteria that is based on employees and they did not want to give too much weight to it. People tend to walk to parks, it is not counted in any other criteria, and they felt it was more valuable to keep it there.

Mr. Culver commented one challenge with parcels in Rosedale and other areas, is there are many more employers than there are parcels. An employment number may be a better indicator, but it is a Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) level. If you touch the TAZ, which are larger squares, then you are touching that number of employees. You may only be touching the western side of it and all the employees are spread out throughout the TAZ. These ranking criteria are not perfect, but it provides the opportunity to take in a lot of different factors and reasonably score these segments.

Chair Cihacek commented his main concern with the point spread is that it potentially biases recreational use versus employment use. However, there may not be a better smaller measure than a TAZ because they are not a large community. With the Transportation Plan, which is helping shift where people are traveling to, some of the areas such as commercial or employment may become more important than recreational use.

Member Wozniak suggested they change Commercial use to Mixed Use, or use whatever the land use terminology is.

Mr. Hingeveld explained this was based off the current land use map which does not have Mixed Use as a term. The future land use map does introduce Mixed Use.

Member Thurnau inquired if they should consider using future land use in this section if it is something they want to include in the adopted land use guide.

Mr. Culver commented it gives it a little more credibility if the land use referenced matches up with the land use maps.

Mr. Hingeveld agreed. He stated the current constraint is they do not have a 2040 Land Use Map adopted yet, but they can make the update.

Volume of usage.

Mr. Hingeveld explained counts on a sidewalk are non-existent, so they looked at population demand and employment.

Chair Cihacek inquired how the spread of numbers works.

Mr. Freihammer referred to a document that explained how they ranked these items. There was a pretty good spread and that is how they came up with the numbers. They determined if there was a low volume, it should be given less credit. They want to rank the ones with a higher need. One of the assumptions that is made on the current plan is they look at an overall segment. The longer a segment is, the more points it is going to accumulate. Sometimes the longest segment is the highest ranked because it is near more of the population. They may need to consider breaking down the segments into smaller ones.

Member Misra agreed that breaking it up makes sense. She inquired about the column on the extreme left of the document.

Mr. Freihammer responded it is referring to the map, it is simply a segment number used to identify the segment on the map.

Member Thurnau TAZ is primarily designated to follow land use.

Mr. Culver inquired if they were using census data or Metropolitan Council forecast data.

Mr. Freihammer responded for the population, they used 2010 census data. He explained they took portions of the TAZ and cannot get down to the absolute detail of it.

Mr. Hingeveld referred to the one-quarter mile distance. He stated most people are comfortable doing this distance and it is standard to use. With the grid system in Roseville, the arterials are generally spaced at half mile apart.

Connects to regional system.

Mr. Hingeveld explained some of the pathways will provide a connection beyond Roseville. The Regional Bike Transportation Network (RBTN) is a new item

that has been established by the Metropolitan Council. It is similar to a regional trail, but focuses on a transportation corridor.

Addresses a gap or barrier in the transportation network.

Mr. Hingeveld explained this item looks at completing a gap that shows high demand and is set up along the roadway system. These pathways priorities are shown on arterial and higher functioning roads. An example would be the HarMar to Rosedale connection where a grade separated trail may be proposed. They used a framework based on readily available data, but things could be adjusted.

Connects to Transit.

Mr. Hingeveld explained this may complete gaps from a residential neighborhood to a nearby Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station.

Connects high-density residential to transit or parks.

Mr. Hingeveld stated this item is also related to transit, but adds a high density element. It considers if it is serving the higher populations that have more of a need to use the pathways.

Chair Cihacek inquired why 100 units versus 10 units.

Mr. Freihammer responded based on the data, they broke it out based on how many units there were. They included a max of five points, but that can be changed. They have data on how many units are in a certain apartment complex. Some corridors had 500 apartment units near them. In the original analysis, it was one point if they had units within one-quarter mile, and two points for additional units within one-eighth of a mile. They decided there should be a bonus for units that have a lot higher density. A lot of them will end up maxing out at five points and they did not want to rate it too high because it already has some points if it is connected to a bus stop.

Chair Cihacek inquired how many apartment complexes have 100 units.

Mr. Culver stated there has to be at least 100 units in order to get the credit of high density. There are quite a few developments in Roseville that have over 100 units.

Chair Cihacek stated this scoring rubric accommodates senior citizens with the high density senior housing.

Mr. Freihammer commented this looked at senior housing facilities, apartment facilities, and condo units.

Member Misra stated if there is going to be growth in Roseville, it is going to have to go up and this is getting at what is important.

Member Heimerl inquired about the rank in the last column and what the red letters meant.

Mr. Freihammer responded the red letters represent new segments that were not previously on the Pathway Master Plan. He noted that number 11 should actually be number 27 and number 27 should be number 11. Also, numbers 27, 28, and 29 were added based on public input. They also added number 30, which would be an off-road pathway between County Road B and County Road C to provide a crossing of Highway 36 along Snelling Avenue. The items highlighted in yellow did not have a full analysis done on them because of the way they are currently defined. Both of the pathways currently have a pathway on one side, but a lot of the master plan is describing both an on and off-road pathway.

Chair Cihacek commented the scoring rubric this is a very clear, objective, and participatory and they can make changes as needed.

Member Heimerl inquired how ranking for availability of funding from other non-City sources is considered with these criteria.

Mr. Culver responded they need to determine what this list now actually represents. Is the result of this list really for the needs of these segments versus the true priority? The priority is going to have other criteria involved with it such as constructability, cost, and available funding. Snelling Avenue across Highway 36 should be one of the top priorities for the City for a bike/pedestrian connection. However, the cost and complexity of it will probably keep it at the top of the list until Mn/DOT does something with the bridge. A lot of these segments will be similar until an opportunity arises. This ranking will be used to identify segments they will seek outside funding for.

Member Thurnau commented this is a wish list, and inquired if they will apply this ranking to what they already have in order to preserve and maintain it.

Mr. Culver responded he hopes they do not get to a point where they have to prioritize their infrastructure in this way. They decide what needs to be replaced by determining what is in the worst condition.

Member Wozniak commented he likes the changes that were made and that transit and density are considered. However, it overweighs existing structures at the expense of underserved areas of the community. If an area has a pathway now, they get points because they are close to a pathway. It also does not take away points if there is already something close.

Member Misra inquired if it is a priority to have a pathway on both sides of a road.

Chair Cihacek pointed out the policy for the pathway plan makes that recommendation, and they can discuss it further when they review the policy.

Mr. Hingeveld stated it will come down to what is being scored and what projects are on the map. They will need to look on the list to determine if it is duplicating something that is already there.

Chair Cihacek commented the policy clearly states a pathway is wanted on both sides. It is not a project list or scoring problem, but is a policy and definition problem.

Mr. Hingeveld stated there may be roads like Snelling Avenue where pathways are needed on both sides because the traffic volumes are so high.

Mr. Culver added Lexington Avenue is another example because it is a lot more difficult to get gaps to cross. They heard from the public that they wanted to get to the park on Lexington, but could not cross because there was not a signal. Then they could not get to the signal at County Road B because there was not a sidewalk there. They used some of the park dedication funds to extend the sidewalk, and they will continue to extend it down to Roselawn next year. There are some roadways where they want sidewalks on both sides of the road. They may need to rewrite the policy to give preference to roadways that do not have any pathways.

The Commission agreed this was a good ranking criteria and rubric moving forward.

Mr. Freihammer asked the Commission if they wanted to include a maximum half-mile or one-mile long segments.

Mr. Culver stated the advantage to having a maximum is it puts all the segments on more of an equal footing. Areas that have long segments are gathering a lot of points because of their length. A disadvantage to segments is the middle segment may score high, the outer segments may score low, and they have to determine if they would want to build a segment in the middle of nothing.

Member Heimerl commented he does not think setting a half-mile measurement is the best measure because it creates half segments. He suggested they use intersections or trail connections to determine segments.

Member Misra commented the pathway on Lexington to County Road D is three miles. Between County Road C and County Road D there is a wetland. They may not need a segment there because there is nothing accessing it and there is one on the other side of the street.

Mr. Freihammer asked the Commission if they should treat the on-road and off-road pathways any different. He explained an on-road pathway would be in the street within the curb and gutter or on the shoulder, and off-road would be behind the curb with separation from traffic. The current on-road pathways are basically striped shoulders, except for on Fairview where there is a defined bike lane. Some of the shoulders also allow parking, so then it is not a true bike lane.

Member Wozniak commented another difference will be with the user of the pathways. People will not be walking their dog on the shoulder, but would on an off-road path.

Mr. Freihammer stated County Road C is proposed to have an on-road and off-road pathway. Currently there is an off-road pathway for the majority of it, but not an on-road pathway.

Chair Cihacek suggested they keep it as vague as possible to allow options and project design development. It should just say they want a pathway that protects pedestrians. Based upon the conditions of the design at the time of funding, they can determine what is needed.

Mr. Culver referred to the segment proposed for County Road B. He inquired if they should change the proposed segment on the north side to an on road bike lane on both sides since there is already an off-road pathway on the south side.

Member Misra stated they have received public comment supporting on-road bike lanes and the safety factor is worth considering.

Chair Cihacek commented when they say it has to be a bike lane, it removes other alternatives based on design or question of current use. They should keep it vague, and staff can go through a public hearing process to determine what is desired in that area. So much can change between now and when these projects will actually get done.

Member Heimerl suggested they still include general guidelines for the options available on different types of roadways.

Member Wozniak stated on-road options will provide the most flexibility. As use evolves, then they can start looking at off-road options. In some cases, a certain road may not be a good option for a bike lane due to increased traffic.

Mr. Culver used Roselawn Avenue as an example. He inquired if they should change it to include only an on-road pathway since the majority of it already has an off-road pathway.

Member Wozniak commented he was disappointed with the scoring on the diagonal connection.

Mr. Culver stated although it is low on the priority list, it is still something the City wants. If the County receives Federal funding for County Road C, it will include a trail. The City will then only have a smaller section to complete and it will get done because it is an opportunity.

Member Wozniak inquired if it will be hard to convince the City to spend money on something if it is lower on the priority list.

Chair Cihacek suggested they call it a preference list, not a priority list. It should be seen as a tool for staff to determine how they should allocate their time and resources.

Mr. Freihammer commented they may have missed a few points with the diagonal connection and it should be ranked higher.

Member Wozniak stated it only gets one point for a gap. The only gap may be a local roadway even though it is a regional system.

Mr. Culver stated before the next meeting, he will take comments from the July meeting and make recommendations to the policies and standards. He will provide these recommendations to the Commission in advance of the next meeting and requested they provide feedback on it. He will then take this feedback and integrate it into a document that will be part of the packet for the September meeting.

7. Items for Next Meeting – September 26, 2017

Discussion ensued regarding the September PWETC agenda and time required for each item:

- Discussion on utility base rates with an estimated time requirement of 15 minutes
- Transportation Pathway Master Plan policies and standards continued discussion and review
- Summary of the PWETC and City Council joint meeting
- Possible discussion on the Transportation Plan

Mr. Culver stated the Council requested they look at the utility base rates from residential users to commercial users. They will provide scenarios at the next meeting for feedback from the Commission.

Member Misra commented the tour was very good.

Mr. Culver thanked the Members that made it to the tour of the Twin Lakes Area and stated it will be posted on the website.

8. Adjourn

Motion

Member Thurnau moved, Member **Trainor seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:37 p.m.**

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.