



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, February 15, 2018– 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**  
2 Chair Murphy called to order the Comprehensive Plan Update meeting of the Planning  
3 Commission at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the  
4 Planning Commission.  
5
- 6 **2. Roll Call**  
7 At the request of Chair Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.  
8
- 9 **Members Present:** Chair Robert Murphy; and Commissioners James Daire, Chuck  
10 Gitzen, Julie Kimble and Peter Sparby  
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** Commissioners Sharon Brown and James Bull  
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, City Planner Thomas Paschke,  
15 Community Development Director Kari Collins, Parks and  
16 Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke, and Public Works Director  
17 Marc Culver  
18
- 19 **3. Approval of Agenda**  
20
- 21 **MOTION**  
22 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Sparby to adopt the agenda as**  
23 **presented.**  
24
- 25 **Ayes: 5**  
26 **Nays: 0**  
27 **Motion carried.**  
28
- 29 **4. Review of Minutes**  
30  
31 None.  
32
- 33 **5. Communications and Recognitions:**  
34
- 35 **a. From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this*  
36 *agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*  
37
- 38 Chair Murphy reminded the public that the Rules and Procedures for Committees  
39 published by the City Council allows a three-minute limit for public comment.  
40
- 41 Tom Kuhfeld, 1021 Larpenteur Avenue West, commented Greenhouse Village  
42 consists of 137 residents and they are concerned with the rezoning near Larpenteur

43 and Lexington. The requirement for a minimum 10 percent high density residential  
44 would be a disadvantage to them. He inquired if there has been any change to what  
45 is proposed since residents have made comments on this issue. He suggested they  
46 keep the high density to the west and change the wording for minimum required to  
47 make it more permissive. He understands there are Metropolitan Council  
48 requirements to be met but feels they should focus more on the City of Roseville.  
49

50 Chair Murphy responded they went over comments received from the public, and no  
51 changes were made in that area. The zoning requirements will come after the land  
52 use determination is made. The draft will be made available in March or April and  
53 comments can be made at that time.  
54

55 Mr. Kuhfeld noted he understands it is a process, but they would like to see some  
56 progress in this area.  
57

58 Senior Planner Lloyd further explained zoning changes will be discussed in early  
59 2019 and will be a long process. The complete Comprehensive Plan draft will be  
60 available for review in late February.  
61

62 Member Daire commented as the plan is approved and calls for certain things in the  
63 mixed-use zones, it suggests that the City is open to the said distinctions in the area of  
64 Lexington and Larpenteur. He inquired if the zoning that follows would allow these  
65 distinctions.  
66

67 Mr. Lloyd responded the existing 2030 Comprehensive Plan already takes the  
68 permissive approach and allows multi-family development in this area and the zoning  
69 code accommodates this. The 2040 update that is being worked on is changing from  
70 allowing multi-family development in this area to requiring it in at least 10 percent of  
71 properties guided Community Mixed Use throughout the City. In 2019, the zoning  
72 code will be updated to provide regulations that put changes into effect from the areas  
73 identified in the Comprehensive Plan.  
74

75 Mr. Daire noted it is 10 percent across all Community Mixed Use areas and not  
76 specifically in each one.  
77

78 Member Sparby clarified he believes this 10 percent requirement is in Corridor Mixed  
79 Use and suggested they identify where these areas are at the next meeting.  
80

81 Jim Mulder, 1021 West Larpenteur, commented they should look at achieving mixed-  
82 use with high density, high scale, and high intensity and has been assured it cannot be  
83 done within the zoning code with limits. He expressed concern that it is disingenuous  
84 to have the Planning Commission pass this with allowing high density, but then not  
85 have it possible with the height limits of the zoning code. If it is not possible to do  
86 the zoning necessary for high density, they should not say high density. They can  
87 find ways to do mixed use in this area and going to a medium density would make  
88 more sense and more closely reflect the requirements of current zoning code. This  
89 would also be less disruptive to the single-family homes that are north and west of the

90 properties. He encouraged the Planning Commission to not kick the can down the  
91 road and expect the zoning code to solve the problem.

92  
93 Member Gitzen inquired what part of the plan is missing.

94  
95 Mr. Lloyd responded the only items left are the surface water management plan,  
96 storm sewers and water service.

97  
98 **b. From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on*  
99 *this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*  
100 *process*

101  
102 Mr. Lloyd requested Planning Commission members put the updated Parks and  
103 Recreation, Transportation, and Resilience chapters provided to them in their binders.  
104 As chapters become available, they will make them available to the Commission.  
105 There is not an equity chapter, but the introductory chapters will include a description  
106 of what is meant when they refer to equity throughout the plan. The Planning  
107 Commission will meet again on February 28 and will discuss the completed 2040  
108 Comprehensive Plan draft that will also be made available to the public. They will  
109 also discuss potential upcoming meeting dates at this meeting as well.

110  
111 Chair Murphy thanked Mr. Lloyd for recently driving to each Commissioner's home  
112 to deliver the updated chapters of the Comprehensive Plan.

113  
114 **6. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

115  
116 **a. Follow-Up on Items from Previous Meetings**

117  
118 None.

119  
120 **b. Parks and Recreation Chapter:** *Review of draft chapter*

121  
122 Mr. Lloyd reported the Parks and Recreation Chapter refers to the Parks and  
123 Recreation system master plan that was previously adopted by the City. He noted the  
124 PowerPoint presentation that he will be reporting on was provided by Lydia Major  
125 from LHB, who has been working closely with staff on this chapter.

126  
127 Mr. Lloyd provided a recap of what took place at the November presentation to the  
128 Planning Commission. He reported on the changes that have been made to the 2010  
129 Master Plan. Current construction projects include the Cedar Home Community  
130 Building, a community design process for the 2134 Cleveland Avenue and 1716  
131 Marion Street Park, and other renewal program activates. An ongoing priority  
132 includes looking for potential acquisition of land in southwest Roseville and  
133 providing a more complete network of parks and trails. A medium priority includes  
134 acquiring some of the lots on the east side of Langton Lake Park and Acorn Park. If  
135 housing density increases in other areas of the City, there will be an effort to focus on  
136 building a smaller park facility in the densified areas. They will also work to achieve

137 ADA compliance in every park incorporated throughout the City as the opportunity  
138 arises. They continue to work on pathway planning as it relates to constellation and  
139 parkway concepts of the master plan and will continue to coordinate with regional  
140 entities.

141  
142 Mr. Lloyd provided a review of the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Chapter.  
143 The introduction highlights the importance of parks, recreation, trails and open space  
144 and provides a history of park planning since 2010. It also highlights the Park and  
145 Recreation Renewal Program and briefly describes other work done since 2010. He  
146 provided map that identified the locations of Marion Street Park, Villa Park, Langton  
147 Lake Park, Cleveland Park and Autumn Grove Park.

148  
149 Mr. Lloyd reported during the public engagement efforts, they routinely heard that  
150 people love Roseville’s parks and it is one of the main reasons they appreciate  
151 Roseville. The City is committed to following the master plan vision for parks that  
152 was set in 2010. The Parks and Recreation Commission also recently confirmed its  
153 goals and policies. He provided a list of the related citywide goals that were also  
154 reviewed by the Planning Commission last spring.

155  
156 Mr. Lloyd provided maps showing an overlay of the pathways plan, regional  
157 facilities, and the approach that is being taken for priorities in southwest Roseville.  
158 He stated this is an area that is recognized as being underserved by park facilities.

159  
160 Chair Murphy inquired who was responsible for the pathways plan.

161  
162 Public Works Director Marc Culver reported it is managed by the Public Works  
163 Department and the Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission  
164 (PWETC). It focuses on trails and sidewalks as well as on road facilities within the  
165 public right of way. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan will have additional  
166 details regarding expansion of trails or pathways within the park system.

167  
168 Parks and Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke explained the Trails and Parks  
169 Constellation Map is a way of delivering parks and recreation services to the  
170 community and the overlay shows the connections within the community as a whole  
171 to connect with the overall trail system. The Parks and Recreation Department  
172 provides daily maintenance to the trails and the Public Works Department constructs  
173 them.

174  
175 Chair Murphy noted staff does a good job with winter snow removal.

176  
177 Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following updated goals and policies: 1) Parks and  
178 Recreation systems management; 2) Parks development, redevelopment and  
179 rehabilitation; 3) Parks and open space acquisition; 4) Trails, pathways, and  
180 community connections; 5) Recreation programs and services; 6) Community  
181 facilities; and, 7) Natural resources management.

182

183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229

Member Kimble inquired if there is anything in the updated Parks and Recreation Chapter that is a new best practice or stands out.

Mr. Brokke responded they have included ways to deliver higher services regarding ADA requirements and technology, as well as considering ways to incorporate sustainability and energy efficiencies. When the Parks and Recreation Commission reviewed this, it considered each of the goals and policies.

Member Gitzen referred to page 2 of the Parks, Trails, and Open Space chapter. He inquired if the goals should be the same as what is listed in Chapter 2, which is also referenced under Citywide Goals.

Mr. Lloyd stated yes, and it is possible is it currently reflected in the updated chapter. They will reconcile these listed goals with what is listed in Chapter 2.

Member Gitzen referred to page 10, item 5.1, and inquired what an “adverse ethnic group” was.

Mr. Lloyd responded it should be “diverse ethnic group” and noted the change.

Member Sparby referred to page 6, item 1.21. He stated he does not like the phrase “discourage commercial uses.” Things like food trucks and other commercial uses could be in the parks to liven them up. The proposed phrase indicates staff would look negatively on any type of commercial use. He suggested they change the language to at least allow the possibility of an innovative type of commercial use in the park.

Mr. Brokke responded there was a lot of discussion on this. Businesses are discouraged from being in parks, but food trucks and similar things are part of the whole park experience. He noted the remainder of the paragraph states commercial use could be permitted in situations where it complements the park or recreation function.

Member Gitzen noted later in the draft it indicates that commercial uses were allowed.

Member Sparby stated he does not like the word “discourage” and suggested they change the wording to align with the strategic objective and allow the synergy between businesses that make sense for the parks.

Chair Murphy suggested it be changed to “limited commercial uses.”

Mr. Lloyd suggested it be changed to “discourage permanent commercial uses.”

Chair Murphy noted there is a strong reference to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and suggested they include a link to that document.

230 Member Daire referred to page 10 and inquired if item 5.11 would accommodate  
231 rental charges for publicly funded recreation buildings.

232  
233 Mr. Brokke confirmed it would be under item 5.11 and would not be classified as a  
234 commercial endeavor.

235  
236 **c. Transportation Chapter: Review of draft chapter**

237  
238 Mr. Culver reviewed the changes made to the Transportation Chapter since it was last  
239 seen by the Planning Commission in October 2017. He noted there has been  
240 considerable expansion of the narratives for each section which should address some  
241 of the questions previously expressed by the Planning Commission. He noted there  
242 were very few, if any, changes to the Level of Services (LOS) congestion areas based  
243 on the change in land use.

244  
245 Mr. Culver reported the Functional Classification System classifies the roadways and  
246 only A Minor Arterial and Principal Arterials are eligible for Federal funds. They are  
247 making one proposed change so that it is eligible for future funding and the  
248 Metropolitan Council must approve the proposed changes. He also noted as they  
249 established their own internal goals and policies for the City's collector streets, it is  
250 good to identify and define them on a map. He referred to a map that shows the  
251 proposed changes that will primarily establish the collector streets. These are  
252 municipal, State aid funded streets. The largest change will be on Fairview Avenue.  
253 It is currently classified as a B Minor Arterial and they want to get it classified as an  
254 A Minor Arterial, so it is eligible for Federal funding, particularly in the area around  
255 Rosedale Mall.

256  
257 Mr. Culver reported on the changes made to the Transportation Chapter's goals and  
258 policies beginning on page 51 of the chapter. He noted item 1.3 was added to address  
259 desired capacity improvements within the Principal Arterial system. This is already  
260 being addressed with the managed lane on Interstate 35W and a study is underway  
261 regarding a managed lane project on Highway 36.

262  
263 Mr. Culver noted Section 2 had items added and consolidated for efficiency.

264  
265 He reported under Section 3, items were added to openly advocate for improvements  
266 on roads they do not control. He referred to item 3.9 and stated based on comments,  
267 they incorporated moving goods and people safely and efficiently within a  
268 multimodal transportation system.

269  
270 Under Section 4, Mr. Culver stated they again consolidated language from previous  
271 areas. Item 4.3 reflects a consolidation of previous items 4.11 and 4.12. They deleted  
272 previous item 4.2 because Metro Transit is the only provider for the City.

273  
274 Mr. Culver referred to Section 5 and noted item 5.6 was deleted.

275

276 Member Daire referred to Figure 1, Existing Functional Classifications. He inquired  
277 if A Minor Augmentor, Reliever, Expander and Connector are subsets within the  
278 Minor Arterial Category.

279  
280 Mr. Culver confirmed this and explained they are defined on page X-9. These  
281 definitions are set by the Metropolitan Council. When they apply for a classification  
282 change, they must prove how the change is justified and how it meets the definition.  
283

284 Member Daire stated the Augmentor, Reliever, Expander, and Connector are defined  
285 in terms of supporting the next higher category. They are using some streets that  
286 people might consider to be local. The way that Highway 36 is managed indicates  
287 they are not anticipating capital investments to increase the capacity but will take the  
288 added capacity and put it on streets that are not highway level.  
289

290 Mr. Culver responded he does not believe that is the intent. The definitions and  
291 framework of the arterial system recognizes they are talking about a transportation  
292 network. While each classification has a primary objective and goal, they recognize  
293 that not all the traffic is going to fit on the Principal Arterials. The Minor Arterials are  
294 set up to offset the Principal Arterials with shorter, regional trips and serve as a good  
295 alternative if there is an incident. They all have a supporting role to play in the  
296 network and the hierarchy has to do with levels of traffic versus types of traffic.  
297

298 Member Daire referred Figure 8, Traffic Analysis Zones. He explained how  
299 projected volumes are determined and inquired if they have found any capacity  
300 problems that cannot be handled with the funding that might be available.  
301

302 In response to Member Daire, Mr. Culver directed the Commission to Figure 10,  
303 Forecasted 2040 Level of Service. He explained the areas in red are projected LOS F.  
304 He noted the LOS is based on average annual daily traffic in comparison to the  
305 capacity of a roadway. The macro models do not consider high-peak hour segments.  
306 The afternoon peak hours are generally 10 percent of the annual daily traffic.  
307 However, in high retail and traffic diversion areas, such as County Road B2 and  
308 Fairview Avenue, the peak percentage will be much higher. These areas need to be  
309 considered individually because it will not be identified in the Metropolitan Council  
310 model. The areas that could have a LOS of F by 2040 are along Rice Street, Highway  
311 36, Interstate 35W, segments of Snelling Avenue, and Lexington, south of Highway  
312 36.  
313

314 Member Gitzen stated there is a difference between CSAH and County roads and  
315 inquired if they are symbolized differently on the maps.  
316

317 Mr. Culver stated they do not have a map that shows the State aid funded roadways  
318 versus the County roads, but they do have a map that shows the jurisdiction of them.  
319 They only have a small segment of County Road B2 that is considered a non-State aid  
320 funded County road.  
321

322 Member Gitzen inquired if Ramsey County plans to turn anything back to the City.

323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369

Mr. Culver responded it will depend on what happens to the access at Hamline Avenue and Snelling Avenue. MnDOT would like to close the median completely so that southbound Snelling Avenue does not have any access to Hamline Avenue. If this happens, the County may then want to turn back Hamline Avenue north of County Road C because it would not serve the County State aid purpose anymore. They have not had any detailed conversations about this, and it is the only segment left as a possibility.

Member Gitzen inquired if the County gives them funds to improve Hamline Avenue going north.

Mr. Culver responded it would affect their planning and CIP and they would negotiate some sort of turnback compensation. It is usually based on the remaining life of the roadway.

Member Kimble referred to Figure 11, Existing Pathways. She stated it shows the existing sidewalk connection in front of the Owasso Ballfields and inquired if the sidewalk that crosses County Road C is on the east side of the road.

Mr. Culver responded when they drew the blue line on the map, they thought the sidewalk between Woodhill and County Road C would be completed on the west side of Victoria by the end of 2017. Construction was started, but then winter hit hard, and it should be completed by mid-summer.

Member Sparby referred to Figure 3, Existing and Proposed Functional Classification. He referred to a proposed collector in southwest Roseville between Fairview Avenue and Snelling Avenue and inquired what a proposed collector was.

Mr. Culver responded the collector definition indicates it is collecting traffic from the purely local roadways and bringing them to the arterial system. In this case, Skillman Avenue is serving the role of connecting the neighborhood streets and bringing the traffic out to Fairview Avenue and Snelling Avenue. Skillman Avenue already has pavement striping on it and carries the collector level of traffic. They are just identifying it for what it is. It is a municipal State aid street and State funds were used to repave it. They would not be able to do this if it were not a higher volume roadway.

Member Sparby explained the residents in that area have a lot of “slow down” signage in their yards and he has seen them track how fast people are going. However, it appears it was previously established as a collector and he wanted to make sure they were not changing anything.

Mr. Culver confirmed nothing has been changed and just because it is a collector, does not mean they will widen it or put in an extra lane. They are simply recognizing the current role it is playing.



370 Member Kimble thanked Mr. Culver for providing the before and after on the slides  
371 he used for this presentation.

372

373 Chair Murphy noted under the Aviation section, it indicates that Lake Owasso was  
374 float plane enabled by MnDOT.

375

376 Mr. Culver confirmed a float plane could land there.

377

378 **d. Resilience Chapter:** *Review of draft chapter, based on Planning Commission*  
379 *feedback*

380

381 Mr. Lloyd reported this updated chapter largely reflects input from the Planning  
382 Commission during the last discussion. He referred to page 6 of the Resilience  
383 Chapter draft and noted he has received some citations that could be referenced from  
384 the City’s resident bee expert as well as suggestions from Ryan Johnson from the  
385 Public Works Department. These will be incorporated in upcoming drafts.

386

387 Mr. Lloyd noted they did receive the final version of the Vulnerability Assessment  
388 and learned that references to other communities that were not specific to Roseville  
389 were removed. The author of the report also verified that the numbers apply only to  
390 Roseville and not other communities.

391

392 He referred to pages 11 and 12 and the area that was struck out. He pointed out this  
393 section was trying to establish what they meant by population vulnerability and what  
394 it was vulnerable to.

395

396 Member Kimble referred to page 3 and expressed concern with the *Background*  
397 section under Land. She explained other background sections talk about why that  
398 topic is important to the City and this background section talks about MPCA funding  
399 resources. They should include more explanation on why land is important and how  
400 it relates to this chapter. She also referred to the first sentence and suggested they  
401 removed “these days.” She also noted the items listed under *Policies* of each section  
402 appear to be tasks or activities and inquired if they should be called something  
403 different.

404

405 Member Kimble referred to page 7, the last sentence. She inquired how Roseville  
406 plans to regulate its residents relative to greenhouse gas reductions.

407

408 Member Kimble referred to page 8 and suggested Regional Indicator Initiative  
409 include a link to its website. She then referred to the top of page 9 and inquired what  
410 was being compared with the pie charts. She also noted she will provide Mr. Lloyd  
411 with a typographical correction and suggested they include a definition of resilience.

412

413 Mr. Lloyd referred to page 5, item 1.2. He noted that past tree canopy surveys looked  
414 at boulevard trees and other trees within 66 feet of the curb line. The inventory  
415 would combine past assessments and fill in the gaps that are past the 66-foot mark. It  
416 would not be a detailed and comprehensive assessment but would find trees within

417 the public realm using aerial photography. They still plan to reword this item to  
418 reflect this type of assessment.

419  
420 Member Gitzen referred page 5, the paragraph just above the bullet points. He  
421 suggested the last sentence be changed to "...will help foster programs and actions  
422 that will add to the number and diversity of trees in Roseville." He also agreed with  
423 Member Kimble that the policies seem more like strategies or action items.

424  
425 Mr. Culver stated it may be possible to reword some of the policies to reflect the  
426 City's goal of why they are suggesting that specific action.

427  
428 Member Daire stated they talked about pollutants, greenhouse gasses and trees. He  
429 inquired if they could include information on how trees can ameliorate pollution. The  
430 trees may be a tool in trying to get their air quality to where it needs to be. He  
431 suggested they quantify it in some way to deal with their reduction goal of  
432 greenhouse gasses.

433  
434 Mr. Culver responded this is briefly addressed in the *Background* section under trees.

435  
436 Member Gitzen stated it could be quantified if they were under a dome in a fixed  
437 environment.

438  
439 Member Sparby also agreed with Member Kimble's comments regarding the policies  
440 seeming more like tasks. He referred to page 6, item 1.3, and commented it seems  
441 odd they are committing themselves to working with neighboring cities and  
442 modifying procurement policies. He suggested this item be changed to "Modify  
443 procurement policies as applicable to ensure diversity of tree species on city property,  
444 while taking into account neighboring cities."

445  
446 Chair Murphy noted the next Comprehensive Plan Update meeting of the Planning  
447 Commission will be on February 28, 2018, and the complete draft will be available  
448 online prior to that meeting. He inquired how they will proceed with the review at the  
449 meeting.

450  
451 Mr. Lloyd stated the Commission has not seen the Surface Water Management Plan  
452 and Storm Sewer and Water Service Elements. However, they are technical updates  
453 and there will not be much for the Commission to discuss. He suggested they provide  
454 him with an email with typographical errors and sections that do not read well. He  
455 does not anticipate the need to go through the document page by page, but suggested  
456 they consider a chapter at a time and determine what still needs to be discussed.

457  
458 Chair Murphy noted the Regular Planning Commission meeting will take place on  
459 March 7, 2018, along with a Variance Board meeting.

460  
461 Member Kimble inquired what the public process was for input on the final draft  
462 plan.

463

464 Mr. Lloyd responded after the draft is published online, there will be ways to provide  
465 feedback that way. Printed copies will be available at City Hall and they will  
466 schedule opportunities throughout the community where people can come and ask  
467 questions. The public review period will be open through March 16, and the City  
468 Council will review it on March 19. The formal Planning Commission public  
469 hearing will be April 4 with a final review by the City Council on May 7. They will  
470 then prepare the final version for distribution to surrounding communities.

471  
472 Member Gitzen inquired if there will be a need for an extra meeting.  
473

474 Mr. Lloyd responded they will know if an extra meeting is needed after their meeting  
475 on February 28, and they can schedule it at that time.  
476

477 Member Gitzen inquired how they will give the public feedback on their comments  
478 and if the Planning Commission will have an opportunity to review them.  
479

480 Mr. Lloyd stated when questions come in, if it is just a comment, he thanks them for  
481 it. If they ask a question, he will provide an explanation. The Planning Commission  
482 will not have an opportunity to see comments from the public during the draft review  
483 phase, but they will be available in packets for review during the public hearing and  
484 final review of the draft.  
485

486 Member Sparby inquired when the Planning Commission will vote on the final draft.  
487

488 Mr. Lloyd responded they will vote on it at the public hearing on April 4. They will  
489 look at the Comprehensive Plan again in the fall with the feedback received from  
490 neighboring communities. The Planning Commission will vote on it again in late  
491 November/early December and City Council will vote on it again for final approval in  
492 late December. It is due to the Metropolitan Council by December 31, 2018.  
493

494 **7. Adjourn**

495

496 **MOTION**

497 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Sparby adjournment of the meeting**  
498 **at approximately 8:17 p.m.**

499

500 **Ayes: 5**

501 **Nays: 0**

502 **Motion carried.**