

# **Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes**

---

---

Tuesday, March 24, 2026, at 6:30 p.m.  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

---

---

## **1. Introduction / Roll Call**

Chair Ficek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and at his request, Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer called the roll.

**Present:** Chair Bryant Ficek, Vice Chair Edwin Hodder, and Members Daniel Fergus, Allison Luongo, and Katie Brokaw Palalay

**Youth Commissioners:** Carsten Bauer, and Alexis Jendro

**Absent:** Members Jarrod Cicha and Des Mueller (Excused)

**Staff Present:** Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer

## **2. Approve Agenda**

### **Motion**

**Member Fergus moved, Member Luongo seconded, approval of the March 24, 2026 Agenda as presented.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

## **3. Public Comments**

Vice Chair Hodder explained that he wanted to draw attention to a Star Tribune article on large data centers and noted that residents were now expressing concerns about smaller facilities. He asked whether the City currently had any data centers.

Public Works Director Freihammer responded that they were not aware of any data centers in the city. It was noted that such facilities are typically constructed on larger parcels of land, which are limited within the city, although smaller-scale versions could exist. He indicated that none were currently known.

#### **4. Business Items**

##### **a. Communication Items**

Mr. Freihammer provided an update on upcoming construction and maintenance activities in the city.

Mr. Freihammer explained that construction season is expected to be busy, with several projects starting in the coming months. He reported that the Lexington pathway project is expected to begin in early May. The Hamline project remains under review with state aid and is likely to start after July, potentially extending into a two-year project. The PMP project is expected to go out for bid soon and begin in June. Sewer lining work was scheduled for award at the April 20 Council meeting. Lift station work is entering the bidding phase, and a related study will be completed soon to support the City's capital improvement plan.

Mr. Freihammer noted that wayfinding signage installation would resume in the coming weeks after ground thawing. The Willow Pond project remains in planning, with work expected in late 2026 or later. He said the environmental review would be submitted for public comment, and neighbors within 500 feet would be notified. Lighting upgrades will continue at intersections and along the Lincoln corridor and parts of Long Lake Road. He added that the Owasso Hills neighborhood project is under review and may return later in the year pending a benefit assessment and possible policy changes.

Mr. Freihammer reported on county projects, noting that County Road C plans were complete and expected to be bid soon, with construction planned for the summer and bridge work in 2027. The Fairview project would include a mill and overlay as well as reconstruction of the intersection at County Road B, which would be turned into a four-way stop. Other county projects are in design, including corridors on County Road D, Fairview Avenue, Cleveland Avenue, Victoria Street path, Rice Street, and the Larpenteur Avenue corridor study.

Mr. Freihammer indicated MnDOT projects would include work on Snelling Avenue starting in mid to late April and continuing through the State Fair, with traffic reduced to one lane in each direction. Highway 280 is expected to be closed for most of the summer, with full closures beginning in mid-April.

Mr. Freihammer announced that extra water efficiency grant funding had been approved and would be available to residents. The climate equity action plan will return to the Council on April 6. A native plant sale will run from April 13 to May 14.

Mr. Freihammer finished with maintenance updates, mentioning that staff had been busy with compost operations and planned to open the leaf site in early

April for about four weeks. He reported that crews responded to several water main breaks and pump failures during the week and had also completed snow removal after a significant storm. He noted that while snowfall totals were lower than expected, it was still one of the season's largest storms and required multiple plow operations.

Member Brokaw Palalay asked whether the Snelling paving project and the Hamline Avenue project would overlap, noting that the Snelling project was outside the Commission's direct purview but related to overall construction timing.

Mr. Freihammer said there would be some overlap between the Snelling paving project and the Hamline Avenue project, noting that the extent of the overlap was not yet known. He explained that if the state project began in April and the City project started after July, the timelines would intersect. He added that the City project limits might not cover the full length of Hamline Avenue. He noted there was a tie-in point at the north end of the project where MnDOT would be completing ramp work, including curb ramps.

Member Brokaw Palalay commented that for connecting streets such as Lydia Avenue and County Road C, there should be consideration of additional signage or traffic-calming measures during construction. She expressed concern that drivers may use those routes as cut-throughs when traffic on Snelling Avenue is reduced to one lane in each direction, particularly at intersections with signals, which could experience increased traffic volumes.

Mr. Freihammer indicated staff would look into the concern regarding additional signage on connecting streets. He noted that staff was already coordinating with MnDOT on the Highway 280 corridor to add signage, particularly in areas where drivers often become confused during closures.

Mr. Freihammer explained that additional signage would be installed in the County Road B neighborhood west of Cleveland Avenue, where drivers sometimes attempt to use disconnected routes during the Highway 280 shutdown. He added that the county was also working with MnDOT to install signage along Cleveland Avenue, as it was expected to serve as a primary detour route. He confirmed that staff would continue working with MnDOT to add signage as needed.

Member Brokaw Palalay expressed concern about speeding along County Road C2, noting that it was already an issue and that the area lacked sidewalks. She said increased cut-through traffic during construction could further impact safety and emphasized concern for pedestrians during the summer months.

Mr. Freihammer explained that dredging at Willow Pond could occur during the winter, depending on the method selected. He noted that contractors had

indicated a preference for working with higher water levels so equipment could operate from barges rather than creating excessive mud conditions.

Mr. Freihammer noted that another option would be winter dredging, in which ice could be removed and excavation completed under frozen conditions. He added that staff may allow contractors to propose either approach, depending on what is most effective for a pond of that size.

Mr. Freihammer said it was uncertain whether Willow Pond would freeze completely because of its large drainage area and continuous water flow. However, he noted that it would need to freeze solid for certain construction methods. He indicated that additional information would be available once plans were finalized.

Mr. Freihammer added that Ryan would be present at the May meeting and could provide a more detailed update on the Willow Pond project.

Member Luongo asked about the amount of road construction planned for the summer, noting that there may be more activity than usual on major city roads. She acknowledged that road construction is typical during the summer months but expressed that this season appeared especially active.

Mr. Freihammer said this construction season would be busier than normal. He explained that several projects had been delayed in prior years, resulting in multiple carryover projects occurring in the same season. He noted that projects such as Twin Lakes, Lexington, and Hamline were all carryovers, contributing to the increased activity.

Mr. Freihammer added that there was also some overlap of larger corridor projects, including County Road C, which further contributed to the higher level of construction. He said the city would also be bidding on two separate pavement projects, including the pavement management project and a reconstruction project in the Walnut and Terminal Road industrial area. He noted that the latter project would take place later in the year and primarily impact businesses in that corridor.

Member Luongo asked whether information about the upcoming construction projects could be included in the city newsletter, noting that staff may already be doing so, but wanted to confirm.

Mr. Freihammer explained that staff already share construction information through city communication channels, including the newsletter, and would continue to provide updates to residents. He indicated that staff make efforts to inform the public about project timing, impacts, and detours so residents can plan accordingly.

Member Luongo asked whether the city could create a dedicated webpage for summer 2026 road construction projects that would compile all projects in one place for residents to review.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the city already provides construction information on its website, including a dedicated projects page and an interactive GIS map that allows users to zoom in and select individual projects for more details.

Mr. Freihammer explained that residents can sign up for construction alerts through the city, which are typically distributed on Fridays and include updates on city, county, and MnDOT projects. He added that residents can also subscribe to Ramsey County alerts, which are generally sent later on Fridays, as well as MnDOT alerts, where users can choose to receive updates on specific projects.

Chair Ficek asked about the leaf site, specifically whether staff would monitor activity and observe operations once it opens.

Mr. Freihammer noted that staff would be monitoring activity at the leaf site and collecting data, explaining that the spring season can be more challenging for gathering information due to lower usage compared to fall. He reported that staff planned to use cameras again to assist with monitoring.

Mr. Freihammer explained that staff had received a high number of calls from residents due to incorrect information online identifying the site as a yard waste facility. He indicated that staff were working to correct the information so residents would not attempt to bring materials that are not accepted.

Mr. Freihammer reported that staff would bring the topic back to the Commission in June for further discussion, with the goal of allowing the Council to make a decision in July. He added that any changes or updates would then be communicated in the fall newsletter to prepare residents for the upcoming season.

**b. Civic Campus Project Update**

Mr. Freihammer reported that there were no major updates at this time, noting that a stakeholder meeting had not yet occurred, but work on the project continued. He explained that both the license passport dance studio and the maintenance operations center remained in the concept design phase. He indicated that the concept for the license passport facility was nearing completion, although negotiations with the VFW were still ongoing.

Mr. Freihammer explained that staff had revisited programming for the maintenance operations center over the past month to refine space needs and sizing. He noted that a design charrette was scheduled for later in the week,

where layout options would be evaluated and refined based on concepts prepared by the architects. He indicated that this exercise would help move the project forward.

Mr. Freihammer reported that more detailed updates were expected at the next meeting and that a stakeholder meeting was anticipated in April to gather additional feedback, particularly regarding the north side of the site. He added that significant progress was expected over the next few months, with more substantial updates anticipated in April and May.

**c. Pathway Master Plan**

Mr. Freihammer explained that the discussion would continue the pathway review process previously started in November. He noted that the goal was to work through as much of the material as possible during the meeting, potentially completing a substantial portion in one session rather than spreading it across multiple meetings.

Mr. Freihammer reported that the materials had been updated to correct minor errors and include additional maps. He explained that the map identified segments by number, with additional lettered segments representing potential additions to the plan. He noted that several segments had already been reviewed and generally supported for further consideration, and that additional segments not previously discussed would be reviewed at the end.

Mr. Freihammer explained that staff would provide a brief overview of each segment, after which the Commission could determine whether to keep, modify, or remove it from consideration. He clarified that adding a segment at this stage would not formally include it in the pathway master plan, but would move it forward for further evaluation.

Mr. Freihammer outlined that the next step would involve neighborhood engagement, including a public meeting, followed by Commission review and potential recommendation to the Council for final consideration. He noted that the proposed segments had originated from input by the Mayor, Councilmembers, staff observations, and resident feedback.

Chair Ficek clarified that the term "segment" did not specify whether the connection would be a sidewalk or a trail; rather, it indicated a general connection.

Mr. Freihammer explained that segments in the pathway master plan can include either sidewalks or trails, depending on existing conditions and available space. He noted that while some segments are identified specifically as sidewalk or trail, many are listed more generally because the exact facility type has not yet been determined.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that when filling gaps in existing infrastructure, staff would typically match what is already in place, such as continuing a sidewalk or trail on the same side of the street. He added that in some cases the plan may specify a particular side, such as north or south, when there is an existing facility on one side and a need to extend it.

Mr. Freihammer noted that, for the proposed segments under consideration, the focus at this stage is on whether the connection should be included at all, rather than on determining the exact placement or facility type.

Member Fergus asked what the difference was between a trail and a sidewalk.

Mr. Freihammer explained that all connections are considered pathways within the pathway master plan, with distinctions between trails and sidewalks based on design and use. He noted that trails are typically eight to ten feet wide, constructed of bituminous material, and designed to accommodate biking and walking with additional clear space.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that sidewalks are generally six feet wide, constructed of concrete, and primarily intended for pedestrian use, although biking is permitted. He added that trails are better suited to multi-use activities, including both biking and walking.

Mr. Freihammer explained that sidewalks are generally intended for walking, although children may also use them for biking. He noted that the standard sidewalk width is typically six feet to allow two people to walk side by side comfortably, although widths may vary in some cases.

Mr. Freihammer then transitioned to the pathway segment review, noting that the Commission would continue working through the listed segments in order. He explained that the meeting materials included the original pathway master plan, a map with labeled segments for proposed additions, and a spreadsheet with descriptions of existing segments for reference and potential modification.

Mr. Freihammer reported that the Commission had previously reviewed segments 9 and 16 and would begin with segment 12C. He described the segment as Lexington Avenue, currently identified as completing an off-road pathway on the east side from County Road C to County Road D. He noted that a pathway already exists from County Road C to County Road C2 and suggested that the description could be modified to reflect a connection from County Road C2 to County Road D.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the segment would pass through an area that includes open space, nearby apartments, and commercial uses. He indicated that staff would recommend a trail for this segment, consistent with existing conditions along much of the corridor. He noted that the Commission could

choose to keep, modify, or remove the segment and that discussion would guide any updates rather than formal motions at this stage.

Member Brokaw Palalay recommended keeping the segment, noting that the existing pathway was already busy and that maintaining the planned connection was supported.

Mr. Freihammer asked whether the Commission wanted to modify the segment description to reflect that the connection would be from County Road C2 to County Road D, noting that the segment between County Road C and County Road C2 had already been constructed in recent years.

Member Fergus recommended modifying the segment, noting that the portion from County Road C to County Road C2 had already been completed.

Mr. Freihammer explained that portions of the pathway had already been constructed as part of recent development. He noted that the apartment and senior housing developments installed segments of sidewalk or pathways as part of their projects, and that the City completed additional connections around the same time, approximately five years ago.

Member Fergus asked whether the segment being discussed included the large wetland area.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that the segment included the wetland area, noting that it is part of Ramsey County land associated with Lake Johanna and Josephine Park. He indicated that staff would modify the segment description to reflect the connection from County Road C2 to County Road D.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the next segment, 12A on Lexington Avenue, described as completing an off-road pathway on the east side from Larpenteur Avenue to County Road B. He noted that the missing portion is only between Larpenteur Avenue and Roselawn Avenue, as a sidewalk has already been constructed north of Roselawn. He indicated that the description could be modified accordingly.

Member Fergus clarified that there is a sidewalk north of Roselawn and asked whether the proposed segment would be an on-road trail or pathway.

Mr. Freihammer clarified that the segment would be an off-road pathway.

Chair Ficek noted that the segment was intended to recognize a gap in the system and acknowledged that it represented a missing connection.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that the segment represented a gap and recommended modifying the description to reflect the portion from Larpenteur Avenue to Roselawn Avenue.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced segment 12B on Lexington Avenue, described as an off-road pathway on the east side between County Road B and County Road C. He noted that a portion of this segment would be completed as part of the 2026 project beginning in May, leaving only the section from County Road B2 to County Road C as the remaining gap.

Mr. Freihammer explained that this segment runs from the high school area to the north end of Central Park. He noted that while there are some informal connections into the park from nearby streets, this segment would provide a more direct connection along Lexington Avenue. He added that the area includes residential properties and landscaping within the city-maintained right-of-way.

Member Fergus asked whether there is a sidewalk on the west side of Lexington Avenue.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that there is a pathway on the west side of Lexington Avenue and crosswalks in the area. He explained that on the east side, the connection near Central Park is incomplete, noting that users traveling from the south are left without a clear continuation at County Road B2.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that while there is some access to Central Park via Brooks Avenue, completing the full segment from County Road B2 to County Road C would provide a continuous north-south connection. He noted that a portion of the segment would be constructed as part of an upcoming project, leaving approximately a half-mile gap.

Mr. Freihammer recommended modifying the segment description to reflect completion of the remaining portion, and the Commission expressed support for finishing the connection.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the segments were being reviewed in the order of the current priority list, noting that higher traffic corridors appeared first and that later segments may require more discussion.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced segment 4B on County Road C, described as the construction of an on-road pathway from Victoria Street to Dale Street. He explained that this improvement, in the form of a bike lane, is already scheduled as part of a 2026 county project associated with roadway reconfiguration.

Mr. Freihammer recommended removing the segment from the plan, noting that it is expected to be completed by the time the review process is finalized.

Mr. Freihammer clarified that segment 4B on County Road C includes on-road pathways in the form of bike lanes from Victoria Street to Dale Street, which will be incorporated into the County Road C project.

Chair Ficek clarified that the segment referred specifically to bike lanes along County Road C and acknowledged that the improvement would be completed as part of the upcoming construction project.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that segment 4B was already planned as part of the County Road C project and, with the Commission's agreement, recommended removing it from the pathway master plan.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the next segment on County Road C, described as the completion of both on- and off-road pathways from Snelling Avenue to Hamline Avenue. He explained that this segment originated from an earlier concept in the pathway master plan that envisioned a continuous bike corridor along County Road C2, including a potential overpass over Interstate 35. He noted that the overpass concept had since been removed and that County Road C had become the primary corridor for connectivity.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that the segment description differs from others due to its historical context and broader scope. He noted that the Commission could choose to simplify the description to a general pathway if preferred. He also explained that the corridor currently lacks dedicated pedestrian facilities, with only a shoulder used for parking, and that the area serves both residential neighborhoods and nearby businesses.

Mr. Freihammer asked whether the Commission preferred to keep the segment as currently written, including both on and off-road pathways, or modify it to specify only an off-road pathway. He noted that the bike plan recommendations for the corridor were not immediately recalled and suggested the Commission could leave the description as is for now and refine it later if needed.

Chair Ficek indicated he was ok with leaving it as written.

Mr. Freihammer introduced the next segment on County Road C, described as the construction of an on-road pathway from Dale Street to Western Avenue. He explained that this improvement would be completed as part of the 2026 project and recommended removing the segment from the pathway master plan, with the Commission's agreement.

Mr. Freihammer then presented another County Road C segment, described as completing both on-road and off-road pathways from Western Avenue to Rice Street. He noted that the on-road component would be constructed as part of the upcoming project, while the off-road pathway would not be included.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the off-road pathway on the north side had originally been proposed but was removed from the project by the Council. However, it remains in the pathway master plan for potential future consideration. He indicated that the Commission could choose to retain the off-road segment and clarify that it would be located on the north side, where no pathway currently exists, since there is already one on the south side. He also noted that the Commission could consider removing it entirely if desired.

Member Fergus noted significant pushback from residents on that segment.

Mr. Freihammer explained that residents had petitioned to remove the segment, and the Council acted on that feedback. He noted that while some residents supported the project, a larger number expressed opposition during the process.

Member Fergus recalled that the Council chose not to pursue the project at that time, but kept it in the pathway master plan for future consideration and asked for confirmation.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the Council considered removing the segment from the pathway master plan but ultimately chose to keep it on the list for future consideration.

Member Luongo asked when the Commission would have another opportunity to review or revisit this segment, expressing concern that they might otherwise miss the chance to weigh in.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the opportunity to include the segment in the current project had passed. He noted that while the right-of-way still exists, any future construction would likely depend on a cost-share policy and would not occur in the near term.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that it could be 10 or more years before the project is reconsidered, and that future opportunities would depend on available funding and stronger community support. He added that while the segment may still rank highly, it would be evaluated based on timing and feasibility, and the Commission could choose to keep it for future consideration or remove it if it is not expected to move forward.

Chair Ficek expressed support for keeping the segment in the pathway master plan. He noted disagreement with the prior decision to remove it from the project, stating that the pathway had been planned for many years. He added that having facilities on both sides of the roadway improves usability by reducing the need for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the street multiple times. He acknowledged that the project is unlikely to occur in the near term but supported retaining it for future consideration.

Member Luongo expressed support for keeping the segment in the pathway master plan. She noted that master plans often remain in place for many years and that community perspectives may change over time, making the segment a viable option for future consideration.

Mr. Freihammer asked whether the Commission preferred to modify the segment description to specify the completion of an off-road pathway on the north side of County Road C from Western Avenue to Rice Street.

The commission agreed to the change.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that he would describe the segment generally as a pathway rather than specifying a trail or sidewalk. He then introduced segment 6 on Cleveland Avenue, described as the development of an off-road pathway between County Road C and County Road D. He noted that the segment was somewhat disjointed and would be reviewed in more detail.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the Cleveland Avenue segment from County Road C to County Road D is largely completed, though in a split configuration. He noted that a sidewalk exists on the east side from County Road C to County Road C2, while a pathway continues on the west side from County Road C2 to County Road D.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that this creates a continuous corridor, but with a mid-segment shift from east to west. He explained that the Commission could consider the segment complete as is, or modify it to create a continuous facility on one side. He noted that completing the corridor on the east side would likely require extending a sidewalk, whereas completing it on the west side would be less desirable due to freeway ramps.

Mr. Freihammer added that the corridor includes a mix of commercial, industrial, residential, and park uses, including access to Langton Park and nearby senior housing. He noted that while Cleveland Avenue is a busy roadway, it is not classified as a full arterial, which may influence whether facilities on both sides are prioritized. He indicated that the Commission could choose to remove the segment or modify it based on priorities.

Chair Ficek asked whether, for the segment from County Road C to County Road C2, where there is no facility on the west side, the city would consider adding a pathway on that side in the future if an opportunity arose, despite the presence of the ramp entrance.

Mr. Freihammer explained that adding a pathway on the west side between County Road C and County Road C2 could be considered. However, it would depend on county priorities and future ranking evaluations. He noted that

because there are no adjacent businesses along that stretch, the city would likely be responsible for winter maintenance, thereby increasing operational costs.

Mr. Freihammer added that the corridor has inconsistencies in bicycle infrastructure, with on-street bike lanes present north of Iona but not south of it, where traffic volumes are higher. He noted that this creates a connectivity gap, particularly in a busy area near Twin Lakes.

Chair Ficek suggested splitting the segment into two parts, identifying a pathway on the west side from County Road C to County Road C2 and a pathway on the east side from County Road C2 to County Road D. He indicated that the Commission would then need to determine whether both segments should be included.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that the segment is currently listed as one, but noted that it could be divided into two separate segments if the Commission preferred, and acknowledged that splitting it may provide clearer direction.

Member Brokaw Palalay expressed support for splitting the segment into two if that approach would provide greater clarity. She also asked for additional clarification on pathway conditions further south along Cleveland Avenue.

Mr. Freihammer explained that, farther south along Cleveland Avenue, there is generally a sidewalk on the east side, extending down to County Road B2. He noted that on the west side, there is a sidewalk in certain areas due to terrain challenges, including a steep hill.

Mr. Freihammer identified a short gap in the system, approximately 400 feet long, that is difficult and costly to complete. He explained that the gap currently requires pedestrians to cross mid-block, creating an awkward and less safe condition. He added that there are only a few properties on the west side in that area, and overall, the corridor functions primarily along an east-side alignment.

Member Fergus described traveling north along the corridor, then transitioning to the west-side sidewalk, and sought clarification on the connection.

Mr. Freihammer explained that pedestrians traveling north and using the west-side sidewalk must cross back due to a gap created by a steep hill in the corridor. He noted that addressing the gap would require significant improvements, such as constructing a retaining wall or narrowing the roadway, which would be costly and complex. He indicated that the current configuration reflects a simpler approach that directs pedestrians to cross mid-block.

Member Brokaw Palalay noted that although there are few residents in that area, several bus stops still generate pedestrian activity.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the corridor includes hotels and pedestrian activity, including people walking to nearby destinations such as Walmart. He noted that the segment from County Road C to County Road C2 is primarily commercial, while areas north of Langton Park include residential properties, particularly on the east side.

Mr. Freihammer added that there is an existing pathway connection between residential lots that provides direct access to Langton Lake, allowing neighborhood residents to reach the park without traveling along Cleveland Avenue, except for those directly adjacent to the corridor.

Chair Ficek summarized the discussion and indicated support for including a segment on the east side from County Road C2 to County Road D. He then raised the question of whether to include a west side segment from County Road C to County Road C2, or remove it if it is not necessary. He also asked whether that segment should be identified specifically as a sidewalk or more generally as a pathway, noting that no facility currently exists there.

Member Fergus confirmed that there is currently no facility in that area and asked whether County Road C2 is where the hotels are located.

Mr. Freihammer explained that County Road C2, or Center Point, is where the hotels are located. He clarified that a portion of the pathway on the west side has already been constructed as part of the Center Point development.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the remaining gap is relatively short, beginning around Iona and extending approximately 400 feet north. He indicated that completing a pathway in that section would fill the remaining connection between County Road C and the existing infrastructure.

Chair Ficek noted that there is currently no pathway on the west side, but explained that adding one would provide additional connectivity options. He indicated that a west-side pathway could allow users to travel south to the signalized crossing at the ramp or continue north without unnecessarily crossing the road. He emphasized that while access is limited today, adding a pathway would improve overall flexibility and connectivity for users along the corridor.

Member Brokaw Palalay expressed support for adding the west side segment and noted that its priority could be evaluated during the future prioritization process.

Chair Ficek agreed that the west side segment would likely rank low in priority, noting that the area is primarily stormwater ponds.

Mr. Freihammer noted that the area includes a stormwater pond on the north side, with the remainder consisting of wetlands owned by MnDOT.

Member Luongo asked whether there may be political viability with the county to extend on-street bike lanes from Iona further south, as an alternative approach.

Mr. Freihammer explained that extending the street bike lanes in that area would be challenging due to traffic conditions at the intersection. He noted that the corridor includes double left-turn lanes and multiple through lanes as part of a relatively recent project, which would make modifications more difficult, though not impossible.

Member Luongo expressed interest in finding a way to continue dedicated bike facilities through the corridor.

Mr. Freihammer noted that extending bike lanes to County Road C would be beneficial but would require significant rework. He indicated that adding southbound bike lanes may be more feasible, whereas northbound improvements would be more challenging given existing roadway conditions.

Chair Ficek suggested that if on-street bike lanes are not feasible, the segment could instead be designated as a trail to accommodate bicycle use better. He noted that this approach could provide a dedicated corridor for bikes and pedestrians, particularly since the east side already includes a sidewalk, and indicated support for describing the segment more generally as a pathway or trail.

Mr. Freihammer summarized the discussion, indicating that the segment would be split into two parts. He confirmed that one segment would include completing a sidewalk on the east side from County Road C2 to County Road D.

Mr. Freihammer noted that the second segment would include constructing a trail on the west side from County Road C to just north of Iona, connecting to existing facilities. He clarified that the trail would be designed as a wider, multi-use facility.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that the segments would be labeled separately for clarity and that the exact naming convention would be determined as part of the plan updates.

Member Fergus asked whether the trails located around and behind the hotel are maintained by the city.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that the trails around and behind the hotel are city trails. He explained that while the city owns and maintains them, winter maintenance is performed by adjacent property owners due to their proximity

to commercial properties. He noted that the trails were reconstructed approximately four to five years ago, having originally been built to a substandard six feet wide, and were widened to eight feet. He added that the trails are well used, particularly by nearby apartment residents, hotel guests, and employees, with many using them to access Langton Park.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the next segment on Rice Street, described as completing an on and off-road pathway from County Road C to the north city boundary. He noted that the portion from County Road C2 to the north boundary has already been constructed, leaving only the segment from County Road C to County Road C2 as the remaining gap. He explained that this area serves primarily residential uses, including a church and a large apartment complex on the west side.

Member Luongo expressed concern about safety in the area, noting that people frequently walk in the street, including older adults and individuals using mobility scooters, creating a dangerous situation.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that the Rice Street segment description would be modified to reflect the remaining portion from County Road C to County Road C2. He noted that the county has a project planned within the next five to six years and that the city has communicated interest in coordinating improvements with that effort.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the next segment on Hamline Avenue, described as an off-road trail from County Road C to County Road C2, and recommended removing it since the city will be constructing that segment within the next year.

Mr. Freihammer then presented the Victoria Street segment north of County Road C, described as developing both on road and off road pathways from County Road C to County Road D. He noted that a portion from County Road C to Woodhill has already been constructed as a sidewalk, while the county is beginning design for a future project, tentatively scheduled for 2028, which may include a trail instead. He recommended keeping the segment as currently written in the pathway master plan, noting that final decisions on facility type and location would be determined through the county's design process.

Member Luongo recommended keeping the segment in the pathway master plan until the project is fully confirmed and constructed.

Mr. Freihammer introduced the concept of constellation links, explaining that they are intended to connect parks and represent preferred routes for traveling between park locations. He noted that these links were added to the pathway master plan during a previous update without extensive discussion, which has led to some confusion.

Mr. Freihammer explained that some of the proposed links follow low-volume neighborhood streets, raising questions about whether additional pathways are necessary when pedestrians can already use the roadway. He indicated that the concept differs from traditional pathway planning, as it focuses on suggested routes rather than required infrastructure.

Mr. Freihammer noted that while some constellation links may align with existing or planned pathways, others may not be practical or necessary. He added that people often choose their own routes and may not regularly travel directly between parks, instead starting from their homes. He provided this context to guide the Commission's review of the upcoming segment.

Member Luongo asked whether an actual pathway could be constructed instead of relying on a designated constellation link route.

Mr. Freihammer explained that a constellation link can be converted into a formal pathway if the Commission prefers, but noted that doing so would require a clear designation. He indicated that labeling something as a constellation link can create confusion, as it is unclear whether it represents a suggested connection or a planned, constructed facility.

Mr. Freihammer emphasized that if the intent is to build a pathway, it should be identified as such in the plan rather than remaining a constellation link. He noted that this distinction had not been clearly defined in previous updates to the pathway master plan.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced constellation link C3, described as a connection along Woodhill Drive between Hamline Avenue and Civic Center Drive, providing access to Howard Johnson.

Member Luongo recommended designating the connection as a formal pathway rather than a constellation link, noting that it would be more appropriate given anticipated future conditions.

Mr. Freihammer noted that designating the connection as a pathway could address both the constellation link concept and previously identified needs for a trail connection in the area. He explained that similar requests had come from both engineering and parks staff, and combining them into a single pathway designation would streamline the plan.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that with upcoming projects, including the Hamline Avenue work in 2026 and the Civic campus project anticipated around 2028, much of the corridor would likely be completed, leaving only a short gap between Civic Center Drive and Hamline Avenue. He recommended keeping the full corridor in the plan to ensure long-term continuity.

Chair Ficek expressed support for converting the segment to a pathway and noted that the current gap is relatively small.

Chair Ficek asked whether the identified gap should be defined as extending from the existing sidewalk connection to Hamline Avenue.

Mr. Freihammer recommended defining the segment to extend to Lexington Avenue, noting that the full corridor should remain in the plan. He explained that the Civic campus project would likely include pathway construction on both sides, supporting a continuous connection through the area.

Chair Ficek expressed concern about adding the pathway, only to end up with a partial connection, noting a preference to avoid creating an incomplete segment.

Mr. Freihammer explained that staff had proposed a similar connection as segment E, which would include a trail from Hamline Avenue to Lexington Avenue on the south side. He indicated that if the Commission supports that approach, segment E could be added and would effectively replace the constellation link.

Member Luongo asked whether a trail within Veterans Park would be included in the Civic campus plan or handled separately through parks planning.

Mr. Freihammer explained that a trail within Veterans Park would likely be included in the Civic campus and park redesign project. He noted that adding a walking path is one of the concepts under consideration and that additional discussion would occur as planning progresses.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced segment 36 on the east side of the Snelling service drive, described as the development of an off-road pathway. He noted that this segment had been previously discussed and referenced the map for its general limits.

Mr. Freihammer recalled that the segment had been previously discussed and clarified that it extends from County Road C2 to Lydia Avenue along the east side of the Snelling service drive. He noted that the segment runs in front of several apartment buildings.

Mr. Freihammer explained that this segment was added in 2021 at the request of residents and had already gone through the full review process at that time.

Member Brokaw Palalay recommended modifying the segment description to specify developing an off-road pathway along the east side of the east Snelling service drive from County Road C2 to Lydia Avenue.

Mr. Freihammer introduced the next segment on County Road C2 west of Snelling Avenue, described as the development of both on- and off-road pathways from the west city boundary to Snelling Avenue, including a proposed pedestrian bridge over Interstate 35W.

Mr. Freihammer explained that this segment originated from an earlier, more ambitious concept intended to create a continuous east-west pedestrian corridor. He noted that existing conditions include partial sidewalk connections, pathways through Langton Park, and segments with wide shoulders but no dedicated pedestrian or bicycle facilities. He added that the corridor passes through wetlands, residential areas, parkland, and industrial areas with limited pedestrian demand.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that the proposed pedestrian bridge was a key component of the original concept, intended to provide an alternative crossing to the County Road C corridor. However, he noted that without the bridge, the corridor would not function as a continuous route. He questioned whether constructing a bridge at this location aligns with current priorities and whether it is a worthwhile long-term investment.

Member Luongo expressed concern about the feasibility of funding a pedestrian bridge, noting uncertainty about the funding source.

Member Brokaw Palalay expressed concern about the value of the proposed corridor, noting uncertainty about how many people would use it. She indicated that without a broader regional connection, such as a continuous greenway linking multiple cities, the segment may have limited usefulness.

Chair Ficek noted that broader considerations regarding regional bike connections would be more appropriate to discuss in the future bike plan.

Member Luongo noted that while the connection could be beneficial for linking to the northeast, it was unclear whether there would be significant demand to travel into the city's residential areas from that direction.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the current primary connection for pedestrians and bicyclists runs along the diagonal trail and County Road C corridor, which has been improved with a pathway on the south side that connects to the city's trail system. He noted that this infrastructure did not exist when the County Road C2 concept was originally developed in the early 2000s.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that additional improvements on the County Road D corridor, planned for a future project, will further enhance connectivity, reducing the need for a separate C2 corridor. He explained that these newer corridors provide viable alternatives that were not previously available.

Mr. Freihammer suggested that the Commission could consider removing the pedestrian bridge component if it is no longer feasible. He also noted that the segment could be modified or broken into smaller portions, such as focusing on a shorter stretch of County Road C2, rather than maintaining the full original concept, particularly since parts of the corridor do not currently exist.

Member Luongo suggested that it may be beneficial to include a sidewalk on the west side of County Road C2 to provide nearby residents with a safe place to walk and improved local connectivity.

Chair Ficek suggested starting the discussion with the proposed bridge over Interstate 35W. He noted that while pedestrian-only facilities can be appealing, the location may limit their usefulness, since they do not connect to a major regional trail and are somewhat out of the way.

Chair Ficek summarized that there was consensus to remove the bridge component from the segment. He explained that the remaining portions of the corridor could be considered separately on each side of Interstate 35W.

Mr. Freihammer recommended breaking the west side into two segments, one from Highway 8 to Highway 88 and another from Highway 88 to Long Lake Road, to allow for more targeted evaluation. He noted that this approach would align with prior discussions about potential improvements along Long Lake Road.

Chair Ficek and Mr. Freihammer discussed focusing on the west side of County Road C2. They noted that a pathway already exists along much of Long Lake Road, allowing for a potential connection from Long Lake to Old Highway 8, which also has a sidewalk. They discussed whether to formalize improvements as on-street bike lanes or maintain flexibility.

Mr. Freihammer recommended keeping the description broad as an on- and off-road pathway to allow for future design decisions, including potential bike lanes or trail development. Chair Ficek supported maintaining flexibility, and the group agreed to use “and or” language to preserve multiple options.

Mr. Freihammer suggested defining the segment from Old Highway 8 to Long Lake Road and noted that it could be split into two segments, Old Highway 8 to Highway 88 and Highway 88 to Long Lake Road, to allow for phased implementation. Chair Ficek acknowledged that keeping segments flexible would not prevent phased construction, and the group agreed on the general approach before moving on to discuss the east side.

Mr. Freihammer discussed the east side of the County Road C2 corridor, noting that a connection already exists into Langton Park. He indicated that additional

improvements on the east side may be limited, but suggested that a potential connection between Langton Park and Oasis Park could be considered.

Mr. Freihammer explained that this would involve a short connection through a primarily residential area near Fairview Avenue, where parks are located on either side. He noted that this concept aligns with what had previously been identified as a constellation link. However, it was not labeled separately because the broader C2 corridor was already included in the pathway master plan.

Member Luongo expressed uncertainty about the need for a separate pathway in that area, noting that it is a low-volume, contained residential corridor and may not justify the investment. She indicated openness to including it if there has been resident interest, but did not strongly support it.

Chair Ficek noted that the connection appearing in multiple planning documents created some uncertainty. He expressed hesitation about prioritizing a pathway in this case, explaining that the corridor is a low-volume local road where pedestrians can already walk safely without additional infrastructure.

Mr. Freihammer noted that the area consists of very low-volume streets serving small, isolated neighborhoods. He explained that there is no through traffic and that vehicles in the area are typically limited to residents accessing their homes or visitors traveling to the nearby parks.

Chair Ficek indicated he could support either option for the segment, noting that it would likely be a low priority regardless.

Chair Ficek and Mr. Freihammer noted that the connection between Langton Park and Oasis Park would likely be a low construction priority and would most realistically be completed in coordination with another project rather than as a standalone improvement. It was noted that while it could score well on planning metrics due to its proximity to Fairview Avenue and its park connectivity, it would likely be an opportunistic project.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that if included, the segment should be clarified as a general pathway connection between the two parks, without pursuing additional expansion beyond that scope. The Commission agreed to retain the segment in a limited, flexible form.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the next segment, a Trunk Highway 51 connection to Old Snelling. He recommended removing it since MnDOT is constructing the pathway on the west side this year, completing the connection with prior improvements by Arden Hills.

Mr. Freihammer next presented a Hamline Avenue segment between County Road C2 and County Road D and recommended removing it as it is planned for construction in 2026.

Mr. Freihammer then returned to the County Road C2 corridor, introducing a segment between Lexington Avenue and Victoria Street. He described the corridor as primarily residential with moderate traffic and noted nearby open space and informal walking trails. He recommended modifying the description to specify completing an off-road pathway along County Road C2 from Lexington to Victoria. He added that the 2028 Victoria Street improvements would include pathways on both sides, further enhancing connectivity. The Commission agreed to retain the segment with the modified description.

Member Brokaw Palalay asked about a remaining gap along County Road C2 near Oasis Pond, noting that most of the corridor had already been discussed.

Mr. Freihammer clarified that the area was part of the previously discussed segment west of Snelling and explained that the Twin Lakes Phase Two project would include pathway connections through that area. He noted that the project would provide a connection, though not a direct one due to wetland constraints, and could potentially be constructed as early as this year.

Member Brokaw Palalay acknowledged the clarification and indicated that it addressed the remaining concern.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced another constellation link, identified as D1 along Oxford Street between Woodhill Drive and County Road C2. He explained that the intent was to connect neighborhood areas to nearby parks. He noted that the area is a low-volume residential neighborhood and suggested that people already have multiple routes to access the parks via existing streets.

Member Luongo indicated that he did not see a clear benefit to the proposed connection.

Mr. Freihammer expressed uncertainty about selecting Oxford Street as the preferred connection, noting that similar access could be achieved from multiple nearby streets. He added that both parks are natural areas rather than destination playgrounds, so there may be limited demand for direct travel between them.

Chair Ficek asked whether the east-west connection at the bottom of the map has already been constructed.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that there is a sidewalk on the south side of Woodhill Drive, providing the east-west connection.

Member Fergus questioned whether Oxford Street was selected because it already had a sidewalk connection.

Mr. Freihammer explained that Oxford Street likely appeared in the plan because it is centrally located in the neighborhood and may have been identified as a logical connection at the time. He noted that a sidewalk now exists south of Woodhill Drive along Oxford and suggested that the constellation link may have been created before that sidewalk was constructed, which may reduce the need for the proposed connection.

Chair Ficek, Member Luongo, and Mr. Freihammer discussed the east-west connection and clarified that the sidewalk along the south side of Woodhill Drive already provides a continuous connection from Lexington Avenue to Victoria Street.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the remaining portion under consideration was the north-south Oxford Street connection, originally identified as part of a constellation link. He noted that because the east-west connection is already complete and local streets provide adequate access, additional infrastructure may not be necessary.

The Commission agreed that the Oxford Street connection did not warrant inclusion as a formal pathway and supported its removal from the pathway master plan, while allowing it to remain as a conceptual constellation link within parks planning.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced segment 27, a Tamarack Park connection from South McCarrons Boulevard. He explained that the area is served by low-volume local streets and already has informal access into the park. The Commission applied consistent reasoning used for similar segments and supported removing both segment 27 and a related segment due to the limited need for additional infrastructure on local roads.

Mr. Freihammer next presented a constellation link along Gregg Street connecting Veterans Park to County Road C2. The discussion shifted to a related proposed segment that would provide a direct connection to Veterans Park from the north. The Commission expressed support for advancing that proposed segment for further study and neighborhood engagement, while removing the Gregg Street constellation link.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced a segment along Aldine Street near Roselawn Avenue, noting that it has been the subject of recent resident input and is currently under review by the Council and Parks Department. He explained that a feasibility study is underway to evaluate a potential nature style pathway. Given ongoing discussions and mixed resident feedback, the Commission

considered leaving the segment unchanged in the plan pending further direction.

Member Luongo asked how removing the segment from the pathway master plan would interact with the ongoing Council process and resident input.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the segment is already under active review, including multiple Council discussions and a pending report related to a potential vacation. He noted that there has been significant resident involvement, including petitions both for and against the proposal.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that Council will likely act on the report before the updated pathway master plan returns for approval. He explained that removing the segment now would not prevent Council from proceeding with a project if they choose to do so, and conversely, Council could also decide to remove it independently. He noted that the pathway master plan update is likely at least a year away from Council consideration.

Chair Ficek and Mr. Freihammer discussed how to handle the Aldine segment given the ongoing Council review. They agreed it would be best to leave the segment as is for now rather than making changes prematurely.

Chair Ficek noted support for the concept of a connection, while Mr. Freihammer indicated staff would revisit it after Council action and update the plan accordingly, either removing it if constructed or if not pursued.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced segment 35 on Fairview Avenue, described as developing an off-road pathway on the west side from County Road B2 to County Road C2. He clarified that a continuous pathway already exists on the east side, while the west side has partial segments with gaps.

Mr. Freihammer explained that this segment intends to fill the remaining gaps on the west side, particularly given the higher traffic volumes on Fairview Avenue south of County Road C2. He noted that recent improvements have addressed portions of the corridor, but several gaps remain that would improve overall connectivity.

Member Brokaw Palalay noted that this Fairview Avenue segment reflects earlier concerns about safety, particularly with people using scooters and walking in the roadway, and pointed out the presence of bus stops that increase pedestrian activity.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed those conditions, and the Commission expressed support for completing the west side gaps.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the Commerce Street segment, described as developing a pathway connection between Albert Street and Hamline Avenue. He explained that the area includes a high concentration of apartments and key destinations such as the library, high school, and nearby retail, including Target. He noted that a portion of the pathway has already been constructed by recent apartment development.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that completing the connection would improve pedestrian access throughout the corridor. He suggested that a road diet on the four-lane street could make it feasible to add the remaining sidewalk or pathway.

Chair Ficek recommended extending the Commerce Street segment west to State Farm Road, noting that pedestrians regularly use that corridor to access nearby destinations such as Target.

Mr. Freihammer confirmed that the upcoming development, including the State Patrol site, may incorporate sidewalk improvements in that area. The Commission supported modifying the segment to develop a pathway on the south side of Commerce Street from State Farm Road to Hamline Avenue.

Mr. Freihammer then clarified that the Minnesota Avenue constellation link was a duplicate of a previously discussed segment. He noted that the Commission had already supported adding a pathway along Minnesota Avenue from Lovell Avenue through Western Avenue and continuing east, effectively covering the entire corridor.

Mr. Freihammer next introduced the constellation link II along Oakcrest Avenue between Fairview Avenue and Rosebrook Park. He explained that the connection would provide access from a residential neighborhood into the park system, with broader links to other parks in the area. He noted that Oakcrest Avenue is a low-volume residential street with limited traffic and that existing pathways are available along Fairview Avenue and within the park.

Member Luongo asked whether there had been any resident feedback regarding the Oakcrest Avenue connection.

Mr. Freihammer indicated there had not been notable input and explained that the roadway now functions as a low-volume local street due to limited access at Snelling Avenue.

The Commission agreed the segment did not warrant inclusion as a formal pathway and supported leaving it as a constellation link rather than adding it to the pathway master plan.

Mr. Freihammer then introduced the Lydia Avenue segment, described as the development of an off-road pathway between Snelling Avenue and Hamline Avenue along the north side of Autumn Grove Park. He noted that this segment was added during the 2021 pathway master plan update at the request of residents and had already gone through neighborhood engagement and Council approval. He added that a portion of the pathway along Hamline Avenue is expected to be constructed this year.

Member Luongo expressed support for retaining the Lydia Avenue segment, noting that it provides a direct connection to Northwestern and serves students living in the neighborhood's eastern portion.

Chair Ficek confirmed that Lydia functions as a collector roadway, reinforcing the need for pedestrian infrastructure.

Member Brokaw Palalay also supported the segment, and the Commission agreed it addresses a clear need.

Mr. Freihammer noted that the segment was originally requested by residents and had received general support during prior engagement, with only limited opposition. He added that implementation could include a road diet to improve safety and accommodate the pathway.

The Commission agreed to keep the segment.

Mr. Freihammer then revisited a County Road C segment related to constructing a sidewalk on the north side between Western Avenue and Rice Street. He noted that this overlapped with a previously discussed segment and recommended keeping the updated version and removing the duplicate.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Freihammer introduced segment 7 on Fairview Avenue, north of County Road B2, described as the development of an off-road pathway between County Road C2 and County Road D. He noted that the corridor currently lacks pedestrian facilities and functions more like a rural roadway with wide shoulders.

The Commission agreed that, given traffic levels and the need for connectivity, the segment should be retained.

Mr. Freihammer concluded by noting significant progress in reviewing the segments.

Chair Ficek suggested pausing at that point.

Mr. Freihammer noted that the Commission reviewed approximately 28 to 30 segments and indicated that the next discussion would likely occur in July or August due to a full meeting schedule. He encouraged members to submit additional segment ideas if they believe anything is missing, explaining that staff can add them for review and initiate the standard neighborhood engagement process before bringing recommendations forward to the Commission and Council.

Chair Ficek asked whether there are other right-of-way corridors in the city, similar to Aldine, that could be considered for future pathway connections.

Mr. Freihammer explained that Aldine is a unique case, as most right-of-way corridors have already been evaluated through a prior process that identified potential vacations. He noted that some corridors were short or disconnected and therefore not suitable for connecting pathways. He added that several existing pathway connections into parks, such as Tamarack and Mattern, were created using former right-of-way corridors.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that only a limited number of additional opportunities remain, with a few still identified in the pathway master plan, including some in the Owasso Hills area that may be reviewed in future discussions.

#### **5. Commission Direction on Member-Initiated Agenda Items**

Mr. Freihammer provided an overview of upcoming Commission activities and meeting topics.

Mr. Freihammer reported that a new Commission member, Luke Sandstrom, would be sworn in at a future meeting and noted that he has prior city experience and familiarity with the pathway master plan. He indicated that ethics training would likely occur in early April.

Mr. Freihammer outlined upcoming agenda items, including the adoption of the bike plan, a potential discussion of streetlight policy, continued review of the pathway master plan, a Waste Management presentation in May, stormwater updates, and preparation for the Joint Council meeting. He noted that the June meeting would likely include a discussion on the climate equity action plan and a leaf site recommendation, which may generate public interest.

Chair Ficek asked whether additional meetings would be needed to complete the pathway master plan review.

Mr. Freihammer indicated there is no strict deadline and explained that the current effort is intended to prepare for a larger transportation plan update expected to begin in 2027. He noted that the Commission is making steady progress and could continue at the current pace, with the option to add a special meeting if needed.

Chair Ficek also asked about the Joint Council meeting timeline and encouraged members to begin thinking about topics they may want to discuss.

Mr. Freihammer indicated the meeting is typically held in July and suggested further discussion at an upcoming meeting to coordinate participation and messaging.

**6. Approval of February 24, 2026, Meeting Minutes**

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

**Motion**

**Vice Chair Hodder moved, Member Fergus seconded, approval of the February 24, 2026, meeting minutes as presented.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Abstain: 2 (Luongo, and Brokaw Palalay)**

**Motion carried.**

**7. Adjourn**

**Motion**

**Member Luongo moved, Member Fergus seconded, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:28 p.m.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**