Bloomington Common Council Regular Session Packet Addendum #2

Wednesday, November 4, 2026, at 6:30 p.m.
Council Chambers, City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, IN 47404

The meeting may also be accessed remotely via Zoom[1].

1. Amended Regular Session Agenda #2 - November 4, 2026
2. Revised Minutes for Approval:
   June 10, 2026 Regular Session
   July 22, 2026 Regular Session
   July 29, 2026 Regular Session
   August 5, 2026 Regular Session
3. Presentation slides for Ord. 2026-31 (UDO Housing Attainability) - Planning
4. Memo - Notice of Typographical Error – Ordinance 2026-31 (Attachment A) - Council Staff
5. Presentation slides for Ord. 2026-23 (UDO Limited Compliance Standards) - Planning
6. Proposed Amendment #2A for Ord. 2026-29 from Cm. Rollo
7. Proposed Amendment #4A for Ord. 2026-23 from Cm. Rollo

Bloomington City Council meetings can be watched on the following websites:

- Community Access Television Services (CATS)[2]
- City's YouTube Channel[3]

Materials for this meeting[4] are available on Council's website.

---

[1] https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/81587237460?pwd=8wx53LVwn550PtGpj5Ax2MVyQnqDWp.1 Meeting ID: 815 8723 7460 Passcode: 416696
[2] https://catstv.net/
[3] https://www.youtube.com/@citybloomington
[4] https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings/2026

Posted: November 4, 2026

City of Bloomington, Indiana Common Council

Amended Regular Session Agenda #2

Wednesday, November 4, 2026, at 6:30 p.m.
Council Chambers (Room 115), City Hall
401 N. Morton Street, Bloomington, IN 47404

The meeting may also be accessed remotely via Zoom.[1]

1. **Roll Call**

2. **Agenda Summation**

3. **Minutes for Approval**
   A. June 10, 2026 Regular Session
   B. July 22, 2026 Regular Session
   C. July 29, 2026 Regular Session
   D. August 5, 2026 Regular Session

4. **Reports (a maximum of twenty minutes is set aside for each part of this section)**
   A. Council members
   B. The Mayor, City Clerk, City Offices, and City Boards and Commissions
   C. Council Committees
   D. Public*

5. **Appointments to Boards and Commissions & Hiring**
   A. Removal of Advisory Member from Historic Preservation Commission

6. **Legislation for First Readings**
   A. Ordinance 2026-27 – To Fix The Salaries Of All Elected City Officials For The City Of Bloomington For The Year 2027

   B. Ordinance 2026-31 – UDO Amendments related to Housing Attainability (ZO2026-06-0007)
   Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

   C. Ordinance 2026-32 – To Amend the City of Bloomington Zoning Maps and Zone Property Currently in the Monroe County Jurisdiction to Mixed-Use Corridor (MC)

[1] https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/81587237460?pwd=8wx53LVwn550PtGpj5Ax2MVyQnqDWp.1 Meeting ID: 815 8723 7460 Passcode: 416696
Posted: October 30, 2026; Revised: November 4, 2026

in Anticipation of Voluntary Annexation
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

D. Ordinance 2026-33 – To Amend the City of Bloomington Zoning Maps and Zone Property Currently in the Monroe County Jurisdiction to Residential Multifamily (RM) in Anticipation of Voluntary Annexation
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

E. Ordinance 2026-34 – To Vacate Public Parcels Re: Two 12-foot Wide Alley Segments Located in the Southwest Corner of West 11th Street and North Rogers Street (Trades District Community Development, LLC, Petitioner/Owner)*Council Sponsor: CM Asare*

F. Ordinance 2026-37 – Amendment To Chapter 14.40.060 Of Title 14 Of The Bloomington Municipal Code Regarding False Emergency Alarms
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

G. Ordinance 2026-35 – To Repeal and Re-Enact Title 18 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Fire Prevention."
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

H. Ordinance 2026-36 – To establish a dedicated Fire Department Fund
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

7. Legislation for Second Readings and Resolutions

A. Ordinance 2026-23 – UDO Amendments related to Limited Compliance and Change in Use Standards (ZO2026-06-0008)
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

B. Ordinance 2026-29 – Amending the Bloomington Municipal Code to Prohibit the Development, Deployment, or Delivery of Superintelligence with the City of Bloomington, Indiana
Council Sponsor: CM Rollo

C. Public Hearing on the Additional Appropriation of Proceeds of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2026

D. Ordinance 2026-30 – Authorizing Issuance of City of Bloomington, Indiana, General Obligation Bonds, Series 2026, to Provide Funds to Finance the Costs of Certain Capital Improvements, and Equipping Projects and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance of the Bonds and

Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds
Council Sponsor: CM Stosberg

8. **Additional Public Comment* (a maximum of twenty-five minutes is set aside for this section)**
9. **Council Schedule**
10. **Adjournment**

*Members of the public may speak on matters of community concern not listed on the agenda at one of the two public comment opportunities. Individuals may speak at one of these periods, but not both. Speakers are allowed up to three minutes.

Bloomington City Council meetings can be watched on the following websites:

- Community Action Television Services (CATS)[2]
- City's YouTube Channel[3]

Materials for this meeting[4] are available on Council's website.

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact the Bloomington Common Council Office at council@bloomington.in.gov or 812-349-3409 and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page with which you are having problems.

[2] https://catstv.net/
[3] https://www.youtube.com/@citybloomington
[4] https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings/2026

Common Council-Regular Session Minutes
Bloomington Council Chambers, City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana
Wednesday, June 10, 2026 at 6:30pm

Council President Isak Nti Asare called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call: (*indicates participation via Zoom) [6:30pm]

Council Members:	
Isak Nti Asare	At-Large, Council President
Courtney Daily	District 5, Council Parliamentarian
Matt Flaherty	At-Large
Isabel Piedmont-Smith*	District 1
Dave Rollo	District 4
Kate Rosenbarger	District 2
Andy Ruff (arrived at 6:31pm)	At-Large
Hopi Stosberg	District 3
Sydney Zulich	District 6, Council Vice President

City staff, officials, and guests present:	
Nicole Bolden	City Clerk
Larry Allen	Common Council, Attorney (temporary)
Michael Wagenaar	O'Neill Leadership Program Fellow
Kelly Murphy	Information Technology Services, Technology Support Manager
Jane Kupersmith	Economic & Sustainable Development (ESD), Director
Andrea de la Rosa	ESD, Assistant Director of Small Business Development
Anna Killion-Hanson	Housing & Neighborhood Development, Director
Gretchen Knapp	Deputy Mayor
Jamie Neibel	Monroe County Emergency Management, Director
Katherine Zaiger	City of Bloomington Utilities, Director

2. Agenda Summation [6:31pm]

Council President Asare summarized the agenda.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to move the reading of Ordinance 2026-12 so that it was considered immediately after Resolution 2026-10. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

3. Approval of Minutes [6:32pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

4. Reports [6:33pm]

4.1. Councilmembers:

There were no councilmember reports.

4.2. The Mayor, City Clerk, City Offices, and City Boards and Commissions:

Jane Kupersmith, Economic and Sustainable Development (ESD) department, Director, introduced Andrea de la Rosa, Assistant Director of Small Business Development, ESD, who presented the Annual Tax Abatement Report. She summarized the tax abatement program and the economic impacts. She

For Approval

highlighted the evaluative criteria and application process, the compliance review process, and reviewed current tax abatements. Kupersmith reviewed the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) agreements including Evergreen Village, Countryview, Cambridge Square, and Henderson Court. Stosberg asked about Union at Crescent's struggles and reputation. Anna Killion-Hanson, Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) department, described the progress made by the property owners. Piedmont-Smith asked about the number of part-time and full-time jobs created by Catalent (Novo Nordisk). She asked why the tax abatement was considered substantially compliant when there were supposed to be 4,212 jobs but there were only 1,867. Kupersmith said the original job growth at Catalent was due to vaccine production and Defense Production Act; the vaccine market lessened which was outside of Catalent's control. Ruff commented on market circumstances and expressed concern with tax abatements. The city did not receive compensation when a business did well; it seemed that tax abatements socialized risk and loss, and privatized profits.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to approve the Tax Abatement Report as presented. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

4.3. Council Committees:

Zulich reported from the Hiring Committee, noting that there were five candidates for the Council Administrator/Attorney that would be interviewed. There was discussion on processes on personnel matters and having alternate committee members. Asare appointed Flaherty and Rosenbarger to serve as alternate members of the Hiring Committee as necessary for the duration of the six-week council recess.

Stosberg referenced the Fiscal Committee's meetings, schedule, and topics discussed.

4.4. Public:

There was no public comment.

5. Appointments to Boards and Commissions [7:10pm]

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

6. Legislation for First Reading [7:11pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

7. Legislation for Second Reading and Resolutions [7:11pm]

7.1. Resolution 2026-10

On the Existential Risk of Artificial Intelligence

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-10 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-10 be adopted.

Rollo presented the legislation and described concerns with artificial intelligence (AI) and super intelligence like artificial general intelligence (AGI) which were designed to replace people. Narrow AI was task-specific and used beneficially for healthcare, fraud detection, and more. He noted the rapid

For Approval

development of AI that autonomously wrote most of its own code and cautioned that it could potentially eliminate humanity; he quoted several AI experts. The alignment problem noted that AI could not be programmed to keep humanity's well-being centered. Developers admitted that AI models were becoming more powerful with many employees leaving the field or becoming whistleblowers. There needed to be regulations. Rollo was indebted to Peter Jensen at Safe AI Forever. Rollo then showed a video provided by Peter Bereson, PhD economist and former vice president of Goldman Sachs. Anthony Geary, professor of Physics and head of Future of Life Institute, a nonprofit seeking to steer advanced AI in beneficial directions, described various concerns about AI including the rapid development of highly autonomous AI systems that competed with humans. It could act independently of human oversight resulting in an acute risk to society. Companies were designing AI to replace human labor and therefore disrupting incomes. He described many other risks and concerns with advanced AGI. The main focus of AI companies was successfully making money. There was discussion on the rapid development of AI systems and their capabilities.

Jami Scholl commented on her concerns with AI and its replacement of human labor. Marc Haggerty spoke against AI. Paul Rousseau supported Resolution 2026-10.

Council discussed local outreach on AI, existential threats, deregulation lobbying in congress, resources for the concerned public, and the relevancy of AI, generally.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2026-10 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7.2. Ordinance 2026-12

To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Vehicles and Traffic" to Seasonally Provide a Carless Kirkwood

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-12 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-12 be adopted.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-12. Rosenbarger presented the amendment. She highlighted key points including public engagement, vibrant third places, investing in public spaces, car-free pedestrian zones, alleys, and a new start date of April 2027. There was brief council discussion.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment updates proposed Ordinance 2026-12 to update portions of the preamble to reflect stated goals and outcomes of the Common Council, to remove references to any alley closures, and to add severability and effective date Sections.

Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, appreciated there would be deliberation sessions. Deputy Mayor Gretchen Knapp thanked the sponsors for the amendment and the new start date. She noted that the public safety officers had requested to not close Kirkwood to cars on the proposed start date because it was going to be Little 500.

Flaherty said the deliberation sessions were ideal to have after the resolution in order to discuss how to do a carless Kirkwood rather than continue to have the same debate on whether or not to do so.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-12 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

For Approval

Rosenbarger reviewed a slide presentation noting the process and discussions so far, the city engineer's power to restore motor vehicle traffic, plans moving forward, and the Comprehensive Plan including pedestrian-friendly spaces and cultural spaces that are publicly available to all. Daily added comparative research of college towns like Bloomington, including Iowa City, State College, and Burlington that had pedestrian malls. She described many solutions to concerns that Bloomington could consider. Rosenbarger said pedestrian malls had positive economic development, increased walking and biking, and revitalized public spaces. Steve Volan, Transportation Commission (TC) Chair, said that while staff had made a negative recommendation for the ordinance, the TC concluded that the ordinance was broadly consistent with the TC's criteria for analysis and review. The TC forwarded a positive recommendation to council by a 5-1 vote.

Stosberg asked for clarification on the two motions that failed to pass at the TC. Volan said one was to adopt a neutral recommendation and the second was to adopt a negative recommendation. Flaherty, TC commissioner, noted there were four codified sets of criteria by which the TC assessed proposals. Council Administrator/Attorney Larry Allen referenced the set of criteria in code.

Zack Ammerman spoke against the administration's resistance to closing Kirkwood to cars. Hilary Martel supported a more pedestrian-friendly Kirkwood, but not car-less, and provided reasons. Hartzell Martel spoke against the permanent closure of Kirkwood and supported closures during special events. Christopher Emge discussed funds, and concerns of come businesses. Chris Sturbaum commented about failures of pedestrian-only streets. Carole Canfield spoke against closing Kirkwood to cars. Ted Polley favored a seasonal car-less Kirkwood working towards a permanent pedestrian only Kirkwood. Claire Woods supported a pedestrian-only Kirkwood. Dave Huber spoke in favor of making downtown and Kirkwood more friendly to pedestrians. Joan Middendorf commented in support of a seasonal closure of Kirkwood to cars working towards a permanent closure. John Santos noted that cars were needed to bring pedestrians to the downtown and urged the city to do the closure properly, like potentially closing during the fall when students were in town. Jami Scholl supported sustainability. Paul Gillard spoke in favor of seasonal closure. Paul Rousseau discussed options for older people being able to access Kirkwood. Jessica [Last Name Unknown] urged council to keep Kirkwood open to cars. Tessa Donohue commented in favor of pedestrian-friendly Kirkwood and frequently walked and biked to the downtown. Alex Jorck supported the closure of Kirkwood to cars. Katie Yoder spoke in favor of the proposal.

Rollo recognized there were mixed opinions; he noted many things to consider. He preferred to table the proposal so more discussion could be had. Zulich would like to see a carless Kirkwood, but it had not been successful the previous year and there were other corridors in the city that needed improvements. She would not support the legislation. Stosberg discussed her thoughts on the pros and cons of pedestrian malls and whether Kirkwood should be car-less. She spoke about the successes of peer cities, parking concerns, year-long closure to vehicles, and other downtown streets that could be considered. She noted that proposed legislation was necessary to force the hand of the administration. Piedmont-Smith agreed with most points made that evening. She was concerned with changing code prior to having discussions on how to implement a successful car-less Kirkwood. Flaherty appreciated the conversation that evening which had been similar to previous years. He believed great things could be done in the city, especially a shared street between the courthouse square and Sample Gates. He commented on funding, studies, a redesign of Kirkwood, committing to ensuring success for a shared street, and the administration's resistance to the proposal. Ruff appreciated the discussion and work on the proposal. He often walked and biked, and discussed fiscal realities to contend with. Rosenbarger read from a resident's email in support of a pedestrian-only Kirkwood and noted local restaurants that had closed. The Commission on Sustainability and Resilience had unanimously passed a resolution to encourage council to have a car-free Kirkwood. She gave reasons to support the proposal. Daily explained the extensive work she and Rosenbarger had done on the proposal. She noted that students were in Bloomington during parts of the closure, and gave various reasons in support of the proposal including investing into

For Approval

things like shade, et cetera. Piedmont-Smith discussed the impacts from the loss of revenue from property taxes, blocks not being active the previous year, and wondered about the cost of investing into a successful car-less Kirkwood. She noted concerns from Leslie Davis, Council on Community Accessibility (CCA); closing Kirkwood to cars disproportionately affected people with disabilities.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-12 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5 (Asare, Daily, Flaherty, Rollo, Rosenbarger), Nays: 4 (Stosberg, Piedmont-Smith, Zulich, Ruff), Abstain: 0.

7.3. Resolution 2026-09

To Adopt the Monroe County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-09 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-09 be adopted.

Jamie Neibel, Monroe County Emergency Management Director, explained how the plan originated. Stosberg noted errors in the plan and asked about the committee members. Neibel stated that an invite was sent to stakeholders, but attendance was not required. Rollo asked if it was required to only work with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Neibel clarified that there were many other plans for different types of emergencies, including a pandemic. Piedmont-Smith referenced Perry Township's report regarding tornadoes and ~~Niebel~~ Neibel said she and her deputy had read the plan. Neibel explained that the plans were not widely shared as a precaution against nefarious entities.

There was no public comment.

Zulich urged councilmembers to tour the emergency management center. Stosberg said that the ESD department would be able to apply for grants if the city had the plan in place.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2026-09 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Daily moved and Stosberg seconded to move Ordinance 2026-13 next on the agenda. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Rosenbarger out of the room).

7.4. Ordinance 2026-13

To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Regarding Loans Between Utilities

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-13 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Rosenbarger out of the room). Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-13 be adopted.

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-13. Stosberg presented the amendment which addressed clarity in the wording of the legislation.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment updates Section 1 to clarify language on establishing Cash Reserve Fund and City utilities ability to make monthly deposits of surplus earnings.

For Approval

There were no council questions. There was no public comment. There were no council comments.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-13 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Rosenbarger out of the room).

There were no council questions. There was no public comment. There were no council comments.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-13 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Rosenbarger, Ruff out of the room).

7.5. Resolution 2026-11

Authorizing the Allocation of the Jack Hopkins Social Services Program Funds for the Year 2026 and Related Matters

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-11 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Ruff out of the room).

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-11 be adopted.

Daily presented the legislation and explained the process of the program and review of applications. Zulich asked if any agencies were denied funding and Daily said there were two that did not meet the criteria for funding. Council discussed funding criteria, scope, and the prioritization of types of funding which included operational costs.

Jami Scholl suggested having more time to submit applications. Carole Canfield spoke against giving money to Planned Parenthood. Joan Middendorf spoke in favor of Planned Parenthood.

Rollo appreciated that the administration raised the funding for JHSSF to $500,000 and noted that inflation affected that amount. Stosberg spoke in favor of Planned Parenthood. Zulich supported Planned Parenthood and the LGBTQ+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Queer, Plus) community and wished all a Happy Pride.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2026-11 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7.6. Resolution 2026-12

Establishing Rules and Guidelines for Alcohol Permit Districts

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-12 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. Piedmont-Smith and Stosberg said they would vote no because the deadline for materials had not been met. Zulich stated that she would vote yes because staff were ready to present. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Stosberg, Piedmont-Smith), Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Resolution 2026-12 be adopted.

Asare passed the gavel to Zulich.

Asare presented the legislation highlighting key points in state code, processes, and guidelines. There was discussion on the discretion in the evaluation criteria, definitions, recommendations for liquor licenses, things to consider and who decided, and council's role. There was additional discussion on

For Approval

the proposal, concerns, processes, and timelines. It was noted that council did not issue the liquor licenses but could make provisions for how the licenses were issued. Living wage ordinance

compliance and which city department would be responsible were factors. Preference for bodegas and restaurants was ideal as well as having a framework for future discussions. Larry Allen, Council Administrator/Attorney, clarified state code, types of liquor licenses, districts, written commitments, applications, and more.

Steve Volan spoke in favor of Resolution 2026-12 and council's role. He gave various examples. Aubrey Williams, Heartworks Brewery, supported Resolution 2026-12. Galen Cassady gave many reasons in support of the proposal. Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, spoke in favor of Resolution 2026-12.

Stosberg moved and Asare seconded to postpone the legislation until the next Regular Session on July 22, 2026 at 6:30pm. There was brief discussion on actions council could take. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Zulich passed the gavel back to Asare.

7.7. Ordinance 2026-14

To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" to Require Councilmember Sponsorship of Legislation Under Chapter 2.04

Daily moved and ~~Zulich~~ Stosberg seconded that Ordinance 2026-14 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Zulich), Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-14 be adopted.

There were no council questions. There was no public comment.

Stosberg and Piedmont-Smith stated the purpose of the ordinance. Flaherty thanked the Committee on Council Processes for their work.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-14 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Asare, Rosenbarger), Abstain: 0.

8. Additional Public Comment [11:22pm]

Jami Scholl spoke about food resilience and challenges agriculture faced.

9. Council Schedule [11:26pm]

Asare mentioned the joint meeting with the county the following day. Stosberg noted the upcoming Fiscal Committee meeting.

10. Adjournment [11:27pm]

Asare adjourned the meeting.

For Approval

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this day: of , 2026.

APPROVE:

Signature of Isak Nti Asare, Common Council President

ATTEST:

Signature of City Clerk Nicole Bolden

Clerk's Note: The above minutes summarize the motions passed and issues discussed rather than providing a verbatim account of every word spoken. Bloomington Common Council meetings can be accessed on the following websites:

- Community Access Television Services[1] (CATS)
- City of Bloomington YouTube[2]

Background materials and packets[3] are available on the Common Council website.

For Approval

[1] https://catstv.net
[2] https://youtube.com/@citybloomington
[3] https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings

Bloomington Common Council-Regular Session
Bloomington Council Chambers, City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana
Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 6:30pm

Council President Isak Nti Asare called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call: (*indicates participation via Zoom) [6:31pm]

Council Members:	
Isak Nti Asare	At-Large, Council President
Courtney Daily	District 5, Council Parliamentarian
Matt Flaherty*	At-Large
Isabel Piedmont-Smith	District 1
Dave Rollo	District 4
Kate Rosenbarger*	District 2
Andy Ruff (arrived at 6:35pm)	At-Large
Hopi Stosberg	District 3
Sydney Zulich (absent)	District 6, Council Vice President

City staff, officials, and guests present:	
Nicole Bolden	City Clerk
Larry Allen	Common Council, Attorney (temporary)
Michael Wagenaar	O'Neill Leadership Program Fellow
Emma Williams	Monroe County Human Rights Commission, Chair
Nathan Ferreira	Bloomington Housing Authority, Executive Director
Chris Cashman	Ice Miller, Bond Counsel

2. Agenda Summation [6:32pm]

Council President Asare summarized the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes [6:32pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

4. Reports [6:32pm]

4.1. Councilmembers:

Stosberg spoke about infrastructure in Belize versus Bloomington.

Piedmont-Smith expressed disappointment that there was not a land swap for the College Square and Seminary Pointe sites.

Asare spoke about the local media site the Bloomingtonian, which was removed from Facebook by artificial intelligence (AI), and a potential hate crime or attack at the People's Market.

4.2. The Mayor, City Clerk, City Offices, and City Boards and Commissions:

Emma Williams, Monroe County Human Rights Commission, Chair, presented the 2026 Human Rights Awards. Melanie Davis was the recipient of the 2026 Individual Human Rights Award. Mother Hubbard's Cupboard received the 2026 Organizational Human Rights Award.

4.3. Council Committees:

For Approval

There were no reports from council committees.

4.4. Public:

Jody Madeira, Monroe County Commissioner, and Julie Thomas, Monroe County Commissioner, asked council for a land swap or sale of the Hopewell site for use as a new county jail. Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, spoke about the city's permitting process audit. Megan Betz, Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, spoke about upcoming programs.

5. Appointments to Boards and Commissions [6:54pm]

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

6. Legislation for First Reading [6:54pm]

6.1. Ordinance 2026-15

Amending Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Regarding Establishment of the Fire Merit Commission *Council Sponsor - CM Zulich*

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Ordinance 2026-15 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to discuss Ordinance 2026-15. The motion to discuss Ordinance 2026-15 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Council Attorney Larry Allen presented the legislation. The ordinance updated language in Title 2 to reflect that the Board of Public Safety no longer had oversight over the Fire Department due to the new Fire Merit Commission and added language about the new commission.

Wes Martin, Bloomington Firefighters Local 586 Political Action Committee, President, spoke in support of the ordinance.

Stosberg moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to postpone consideration of Ordinance 2026-15 until the next Regular Session to be held on July 29, 2026 at 6:30pm. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7. Legislation for Second Reading and Resolutions [7:01pm]

7.1. Resolution 2026-12

Establishing Rules and Guidelines for Alcohol Permit Districts *Council Sponsor - CM Asare*

Asare asked council to not introduce but to postpone Resolution 2026-12 due to a large amount of feedback and lack of time to address it. Allen suggested tabling the resolution indefinitely.

Daily moved, and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 2026-12 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Stosberg seconded that Resolution 2026-12 be adopted.

For Approval

Stosberg moved and Daily seconded to table Resolution 2026-12 indefinitely. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7.2. Resolution 2026-13

Authorizing Issuance of Bonds for the Bloomington Housing Authority *Council Sponsor - CM Zulich*

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 2026-13 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 2026-13 be adopted.

Nathan Ferreira, Bloomington Housing Authority (BHA), Executive Director, and Chris Cashman, Ice Miller, Bond Counsel, presented the legislation. Cashman said the bonds would be issued under the local housing authority and explained the approval and bonds issuance process. Ferreira gave an overview of the properties and the scope of the project. The apartments were intended as workforce housing and would create a pipeline for future low-income tax credit deals, as revenue from the US Department of Housing & Urban Development had become less dependable.

Piedmont-Smith and Stosberg asked about the bond repayment timeline and amount. Cashman and Ferreira spoke about assuming debt versus paying debt off. The project would be partially funded by assuming the existing debt, and the remainder would be bond financed. Flaherty asked about workforce housing stability and proposal risks. Ferreira spoke about landlord issues and property management capacities. There was discussion on the property selection process, Seminary Pointe, BHA's authority limits, and resolution wording.

Mary Morgan, Heading Home of South Central Indiana, Executive Director, supported the project. Randy Cassaday expressed concern about property tax-exempt status and revenue impact. Kevin Keough stated finance concerns.

Piedmont-Smith asked about property tax-exempt status. Ferreira stated the properties were tax-exempt. Stosberg questioned the council's involvement. Cashman explained it was Indiana state statute, and Allen gave further context. Asare asked follow-up questions on risk, and Ferreira and Cashman responded in detail. There was further discussion on BHA approval, due diligence, and flexibility. Stosberg commented on the Kingston Manor Apartments and supported the resolution. Piedmont-Smith spoke in support of the resolution. Flaherty supported the legislation and commented on the council and BHA's relationship. Asare stated the project was bold but shrewd and he was supportive.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2026-13 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7.3. Ordinance 2026-12

To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Vehicles and Traffic" to Seasonally Provide a Carless Kirkwood *Council Sponsor - CM Daily and Rosenbarger*

Clerk's note: On June 10, 2026, the council passed Ordinance 2026-12 by roll call vote of Ayes: 5 (Asare, Daily, Flaherty, Rollo, Rosenbarger); Nays: 4 (Stosberg, Piedmont-Smith, Zulich, Ruff); Abstain: 0. On June 19, 2026, Mayor Kerry Thomson vetoed the legislation.

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Ordinance 2026-12 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

For Approval

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Ordinance 2026-12 be adopted.

Rosenbarger presented the ordinance. She and Daily were aware the legislation would not have the votes to overturn the mayoral veto and were disappointed. The ordinance sought to make the Kirkwood vehicle closures a predictable occurrence, and she spoke about her positive experience working with and hearing from residents on the project. She spoke about accessibility and working with the Council for Community Accessibility. The ordinance was recommended by the Bloomington Commission on Sustainability & Resilience, the Transportation Commission, and the majority of councilmembers voted in favor of the proposal. 90% of respondents to a 2025 survey for program participants favored closing Kirkwood to cars. She gave examples of cities with similar programs and commented on the state's CreatINg Places grant program.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the CreatING Places grant. Rosenbarger gave further details.

Paul Rousseau appreciated Rosenbarger's comments and thanked those involved. Steve Volan, Transportation Commission, commented on the Transportation Commission's vote, a Downtown Circulator, and revenue from increasing parking meter rates. Buff Brown commented on his experience in transportation advocacy and city planning, urging the council to activate Kirkwood and close it to vehicles.

Daily and Rosenbarger were cosponsors and had decided to pause the ordinance after the mayoral veto, but they had received much positive community outreach so were bringing it before council again. Daily reiterated that there was money in the budget set aside for Kirkwood. Flaherty spoke about Kirkwood being the ideal location for the program and the proposal was in alignment with the Climate Action Plan. He expressed concerns about conflation of car access with accessibility, and quoted data stating that car-heavy cities were more dangerous for people with disabilities. There needed to be policy certainty for business owners to plan for, and most challenges were solvable. Asare spoke about lack of trust in city government to follow through with plans. Economic development conversations consistently included attracting a young workforce, and that target demographic was excited about a closed Kirkwood. Problems were opportunities for innovation, and doing nothing would not achieve the Bloomington they were trying to become. Stosberg said she was tempted to change her vote due to concerns over the mayor and legislative body power, but she would vote no because administration/council collaboration was required for success for a pedestrian-friendly Kirkwood. She preferred collaboration over adversarial debate. Rollo had previously supported the ordinance but would not vote yes because it would not succeed without community buy-in. An adversarial act of overriding a veto would not move the project forward, and there were divided community opinions. Ruff agreed with Rollo and spoke about riding his bike in Bloomington, feeling that it was less safe to bike on Kirkwood during the closure. He appreciated the enthusiasm but felt the program's positive impact was exaggerated. He had previously voted yes for the closure but had since heard from businesses and residents in opposition of the proposal. Piedmont-Smith spoke positively about pedestrian zones in Germany. Local governments in Indiana were facing decreased revenue due to changes by the Indiana General Assembly. She needed to be a steward of taxpayer dollars and would vote no. She had hesitations about collaborating with the administration due to prior experiences, but collaboration was possible. Rosenbarger thanked Asare and Flaherty for their comments. She stated that the mayor had failed to collaborate with the council. The point of the ordinance was to encourage the mayor to work with council. Kirkwood was platted 100 years ago and was not planned for cars. Council needed to take action on initiatives as opposed to continuing to pay for studies and talk about taking action and not doing so.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-12 received a roll call vote: Ayes: 4 (Asare, Daily, Flaherty, Rosenbarger); Nays: 4 (Stosberg, Piedmont-Smith, Rollo, Ruff); Abstain: 0. FAILED

8. Additional Public Comment [9:24pm]

For Approval

There was no additional public comment.

9. Council Schedule [9:24pm]

Asare reviewed the council's upcoming schedule. Stosberg mentioned the Fiscal Committee's upcoming meeting, and Piedmont-Smith stated the Committee on Council Processes schedule.

10. Adjournment [9:25pm]

Asare adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this day: of , 2026.

APPROVE:

Signature of Isak Nti Asare, Common Council President

ATTEST:

Signature of City Clerk Nicole Bolden

Clerk's Note: The above minutes summarize the motions passed and issues discussed rather than providing a verbatim account of every word spoken. Bloomington Common Council meetings can be accessed on the following websites:

- Community Access Television Services[1] (CATS)
- City of Bloomington YouTube[2]

Background materials and packets[3] are available on the Common Council website.

For Approval

[1] https://catvstv.net
[2] https://youtube.com/@citybloomington
[3] https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings

Bloomington Common Council-Regular Session Minutes
Bloomington Council Chambers, City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana
Wednesday, July 29, 2026 at 6:30pm

Council President Isak Nti Asare called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call: (*indicates participation via Zoom) [6:30pm]

Council Members:	
Isak Nti Asare	At-Large, Council President
Courtney Daily	District 5, Council Parliamentarian
Matt Flaherty	At-Large
Isabel Piedmont-Smith	District 1
Dave Rollo*	District 4
Kate Rosenbarger* (joined at 6:33pm)	District 2
Andy Ruff (absent)	At-Large
Hopi Stosberg	District 3
Sydney Zulich	District 6, Council Vice President

City staff, officials, and guests present:	
Jennifer Crossley	Deputy Clerk
Larry Allen	~~Council Administrator/~~Common Council Attorney (temporary)
Michael Wagenaar	O'Neill Leadership Program Fellow
Geoff McKim	Controller
Sharr Pechac	Human Resources, Director

2. Agenda Summation [6:31pm]

Council President Asare summarized the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes [6:32pm]

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to approve the amended minutes of January 7, 2026, January 14, 2026, February 4, 2026, February 25, 2026, and March 31, 2026. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

4. Reports [6:32pm]

4.1. Councilmembers:

Piedmont-Smith spoke about the 250th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and read part of a poem by Amanda Gorman titled "In This Place, An American Lyric."

Rollo reported on the recent escape of OpenAI's model where advanced autonomous agents broke out of their secured servers and discovered a software flaw,~~,~~immediately hacking a network called Hugging Face. The AI used stolen credentials, chained multiple attack vectors together to execute remote code on servers. He cautioned that powerful AI could act completely on its own, bypassing safety limits, and intruding on an outside company. He called for a moratorium on the development of AI superintelligence and urged people to contact their representatives.

Stosberg noted that Lynn Coyne was appointed interim director of Planning and Transportation at a recent Plan Commission meeting. She said she would be at the Democrat's booth at the Farmer's

For Approval

Market in a couple weeks. She would submit a written report from the Fiscal Committee containing information from the Reedy Financial Group presented at a recent meeting. She spoke about

the discussion on a location for a new jail and referenced Piedmont-Smith's letter to county commissioners. She said the commissioners had not participated in working groups over the summer.

4.2. The Mayor, City Clerk, City Offices, and City Boards and Commissions:

There were no reports.

4.3. Council Committees:

Piedmont-Smith reported from the Committee on Council Processes. Memberships on the Transportation Commission and Environmental Commissions and Title 2 updates were discussed.

4.4. Public:

There was no public comment.

5. Appointments to Boards and Commissions [6:45pm]

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

6. Legislation for First Reading [6:45pm]

6.1. Ordinance 2026-16

To Amend an Ordinance Fixing the Salaries of Officers and Employees of the Police and Fire Departments for the City of Bloomington, Indiana for the Year 2026 Council Sponsor - N/A

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-16 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Deputy Clerk Jennifer Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to discuss Ordinance 2026-16. The motion to discuss Ordinance 2026-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Sharr Pechac, Human Resources Director, presented the legislation and noted errors and transposed numbers in the ordinance. She would submit an amendment correcting the errors for the second reading of the legislation. She gave a background on the Workforce Evaluation and Realignment Committee (WERC) process that allowed department directors to adjust job duties, reporting, and distribution of workload. The requests were to be net neutral with no new funding. She highlighted key changes for the Bloomington Police Department (BPD) including a new lieutenant position.

Piedmont-Smith asked about future funding of the new position. Geoff McKim, Controller, said it was not a new position, it converted a sergeant to a lieutenant. There was discussion on the number of staff in BPD, and duties, compared to other cities. Flaherty asked for clarification on the instructions to directors regarding the net neutral request, given that, for BPD, there would be an increase in personnel funding in future years. Flaherty noted no other director had submitted a request. Pechac stated that had been communicated clearly to all directors and in cabinet meetings, too.

There was no public comment.

For Approval

Stosberg looked forward to clarification on the questions and errors in the legislation at second reading. Asare said it would be informative to have more information on the distribution of job duties in BPD at their current staffing level.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to present Ordinance 2026-16 for second reading at the next Regular Session to be held on August 5, 2026 at 6:30pm. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

6.2. Ordinance 2026-17

To Amend the 2026 Salary Ordinance of Appointed Officers, Non-Union, and A.F.S.C.M.E. Employees for All Departments of the City of Bloomington, Indiana Council Sponsor - N/A

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-17 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to discuss Ordinance 2026-17. The motion to discuss Ordinance 2026-17 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Pechac presented the legislation and noted there were typos so an amendment would be forthcoming at second reading. There were eight requests that impacted the salary ordinance. Utilities, Human Resources (HR), and Public Works had submitted requests. She highlighted details on each request including fiscal impacts. Piedmont-Smith asked who was on WERC and assessed requests. Pechac stated it was primarily HR and the Office of the Controller, with some assistance from the Office of the Mayor. There was discussion on human resource systems, clarification on the total requests such as part-time positions that did not affect the salary ordinance, justification for the requests, shifts in job duties and direct reports, and overall effects on the budget. Pechac noted that directors only had opportunities to adjust the salary ordinance, job duties, et cetera once per year. She had hoped to have gotten the requests done earlier in the year, but WERC had been a complex process. There was additional discussion on opportunities for directors to submit requests and clarification on offsetting personnel funding and duties in Utilities and Public Works.

There was no public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said the fiscal impact should be calculated beyond the current year. Rosenbarger agreed. Asare noted that departments could offset any fiscal impact by cutting funds in other areas. Stosberg said the fiscal impact beyond the current year could highlight where the cuts might occur.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded to present Ordinance 2026-17 for second reading at the next Regular Session to be held on August 5, 2026 at 6:30pm. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7. Legislation for Second Reading and Resolutions [7:45pm]

7.1. Ordinance 2026-15

Amending Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Regarding Establishment of the Fire Merit Commission Council Sponsor - CM Zulich

For Approval

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-15 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that ~~Resolution~~Ordinance 2026-15 be adopted.

Chris Wheeler, Legal, Assistant City Attorney/Senior Assistant City Attorney, presented the legislation and gave a background on the commission and proposed updates to code like clarifying that the Board of Public Safety no longer had the authority to hire, promote, or discipline fire members.

There were no council questions. There was no public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said Ordinance 2026-15 could have been on a consent agenda. Consent agendas were being considered by the Committee on Council Processes.

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

8. Additional Public Comment [7:50pm]

There was no additional public comment.

9. Council Schedule [7:51pm]

There was no discussion on the council's upcoming schedule.

10. Adjournment [7:51pm]

Asare adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this day: of , 2026.

APPROVE:

Signature of Isak Nti Asare, Common Council President

ATTEST:

Signature of City Clerk Nicole Bolden

Clerk's Note: The above minutes summarize the motions passed and issues discussed rather than providing a verbatim account of every word spoken. Bloomington Common Council meetings can be accessed on the following websites:

- Community Access Television Services[1] (CATS)
- City of Bloomington YouTube[2]

Background materials and packets[3] are available on the Common Council website.

[1] https://catstv.net
[2] https://youtube.com/@citybloomington
[3] https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings

For Approval

For Approval

Bloomington Common Council-Regular Session Minutes
Bloomington Council Chambers, City Hall, 401 North Morton Street, Bloomington, Indiana
Wednesday, August 5, 2026 at 6:30pm

Council President Isak Nti Asare called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call: (*indicates participation via Zoom) [6:33pm]

Council Members:	
Isak Nti Asare	At-Large, Council President
Courtney Daily	District 5, Council Parliamentarian
Matt Flaherty (absent)	At-Large
Isabel Piedmont-Smith	District 1
Dave Rollo*	District 4
Kate Rosenbarger	District 2
Andy Ruff	At-Large
Hopi Stosberg	District 3
Sydney Zulich	District 6, Council Vice President

City staff, officials, and guests present:	
Nicole Bolden	City Clerk
Larry Allen	Common Council, Attorney (temporary)
Michael Wagenaar	Common Council, O'Neill Leadership Program Fellow
Geoff McKim	City Controller
Sharr Pechac	Human Resources, Director
Desiree DeMolina	Office of the Mayor, Communications Director
Jane Kupersmith	Economic & Sustainable Development, Director
Michael Diekhoff	Police Department, Chief
Jeff Andreasen	aQity Research & Insights, President
Lauren Sturdivant	Walker Consultants, Planner
John Martens	Walker Consultants, Senior Consultant
Michelle Wahl	Parking Services, Director

2. Agenda Summation [6:33pm]

Council President Asare summarized the agenda.

Piedmont-Smith moved and Daily seconded to amend the agenda to move any reports about hiring, which was under item #5, to council committee reports under #4. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

3. Approval of Minutes [6:33pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

4. Reports [6:37pm]

4.1. Councilmembers:

Stosberg announced she would be available for conversations at the upcoming farmer's market.

Zulich expressed displeasure in the change of neighborhood parking permit distribution to include only residents living in a single-family unit. The last-minute change took those affected by surprise,

For Approval

and local government had a responsibility to inform people in a timely manner. The government should not dictate who can own a car based on the type of residence they live in.

Piedmont-Smith announced her monthly constituent meeting and spoke about the recent Redevelopment Commission (RDC) meeting, where they discussed a new Hopewell economic development area and proposals for the College Square site. She expressed disappointment with the options and asked RDC to issue a new call for proposals.

Rosenbarger spoke about vehicle ownership in Bloomington.

4.2. The Mayor, City Clerk, City Offices, and City Boards and Commissions:

Piedmont-Smith ~~(roll call sheet says Stosberg made the motion)~~ moved and Daily seconded to amend the rules to allow members of the public to comment on the Parking Study report and the community survey report during the first period of open public comment. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Mayor Kerry Thomson presented a general report to the council. She highlighted two recent accreditations, one for Public Works and another for the Police Department. She gave an update on Showers West tenancy and Readi 2.0 grant funding.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on the Readi 2.0 grant.

Desiree DeMolina, Communications Director, Office of the Mayor, introduced Jeff Andreasen, President, from aQity Research & Insights, who presented the Community Survey results. The survey included a random sample of Bloomington residents, weighted to focus on permanent residents and not on Indiana University (IU) students. 72% of respondents were likely to recommend Bloomington as a place to live. Restaurants, outdoor spaces, ease of getting around, and being a college town were rated as the highest strengths. Most commonly stated weaknesses were expensive housing, number of unhoused people, and issues with city services including transparency, street conditions, and drinking water.

Asare extended the time for the section for mayoral reports by 20 minutes with no objections.

Stosberg expressed concern about mismatch between Bloomington census data and survey respondents. Significantly more respondents stated they were homeowners and/or lived in single-family homes than census data reflected, and the previous 2023 survey was more aligned with the census. Andreasen said the sample was designed to be representative of year-round residents as they are taxpayers and more engaged/familiar with the community compared to IU students. Stosberg stated that while individual students may change, student needs remained consistent and excluding them from the survey was a disservice. Zulich agreed with Stosberg and asked how the survey firm was chosen. DeMolina explained the process and stated the 2023 survey questions received many critiques. Andreasen said surveys conducted with students received a low response rate. Asare asked about the final response rate and asked if it was statistically valid. Andreasen said it was 4-5%. Low student response rate could invalidate statistical confidence. Rosenbarger spoke about prior work in evaluation and said it was difficult to get scientifically valid responses, expressing concern about the 4-5% response rate. The respondents appeared to be the same category of people who already went to public meetings. Piedmont-Smith expressed concern about screen reader accessibility in the slide presentation and survey question wording.

Asare extended the time for the section for mayoral reports by 5 minutes with no objections.

Ruff asked about comparable data in other similar cities. Andreasen stated the firm did not have comparison data because Bloomington was a unique city. Stosberg spoke about her responsibility to her constituents and her disappointment with the study. Zulich said the study was not a responsible

For Approval

use of taxpayer money and it eliminated future long-term residents from shaping the future of the city. Asare thanked Andreasen and DeMolina.

Asare extended the time for the section for mayoral reports by 20 minutes with no objections.

Michelle Wahl, Parking Services Director, introduced Lauren Sturdivant and John Martens from Walker Consultants, who presented the Parking Rate Study and Comprehensive Review. The study looked at downtown parking and recommendations were made based on stakeholder meetings and surveys, city data, and best practices. Key findings included that parking rates were low, technology was outdated, communication was confusing, and there was a need for transparency. Organizational recommendations included centralizing parking citations appeals within Parking Services and establishing a parking services mission statement and a data-driven approach; Policy recommendations included zone-based pricing, increasing parking rates, and reducing enforcement hours; Operations recommendations included replacing outdated technology, using multi-space kiosks, and implementing mobile license plate reader (LPR) technology; and Communications recommendations included a recognizable logo, communications campaign, and improved signage.

Piedmont-Smith stated former councilmember Steve Volan recommended zone-based parking rates years ago and expressed concern about LPR technology. Rollo asked about parking technology issues. Martens said there were over 1,400 physical meters/devices and maintaining them was expensive and labor-intensive. Stosberg asked about parking turnover and implementing 2-hour parking zones. Martens spoke about the limitations of using data from Parkmobile and individual meters. Rosenbarger asked about hourly rate recommendations. Martens stated the rate had not increased in a long time and recommended a ten year timeline increase.

Asare extended the time for the section for mayoral reports by 20 minutes with no objections.

Clerk Nicole Bolden commented on the parking study. The parking citation appeals were in the Clerk's Office due to judicial order after Dan Combs sued the city. She expressed concerns with data errors, generalities, and misstatements, and suggested council ask for additional information before accepting the recommendation to move appeals to Parking Services. While the report said the appeal response rate was 2-4 weeks, the actual median response rate was 3 days. Appeals had increased due to legislative and enforcement changes, and parkmobile user error. The Clerk's Office had subject matter experts in parking, and broad statements unsupported by data were inaccurate and unhelpful.

Zulich asked if Bolden was consulted during the study. Bolden stated they had a one-hour conversation at the beginning of the study. Asare asked about action needed on the report.

4.3. Council Committees:

Stosberg reported from the Fiscal Committee on potential local income tax estimates. Due to changes in state law regarding property taxes, revenues would be significantly decreased for local government units, especially for the local school district and the public library.

4.4. Public:

Steve Volan, Transportation Commission, Chair, expressed disappointment that the Community Survey de-emphasized students and stated the Transportation Commission would take a vote on the study recommendations in September. Terry Amsler commented on the Community Survey methodologies. Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, spoke about upcoming chamber events and commented on the 2027 proposed city budget. Paul Rousseau commented on the Community Survey and stated it was necessary to capture the views of IU students despite the difficulty. Kevin Keough expressed disappointment with the Community Survey.

For Approval

5. Appointments to Boards and Commissions [8:42pm]

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

6. Legislation for First Reading [8:42pm]

6.1. Ordinance 2026-18

Adopting Guidelines and Requiring Formal Written Commitments as a Condition of Eligibility for On-Premises Alcoholic Beverage Permits within Eligible Statutory Districts Council Sponsor - CM Asare

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-18 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Asare passed the gavel to Zulich.

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to discuss Ordinance 2026-18. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Asare and Jane Kupersmith, Economic and Sustainable Development, Director, presented the legislation. Asare stated it would establish a clear and transparent process for businesses seeking certain alcohol permits. The city would determine which establishments should be eligible, and the Indiana Alcohol & Tobacco Commission had the final authority to issue the permits. There was much engagement with local business owners, and the ordinance would set a framework for the process. Kupersmith gave examples of other cities with successful programs, and stated Bloomington had a high number of visitors, and demand exceeded supply. It was difficult for restaurants to stay open in Bloomington, and were cost-burdened if they had to purchase a permit secondhand. Bloomington received three new, non-quota permits from Indiana Senate Bill 89 earlier in the year. The non-quota permits must be renewed annually and could not be sold or transferred.

Stosberg expressed approval of the ordinance and offered comments on the legislation, including on the living wage ordinance compliance. Piedmont-Smith expressed appreciation for council involvement and said the evaluation criteria was vague. Rosenbarger was excited about fewer barriers for restaurants but wished that more bars would be eligible. Asare spoke about resident concerns with bars and expounded upon the goal of the ordinance. There was discussion on eligibility criteria.

Galen Cassady, Uptown Cafe, co-owner, stated the ordinance provided a lower barrier of entry for talented young operators to open a business. He expressed disdain that current permit holders may oppose the ordinance because new permits would reduce the scarcity value of their own permit. Randy Cassaday supported the ordinance and spoke about Taste of Bloomington. Christopher Emge, Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support for the ordinance.

Daily moved and Asare seconded to send Ordinance 2026-18 to second reading on September 2nd, 2026. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Zulich passed the gavel to Asare.

7. Legislation for Second Reading and Resolutions [9:07pm]

7.1. Ordinance 2026-16

To Amend an Ordinance Fixing the Salaries of Officers and Employees of the Police and Fire Departments for the City of Bloomington, Indiana for the Year 2026 Council Sponsor - N/A

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-16 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-16 be adopted.

Sharr Pechac, Human Resources, Director, had previously presented the ordinance.

Piedmont-Smith moved and Zulich seconded to introduce Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-16.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment updates proposed Ordinance 2026-16 to correct typos and inadvertently transposed numbers.

There was no public comment on Amendment 01. There was no council comment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Pechac recapped the ordinance and answered questions previously asked by council. Controller Geoff McKim provided context on cost, position impact, and budget. Chief Michael Diekhoff, Police Department, addressed the need for the new position.

Stosberg asked about the implication of documents incorrectly stating the number of police sergeants for years. Diekhoff said the position had never been filled, and McKim stated that funding for 14 sergeants had been appropriated by council at least ten years prior, but there appeared to have been a disconnect between the budget as appropriated and the salary ordinance document.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-16 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

7.2. Ordinance 2026-17

To Amend the 2026 Salary Ordinance of Appointed Officers, Non-Union, and A.F.S.C.M.E. Employees for All Departments of the City of Bloomington, Indiana Council Sponsor - N/A

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-17 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Daily moved and Zulich seconded that Ordinance 2026-17 be adopted.

Piedmont-Smith moved and Zulich seconded Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-16~~6~~7.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment updates proposed Ordinance 2026-17 to correct typos and misplaced job positions and titles.

There was no public comment. There was no council comment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2026-17 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Pechac had previously presented the ordinance and answered prior questions that had been asked from council regarding the timing of the ordinance. The requests were made in order to prioritize personnel and operations. McKim spoke about fiscal impacts, stating it would result in future savings and gave examples.

There was no public comment.

Zulich spoke about working with Cassie Werne, Special Projects and Operations Manager. Stosberg thanked Pechac, McKim, and Diekhoff. Rosenbarger asked if the council office had been notified of ~~the salary regarding~~ the opportunity to review staff salaries. Pechac did not remember including the council office and apologized. Piedmont-Smith expressed disappointment and stated that the council did not have more leeway in setting staff salaries. Bolden stated that there were emails from HR about staffing updates that were sent to the clerk and council office in April. Stosberg suggested moving forward with the ordinance and revisiting the council office roles later.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2026-17 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Rosenbarger), Abstain: 0

7.3. Resolution 2026-14

Approval of Amended Legal Representation Agreement for Common Council

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 2026-14 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Asare passed the gavel to Zulich.

Daily moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 2026-14 be adopted.

Asare presented the legislation. The resolution amended a previous resolution that established the council's ability to enter into a contract with interim council attorney Larry Allen. Council was coming to the end of the process of appointing a new council attorney and anticipated overlap between the new attorney and Allen's contracting services.

Piedmont-Smith asked how much the council had paid for the contract. Allen said it was $49,390. Stosberg asked about the not-to-exceed amount. Asare stated that there was enough funds in Line 1 of the budget, and none of the three council staff positions had been filled for several months.

There was no public comment.

Asare spoke about council processes and stated that some needed consideration, such as paying an attorney to attend a meeting and how to staff the office. He stated a lot of the processes were habit, and some inefficiencies were hidden. Councilmembers had expressed concerns about staff's workload and time. He thanked Allen for his services. Piedmont-Smith thanked Allen and spoke about paying rates for and requiring administration work that did not require a Juris Doctorate. Rosenbarger stated it was necessary to have an attorney at council meetings due to adversarial conversations during meetings. She suggested reorganizing some processes such as meeting packet production. She thanked Allen. Stosberg thanked Allen and spoke about staff tasks, stating she had not been able to bring forth most of her legislative initiatives in the past year due to staffing challenges.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2026-14 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Zulich passed the gavel to Asare.

For Approval

8. Additional Public Comment [9:50pm]

There was no additional public comment.

9. Council Schedule [9:50pm]

Asare reviewed the council's upcoming schedule. Stosberg stated there would be a Fiscal Committee meeting discussing elected official salaries.

10. Adjournment [9:52pm]

Asare adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana, upon this day: of , 2026.

APPROVE:

Signature of Isak Nti Asare, Common Council President

ATTEST:

Signature of City Clerk Nicole Bolden

Clerk's Note: The above minutes summarize the motions passed and issues discussed rather than providing a verbatim account of every word spoken. Bloomington Common Council meetings can be accessed on the following websites:

- Community Access Television Services[1] (CATS)
- City of Bloomington YouTube[2]

Background materials and packets[3] are available on the Common Council website.

For Approval

[1] https://catstv.net
[2] https://youtube.com/@citybloomington
[3] https://bloomington.in.gov/council/meetings

Common Council

November 4, 2026
5:30 PM

Council Chambers and Zoom

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

citybloomington

Accessory Dwelling Units

The Department is proposing to adjust the standards for the use “Dwelling, Accessory unit” to allow for attached ADU’s for single family residences to be 1,000 square feet and detached ADU’s to be 1,000 square feet or 75% of the primary structure, whichever is less. This adjustment, as well as adjusting the definition, aligns the Unified Development Ordinance with language within House Bill 1001 that was passed this year.

Cottage Development

The Department is proposing to adjust the standards for the use “Dwelling, Cottage Development” to reduce some of the restrictions for this use that have limited the use of this section of the UDO. This use has seen very limited utilization and provides an opportunity for a housing type that can help increase housing options within the community. The proposed changes would increase the allowable density, remove minimum and maximum project size requirements, and modify some of the related standards.

Use Specific Standards for Duplexes

The Department is proposing to adjust the following standards for the use “Dwelling, Duplex”-

- Remove the limit on the number of duplexes approved per calendar year. The Unified Development Ordinance currently restricts the number of duplexes that can be approved in one calendar year to 15.

- Spatial buffer requirements. There is a 150 foot buffer that is created around each duplex which prohibits the creation of any new duplexes within that buffer for 2 years.

- Removing the restriction on the number of entrances facing a public street for triplex’s and fourplex’s to allow for a townhome style design that is desirable.

- The Department has also added language to state that for the evaluation of the Use Specific standards for duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes that both sides of the street along the block face are included.

Accessory Dwelling Units

SECTION 13. IC 36-7-1-1.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA CODE AS A **NEW** SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2026]: **Sec. 1.5. "Accessory dwelling unit" means a self-contained living unit internal to or on the same lot or parcel as a single family dwelling that:**

(1) does not exceed the lesser of:

(A) seventy-five percent (75%) of the interior habitable area (gross floor area) of the single family dwelling; or

(B) one thousand (1,000) square feet;

(2) includes its own cooking, sleeping, and sanitation facilities; and

(3) complies with or is otherwise exempt from any applicable building codes, fire safety codes, and other public health and safety laws.

The term does not include a manufactured home (as defined in IC 36-7-4-1106(b)) that is subject to the standards and requirements set forth in IC 36-7-4-1106.

Accessory Dwelling Units

"Dwelling, accessory unit (duplex)" means a self-contained living unit internal to or on the same lot or parcel as a “dwelling, duplex” unit that does not exceed the lesser of seventy-five percent (75%) of the smallest interior habitable area (gross floor area) of a unit in of the “dwelling, duplex” ; includes its own cooking, sleeping, and sanitation facilities; and complies with or is otherwise exempt from any applicable building codes, fire safety codes, and other public health and safety laws. The terms does not include a manufactured home (as defined in IC 36-7-4-1106(b)) that is subject to the standards and requirements set forth in IC 36-7-4-1106 .

"Dwelling, accessory unit (single family) " means a self-contained living unit internal to or on the same lot or parcel as a single family dwelling unit that does not exceed the lesser of seventy-five percent (75%) of the interior habitable area (gross floor area) of the single family dwelling or one thousand (1,000) square feet; includes its own cooking, sleeping, and sanitation facilities; and complies with or is otherwise exempt from any applicable building codes, fire safety codes, and other public health and safety laws. The terms does not include a manufactured home (as defined in IC 36-7-4-1106(b)) that is subject to the standards and requirements set forth in IC 36-7-4-1106 . ~~an additional residential dwelling unit, but not a mobile home, camper, or recreational vehicle, that is located on the same lot as a single-family dwelling unit, either within the same building as the single-family dwelling unit or in a detached building. Without limiting the generality of the previous sentence, this definition includes a transportable living unit that meets either the applicable City building code or the construction standards of the Federal Manufactured Housing Act, contains less than five hundred square feet of gross floor area, is mounted on a permanent foundation, and is connected to City utilities as required for other types of dwelling units.~~

Accessory Dwelling Units

(D) Standards for Attached ADUs.

i. The maximum square footage of any attached ADU shall be 1,000 ~~eight hundred forty~~ square feet.

ii. The maximum height of any attached ADU shall be the same as that applicable to the primary dwelling structure in the zoning district where the ADU is located.

iii. Each ADU shall be set back from each property line by at least the same setback distance applicable to the primary dwelling structure in the zoning district where the ADU is located.

(E) Standards for Detached ADUs. Detached ADUs shall meet the architectural and foundation requirements for a single-family dwelling within the applicable zoning district as found in Section 20.04.070(d)(3) (Residential).

i. The maximum gross floor area of the detached ADU portion of any accessory structure for the use "dwelling, single family" shall be ~~eight hundred forty square feet or the maximum square footage allowed for accessory structures permitted by Section 20.03.030(g) (Accessory Uses and Structures), whichever is less.~~ 1,000 square feet or seventy-five (75%) percent of the interior habitable square footage of the primary structure whichever is less. The maximum gross floor area of the detached ADU portion of any accessory structure for the use "dwelling, duplex" shall be 75% of the interior habitable square footage of the primary structure.

Cottage Development

Table 03-2. Cottage Development Bulk and Density Standards

Zoning District	Maximum Density (dwelling units/acre)	~~Minimum Project Size~~	~~Maximum Project Size~~
R1	~~3~~ 9	~~1 acre~~	~~2 acres~~
R2	~~5~~ 24		
R3	~~6~~ 35		
R4	~~11~~ 43		
RM	~~15~~ No Maximum	~~1 acre~~	~~5 acres~~
RH	~~20~~ No Maximum		
RMH	20		
MN	~~15~~ 43		

Cottage Development

(C) Setbacks.

i. Parking Lot. Minimum of thirty feet from the right-of-way.

ii. ~~Minimum Dwelling Separation. Minimum of ten feet between dwelling units.~~

iii. Building Setbacks. Cottage developments shall have their rear setback reduced to 5'. All other setbacks for the project site (not individual units) shall comply with those applicable in the underlying zoning district.

iv. ~~R3 Zoning District.~~ Cottage developments ~~within the R3 zoning district~~ shall include a minimum of one dwelling unit that is built at the build-to-line.

(D) Central Open Space. Each cottage development shall include at least one centrally located open space area of at least ~~four hundred~~ 200 square feet per dwelling unit. Parking areas cannot be counted toward this open space requirement.

(E) Parking and Access.

i. Parking shall be designed to limit curb cuts and most efficiently park vehicles.

ii. Parking may take place on a shared, paved parking lot or in shared driveways.

iii. Shared driveways may access individual garages.

iv. External sidewalks and tree plots with street trees along adjacent public roads are required and internal sidewalks shall connect each cottage to the project external sidewalks ~~Project perimeter sidewalks may be required, and internal walkways shall connect each cottage unit to the project perimeter sidewalks.~~

Cottage Development

(F) Landscaping and Buffering.

i. All cottage developments located in the RM, RH, RMH, or MN districts shall install a bufferyard type 1 along rear and side lot lines if adjacent to R1, R2, R3, or R4 districts per Section 20.04.080 (Landscaping, Buffering, and Fences).

ii. Parking lot landscaping shall be provided per the requirements of Section 20.04.060 (Parking and Loading).

(G) Architecture/Design.

i. All structures shall meet the design standards applicable to single-family homes in the zoning district where the property is located. No more than two units are allowed in one building.

~~ii. Dwelling units shall have a maximum one to three width to depth ratio for the first floor. ¶~~

~~iii. Each unit shall have a maximum cumulative area of one thousand two hundred square feet~~

Duplex changes

(B) Occupancy. Occupancy of each dwelling unit in a duplex dwelling is subject to the definition of "Family" in Chapter 20.07 (Definitions).

(C) Design. In the R1, R2, R3, and R4 zoning districts the following shall apply:

i. Each unit in a newly constructed duplex dwelling shall have a separate exterior entrance facing a public or private street. Duplex dwellings created through renovation or expansion of existing structures shall have at least one exterior entrance facing a public or private street.

ii. The following design elements of the duplex dwelling shall be similar in general shape, size, and design with the majority of existing single-family or duplex structures on the same block face on which it is located (for purposes of this section, both sides of the street along the block face shall be included):

1. Roof pitch and orientation;

2. Front porch width and depth;

3. Front building setback; and

4. Vehicle parking access (i.e., front-, side-, or rear-access garage or parking area).

iii. No duplex dwelling structure shall contain more than six bedrooms total.

(D) ~~Approval. In the R1, R2, and R3 zoning districts, upon Conditional Use approval, a one hundred fifty foot buffer shall be created around the approved duplex dwelling. No newly created or expanded (through addition or habitable space) duplex dwellings shall be allowed in said buffer in the R1, R2, and R3 zoning districts for a period of two years after the date of the Conditional Use approval. For purposes of this section, the one hundred fifty feet shall be measured from the property lines of the parcel receiving approval.~~ ¶

~~(E) Maximum Number. In the R1, R2, and R3 zoning districts, the BZA shall approve a maximum of fifteen duplex dwellings (newly created or expanded through addition or habitable space) per calendar year.~~ ¶

Duplex changes

(4) Dwelling, Triplex and Fourplex.

(A) Generally.

i. The property owner (or HAND registered agent) shall have no Notices of Violation on file in the Planning and Transportation Department for the prior three years at the time of Conditional Use application.

(B) Occupancy. Occupancy of each unit in a triplex and fourplex dwelling is subject to the definition of "Family" in Chapter 20.07 (Definitions).

(C) Design.

i. ~~Triplex and fourplex dwellings shall have a minimum of one exterior entrance and no more than two exterior entrances facing a public or private street.~~ ¶

ii. The following design elements of the triplex or fourplex dwelling shall be similar in general size, shape, and design with the majority of existing structures on the same block face on which it is located:

1. Roof pitch and orientation;

2. Front porch width and depth;

3. Front building setback; and

Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Plan Commission forward this petition to the Common Council with a favorable recommendation.

Memorandum

To: Bloomington Common Council
From: Council Staff
Date: November 4, 2026
Re: Typographical Error Notice – Ordinance 2026-31 (*Attachment A*)

Please note a typographical error in Attachment A of Ordinance 2026-31 (UDO Housing Attainability Amendments):

Location: Chapter 20.07 (Definitions) – “Dwelling, accessory unit (duplex)”

Note: The current draft text in the packet contains a duplicate preposition (“in of the”). The word “in” will be removed as a scrivener's error when the text is prepared for Second Reading and final codification.

Common Council

November 4, 2026
5:30 PM

Council Chambers and Zoom

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

citybloomington

Change In Use Triggers

- Additions to a building
- Additional parking
- Additional dwelling units
- Reuse of a building after previous use abandoned
- Change from one land use to another
- Subdivision

Challenges encountered-

- Cost for improvements and design professional services
- Delay for moving through process
- Burdensome for small business owners

Site Improvements required with Change in Use

- Removal of parking
- New landscaping
- Bicycle parking
- Lighting modifications
- Sidewalks and street trees
- Entrances and Drives
- Dumpster enclosure
- Parking and paving

The proposed amendments modify the activities that trigger compliance and the improvements subsequently required. The proposed changes are described below:

Triggers-

- Removes the requirement that a subdivision requires all involved properties to come into compliance.
- Adjusts the compliance threshold for new building construction on a site with existing buildings. Construction of a new building on a property that is less than 25% of the square footage of existing structures will only trigger limited compliance, rather than full compliance for the site.
- Allows for expansions of parking areas of less than 25% to be exempt from limited and full compliance.
- Adjusts the threshold for building additions. Additions of up to 25% will be exempt from limited and full compliance.
- Adjusts change in use triggers regarding new uses. A new use that is not in the same subheading as the previous use in Table 03-1 will no longer trigger limited compliance.
- Adjusts the abandonment threshold. Improvements to a site will not be triggered by redevelopment unless a property has been vacant for two years.

Impacts-

- Allows existing parking lots with 14 parking spaces or less to not have to remove any parking spaces in situations where limited compliance is triggered.

Change In Use Triggers - Full Compliance

(f) Nonconforming Site Features

A lawfully nonconforming site feature may continue in its existing condition unless and until full or limited compliance with the development standards of this UDO is required. No increase in the degree of nonconformity with any site feature is permitted except as expressly provided in this section.

(1) Full Compliance

A lawful nonconforming site shall be brought into compliance with this UDO with any petition for new building construction or in connection with demolition of existing and construction of new buildings, except that existing nonconforming setbacks, architecture, and height for existing structures and parking can remain.

Change In Use Triggers - Limited Compliance

i. **Nonresidential and Mixed-Use**

1. Any change in use, expansion, enlargement, or relocation of any use;
2. Reestablishment of a prior conforming use that has been discontinued for a period of 12 months or longer; or
3. Expansions, alterations, or modifications that increase the gross floor area of the building by more than 10 cumulative percent, including previous additions approved under any UDO effective since February 12, 2007.

ii. **Multifamily and Group Living**

1. Any expansions, alterations, or modifications to an existing building, with the exception of accessory structures less than 580 square feet, provided that the accessory structure does not increase the degree of nonconformity regarding required maximum impervious surface coverage or required number of parking spaces;
2. Any change in use, or any expansion, enlargement, or relocation of any use; or
3. Any addition of dwelling units.

Change In Use

Use, Change In

Includes, for any portion of a building (excluding individual tenant space in a single building multi-tenant center), structure, or lot:

1) Any change from a residential use to a nonresidential use;
2) Any change from a nonresidential use to multifamily use;
3) Any change from one residential land use to another;
4) Any increase in the number of dwelling units;
5) Any establishment of a use on a previously unused site, or the inclusion of a new use in addition to an existing use;
6) Any use which requires a conditional use approval;
7) Any change from a single-tenant to a multi-tenant center or building;
8) Any use that differs from the previous use of a building or land, as determined by subheadings in Table 03-1: Allowed Use Table, or where the new use differs substantially in the amount of required parking, traffic generation, number or frequency of customers/users, hours of operation, or other similar aspects of the use; and
9) Any establishment of a new use after a previous use has been abandoned, as defined by this UDO.

"Use, change in" includes, for any portion of a building (excluding individual tenant space in a single building multi-tenant center), structure, or lot:

(1) Any change from a residential use to a nonresidential use;

(2) Any change from a nonresidential use to multifamily use;

(3) ~~Any change from one residential land use to another;~~

(4) Any increase of 25% or more in the number of dwelling units;

(5) Any establishment of a use on a previously unused site, or the inclusion of a new use in addition to an existing use;

(6) Any use which requires a Conditional Use Approval;

(7) Any change from a single-tenant to a multi-tenant center or building;

(8) ~~Any use that differs from the previous use of a building or land, as determined by subheadings in Table 03-1 (Allowed Use Table), or where the new use differs substantially in the amount of required parking, traffic generation, number or frequency of customers/users, hours of operation, or other similar aspects of the use; and~~

(9) Any establishment of a new use after a previous use has been abandoned, as defined by this UDO.

Entertainment and Recreation																		
Amenity center	P*	P*	P*	P*	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P					20.03.030(d)(5)
Country club	C										P							
Recreation, indoor			P*	P*	P*	P*		A	C	P	P			P				20.03.030(d)(6)
Recreation, outdoor	C										C	P	P			C		
Sexually oriented business										C*	P*					P*		20.03.030(d)(7)
Stadium													C					
Food, Beverage, and Lodging																		
Bar or dance club								P		P	P			P				
Bed and breakfast	C*	C*	C*	C*	C*	P			P	P	P			P				20.03.030(d)(8)
Brewpub, distillery, or winery								P*	P*	P*	P*	P*		P*		P*		20.03.030(d)(9)
Hotel or motel								P			P	C		P				
Restaurant					C*	C*		P	P	P	P	P*	A	P	A	A		20.03.030(d)(10)
Office, Business, and Professional Services																		
Artist studio or workshop	A*	A*	A*	A*	P	P		P	P	P	P	C	C	P				20.03.030(d)(11)
Check cashing										C	C							
Financial institution								P		P	P	C		P		A		
Fitness center, small					A	A		P	P	P	P	A	A	P	A	A		
Fitness center, large								P	P	P	P			P	A			
Office								P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P*	P		20.03.030(d)(12)
Personal service, small					A	A		P	P	P	P	P	C	P				
Personal service, large								C	C	P	P	P		P				
Retail Sales																		
Building supply store										P	P					P		
Firearm Sales										P	P	P						
Grocery or supermarket					A	A		P	P	P	P	P		P				
Liquor or tobacco sales										P	P			P				
Pawn shop										P	P			P				
Retail sales, small					C	C		P	P	P	P	P		P				
Retail sales, medium								P		P	P	P		P				
Retail sales, large											P			P				
Retail sales, big box											P					P		

(3) Abandonment of a Nonconforming Use. A lawful nonconforming use shall be deemed abandoned when the nonconforming use has been replaced by a conforming use or when the nonconforming use has ceased and has not been resumed for a continuous period of twenty-four ~~twelve~~ months, or when the furnishings have been removed and not replaced for a continuous period of twenty-four ~~twelve~~ months.

"Use, abandonment of" means the relinquishment of property or a cessation of the use of property for a continuous period of twenty-four ~~twelve~~ months ~~by the owner~~.

Proposed Changes

(1) Full Compliance. A lawful nonconforming site shall be brought into compliance with this UDO with any petition for new building construction greater than 25% of the square footage of existing primary structures or in connection with demolition of existing and construction of new buildings, except that existing nonconforming setbacks, architecture, and height for existing structures can remain.

(2) Limited Compliance.

(A) Applicability. A lawful nonconforming site or structure shall be brought into compliance with the standards in paragraph (B) below when any of the following occur on the site:

i. Nonresidential and Mixed-Use.

1. Any new construction that does not meet Section 20.06.090(f)(1), change in use, expansion, enlargement, or relocation of any use;

2. Reestablishment of a prior conforming use that has been discontinued for a period of twelve months or longer; or

3. Any ~~E~~expansions, alterations, or modifications that increase the gross floor area of the building or parking spaces by more than ~~ten~~ 25% cumulative percent, including previous additions approved under any UDO effective since February 12, 2007.

ii. Multifamily and Group Living.

1. Any expansions, alterations, or modifications to an existing building, with the exception of accessory structures less than five hundred eighty square feet, provided that the accessory structure does not increase the degree of nonconformity regarding required maximum impervious surface coverage or required number of parking spaces;

2. Any new construction that does not meet Section 20.06.090(f)(1), change in use, or any expansion, enlargement, or relocation of any use; or

3. Any ~~addition~~ increase of 25% or more of dwelling units.

(B) Required Compliance. A lawful nonconforming site or structure that meets or exceeds the thresholds established in paragraph (A) above shall comply with the following standards:

i. Building Setbacks and Height. Existing buildings shall not be subject to current setback or height standards and shall remain lawful nonconforming unless completely demolished and replaced, in which case full compliance with this UDO shall be required.

ii. Parking Setback and Maximum Number of Spaces. Properties with 14 or less parking spaces (excluding ADA spaces) are not required to remove any parking spaces over the maximum.

Properties with more than 14 parking spaces (excluding ADA spaces) must remove ~~A~~all parking spaces over the maximum number of spaces allowed ~~must be removed~~. If all setbacks cannot be met through the removal of excess parking spaces, then priority shall be given to the parking spaces located in the front setback. If on a corner lot, then priority for front setbacks shall be given for the side facing the higher classified street. Any parking spaces or asphalt that encroaches into public right-of-way or adjacent property not owned by the petitioner must be removed.

Subdivision compliance 20.04.020(d)(1)

(d) Lot and Space Requirements.

(1) Minimum Lot Dimensions. No space that is needed to meet the width, setback, area, open space, impervious surface coverage, parking, landscaping, or other requirements of this UDO for a lot or building may be sold, leased, or subdivided away from such lot or building. ~~All lots affected by a proposed subdivision shall meet the standards of this UDO.~~

Recommendation

The Plan Commission voted 7-0 to forward this petition to the Common Council with a favorable recommendation.

Proposed Amendment

Ordinance: 2026-29
Amendment #: 02A
Submitted by: CM. Rollo
Date: November 4, 2026

Proposed Amendment:

1. The Preamble shall be amended to add the following as the twelfth "Whereas" clause:

> WHEREAS, ASI should only be permitted to be developed when there is broad scientific consensus that the development of Superintelligence can be done safely and controllably using a probabilistic risk assessment examining the catastrophic risk, which should be similar to the civil engineering standard for nuclear power plants requiring a safety level of 99.999% percent certainty; and

2. Section 1 shall be amended to delete the current section labeled "**14.25.040 - Conditions for Dissolution of Prohibition"** in its entirety. The remaining proposed code sections under Section1 shall be renumbered accordingly (red strikethrough = deletion):

> ~~**14.25.040 - Conditions for Dissolution of Prohibition.**~~
> ~~The prohibition in Section 14.25.030 shall remain in effect and shall not be lifted unless the Common Council of the City of Bloomington enacts an ordinance making specific findings that both of the following conditions have been met:~~
>
> ~~(a) There is broad scientific consensus that the development of Superintelligence shall be done safely and controllably using a probabilistic risk assessment examining the catastrophic risk, which shall be similar to the civil engineering standard for nuclear power plants requiring a safety level of 99.9999% percent certainty; and~~
>
> ~~(b) There is voter approval for the development of Superintelligence by the electorate of the City of Bloomington, with an affirmative vote of more than 95% of registered voters.~~

Synopsis: This amendment deletes the section creating alternative standards for dissolution of the prohibition on ASI, and adds to the preamble the recommended probabilistic safety standard by which the development of ASI shall be judged.

November 4, 2026 Regular Section Action: Pending

Proposed Amendment

Ordinance: 2026-29
Amendment #: 04A
Submitted by: CM. Rollo
Date: November 4, 2026

Proposed Amendment:

1. Section 1 shall be amended to change the section labeled "**14.25.030 - Prohibition distribution of Superintelligence"** as follows (red bold = addition; red strikethrough = deletion):

> **14.25.030 - Prohibition against the distribution of Superintelligence.**
> No person or corporation shall distribute or permit to be distributed nor deployed into the premises of any ~~citizen~~ **resident** or business in ~~our~~ **the** City **of Bloomington**, any **ASI** ~~Superintelligence~~ for any purpose. Deployment, for the purposes of this ordinance, shall include ~~the remote execution, activation, or utilization of any unauthorized digital agent~~ **making available, broadcasting, or transmitting to any consumer within the City of Bloomington ASI in any form of electronic or digital information, software, electronic interface over any communication or transmission medium now existing or developed in the future, including** through a locally accessed interface, browser, API, or connected hardware, regardless of the physical location of the server infrastructure hosting the system. **Distribution and deployment in this Ordinance shall not include any end-user access to such an ASI system.**

Synopsis: This amendment updates the language of Section 1 regarding the definition of distribution of artificial superintelligence (ASI) to clarify enforcement of the ordinance against only distributors of ASI and not end users.

November 4, 2026 Regular Section Action: Pending