

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Tuesday, October 24, 2017 at 6:30pm with Council President Susan Sandberg presiding over a Special Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL SESSION
Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Clerk's Note: On August 29, 2017, the Common Council called to order a Special Session, which began the Council's consideration of Resolution 17-28 to be completed over a series of meetings. Please refer to the minutes from that meeting for a description of the procedure for consideration of the resolution and amendments thereto.

Resolution 17-28 – To Adopt the
City's Comprehensive Plan

Roll Call: Sturbaum, Chopra, Sandberg, Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Sims, Rollo

ROLL CALL

Members Absent: Ruff, Granger

Council President Susan Sandberg gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of August 29, 2017. The motion was approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
August 29, 2017 (Special Session)
[6:32pm]

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, introduced himself and provided a general overview of the structure and purpose of the Comprehensive Plan (Plan). He explained the structure of the Plan. He summarized the introduction and executive summary sections, briefly explaining what each section contained and what they attempted to accomplish. He asked if the Council had any questions about those sections.

Presentation, Discussion, and
Public Comment on
Introduction and Executive
Summary

Piedmont-Smith asked for more information about a graph depicting population change in the city over time.

Council Questions:

Robinson explained how to read the graph in question.

Councilmember Steve Volan pointed out that the growth in enrollment at Indiana University made up a large portion of the overall population growth of the city.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum asked for more information regarding the projection of 6,100 housing units that would need to be replaced between 2010 and 2030, listed on page 22 of the Plan.

Robinson pointed out that the data covered the metropolitan statistical area, not just the city. He also said the information was meant to be a projection. He did not read the passage as calling for 6,100 demolitions within the corporate boundaries.

Sturbaum said the passage concerned him due to other portions of the Plan that called for more density in neighborhoods to accommodate growing housing needs. He said the numbers used in the projection were inconsistent with his vision and understanding of Bloomington's future needs. He thought the passage called for demolitions and was not clear as to the geographic area. He asked whether the passage reflected the city's vision for Bloomington and, if not, asked why it was in the document.

Robinson said the passage was a projection on growth and the Plan later addressed how to manage that growth.

Sturbaum said it was a projection of how many units would need to be replaced.

Piedmont-Smith pointed out that units included apartments and not just single-family houses.

Sturbaum said the Plan did not call for replacing aging multi-family units.

Volan suggested Sturbaum's concerns could be addressed through an amendment.

Sturbaum asked why the data was in the document if the city did not intend to demolish 6,100 homes.

Robinson said the date was meant as an preliminary evaluation of where the city was and what could happen in the future.

Sturbaum asked if it was appropriate to leave the information in the Plan if it was confusing or misleading.

Robinson said it was simply a statement of the growth that could happen in the community. He said it was included as information for people to consider.

Councilmember Dave Rollo wondered if the data was based on historical figures.

Robinson said he did not know the methodology used by the consultant in generating the estimate. He reiterated the numbers were an estimate and might not be what actually occurred.

Rollo suggested that the Council might need more information about how that estimate was created.

Robinson said he could try to follow up with the consultant that had generated the data. He reiterated that the figures provided were for the metropolitan statistical area, which was much larger than the city limits. He also said the estimates were simply meant to provide background information and were meant to be considered as the city managed growth.

Sandberg pointed out that upcoming amendments might also be relevant to the discussion of housing needs and market analyses.

Sturbaum referred to other passages in the Plan that called for guiding future multi-family developments to areas appropriate for higher density. He thought the background information he had referred to would be used to justify higher densities in neighborhoods, which he considered inappropriate.

Robinson provided additional information on how the consultant estimated that 6,100 units would need to be replaced. He pointed out that the estimate was for a two-county area and included multi-family units.

Sturbaum said he viewed the Plan as a city plan, not a regional plan.

Robinson said some of the data was only available at the level of the metropolitan statistical area.

Sturbaum wondered if the data for the larger metropolitan statistical area would then be used to justify more density in the smaller city limits. He did not want the need for denser housing to be exaggerated.

Robinson said no.

Piedmont-Smith wanted to add chapter numbers to the table of contents and asked whether an amendment would be necessary to do so.

Robinson said staff could easily add chapter numbers, but thought the approval process might require an amendment.

Council Attorney Dan Sherman confirmed that such a change would need to be made through an amendment in writing.

Presentation, Discussion, and
Public Comment on
Introduction and Executive
Summary
(cont'd)

Volan said he too had concerns about the organization of the document. He suggested there could be an omnibus amendment to address any such concerns.

Presentation, Discussion, and
Public Comment on
Introduction and Executive
Summary (*cont'd*)

Jan Sorby voiced her concern over the 6,100 estimate of number of buildings that would need to be replaced.

Public Comment:

John Kennedy spoke about the need for better estimates in the Plan.

Jon Lawrence expressed concern about using inaccurate estimates as justification for demolishing homes.

Jane Goodman said she was concerned with houses being replaced by multi-family developments and with the Comprehensive Plan process in general.

Glenda Murray said she was concerned with poor data that could be confusing or misleading.

Rachel Glago spoke about the inevitability of growth and the need for increased density.

Denise Valkyria said she was concerned with allowing multi-family units to be built in residential neighborhoods.

Volan responded to the concerns voiced about the number of housing units that would need to be replaced in the future. He provided context for the geographical area to which the 6,100 estimate applied. He pointed out that amendments could be introduced to address the passage in question.

Council Comment:

Sturbaum acknowledged growth was inevitable but said his concern was where that growth would occur. He saw a theme in the Plan of densifying single-family neighborhoods. He said he was trying to point out those statements throughout the plan and thought those statements should be removed if that was not the Council's vision for Bloomington's future.

Rollo said he shared the concern over the 6,100 estimate of units that would need to be replaced. He thought the estimate was ambiguous because there was no information about how it was created. He thought the figure should be taken out of the plan or more information should be included to justify the estimate.

Piedmont-Smith said she thought the Plan should be updated regularly. She thought the controversial paragraph with the 6,100 estimate could just be removed. She wanted to avoid any suggestion that the city wanted to demolish some of the more affordable housing that existed in the city.

Volan suggested that people were reading too much into the demographic data. He said that it was only a problem if the Council allowed such a statistic to set policy for the city. He pointed out that the concerns voiced were fixated on single-family neighborhoods but that half of city residents were students. He said that affordable student housing should be considered as well.

Sturbaum said he was surprised to hear that Volan was not more concerned with misleading information in the Plan. He thought the estimates applied to a larger area than the city and were therefore misleading.

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Introduction and Executive Summary (cont'd)

Sandberg said she believed a market analysis that looked at the city's housing stock was necessary and said it would be addressed in coming amendments.

Robinson explained that the chapter followed the same structure as other chapters. He said the chapter was based on the major objective of fortifying the community and economic vibrancy. He briefly described the chapter's narrative section and noted the goals contained within the chapter. He said there were 25 policies that followed from the goals, along with numerous programs, followed finally by outcomes and indicators meant to measure performance.

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Community Profile, Chapter 1: Community Services & Economy

Volan pointed out that Chapter 1, more than other chapters, dealt with issues other than the built environment. He asked what the purpose of the chapter was.

Council Questions:

Robinson said the chapter did address aspects of the built environment. He said Chapters 1 and 2 were largely in response to community feedback. He said some of those concerns did relate to the built environment.

Volan read previous comments made by the Mayor stating that the Plan was meant to deal with the built environment, not to be a master plan that dealt with every aspect of life in the city. He asked how that vision of the plan comported with the aspects of Chapter 1 that seemed to deal with things other than the built environment.

Robinson said that the information provided could be aspirational and could help avoid looking at issues in a vacuum. He said the chapter was meant to be a starting point to help guide policies and programs.

Sturbaum asked whether there should be some mention of homelessness or drug addiction issues in the chapter.

Robinson said the chapter did not necessarily deal with specific issues and was more general in nature. He said there was a balance in how much background information to include in the narrative portions of the chapters.

Rollo pointed out that the chapter had many references to growth. He asked whether there had been any discussion of what would be an optimum size for Bloomington.

Robinson said that the Plan was meant to be the beginning of a process that would continually look at how Bloomington was growing and how best to manage that growth.

Rollo said he was not looking for an answer in the Plan. He wondered if the question had ever been raised.

Robinson said it had not been raised in the way Rollo phrased it, but had been brought up in a more general discussion of how to deal with growth.

Terry Amsler spoke about the importance of public engagement.

Public Comment:

Lindsay Brown spoke about the speed of traffic in the Broadview neighborhood.

Sorby spoke about quality of life as an economic driver.

Valkyria spoke about walkability and community health issues.

Rollo spoke about the need to consider Bloomington's constraints when addressing growth. He said growth was not the same thing as development and would not automatically lead to a better quality of life in the city. He suggested using metrics to measure quality of life.

Volan said the Plan was not meant to be a master strategic plan for the whole city. He thought there were portions of the Plan that were not related to location or the built environment. He said he was unsure how to address the problem, but wanted to bring it up so people could think about it.

Rollo responded to Volan's concern by saying that economic, social, environmental and other considerations did impact how the built environment should develop and how people interacted with the built environment.

Volan reiterated his view that the Plan contained issues beyond the built environment. He also said that, despite Rollo's suggestion of an optimum size for Bloomington, growth was inevitable and the city had to plan for it.

Robinson pointed out that the enabling statute authorized the Plan to be comprehensive in nature.

Robinson explained that Chapter 2's major objective was to sustain and celebrate the arts and education of the community. He outlined the organization of the chapter, which followed the organization of other chapters.

Piedmont-Smith asked what urban centers and neighborhood villages were, as mentioned in Goal 2.1.

Robinson said urban centers were locations with a lot of activity, such as downtown or other commercial nodes. He said neighborhood villages could be something like a neighborhood park or smaller commercial centers.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there were definitions for the terms in the Plan.

Robinson said no and explained how the terms were meant to be used.

Gabe Gloden spoke about the need for art in public spaces.

Sorby spoke about the importance of public art.

Sandberg said the issues addressed by the chapter were important to the quality of life in the city and were what made Bloomington such an attractive place to live. She said she would support increasing funding for the Art Commission. She hoped to bring forward an amendment to encourage the city to make more of an investment in public facilities that hosted art in the city. She also thought there should be more included in the chapter about Bloomington's diverse residents.

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Community Profile, Chapter 1: Community Services & Economy (cont'd)

Council Comment:

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Chapter 2: Culture and Identity

Council Questions:

Public Comment:

Council Comment:

Chopra said she would support the amendment suggested by Sandberg and thought there should be increased support for public art.

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Chapter 2: Culture and Identity (*cont'd*)

Volan thought Chapter 2 did a better job of adhering to issues related to the built environment. He thought increasing funding for the arts was a good thing, but not something that should be addressed by a Plan meant to deal with the physical environment of the city.

Rollo said Chapter 2 did a good job of discussing the sorts of things that affected quality of life. He distinguished between growth for growth's sake, and meaningful investment and improvement in quality of life. He thought having a quality-of-life indicator might help direct meaningful development.

Piedmont-Smith provided a reminder that the city contributed \$50,000 each year to the Buskirk-Chumley Theater. She agreed that there could be stronger language in the chapter to support the arts. She suggested a few areas that could be strengthened.

Volan clarified his earlier comment by adding that he thought growth was inevitable and that the Plan should focus on guiding that growth to appropriate locations.

Robinson explained what was contained in the appendix.

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Appendix

Piedmont-Smith asked whether there would need to be amendments to the appendices to incorporate changes made by other amendments.

Council Questions:

Robinson said staff would incorporate any changes to the appendices.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt amendments (60, 61, 63, 64, 69) listed under the consent agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA:

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Chopra out of the room).

Vote on Consent Agenda Items [8:20pm]

It was moved and seconded to adopt Amendment 49.

Amendment 49

Sturbaum described the amendment and explained it was intended to address comments in the Plan that seemed to support densifying single-family neighborhoods.

Sandberg asked if staff had any thoughts on the amendment.

Council Questions:

Robinson said that the amendment confused density with certain rental requirements prohibiting more than three unrelated adults. He also pointed out that the passage in question was meant to apply to all neighborhoods, both existing and new.

Sorby, Sandi Clothier, Lawrence, Kennedy, and Goodman spoke in support of the amendment.

Public Comment:

Rachel Glago spoke against the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 49.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 49

Volan said he supported the change to Amendment 49.

Council Comment:

Chopra asked where underutilized housing types should be located.

Piedmont-Smith said they could be located along corridors going into and out of downtown.

Sturbaum listed additional locations where he thought such housing was appropriate.

Chopra said she did not understand why people who wanted different housing types should be excluded from single-family neighborhoods.

Piedmont-Smith said many of the core single-family neighborhoods were affordable. She thought allowing more multi-family developments in the single-family neighborhoods would allow developers to buy land and build student-oriented developments that would not be affordable. She did not view the amendment as excluding people from the neighborhoods. She thought anyone wanting to live in the neighborhoods would have a better chance of finding something affordable in the existing neighborhoods.

Volan asked what people meant when they referred to neighborhoods. He wondered where the borders of such areas were located.

Sturbaum said edges of neighborhoods could be addressed in different ways, like allowing conditional uses.

Chopra asked if the amendment was calling for diversity in pocketed areas.

Piedmont-Smith said no, and pointed out that many of the neighborhoods under discussion were already diverse.

Sturbaum said that neighborhoods like Broadview had natural-occurring affordable housing and were also the neighborhoods least able to protect themselves.

Chopra asked which neighborhoods were included when the term neighborhoods was used.

Piedmont-Smith said the text of the amendment applied to single-family neighborhoods.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 49 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 49 [9:02pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 02 to Amendment 49.

Amendment 02 to Amendment 49

Sorby asked for the amendment to be read.

Public Comment:

Volan read the amendment.

Chopra asked why new diverse housing types had to be relegated to arterials and vacant commercial spaces. She said that felt exclusionary rather than encouraging diversity.

Council Comment:

Sturbaum said there would be unwanted consequences if single-family zoning were eliminated to allow diverse housing types in single-family neighborhoods.

Rollo said that the change he was proposing to the amendment simply eliminated the directive to guide diverse housing types into neighborhoods. He thought such housing could be appropriate in many different locations, but thought it should not be directed only into neighborhoods.

Amendment 02 to Amendment 49
(*cont'd*)

Volan pointed out there was a logic to the policy as originally written, but he was agnostic about Rollo's suggested change.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 49 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 1 (Volan).

Vote on Amendment 02 to Amendment 49 [9:12pm]

Lawrence said the amended Amendment 49 encouraged diverse housing in the entire city, not just neighborhoods.

Public Comment:

Sorby spoke about locations where diverse housing options could be located.

Clothier spoke about affordable housing.

Goodman spoke about existing diversity in neighborhoods.

Chopra clarified that she did not intend to imply that single-family zoning should be eliminated.

Council Comment:

Volan said he was frustrated with some of the points made and concerns raised about the number of housing units that would need to be replaced in the future. He also said he was still unclear on whether people considered arterial roads part of neighborhoods. He raised concerns with the rhetoric surrounding the issue.

The motion to adopt Amendment 49 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 49 as amended [9:26pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 50.

Amendment 50

Piedmont-Smith explained how the amendment would change the text of Goal 5.4 of the Plan.

Lawrence and Clothier spoke in support of the amendment.

Public Comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 50 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 50 [9:30pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 51.

Amendment 51

Sandberg explained the additions made by the amendment.

Robinson suggested that future updates might encompass the entire Plan, not simply individual chapters. He also clarified the title of Chapter 5.

Volan asked whether the amendment could call for future updates to Chapter 5 of the Plan rather than a separate Housing Strategy document.

Council Questions:

Sandberg said the amendment had been inspired by work done by the Affordable Living Committee. She invited Deborah Myerson to speak about the issue.

Myerson spoke about the work of the Affordable Living Committee and the need for a Housing Strategy.

Amendment 51 (cont'd)

Volan asked whether the Housing Strategy would be more appropriately named a Housing Strategic Plan.

Myerson said there were different names that could be used, but it referred to something more detailed than what was included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Myerson spoke in favor of the amendment.

Public Comment:

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 51.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 51

Volan suggested that a separate Housing Strategy was not needed, and that Chapter 5 of the Plan could effectively serve the same purpose.

Myerson explained why a separate Housing Strategy was appropriate.

Volan withdrew Amendment 01 to Amendment 51.

Volan suggested Housing Strategy might need to be defined in the glossary.

Council Comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 51 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 51 [9:40pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 52.

Amendment 52

Sandberg described the amendment.

Robinson said that staff had some concerns about the need to create another commission and the resources required to manage it.

Sandberg said that the request for the commission was coming from the Affordable Living Committee and would help continue the work started by that committee.

Chopra asked whether the commission seats would be filled exclusively by members of the public.

Sandberg said that the amendment did not include that level of detail.

Council Questions:

Sturbaum suggested that the amendment should only call for a housing commission without also including language about some other appointed citizen advisory body.

Volan thought that the original language of the amendment was appropriate for the Plan.

Sandberg said she wanted a Housing Commission that would help continue the work that was started by the Affordable Living Committee.

Sturbaum moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 52.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 52

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 52 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 52 [9:47pm]

Volan said that the administration was hesitant to add additional commissions without also reviewing and overhauling Title 2 of the city’s municipal code.	<u>Amendment 52</u> as amended (<i>cont’d</i>) Council Comment:
Sandberg said she was not proposing the commission lightly. She thought the work done by the Affordable Living Committee was important and should be continued.	
The motion to adopt <u>Amendment 52</u> as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.	Vote on <u>Amendment 52</u> as amended [9:49pm]
Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt <u>Amendment 56</u> .	<u>Amendment 56</u>
Sturbaum described the amendment and explained that the Council Sidewalk Committee was well-positioned to identify and prioritize sidewalk improvement projects as called for by the Plan.	
Volan asked how much more funding would be appropriate. Sturbaum said it would be a balance between need and ability, but thought that because the Plan was a guiding document, it was appropriate to call for a general increase in funding.	Council Questions:
Piedmont-Smith thought that calling for increased funding was too specific for the purposes of the Plan. She suggested changing the amendment.	
Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 56</u> .	Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 56</u>
Robinson echoed Piedmont-Smith’s concerns with the original language of the amendment. He also pointed out that the city implemented street and sidewalk improvements through other means than just the Council Sidewalk Committee. He supported Piedmont-Smith’s suggested change.	
Lawrence, Clothier, and Sorby spoke in favor of increased sidewalk funding.	Public Comment:
Volan thought both the original amendment and the change proposed by Piedmont-Smith were pointless and said he disagreed with staff’s desire to keep the Plan general, rather than specific.	Council Comment:
Sturbaum said he preferred the amendment as originally proposed because the Council Sidewalk Committee heard directly from constituents and was well-positioned to address problems.	
Chopra said she would support Piedmont-Smith’s suggested change because she thought the call for increased funding was inappropriate for the Plan.	
The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 56</u> received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Volan), Abstain: 0.	Vote on Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 56</u> [10:00pm]
The motion to adopt <u>Amendment 56</u> as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Volan), Abstain: 0.	Vote on <u>Amendment 56</u> as amended [10:01pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt <u>Amendment 57</u> .	<u>Amendment 57</u>
Sandberg described the amendment.	
The motion to adopt <u>Amendment 57</u> received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.	Vote on <u>Amendment 57</u> [10:02pm]
Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt <u>Amendment 59</u> .	<u>Amendment 59</u>
Rollo described the changes made by the amendment. He said that the Plan had no mention of climate change, so the amendment was intended to address that.	
Piedmont-Smith echoed Rollo's comments. She said that many of the amendments already approved as part of the consent agenda also addressed the issue of climate change and efforts the city could make to address climate change.	
Nick Kappas, Clothier, and Sorby spoke in favor of the amendment.	Public Comment:
Sandberg pointed out that the process of approving the Plan was a long one and said that the Council would be discussing extending deliberations even further.	Council Comment:
Volan said that the Imagine Bloomington process started in 2011. He said the process had been a transparent and public process. He praised both the amendment and the original text in the Plan for emphasizing that the city should be more serious about protecting the natural environment.	
Chopra thanked the sponsors of the amendment.	
The motion to adopt <u>Amendment 59</u> received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.	Vote on <u>Amendment 59</u> [10:16pm]
Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt <u>Amendment 65</u> .	<u>Amendment 65</u>
Rollo described the amendment.	
Volan asked Rollo what he thought about removing the bullet-point in question all together. Rollo said he supported <u>Amendment 65</u> as originally proposed.	Council Questions:
Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 65</u> .	Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 65</u>
Piedmont-Smith said the amendment seemed meaningless, as the Plan could call for improving many aspects of the city.	
Rollo suggested that the original amendment could be adopted and the topic could be revisited later.	
Kappas spoke in favor of Amendment 01 to <u>Amendment 65</u> , but hoped that the topic would be addressed further by a future amendment.	Public Comment:

Volan said he agreed with Rollo that the original amendment could serve as a place-holder for the topic.

Sandberg agreed that the original amendment could serve as a place-holder. She believed that there should be an examination of the new sanitation system and how it was working.

Piedmont-Smith pointed out that Amendment 66 also addressed sanitation.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 65 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 2 (Sims, Piedmont-Smith), Nays: 5, Abstain: 0. FAILED.

The motion to adopt Amendment 65 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Piedmont-Smith), Abstain: 0.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 66.

Piedmont-Smith described the amendment.

Sturbaum asked if Piedmont-Smith was proposing to bring back trash stickers.

Piedmont-Smith said the amendment did not specify how a pay-as-you-throw system would be implemented, but she felt there should be some correlation between how much people threw away and how much they paid for trash service.

Volan suggested that a rebate system might be the most practical way of implementing such a system.

Rollo thought there was already a pay-as-you-throw system in place, because different-sized bins were charged differently.

Volan said that was not a true pay-as-you-throw system, because the customer would still be charged even if the bin was not set out on the curb.

Sturbaum moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 66.

Chopra said the amendment as originally proposed was the better option if the Council wanted a pay-as-you-throw system.

Rollo said he preferred the language suggested by Sturbaum, as there was too much ambiguity as to how such a system would be implemented.

Lawrence said he supported a pay-as-you-throw system.

Kennedy spoke against Amendment 01 to Amendment 66.

Volan said he did not support Amendment 01 to Amendment 66. He thought calling for the development of a pay-as-you-throw system was appropriate, because many of the concerns with such a system had already been addressed.

Rollo asked whether the Public Works Department had committed to a pay-as-you-throw system within a certain timeframe.

Robinson thought that the department was still evaluating how the new sanitation system was working.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 65
(cont'd)

Council Comment:

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 65 [10:23pm]

Vote on Amendment 65 [10:24pm]

Amendment 66

Council Questions:

Amendment 01 to Amendment 66

Public Comment:

Council Comment:

Rollo asked why the Plan should call for developing a pay-as-you-throw system when the city just moved from such a system to its current system.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 66
(cont'd)

Volan provided additional details about the financing of the sanitation system. He doubted whether the city would ever revert to a system that did not pay for itself.

Chopra said she would support Amendment 66 as originally proposed by Piedmont-Smith.

Sturbaum thought that the issue was sufficiently complicated that the Plan should not dictate to the department what sort of system to implement before the department finished studying the existing system that had just been put in place.

Volan reiterated his support for Amendment 66 as originally proposed.

Rollo said he did not know if a pay-as-you-throw system would be feasible given the new changes to the sanitation system, so he supported Amendment 01 to Amendment 66.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 66 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 3 (Sturbaum, Sandberg, Rollo), Nays: 4, Abstain: 0. FAILED.

Vote on Amendment 01 to
Amendment 66 [10:41pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 66 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 2 (Sturbaum, Sims), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 66 [10:41pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to introduce Amendment 67. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 0, Nays: 7, Abstain: 0.

Amendment 67

Volan moved and it was seconded to extend deliberations of Resolution 17-28 as follows:

COUNCIL SCHEDULE

I move that the Council amend its schedule for review of Res 17-28 (Proposing Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan) as set forth below.

On the following dates, the Council will take the following actions:

- Tuesday, November 7, 2017 – the Council will meet and cover the same topics as previously scheduled for the date, but in a different order. At this meeting, the Council will:
 - Begin with an overall review of the Comprehensive Plan as amended (which will include an opportunity for staff and the public to comment on the progress of the deliberations and the proposed changes to the Plan);
 - Consider any amendments carried over from the previous meeting; and lastly,
 - Consider amendments to the parts of the Comprehensive Plan presented and discussed at the October 24, 2017 meeting (Introduction and Executive Summary; Community Profile; Chapter 1 Community Services & Economy; Chapter 2: Culture & Identity; and Appendix);

COUNCIL SCHEDULE (cont'd)

- Tuesday, November 28th at Noon (*not November 14th*) – Council members may file further amendments by this date and time. These amendments pertain to the review of the Comprehensive Plan as a whole on November 7th and will be released by the Council Office on Friday, December 1st;
- Tuesday, December 5th at 6:30 pm – the Council will hold another meeting of the Special Session to consider amendments released the previous Friday;
- Tuesday, December 12th at 7:00 pm – if needed, the Council has scheduled a back-up meeting of the Special Session on this date and time to conclude consideration of those amendments and forward the legislation to the first regular meeting of the new year);
- Friday, December 15th – the Council Office will release a compilation of amendments – including those adopted, rejected, and withdrawn;
- Tuesday, January 2nd at Noon – Council members may file final amendments which will be released by the Council Office on Friday, January 5th;
- Wednesday, January 10th at 6:30 pm – the Council will hold its first regular meeting of the new year. After preliminary matters are concluded, the Council will:
 - introduce the Comprehensive Plan under a new resolution number,
 - ratify previous actions and amendments,
 - consider additional and perhaps reconsider past amendments, and,
 - consider a motion to adopt Res 17-28 as amended.
- Wednesday, January 17th at 6:30 pm – the Council may use this Regular Session (if needed) to finish consideration of the amendments and consider motion to adopt the Plan as amended by the Council.

The Council and staff had an extended discussion on its schedule of deliberations for Resolution 17-28.

Kennedy spoke about the need for additional information about the Plan.

Public Comment:

Sorby spoke in favor of extending deliberations.

The Council and staff had continued discussion on its schedule of deliberations.

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Chopra).

Vote on Motion to Extend Deliberations of Resolution 17-
[11:10pm]


The meeting went into recess at 11:10pm.

RECESS


APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this
21st day of February, 2018.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:



Dorothy Granger, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council



Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington

