In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, January 30, 2019 at 6:30pm, Council President Dave Rollo presided over a Special Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL SESSION
January 30, 2019

Members present: Ruff, Chopra, Piedmont-Smith, Rollo, Volan, Sims
Members absent: Granger, Sturbaum, Sandberg

ROLL CALL [6:30pm]

Council President Dave Rollo summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:30pm]

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:32pm]

Councilmember Steve Volan moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of December 12, 2018. The motion was approved by voice vote.

December 12, 2018
(Special Session)

Volan moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of December 05, 2018. The motion was approved by voice vote.

December 5, 2018
(Special Session)

Volan moved and it was seconded to appoint Donald Eggert to the Environmental Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [6:33pm]

Councilmember Allison Chopra moved and it was seconded to approve Susan Dyar's mayoral appointment to the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to reappoint Cynthia Bretheim to the Commission on Sustainability. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to reappoint Adrienne Evans Fernandez to the Parking Commission, to appoint Nico Sigler as a voting member and Amy Oakley as an advisory member to the Commission on Hispanic and Latino Affairs, and to reappoint Rhonda Gambill to the Human Rights Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Volan moved and it was seconded to limit public comment to five minutes per person after every two sections of presentation for consideration.

RESOLUTION 19-01- TO ADOPT THE CITY'S TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN [6:34pm]

Ruff moved and it was seconded to amend Volan's motion to limit public comment to seven minutes per person after every two sections of presentation. The motion to amend received a roll call vote of Ayes: 3 (Ruff, Piedmont-Smith, Rollo), Nays: 3 (Chopra, Volan, Sims), Abstain: 0. FAILED.

The motion to limit public comment to five minutes received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 1 (Ruff), Abstain: 0.

Vote on motion to limit public comment

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable)

3.1 Transportation Planning Approach & 3.2 Street Typologies

Beth Rosenbarger, Planning Services Manager, explained that Chapter 3 of the proposed Transportation Plan had six subsections, which included: transportation planning approach, street typologies, bicycle facility types, bicycle network, pedestrian network assessment, and key treatements and supporting guidance. She presented the first two subsections, 3.1 Transportation Planning approach and 3.2 Street Typologies, to the Council.

Council questions:

Volan asked what Rosenbarger meant when she used the term existing streets.

Rosenbarger said that term referred to preexisting neighborhood residential streets and neighborhood connector streets.

Volan pointed out that some existing streets did not match the typology applied to them. He asked if those streets would be classified differently than a new street of the same typology.

Rosenbarger said she was using the term preexisting streets to refer to streets of that specific category, so any street that was categorized as that would be an existing street. She said staff might be able add a different label, such as "existing", for clarification.

Volan noted that streets like North Washington Street or North Lincoln Street did not meet the standards for their typology. He asked how such streets would fit into the residential neighborhood typology.

Rosenbarger said an amendment might be needed to address that, possibly through a new category. She said it would mean the priorities for the street would still be what was outlined in the Plan, but an amendment could help clarify that the city did not intend to widen existing right-of-way.

Volan asked how to respond to people who objected to new connections, such as connections where there was once a cul-de-sac.

Rosenbarger said the Plan tried to focus on the bigger picture and incorporate the city's transportation goals. She said a cul-de-sac might benefit the people who lived on it, but it created pressures on the transportation system as a whole. She pointed out that culs-de-sac were prohibited in the subdivision code, and the city wanted to signal to the public that such connections might happen in the future.

Piedmont-Smith appreciated that there would be clarifying amendments forthcoming but said she was still puzzled about the street typologies. She asked what they accomplished.

Rosenbarger said the typologies were intended to plan for the future. She acknowledged that some clarification might be needed. She said the typologies were a way to connect streets with the built environment. She said the typologies would connect with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to help plan for any future developments.

Piedmont-Smith asked if future development on a residential street might be required to have a tree plot depending on the street typology for the street near the property.

Rosenbarger said that was correct. She said the typologies affected where people could put a new building.

Piedmont-Smith said she did not see setback requirements in the Plan.

Rosenbarger said the street typologies, which included proposed right-of-way widths would tie into and be referenced by the UDO, which would address setbacks for the varying zones.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Chopra asked what the difference was between the neighborhood connector street typology and the suburban connector street typology.

Rosenbarger said the neighborhood connector streets were streets that connected with neighborhoods, parks, and other facilities. She said the target speed for such streets was 25 mph and noted they might also be appropriate for some parking. She said a suburban connector street would not have as much parking and was more focused on movement. She also pointed out that the typologies would tie in with the UDO and could impact future land use.

Sims noted that the Plan said there were higher volumes and speeds on 10th Street and Rogers Street than on College Avenue and Walnut Street. He asked if that was correct.

Rosenbarger said that statement was not correct and needed to be amended.

Sims asked where freight and delivery trucks parked on the general urban streets.

Rosenbarger said a truck route was distinct from a loading zone. She said routes were the streets that trucks were directed to use on the way to their destinations and not where they would deliver the goods.

Sims asked whether the organization Smart Growth America was a consulting firm and if any other consulting firms were considered.

Rosenbarger said Smart Growth America was a national level organization that provided research and data to cities. She said it was not used as a consultant for the Plan.

Sims asked if the city used data and information from the organization in the Plan.

Rosenbarger said she used its definition of complete streets.

Sims asked if the Plan would cite any other organizations.

Rosenbarger said the Plan also used information from the National Association of City Transportation Officials. She said that organization provided information to cities about street design. She said the organization was formed in response to the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials to focus more on urban and city street design.

Rollo asked if the Plan proposed increasing the public right-of-way from 50 feet to 60 feet for a neighborhood residential street.

Rosenbarger said yes, for newly-built streets.

Rollo asked if the same proposal would apply to existing streets.

Rosenbarger said yes, as the Plan was written, but she said staff would like to introduce an amendment so it would not apply to existing streets.

Rollo asked if the existing streets would continue to have the 50 foot right-of-way.

Rosenbarger said there was a distinction between proposed right-of-way widths and actual right-of-way widths. She said the proposed change from 50 feet to 60 feet only affected the proposed right-of-way widths.

Rollo asked if the proposal would affect people's ability to build structures within the existing setbacks.

Rosenbarger said it would reduce the setback overall. She stated that the setback would be based on the property line.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith asked Rosenbarger to explain how appendix G was meant to be used.

Rosenbarger said the appendix was created at the request of the city engineer and was something that had never been included with previous transportation plans. She said it was meant to be viewed mainly by staff and developers. She said they wanted to take all the proposed right-of-ways from the last transportation plan and apply the specific bicycle facility network recommendation and then update the proposed right-of-way to more accurately reflect that.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the whole table was about bicycle facilities.

Rosenbarger said it was about proposed right-of-way widths for every street segment in the City based on the default typology width and on the facility recommendation.

Piedmont-Smith said she was concerned about putting something in the Plan that the average person could not understand. She suggested better headers or more explanation in the Plan.

Rosenbarger said the Plan could be amended to change the columns and make it more readable.

Rollo asked if the possible future extension of Hunter Avenue east of High Street would create clashing street types, as Hunter Avenue was a greenway west of High Street, but could be a general urban street east of High Street.

Rosenbarger thought it was more important to look at how a new connection would fit in with the land use and surrounding development. She said it was not unheard of to see streets change from one type to another, like Third Street west of Rogers Street.

Public comment:

Rega Wood was worried that proposed changes would endanger her neighborhood.

Peter Dorfman expressed his concern about proposed neighborhood connector streets.

Frank Marshalek thought the Plan's call for complete streets did not take into account the residents of the neighborhoods.

Jim Rosenbarger thought some of the street typologies needed to be amended. He discussed some different walk scores and why some areas needed to prioritize walkers and bicyclists.

Marc Cornett thought some of the street typologies needed amendments. He expressed his concern about widening streets and how it could affect sidewalks.

Eoban Binder did not think streets in residential areas needed to be widened.

Sandi Clothier discussed Fairview Street and said it did not seem appropriate to call that street a neighborhood corridor. She thought there needed to be clarification of what the city intended to do in the future.

Volan said the Council was in the third Wednesday of discussing the Plan. He said the Plan was not approved yet and was still subject to amendment. He encouraged the public to write amendments and contact councilmembers to sponsor them.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Council comment:

Ruff said he wanted to give staff an opportunity to respond to the concerns voiced by the public regarding widening streets and demolition of houses.

Rosenbarger said it was not the intent of the city to widen existing streets or right-of-ways in existing neighborhoods. She said she understood the call for amendments and said staff would be happy to work on amendments.

Chopra said she would be happy to sponsor Rosenbarger's proposed amendments.

Piedmont-Smith said the deadline for amendments was February 13, 2019, but that would not leave time for review. She urged the public to send amendments to the Council by February 11, 2019. She thought the plan still needed a lot of work.

Volan said the illustrations and renderings in the Plan could have been clearer to better show the intent of the city. He thought the city needed to carefully consider how the street typologies were applied to Bloomington's streets. He thought the Plan could do a better job of discussing walkability, and also thought the city needed to think harder about sidewalks. He was eager to see amendments that took sidewalks into account. In general, he did support the goals of the Plan.

Sims agreed that the renderings in the Plan needed to be drawn to scale. He could see why the public was leery and that was why public input was so important.

Rollo voiced concern with some of the street typologies assigned to certain streets in the city. He said mislabelings of some streets made him question all the typologies. He anticipated there would be amendments. He wanted to explore which streets could resemble Kirkwood Avenue and its sidewalks. He said councilmembers would issue questions to staff, and amendments would hopefully evolve.

3.3 Bicycle Facility Types & 3.4 Bicycle Network

Rosenbarger presented subsections 3.3 Bicycle Facility Type and 3.4 Bicycle Network to the Council. She said that there were different bicycle facilities for different kinds of bicycle uses. She said such facilities included, multi-use paths, trails, protected bicycle lanes, and neighborhood greenways, among others. She gave recommendations on how the city could achieve platinum status for its bicycle-friendly ranking, which included the city's percentage of total bicycle network mileage to total road network mileage. She displayed maps that showed various aspects of the city's bicycle network.

Council questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked why some of the street segments on the bicycle facility map had more than one facility type.

Rosenbarger said it was to indicate facilities already in place as well as facilities the city wanted to see in the future.

Piedmont-Smith asked why there was no mention of bicycle parking or covered bicycle parking.

Rosenbarger said the Plan did not have any recommendations for those facilities, as the UDO would likely address that issue.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked what kind of facility might be built along Hunter Avenue.

Rosenbarger said the goal would be to have a neighborhood greenway along Hunter Avenue, which would entail outreach to the residents.

Rollo pointed out there was a pathway east of Mitchell Street that only bicyclists or pedestrians could use. He asked if that would remain.

Rosenbarger said yes.

Rollo said that some greenways in the city simply had pavement markings for identification. He asked if that was what the city intended for Hunter Avenue.

Rosenbarger said pavement markings and signage represented the first wave of neighborhood greenway installation efforts by the city. She said the city hoped to add elements in the future to increase rider comfort.

Rollo asked if traffic counts were used to see if a street was an appropriate area for a greenway.

Rosenbarger said the city had used traffic counts in the past. She said that the city completed traffic counts and reached out to residents before creating previous neighborhood greenways

Rollo asked if protected bicycle lanes would be appropriate along Third Street near Indiana University.

Rosenbarger thought that street be a good candidate for protected bicycle lanes.

Public comment:

Matt Flaherty discussed issues with people blocking bicycle lanes and the need for protected lanes.

Jessika Griffin thought the Plan should address bicycle parking.

Eoban Binder said bicycle facilities were only as useful to the extent that they connected with each other.

Kate Rosenbarger echoed Flaherty's comment and was excited to hear that Third street could have a protected bicycle lane in the future.

Council comment:

Volan thought the city needed to create a protected bicycle lane on Third Street. He stated that the presentation revealed how much work the city still had before it achieved platinum bicycle city status.

Rollo thanked the public for their comments.

3.5 Pedestrian Network Assessment & 3.6 Key Treatments and Supporting Guidance

Beth Rosenbarger presented subsections 3.5 Pedestrian Network Assessment and 3.6 Key Treatments and Supporting Guidance. She described different types of pedestrian facilities, which included sidewalks, shared streets, multiuse paths and trails, rails with trails, and neighborhood greenways. She said the city hoped to improve comfort and connectivity in Bloomington. She stated that the city also wanted to retrofit and fill in network gaps on existing streets. She displayed a map that indicated pedestrian priority areas, which were areas most in need of pedestrian facilities. She said the Plan also considered pedestrian access to transit, seating areas at bus stops, issues related to intersections, roundabouts, loading zones, alleyways, and traffic calming.

Council questions:

Volan asked if narrowing a travel lane by adding on-street parking served as a traffic calmer.

Rosenbarger said yes.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith voiced concern with the idea of loading zones being placed in the center left-turn lanes. She asked Rosenbarger to comment.

Rosenbarger said the idea was included based on similar setups in other cities. She said she had not heard of any safety issues, as an unloader would only have to cross one lane of traffic. She said another goal that would go along with such a change would be to slow traffic, so a person crossing the street would not have to cross fast traffic.

Piedmont-Smith asked if traffic would be slowed because of the perception of a narrower lane.

Rosenbarger said that loading policy would likely make sense only with other changes. She said it would make more sense for a two-way street or on a side street.

Piedmont-Smith asked if any changes would be discussed with public review.

Rosenbarger said yes. She said any changes would involve a change in code after Council approval and review.

Sims asked what the percent minority portion referred to as used in Appendix F for the pedestrian network assessment.

Rosenbarger said that metric was based on census block data and was meant to further the city's equity goals. She stated that, traditionally, neighborhoods with a higher percentage of minority population did not quality pedestrian facilities. She said the city needed to address that.

Sims asked if Rosenbarger had an example of an such area in town.

Rosenbarger said the metric was based on what percentage of an area were people from a minority population and what percentrage of people in an area were in poverty. She said 11th Street between Rogers Street and Adams Street might be an example.

Sims was wondering if she knew an example of a minority area.

Rosenbarger said she did not have an example. She said the consultants meant what percentage of that census block group was part of a minority population. She said the reason for considering that information was because of historic inequities in the way infrastructure had been funded.

Piedmont-Smith asked what hope there was to correct the problem of having a very busy street with a monolithic sidewalk.

Rosenbargers said it would require funding and will. She said priorities changed over time, so the Plan was meant to help the city prioritize projects in the future.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the Plan would ensure that the city could also address areas with insufficient sidewalk facilities.

Rosenbarger said yes. She said the pedestrian facility network map was based showed areas without sidewalks, but the city could still address other areas.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked if potential changes along the corridors of College Avenue and Walnut Street, along with Atwater Avenue and Third Street, would be studied further.

Rosenbarger said the Plan recommended studying those corridors but did not provide a set recommendation as to what the end configurations needed to look like.

Rollo asked if part of that consideration would be whether to change those streets from one-way streets to two-way streets.

Rosenbarger said the Plan called for consideration a variety of options, including but not limited to restoring two-way circulation.

Rollo asked what the process would be for studying those corridors.

Rosenbarger said it was unclear at that point. She thought the city would likely hire a consultant to conduct a study of the corridors. She said the process would typically involve public input and engagement as well. She said such an undertaking was not in 2019's budget.

Public comment:

Sandi Clothier liked the idea of a residential neighborhood that had calm streets and might not need to have sidewalks. She liked the flexibility of such an idea.

Eoban Binder voiced concern with the way the city maintained sidewalks and alleys.

Kate Rosenbarger echoed Clothier's comments and voice approval of traffic calming and slow streets.

Jean Capler thought there were some areas with sidewalks that were dangerous and in poor repair. She thought the city needed to commit to the multi-modal plan and commit to building and maintaining surfaces for people to walk on.

Matt Flaherty spoke about pedestrian and bicycle priorities. He commented on climate change and how it related to the city's goal of achieving platinum status.

Cynthia Bretheim did not see a focus on mass transportation and did not think the city did anything to increase use of transportation systems.

Council comment:

Piedmont-Smith was glad that Bretheim brought up public transportation. She thought, given the urgency of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the city should reconsider whether and how the city could support increased transit. She said she would look at introducing amendments to the Plan to put more emphasis on transit in the Plan.

Volan noted potential sources of transit funding. He said that if the state would allow Monroe County to raise a public transit local income tax it would be an extraordinary increase to transit funding. He supported returning the Walnut/College and Third/Atwater corridors to two-way streets. He said he often heard complaints about trucks unloading on Walnut Street, but said there were easy solutions if people were willing to change things.

Rollo said that restoring neighborhood alleyways was very important and would help the transportation grid. He appreciated Piedmont-Smith's comment because he agreed public transit was a missing part of the Plan. He said there were challenges, but thought the city could still do more to promote public transit. He reminded the public to submit amendments and noted that the Council would be going into recess at the end of the meeting.

Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications (and Portions of the Appendicies where Applicable) (*cont'd*)

Rollo read a letter that called for state legislators to pass hate crime legislation.

OTHER BUSINESS

Volan moved and it was seconded to authorize the Council President to sign a letter in support of hate crime legislation.

Motion authorizing joint statement regarding hate crime legislation

Anne Bono, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, thanked the Council for its support and collaboration on the letter. She said the town hall discussion held that day was a great talk about hate crime legislation, privilege, diversity, and inclusion.

Chopra thought it was interesting that the same people who were interested in enhancing criminal sentences for crimes motivated by bias were also concerned with mass incarceration.

Council comment:

Piedmont-Smith supported the letter. She noted that the state needed to do a better job of collecting data about hate crimes.

Sims spoke about participating in a recent Facebook live event that dealth with such issues. He agreed there was a problem with reporting on hate crime statistics. He said that the media could play a role in investigating such crimes and why other communities were not reporting statistics. He looked forward to having many people be involved and participate in a public conversation on those issues.

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

Vote on motion authorizing joint statement regarding hate crime legislation

The meeting went into recess at 10:01pm.

RECESS

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 20th day of March, 2019.

APPROVE:

Dave Rollo, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington