



Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes

Special Meeting: Wednesday, March 30, 2022
5:00pm – 6:00pm

City Hall
McCloskey Conference Room

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Meeting was called to order by Kathleen Mills at 5:02

Present: Kathleen Mills, Ellen Rodkey, Israel Herrera and Jim Whitlatch

A. OTHER BUSINESS

A-1. Review/Adoption of Resolution 22-02 Titled: Declaratory Resolution Approving Projects of the Park District of the City of Bloomington, Indiana, and Making Preliminary Decision to Issue Bonds to Finance Costs of the Projects and Costs Incurred in Connection with and on Account of the Issuance of the Bonds

Paula McDevitt, Director comments: the resolution was introduced to the Park Board at the March 22, 2022 Board meeting for information purposes. Tonight would be the first step in the process. The Board of Park Commissioners have the ability to Bond, and has been done so successfully in past years. Most recently the General Obligation Bond, and the 2018 Bicentennial Bond. The same process would be followed for this bond. The bond would essentially allow for completion of Capital Projects for the City. Parks had this bond process to do, and the City would also be following the same process in City Council under Public Works. There would be quite a comprehensive list of projects that had been discussed and prioritized, many departments had come together and collaborated.

Jeff Underwood, City Controller comments: the approval of the Resolution 22-02 would be the beginning of the process for the issuance of a General Obligation Bond under the Parks authority. Under the legislation that was established for the Parks Board, there was no statutory limit on the amount of General Obligation debt that could be issued. The City did have one. The resolution would authorize a bond up to \$5,800,000, for a term not to exceed six years, the goal would be to pay back in five years, with an interest rate of up to 5%, it was anticipated to be less than 5%. It was expected to be for five million dollars, and be used for project construction cost, then the issuance cost needed to be added, making the total amount of \$5,800,000. The goal would be to have projects that could be completed in the next five to six years. If the Declaratory Resolution was approved, it would then go to City Council, and then come back to the Park Board. The rate was anticipated to be 3.3 cents, and property tax backed. Once approved and issued, the Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) would authorize a property tax rate to specifically repay the bond.

Beth Cate, City Counsel comments: The projects that we were seeking approval for bond payments for, were focused on achieving the City's climate and equity goals. After tonight, the Parks Bond and the Public Works Bond would be introduced at Common Council on April 6th. The bonds would be discussed at the Common Council on April 13th, and would be voted on April 20th. The Park bond would then come back to the Park Board for a Public Hearing, and for final vote. Then there would be a series of steps to get the bond issued.

Tim Street, Operations and Development Division Director Parks and Recreation, and Beth Rosenbarger, Community Service Planning Manager presented projects for the General Obligation Bond

Beth Rosenbarger presented

East Covenanter Protected Bike Lane: the goal would be to increase access for residents by improving E. Covenanter Drive by adding protected bicycle lanes, sidewalk improvements, and bust stop enhancements. The bicycle infrastructure creates active transportation and recreation options to increase access to parks. Latimer Woods and Southeast Park are the closest parks to residents living in the area. The census block has the highest

population density on the southeast side of town. People were more likely to use protected bike lanes, which physically separates vehicles from bikes. Estimated cost - \$2.6 – \$2.88 million to design and construct the project.

N. Dunn Multi-Use Path: the goal would be to design a multiuse path along Dunn Street from the 45/56 Bypass to Old State Road 37 in order to create a way for residents to access Griffy Lake Nature Preserve. Estimated cost – \$800,000 - \$900,000 for construction design. The intention was to create a project ready for possible state trails funding. Purchase of right of way would need to occur before project would be constructed.

Tim Street, presented

Griffy Loop Dam Crossing: the goal was to close the western end of the Griffy Loop trail with improvements to the dam that were value engineered out of the 2021-2022 bond project. There was a current grant request submitted for the project. Estimated cost - \$375,000 based on bids received in fall of 2021.

Beth Rosenbarger presented

West 2nd Protected Bike Lane: the goal is to construct safety, accessibility, and mobility improvements including protected bicycle lanes and new traffic signals to connect to the B-Line. Estimated cost - \$3,161,756 of federal funding has been awarded to pay for up to 80% of the construction and inspection costs. The City must provide 20% local match in addition to design and potential right of way costs. The total local portion necessary to leverage the federal funds is estimated to be \$1,500,000.

Tim Street presented

Replace Gas Equipment, the goal would be to replace handheld and other gas equipment used to maintain parks, trails, and cemeteries. In 2020 & 2021, Parks invested more than \$11,000 in battery-operated landscaping equipment. Battery-operated mowers had the potential to pay off their high purchase price in fuel savings in about a year. Cost - \$25,000 to accelerate efforts to replace gas equipment inventory.

Replace Rogers St. Sidewalk: the goal would be to replace approximately 250 feet of missing sidewalk along Rogers St. Includes culvert extensions on west fork of Clear Creek. Estimated cost - \$200,000. The design was already funded and in progress.

Cascades Phase 6 Trail: the goal is to create a path/trail connection from Millers Showers Park to Cascades Phase 5 Trail & beyond. Estimated cost – up to 3.2 million, including potential necessary infrastructure work.

Park Board Comments: *Kathleen Mills inquired:* the E. 7th Street protected bike lane had created issues for emergency vehicles and was confusing, would there be the same issues on the proposed protected bike lanes. The concern was the amount of traffic on 2nd Street. *Beth Rosenbarger responded:* the issue was with public transit, at that time they used what was thought to be the least possible lane width. The curb did come into play, as well as if it was a 2 way protected lane, or a one way lane on each side of the street. All of that would be taken into consideration when planning the protected bike lanes to prevent issues. We did not see it as a tradeoff, as the bicycles would be taken out of the flow of traffic, causing less times vehicles had to slow down. Slower traffic does not necessarily mean arriving later, the stopping and starting had more of an impact. *Kathleen Mills inquired:* on the process of purchasing right of way. *Beth Rosenbarger responded:* it would be for whatever amount of space that is not currently owned by the City that would needed for street or sidewalks. *Jim Whitlatch commented:* right of way would need to be purchased when there was not enough existing right of way to complete a project. Which was imminent domain, the property owner would be paid fair market value.

Beth Cate presented a list of projects in priority order that would be presented to City Council

<u>Item</u>	<u>Min. Cost Estimate</u>	<u>Max. Cost Estimate</u>
Replace various gas-powered equipment with electrically-powered equipment	\$25,000	\$25,000
Replace missing sidewalk on Rogers St. by Switchyard Park	\$200,000	\$200,000

Addition of protected bicycle lanes along Covenanter Drive (from College Mall to Clarizz Blvd)	\$2,400,000	\$2,880,000
Design and right-of-way for North Dunn Street multiuse path (from the SR 45/46 Bypass to Old SR 37)	\$800,000	\$960,000
Griffy Loop Trail dam crossing and community access improvements	\$375,000	\$375,000
Implementation of West 2nd Street modernization, including new signalization and protected bicycle lanes (from Walker Street to B-Line trail)	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Construction of a pathway to connect Lower Cascades Park to Miller Showers Park (Phase 6)	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000

Beth Cate comments: the total amount of projects were over the \$5,800,000 of the bond. Only a certain bond amount would be approved to be put towards the chosen projects. The projects on the list would be prioritized by Park Board and City Counsel.

Board Comments: Jim Whitlatch inquired, on how the projects would be approved. Would the Park Board and Common Council have to approve and agree on what would be funded? Beth Cate responded: yes, what Common Council approves, would be sent back to the Park Board for final approval. They could change the order of prioritized projects or remove projects from the list. That would be what would come back to the Park Board for approval. Jim Whitlatch inquired: what if the Common Council and the Park Board had a difference of opinion in the priority. Bradley Bingham, Barnes & Thornburg, LLP responded: the Common Council had the final say. The process to issue bonds was: the Park Board acted first, then it had to be approved by the Common Council, and that would then come back to the Park Board. If there would be a fundamental disagreement, Common Council would have the final say. Their approval would be conditional on some items, such as size of bond, or scope of projects. Jim Whitlatch request: clarification on following statement in the staff report “*The proceeds of the Bonds will be used for park purposes throughout the City of Bloomington, Indiana Park District, in order to promote climate change preparedness and implement equity and quality of life for all, which projects and investments may be modified based on input from the Common Council of the City, and which, upon completion, are expected to generate revenue savings in amounts necessary to offset debt service on the Bonds*” Bradley Bingham responded: the first part, the Council would have input on projects and so forth. The second part, the projects and improvements being financed with the bond proceeds were expected to save the City money in other respects. The saving were not going to pay debt service, more of a benchmark or aspirational goal of what was being done. Buzz Krohn, O.W. Krohn & Associates, LLP commented: the total bond issued was kept under what was called the Controlled Project Debt Limit. \$5,800,000 of bonds could be issued without having to go to referendum. That was the reason not all eligible projects authorized on the list would be funded. That was the maximum set bond amount, and however many projects could be funded for that amount had to be on the list. That was the difference between the Controlled and Non Controlled bonds, and why there was a limit on the amount of bonds to be issued. Ellen Rodkey inquired: when would the current Park Bonds be paid off. Paula McDevitt responded: the current General Obligation Bonds that were started in 2016, were currently being finalized. The Bicentennial Bonds that were started in 2018, would be finished in 2023. Ellen Rodkey inquired: how often did Parks go through the bonding process. Paula McDevitt stated: there was no limit, and referred the question to Jeff Underwood. Jeff Underwood responded, there was no limit. The criteria was, if the funds were needed a General Obligation Debt could be done. The debt per capita burden was looked at, as well as what it would do to property tax rates. In the past, one large bond was issued and the rate and repayment would be for fifteen to twenty years, and then it would be renewed. That was similar to what was being proposed here. The five million would have a rate of 3.3 cents, and be paid off in five years, it could then be reauthorize and reissue and keep the same rate. It was less of an impact, but essentially the same criteria. It was decided to do three five year deals instead of one 15 year. Israel Herrera inquired, on the bus enhancement in the East Covenanter project. Beth Rosenberger responded: staff would work with transit on the project to improve the bus stops. A lot of stops did not have shelters or curb ramps. It would be helpful to have a slightly raised platform, which aids in faster bus loading and unloading. There would

be no new services, just improvements at bus stops that would be helpful for the riders as well as City Transit. Israel Herrera inquired: on the amount of gas powered equipment Parks currently had, and what would happen to the gas powered equipment that would be replaced. Tim Street responded: Parks currently had quite a bit of gas powered equipment. There were stationary mowers at many locations, and contractual mowing which currently there was no control over. BPRD would replace equipment as it aged out. \$25,000 would purchase approximately one new electric mower. Staff would know after one year how well an electric mower would work. Israel Herrera inquired: why was there a difference between the minimum and maximum on some items on the project list. Beth Rosenberger responded: due to the length of some projects, they could take up to three years, a design would need to be completed, then possible purchase of any right of ways, then construction. Paula McDevitt responded: some of the projects listed were shovel ready, and a good estimate of cost was known. Tim Street commented: currently, the cost of construction was very volatile and could change rapidly. Ellen Rodkey inquired: if the Common Council could reprioritize the list being presented tonight. Beth Cate responded: the list presented would be sent to Common Council and they could prioritize the list. Ellen Rodkey inquired: why Phase 6 of Lower Cascades was on the priority list and not Phase 4. Tim Street responded: Phase 4 was also on the list of bond possibilities, but after consultation with other departments and public input, Phase 6 was selected. Jim Whitlatch inquired: if tonight's task for the Park Board was to vote on Resolution 22-02. Paula McDevitt responded: correct, a vote would need to be taken.

Public comment was taken: Citizen supported North Dunn Street multi-use path.

Board Comments: Israel Herrera thanked the citizen for the comments and recommended they attend the City Council meetings.

Beth Cate recommended: when voting on the project list, vote on them in the order they were presented tonight, which was the order that would be going to the Common Council. The projects were all the same, but Exhibit A in the packet had recently been updated.

Jim Whitlatch made a motion to approve Resolution No. 22-02 with Exhibit A, being the exhibit that was present by Beth Cate, City Counsel, with modification to item four on the list, was for design only. Ellen Rodkey seconded the motion. Vote taken: motion unanimously carried 4-0.

Paula McDevitt stated the next Park Board Meeting would be a Work Session scheduled on April 6th at 4:00 pm, and would be held in the Allison Conference Room in City Hall.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.