

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, June 15, 2022 at 6:30pm, Council President Susan Sandberg presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
June 15, 2022

Councilmembers present: Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith (left at 11:30pm), Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger (arrived at 6:32pm, left at 11:23pm), Susan Sandberg, Sue Sgambelluri, Jim Sims, Ron Smith
Councilmembers present via Zoom: Stephen Volan (arrive 6:37, left at 10:10pm)

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Councilmembers absent: none

Sgambelluri moved and it was seconded that the council amend the agenda to change the order of Reports from the Mayor and City Offices to follow the Legislation for Second Readings and Resolutions, and under legislation for Second Readings, the council shall take up the legislation in the following order: Ordinance 22-19, Resolution 22-13, Resolution 22-12, Ordinance 22-18, Ordinance 22-17, and Ordinance 22-15.

Rollo stated he would not support the motion and said the public was expecting the agenda for the meeting as published.

Council discussion:

Sandberg provided options including amending the motion.

The motion to amend the agenda received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 2 (Piedmont-Smith, Rollo), Abstain: 0.

Vote to amend agenda [6:33pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:36pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:37pm]

Sgambelluri mentioned her upcoming constituent meeting.

REPORTS

Piedmont-Smith spoke about the former hospital site, newly named Hopewell. She provided an update on the site and the city's progress.

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:37pm]

Flaherty noted his constituent meetings. He provided an update on the Community Voices in Health's Community Health Improvement Plan including think tanks, community health considerations and concerns, and focus areas.

Rollo mentioned his and Sandberg's upcoming joint constituent meeting. He commented on traffic concerns by Maxwell and Sheridan and his disdain for the planned speed bumps.

There were no council committee reports.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [6:48pm]

Sandberg limited the public speaker comment period to four minutes per speaker.

- PUBLIC [6:48pm]

Sarah Owen commented on her employment in the Parks and Recreation department. She said that there had been a bonus given to employees for in-person work during 2021. She believed she qualified for the bonus but had been denied. She had reached out to the department and Human Resources, with no response.

Jim Shelton spoke about the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), and the Herald Times article about the Oxford House which helped those facing addiction.

- Public (cont'd)

Marc Haggerty noted issues with the basketball courts and posts at Switchyard Park. He also discussed shootings in his neighborhood.

Mike Carmin commented on property owned by the city and the money spent on acquisition, maintenance, and more.

There were no appointments to boards or commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:04pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:04pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-19 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Deputy Clerk Jennifer Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 1, Nays: 0, Abstain: 5.

Ordinance 22-19 –An Ordinance Authorizing the Entering into of a Conditional Project Expenditure Agreement of the City of Bloomington, Indiana (Meridiam Project), and the Disposition of the Proceeds Thereof to Meridiam, and Authorizing and Approving Other Actions in Respect Thereto [7:04pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-19 be adopted.

Mayor John Hamilton presented the legislation and highlighted the benefits of digital equity in the community. He provided details on costs, the partnership with Meridiam, and concerns with potential delays. Hamilton also discussed the process and history of the project and the selection of Meridiam.

Rick Dietz, Director of the Information and Technology Services (ITS) department, reviewed the legislation. He discussed open access network, network neutrality, digital equity, fiber optic communications, and objectives, competition, and the history of the project. Dietz detailed the project elements, digital equity impacts, city contributions to the project, and the Public Tax Increment Finance (TIF) and its district. He also outlined the input and feedback from the public throughout the process.

Sandberg asked Dietz to explain why the discussions with Meridiam had been held in private.

Council questions:

Dietz explained that when the city entered into a letter of intent with Meridiam, it included a non-disclosure agreement where Meridiam was able to share proprietary information with the city. He explained the process.

Beth Cate, Corporation Counsel, concurred with Dietz and further explained the purpose of the non-disclosure agreement. She noted that the discussion pertained to the substantive terms of a deal between the city and a partner. It allowed for candid exploration of options.

Rollo was concerned about the imprecision of numbers such as the TIF which had recently changed and asked for clarification.

Dietz said that the TIF number had changed because the term went from twenty-five years to twenty, which was an improvement.

Rollo stated that the agreement provided to council was in draft form and asked if it could be further changed.

Ordinance 22-19 (cont'd)

Cate corrected Rollo regarding the TIF amount. She also said that there might be editorial or typo corrections to the agreement, but not substantial changes.

Sims said that the city committed to twenty years, and asked if Meridiam would be committing to the market for only ten years.

Dietz explained that the agreement was that Meridiam would stay in the market for ten years and not sell, for example. It was an additional provision that there would not be a change in ownership.

Sgambelluri asked what other benchmarks there were to determine the Internet Service Provider (ISP) was successful.

Dietz responded that the goal was that the provider would make the appropriate investment to have the project be a success. One benchmark was achieving a 35% target after five years, specifically in low-income communities, and another was net neutrality. He provided additional information.

Sgambelluri asked if there was a plan to obtain user feedback.

Dietz explained that was not in the contract but that achieving 35% access would be a result of providing quality service.

Rosenbarger asked if the timeline included putting infrastructure in lower-income communities first.

Dietz said that there would be active targeting during the build out, and the city intended to prioritize low-income areas.

Rosenbarger said that residents had not been using the digital subsidy and asked why the administration thought that they would with Meridiam.

Dietz explained that part of Meridiam's ethos was equity and that they would have staff going to households to assist with signing up for the service.

Piedmont-Smith said that the legal agreement was thirty years, but that the TIF was only twenty years. She asked if that meant that the TIF only existed for twenty years, or if that was the reimbursement period.

Larry Allen, Assistant City Attorney, said that the Redevelopment Commission passed the TIF for twenty years, and it could be extended.

Brad Bingham, Barnes & Thornburg representative, explained that the TIF would automatically expire after twenty years, but could be extended for an additional five years.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the period of the TIF was the same as the period in which the personal property tax would be refunded.

Bingham confirmed that was correct.

Allen clarified that 5% went to the city.

Volan asked if the \$85,000 annual donation was indefinite.

Dietz said it was for the length of the contract and would go into a digital equity fund maintained by the city.

Volan asked if there was a plan to have future providers using the infrastructure also make an annual donation. He asked if the figure would escalate with cost of living.

Dietz said that only Meridiam was bound by the contract, and not future providers. The dollar amount was fixed and would not escalate with cost of living.

Cate added that if the contract was renewed, then the annual donation would grow to \$100,000.

Volan asked when the exclusive provider would be identified.

Dietz said that agreement was still under negotiation.

Scott Layman, Meridiam, confirmed that they were in the process of finalizing the contract and would announce in the coming weeks.

Volan asked if the provider's identity was being withheld until council considered Ordinance 22-19.

Layman said it would be withheld until the negotiation was complete.

Smith asked if neighboring communities would also have TIFs.

Dietz said that other communities had done an abatement.

Flaherty asked how the program would be marketed, especially for low-income households.

Dietz said there was a draft of the marketing plan and that there would be a dedicated person going to households to share information and assist with signing up for the service.

Flaherty asked about the digital strategic plan, the recommendation for a digital equity coalition composed of community members, and how that fit into the city's plans.

Dietz explained that there was not a formal group established yet, but that a coalition would be part of the process.

Sgambelluri commented on nationwide efforts to establish fiber optics, and asked if the city's plan would collaborate with that effort.

Dietz believed that the efforts were rural based and would not impact the city's plans.

Sgambelluri asked who would do upgrades throughout the life of the project.

Dietz understood it was at Meridiam's and the ISP's discretion, with the city ensuring that the equipment was updated.

Rollo asked if the project offered something to the city that was not already available and why there was not a requirement of 100% coverage.

Dietz explained the city's authority with requiring 100% coverage from Comcast, for example. He provided additional details.

Rollo asked if things like utility poles could be used, much like electricity having full coverage.

Dietz clarified that not every area had poles, but could be used with certain requirements, criteria, and limitations. Another constraint was private land owners giving permission for the infrastructure to pass through.

Rollo asked if the city would be allowed free access.

Dietz explained the details in the contract. He said it was not entirely free but was a reduced rate.

Sims asked for clarification on possible downsides to residents and businesses even if they were not clear at the time.

Dietz said the underground and aerial installation could be cumbersome. He provided additional examples.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the minimum coverage of 85% and if the provider was required to explain why certain areas could not be covered.

Dietz said that the providers had to demonstrate where they were providing service and that they would need to disclose to the city if there was an area where they could not provide service.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the city had any recourse.

Cate said that the providers were required to provide details to the city and document the area and reasons, satisfactorily to the city and verified by a third party.

Ordinance 22-19 (cont'd)

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on the inconvenience of the installation to the community.

Dietz stated that construction and installation had to adhere to city requirements like not obstructing sidewalks. He said that the concentrated period of installation was ideal and the network would be built out as quickly as possible.

Flaherty said that the TIF district was roughly the size of the city, and asked how growth or annexation impacted the district.

Dietz said that the annexation areas were included in the project but the city would go live first.

Allen explained that if the district expanded, the TIF process would restart and the proposal would go to the Redevelopment Commission and council.

Cate further explained that if the build out included areas subject to annexation, prior to the completion of annexation, they would be subject to county approval. For future growth, the parties could opt to include those areas.

Flaherty asked if county approval was required for certain areas.

Cate confirmed that was correct, in the case that the build out was ready prior to the finalization of annexation or if the litigation resulted in some areas not being annexed.

Flaherty asked what would be the funding mechanism if the county wanted the expansion.

Dietz clarified that Meridiam, as a telecom provider, had the right to build in the city and county.

Flaherty asked if the service would be free to the county via the city's TIF.

Dietz explained that the design included those areas, but that there were unknown factors due to litigation on annexation.

Bingham further explained the provision for the county.

Christopher Emge spoke in favor of Ordinance 22-19 and voiced concerns on possibility of bankruptcy, et cetera.

Public comment:

Peter Dorfman commented against the exclusivity with Ordinance 22-19 and stated there was not an urgency at the time.

David Wolfe Bender discussed reasons for supporting Ordinance 22-19 and commented on tax abatements.

William Coultier spoke about the process and sudden urgency in drafting Ordinance 22-19 and urged delaying the project.

Matt Kelly spoke as a representative of Comcast and discussed the speeds of service, uploads and downloads, and costs.

Steve Layman commented on fiber technology and his experience with internet services, and against Ordinance 22-19.

Russ Skibo discussed digital equity and the cost of internet service.

Eric Ost believed insufficient time had been given to Ordinance 22-19.

Mike Trotzke spoke in favor of Ordinance 22-19 including the advantages and benefits of citywide fiber.

Cate read a statement from Brad Wheeler in support of TIF financing for the fiber proposal with Meridiam and the city and provided reasons.

Ordinance 22-19 (cont'd)

Rollo reiterated his concern on requiring only 85% coverage and asked if a higher commitment could be achieved.

Council questions:

Dietz explained the current agreement and said that Meridiam agreed to get as close to 100% as possible.

Layman clarified that Meridiam was not prepared to commit to 100% coverage. He also said that other providers, like Comcast, had exclusivity and Meridiam would be coming into a competitive market. The 85% provision was a precaution in case there were areas where infrastructure could not go in, like not being able to dig.

Rollo asked why equal internet speed was not included for low income households.

Dietz explained the internet speeds, and said that the subsidy could be expanded to beyond the current speed offered by providers like Comcast.

Rollo asked if the \$1 million that was being put towards digital equity could be used differently.

Dietz confirmed that was correct, but that the investment with fiber would extend much further than \$1 million. It would be a robust program with equity as the goal.

Cate said that the funds were dedicated to pay for half of the coverage for low income households, and Meridiam was paying the other half. The low income household would not pay anything.

Sgambelluri asked for clarity on what it meant to be a benefit corporation, as Meridiam had been described.

Dietz said that a benefit corporation was not 100% guided by profit. There were other elements for a corporation's board to measure success, like social objectives such as sustainability and equity.

Sgambelluri asked what the mechanism was for measuring that type of success.

Dietz responded that staff had looked closely at that component during negotiations.

Layman stated that Meridiam had committed to 85% coverage and would assure that the construction would go into low-income communities. Those households would then choose which provider to use and could also opt for a higher speed.

Cate said that net neutrality, accountability, and open access were in the contract.

Rollo asked if a service level agreement had been negotiated.

Dietz responded that there were provisions for the city and asked Layman to also address the question.

Layman said that there were service level agreements with the ISP and they had similar commitments with end-user customers.

Rollo asked if that agreement had been shared with the city.

Layman stated that it had not.

Rollo said that there was a 35% take rate, and with twelve to fourteen thousand households in Bloomington, Meridiam stood to make a significant profit.

Dietz said that staff had estimated the overall value of the project which was a multi-layer project including the infrastructure provider, and the ISP. So the profit did not go directly towards one entity. He noted there would be more than one ISP, too.

Rollo asked if a public option had been considered.

Dietz referenced the history of the project, and the request for proposals. He said that the public option was risky because the city did not own the electric utilities. Owning the utility poles was a significant contributing factor for the success of municipal broadband. He said that it was likely that the state would not allow a city to build fiber infrastructure. Also, the city would have to bond,

and without bond capacity would then have to fall back on property taxes and end-user rates. With the agreement, Meridiam was taking on the risks.

Ordinance 22-19 (cont'd)

Rollo believed more time was needed to consider the project. He did not believe that there was sufficient consideration of a public option. The city was intervening with the market. He saw an opportunity for tremendous revenue potential and did not believe it was ideal to lock into an agreement for the next several decades. He would be voting against the legislation.

Council comment:

Sims appreciated the discussion and would be voting in favor of Ordinance 22-19. He wondered how lucrative the revenue had been for the current ISPs. He also wondered why the discussion on digital equity was occurring with this legislation but had not been brought up in the past. He commented that the Bloomington chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) had discussed things like digital equity, as was questioned by a public commenter. Sims expressed disdain with a public speaker's reference to Brown v. Board of Education as equal to ISPs. He reiterated that the council and administration would hold Meridiam and ISPs accountable.

Piedmont-Smith thanked Dietz and Cate for their work on the proposal. Currently, no one was building a high-speed fiber optic in the city. The proposal put forth by Meridiam, whose values aligned with the city's, would invest \$50 million for infrastructure, offer high speeds to low-income households, and donate \$85,000 per year to the digital equity fund. She believed that the proposal put all the risk on Meridiam and in return the city got a digital fiber network which was more reliable and had better speeds. She agreed with Dietz that the state would likely prohibit the city from building its own municipal broadband. The state had demonstrated they did not believe in Home Rule for certain agendas. Piedmont-Smith would support Ordinance 22-19.

Rosenbarger thanked everyone for their input. She would be voting in favor of Ordinance 22-19. She appreciated that there would be a dedicated person to assist households with signing up. Rosenbarger commented on the history of the project and in reaching an agreement with Meridiam, which had a good mission. She hoped that the areas with little or no access to internet would have service first.

Smith noted his process in considering the project and his discussions with many knowledgeable community members and staff. He determined that it was not possible to have municipal broadband service, and did not see a significant downside to the project. Smith appreciated that there would be a dedicated person to assist households with signing up. He would support Ordinance 22-19.

Volan referenced his experience with being an ISP with his company Blue Marble. He commented on additional ISPs like Comcast who had been a cable provider only, at first. Volan provided a history of ISPs in Bloomington. He noted that internet service was necessary for schools and work and that the current service was inadequate. The three ISPs in Bloomington had the capability of providing better service and speeds but had not done so. Volan said that Meridiam was proposing to provide an expansion of the digital underground at a reasonable price. He appreciated that there would be truer

competition and not a monopoly by the current large telecom companies. Volan commented on the fiber cables which would provide high speed internet, for free to those who qualified, at a higher speed than what he paid \$85 per month for. He believed the deal with Meridiam was a good agreement with little risk to the city and it leveled the playing field in the community. He would be supporting Ordinance 22-19.

Ordinance 22-19 (cont'd)

Sgambelluri thanked everyone for the discussion. She referenced her analysis and consideration of Ordinance 22-19. She believed fiber was ideal and that the proposal had not been rushed. She mentioned the input from commissions and the community, prior to council's consideration. She noted that there were always going to be items that were unknown along with imperfect information. She appreciated that the project facilitated the city's goal of digital equity, and the additional ability to assist those who needed hardware, like computers, through the digital equity fund.

Flaherty stated that he would support Ordinance 22-19. He appreciated all the work on the proposal. He believed it was a good proposal.

Sandberg said it was a difficult decision and appreciated that council had carefully considered the proposal, including the TIF. She understood why the final agreement could not be presented due to council's consideration of the TIF. She noted it would be ideal to allow more time to consider the proposal, especially for the public who might not fully understand the proposal.

Rollo said that since most councilmembers indicated they would support the project, he would not make a motion to postpone. He believed that more time was needed to consider the proposal which had been rushed. He stated that the city commissions' consideration of the project was in favor with the mayor's proposal since they were mostly appointed by the mayor. Rollo said that the infrastructure was essential, different from water and electricity, but that the vast majority of community members needed the service. He did not believe that the commitment to only 85% was equitable. He thought it ideal to have a detailed analysis of the public option. He commented on the exclusivity of the ISPs. Rollo would vote against Ordinance 22-19.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-19 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Rollo), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-19
[10:03pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-13 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 1, Nays: 0, Abstain: 5.

Resolution 22-13 – To Approve and Issue the Plan Commission Order Found in Plan Commission Resolution RS-23-22 Re: Authorizing the Bloomington Redevelopment Commission to Create a New Meridiam Econor Development Allocation Area
[10:05pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-13 be adopted.

Larry Allen, Assistant City Attorney, presented the legislation and highlighted the key components.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comment:

The motion to adopt Resolution 22-13 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Rollo), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 22-13 as amended [10:07pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-12 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.

Resolution 22-12 –Authorizing the Allocation of the Jack Hopkins Social Services Program Funds for the Year 2022 and Related Matters [10:09pm]

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, noted that voice votes were appropriate since Volan had left the meeting.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-12 be adopted.

Lucas presented the legislation and noted the criteria, goals, and allocations of the funds. He highlighted the number of applications and funding requests, as well as the total available funding and process undertaken by the committee. Sandberg read the recommended funding allocations to community organizations.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the Open Arms Christian Ministries, Inc., and if there was a religious test for people to receive the support.

Council questions:

Sandberg said that the request was carefully scrutinized and the committee felt it was appropriate to fund.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the families receiving assistance were required to be members of a church.

Sandberg confirmed they did not have that requirement.

Carol Canfield morally objected to funding for Planned Parenthood.

Public comment:

Flaherty thanked the committee for their work.

Council comment:

Sgambelluri thanked the committee and members of the public who had reached out to councilmembers. She had reached out to Planned Parenthood and All-Options and confirmed that no Jack Hopkins funding went to providing abortions.

Sims also thanked the public for their feedback. He believed that funding contraceptives and education helped prevent abortions. He commented on the difficulty for some community members in obtaining resources like contraceptives.

The motion to adopt Resolution 22-12 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 22-12 [10:27pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-18 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 2, Nays: 0, Abstain: 4.

Ordinance 22-18 – To Amend Title 8 of the Bloomington Municipal Code, Entitled “Historic Preservation and Protection” to Establish a Historic District – Re: 200 E Kirkwood Ave. (Bloomington National Savings And Loan Association) (Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission, Petitioner) [10:28pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-18 be adopted.

Gloria Colom-Braña, Program Manager, Historic Preservation in the Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) department, presented the legislation. She summarized the historic district nomination and discussed the property and the unique structure.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

Matt Seddon, Historic Preservation Committee (HPC), spoke in favor of the historic district nomination and provided reasons. Public comment:

Chris Sturbaum, HPC, commented about preserving architectural forms around Bloomington.

Tim Culver spoke on behalf of the owner of the property and asked council to understand that the property was purchased with the intention of redeveloping. He explained the difficulty with moving forward with the development if the historic nomination passes.

Mike Carmin urged council to not pass Ordinance 22-18.

Sam DeSollar, HPC, provided reasons to keep the structure in question in Ordinance 22-18.

Duncan Campbell, HPC, spoke in favor of Ordinance 22-18 and highlighted the importance of keeping the structure.

Rosenbarger asked what the difference was between contributing and notable ratings.

Council comments:

Colom-Braña explained the types of ratings, which was standard nationwide. She said a structure was contributing as a grouping whereas a notable structure had historic value on its own.

Rosenbarger asked about the difference in reviewing the different types of structures.

Colom-Braña clarified that there were restrictions with things like demolition and the percentage of the structure that could be demolished or changed.

Rosenbarger asked if the historic designation decreased the market price of the property.

Campbell said it could possibly change the price and described different scenarios that were possible, as well as studies that were conducted.

Rosenbarger asked why the parking lot was included and if it had to remain the same if designated historic.

Campbell stated that typically the entire property would be included in the historic district but the parking lot did not have to remain the same. He described options the owner could take.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on what the opportunity zone was.

Alex Crowley, Director of the Economic and Sustainable Development (ESD) department, explained that an opportunity zone allowed an investor to develop in an area and have their taxes deferred, for example. It was a national effort and Bloomington had three opportunity zones.

Piedmont-Smith asked if it made financing in the zone easier and if there was a time limit for the zone's designation.

Crowley clarified that it lowered the cost of capital. He believed the designation was for ten years.

Rollo said the building was integral to Kirkwood and thanked the public for their feedback.

Sims stated that he had been concerned with the increase in cost of maintenance regarding historic designations. If the structure was usable, it was important to keep it. He thanked Colom-Braña for her effort in researching any associated racist history with the building. He said it was easy to see the beauty in the structures and overlook some ugly history. It was important to be comprehensive in

knowing the history of properties. He referenced the many deeds in the Monroe County Recorder’s office that explicitly prohibited a property to be sold to “negroes.”

Ordinance 22-18 (cont’d)

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-18 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-18 [11:17pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-17 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 6, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Ordinance 22-17 – An Ordinance to Amend Ordinance 21-36, as Amended by Ordinance 22-03, Which Fixed Salaries for Officers of the Police and Fire Departments for the Year 2022 - Re: Incentives for Police officers and increasing Probationary Officer base pay instead of providing retention pay [11:17pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-17 be adopted.

Caroline Shaw, Director of Human Resources, presented the legislation and highlighted the key components of the proposed salaries. She reviewed answers to questions from council such as tracking, metrics, and recruiting.

Council questions:

There were no council questions.

Public comment:

There was no public comment.

Council comments:

Rollo supported Ordinance 22-17 as one step forward though more was needed.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-17 [11:25pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-17 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-15 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 0, Nays: 2, Abstain: 3.

Ordinance 22-15 – To Vacate a Public Parcel - Re: A 12-Foot Wide Alley Segment Running East/West between the B-Line Trail and the First Alley to the West, North of 7th Street and South of 8th Street (Peerless Development, Petitioner) [11:25pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-15 be adopted.

Michael Cordaro explained why the petitioner requested the delay including a possible redesign.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-15 be postponed until the Regular Session on July 20, 2022.

Council questions:

There were no council questions.

Public comment:

There were no public comments.

Council comments:

There were no council comments.

The motion to postpone Ordinance 22-15 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to postpone Ordinance 22-15 [11:28pm]

Crowley explained the requirement for the annual tax abatement report.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [11:28pm]

Jane Kupersmith, Assistant Director for Small Business Development, ESD, reviewed the annual report including the compliance review process, roles and responsibilities, general standards, evaluative criteria, authorization process, economic impacts, jobs, and provided details on specific abatements.

Crowley highlighted two items that staff had looked at more closely. First, Urban Station had fewer jobs and lower salary numbers they had committed to. Second, the average wage at Catalent. He provided additional details.

- The Mayor and City Offices (cont'd)

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

Sims said that in regards to Urban Station, it seemed unnecessary to list it in the abatement if there were no expectations of compliance.

Council comments:

Allen said it would continue to be listed and noted that compliance was for things under the entity's control and excluded issues out of their control.

Rollo moved and it was seconded to approve the Annual Tax Abatement and Economic Development Commission Report. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to approve report [11:48pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [11:48pm]

There was no public comment.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [11:48pm]

Lucas reviewed the upcoming schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [11:50pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded to adjourn. The motion was approved by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT [11:52pm]

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 21st day of June, 2023.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

Sue Sgambelluri
Sue Sgambelluri, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

Nicole Bolden
Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington