

In Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, September 16, 2020 at 6:30pm, Council President Stephen Volan presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council. Per the Governor's Executive Orders, this meeting was conducted electronically via Zoom.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
September 16, 2020

Councilmembers present via Zoom: Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger, Susan Sandberg, Sue Sgambelluri, Jim Sims, Ron Smith, Stephen Volan
Councilmembers absent: none

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Council President Stephen Volan summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:31pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:33pm]

There were no reports from council members.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS
- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [6:34pm]
- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [6:47pm]
- PUBLIC [6:49pm]

Mayor John Hamilton gave a statement and provided details about the proposed Local Income Tax (LIT) Resolution that the Council would be hearing later that evening.

Sgambelluri reported that the Sustainable Development Committee would be meeting to hear from Alex Crowley, Director of Economic and Sustainable Development.

Jim Shelton spoke about the need for Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) volunteers and said that training was starting soon.

David Keppel, spokesperson for Bloomington Peace Action Coalition, spoke about the dangers related to nuclear weapons.

Greg Alexander spoke about the need for better sidewalk funding.

There were no appointments to boards or commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [6:59pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [6:59pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 20-15 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 20-15 - To Rezone a 19.73 Acre Property from Employment (EM) to Residential Estate (RE) - Re: 2300 W. Tapp Road (Duncan Campbell, Petitioner)

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 20-15 be adopted.

Ryan Robling, Zoning Planner from the Planning and Transportation Department, presented the legislation. The current zoning classification of Employment (EM) did not allow for the construction of a single family dwelling. The petitioner requested the property be rezoned to Residential Estate (RE) to allow for the expansion of the currently existing structure. The Plan Commission voted 9-0 to send the legislation to the Council with a favorable recommendation to approve the request to rezone.

Duncan Campbell, Petitioner, said that he was available for any questions.

Piedmont-Smith, Chair of the Land Use Committee, shared the committee's support of the project.

Ordinance 20-15 (cont'd)

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

Greg Alexander said the rezoning process for this project was objectionable.

Public comment:

Piedmont-Smith disagreed with Greg Alexander and said she supported the legislation.

Council comment:

Sandberg said the legislation had been approved by the Plan Commission and thanked Piedmont-Smith for reminding people about the updates to zoning maps.

Sims pointed out that the Land Use Committee recommended this legislation be forwarded to the council with a 4-0 vote to approve the request by the petitioner.

Flaherty responded to Alexander's comments, noting that RE was used sparingly for narrow uses, and this property qualified for that use.

Volan asked if the EM zoning allowed for any type of housing.

Robling responded that it did not.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 20-15 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 20-15 [7:22pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 20-16 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the Land Use Committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 4, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Ordinance 20-16 - To Establish the Sustainable Development Non-Reverting Fund and To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" (Adding Chapter 2.35 Entitled "Sustainable Development Fund Advisory Commission") [7:23pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 20-16 be adopted.

Flaherty summarized Ordinance 20-16 including the creation of a dedicated Sustainable Development Fund to receive all monies received by the City of Bloomington from an income tax rate that had been designated for economic development purposes. The proposal would also amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code (BMC) titled Administration and Personnel to create a new seven member Sustainable Development Fund Advisory Commission. This Commission would, among other duties, prioritize projects to be funded with the income tax revenue, make funding recommendations, and report on the use of the fund.

Hamilton strongly welcomed collaboration between such a commission and the administration. He suggested the ordinance be tabled until after the vote for the income tax, in case it did not pass and the commission was not needed.

Rollo asked about the procedure for tabling or postponing the adoption of the ordinance.

Council questions:

Volan stated that the number of votes in favor of Resolution 20-13 would indicate the next steps.

Rollo asked Flaherty if it was ideal to wait to see if the Local Income Tax (LIT) passed.

Ordinance 20-16 (cont'd)

Flaherty said that there was uncertainty about how the funds would be used if the tax was adopted. If Ordinance 20-16 passed, it would establish a procedure for advising how the funds were spent and would affect councilmembers' votes.

Piedmont-Smith added that a motion to postpone should include a date for consideration of the postponed legislation.

Sims asked if this advisory commission would evaluate only revenues that came from this tax.

Flaherty confirmed that was correct.

Sims asked Flaherty if it was only the LIT that would be affected by Ordinance 20-16.

Flaherty confirmed that Ordinance 20-16 would only redirect LIT monies to the non-reverting sustainable development fund established by the legislation. It would not affect other city funds.

Sims stated that the LIT funds would go into the general fund and he was not sure if the investments would be separate.

Flaherty said there was no Economic Development Income Tax (EDIT) and it would be clear and isolated in the new fund.

Sims asked if the legislation would have no effect on non-EDIT funds.

Flaherty confirmed that was correct.

Sims referenced a whereas clause that stated that climate change had a disproportionate impact on the health and financial well-being of low-income communities and communities of color. He inquired how the ordinance would affect low-income communities and communities of color in Bloomington.

Flaherty said that nationally and statewide, it was clear that there was classism and racism in policy that affected low-income communities and communities of color. He said that by addressing climate action, the communities would be affected positively in Bloomington. He provided additional details regarding racial and socioeconomic injustices.

Sgambelluri asked if Ordinance 20-16 and the LIT were passed that evening, would they apply to future income taxes.

Flaherty believed it would though that was not the intent. The ordinance could be amended in the future if another income tax was adopted.

Sgambelluri asked how Flaherty envisioned measuring the impact of the recommendations of the commission.

Flaherty gave examples of potential metrics that might be used to measure the impact.

Rollo made a motion to postpone the adoption of Ordinance 20-16 until after the vote is taken for the adoption of an income tax tonight. The motion was not seconded.

Motion to postpone adoption of Ordinance 20-16

Smith asked how the commission would be authorized to say how these revenues would be spent and if it was permissible.

Council questions:

Flaherty responded that the intent of the ordinance was to create a dedicated fund for the revenues from this tax. The commission would not have the authority to decide how the funds were spent, and would only advise the council and city administration how they felt the money should be spent. Any recommendations made by the commission for capital improvement expenditures would also be advisory.

Smith asked how it would relate to the capital plan.

Flaherty explained that a capital improvement plan was required by state law. He said that as changes were made, the plan would need to be update. He provided examples.

Ordinance 20-16 (cont'd)

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Amendment 01 to Ordinance 20-16 be adopted. Flaherty presented Amendment 01.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 20-16

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Councilmember Flaherty and clarifies that the Common Council may adopt legislation for the expenditure of income tax revenue without a recommendation from the Sustainable Development Fund Advisory Commission if the Commission fails to provide a timely recommendation. The amendment also clarifies that the Mayor and Common Council should generally accept the Commission's funding recommendations but are not bound to do so.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

Daniel Bingham wondered if Amendment 01 undermined the commission and removed the authority to dictate how the revenues from the tax would be spent.

Public comment:

David Keppel stated his support for Amendment 01 and spoke in favor of collaboration.

Alex Goodlad opposed Amendment 01 and thought it was necessary to balance spending power with the community.

Rollo asked if Amendment 01 was created to explicitly state that the commission could not make binding decisions and added a time frame for the commission's advice.

Council comment:

Flaherty stated the main purpose of the Ordinance 20-16 was to get the community and elected officials involved at an earlier stage in developing and making a recommendation for the use of the funds. He did not believe that a commission was not permitted to delegate authority over funding.

Lucas explained that state law prohibited delegating funding authority.

Rollo asked if the council had to wait until a recommendation came from the advisory commission before the administration or council took action.

Flaherty responded yes but with a time limit given to the commission to make a recommendation.

Sandberg appreciated the concept of Ordinance 20-16 and did not oppose it but would abstain on a vote to adopt due to the uncertainty of the income tax being adopted.

Rollo felt Amendment 01 was necessary when no recommendation came from the commission. He said he would vote to adopt it.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 20-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 2 (Sandberg, Sims).

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 20-16 [8:03pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 20-16. Flaherty presented Amendment 02.

Amendment 02 to Ordinance 20-16

Amendment 02 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Councilmember Flaherty and removes a condition for effectiveness of Ordinance 20-16 in order to avoid improper delegation of legislative authority.

There was no council questions.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There was no council comment.

Council comments.

The motion to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 20-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 2 (Sandberg, Sims).

Vote to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 20-16 [8:07pm]

Sgambelluri asked if the work of other commissions would influence the decisions of the proposed commission. She wondered if the commission would undermine other commissions.

Council questions:

Flaherty described how the commission members would be chosen, with the goal that there would be a good representation of opinions. At a later date, this question might need to be revisited and reevaluated. The commission could ask other commissions for their expertise when it was relevant.

Sgambelluri asked if any boards would change as a result of the passage of the legislation forming the new commission.

Flaherty explained that was to be determined by the commission including if they sought feedback from other commissions and boards.

Sims inquired about the language in Ordinance 20-16 that allowed undefined types of expenditures in times of economic crisis.

Flaherty included the language to provide flexibility to the commission in times of economic crisis, natural disaster, or health emergencies and provided examples. In those times, the revenues from the income tax could be used differently. He provided examples of the usage of other funds.

Sims asked if the commission could recommend using the EDIT funds to enhance public safety.

Flaherty said that needs could be identified and the commission could consider the appropriateness of the need in the context of the adopted city plans.

Rollo asked if appointments were specified in Ordinance 20-16. He felt that in the event that the mayor and councilmembers could not agree on an appointment, that the parties would make a ranked-choice vote from among the qualified candidates and should be defined clearly in the legislation. He felt the way it was currently stated was ambiguous.

Flaherty stated that it was implied in the legislation but could be clarified via an amendment.

Bolden read a Zoom chat comment from Sam Dove who asked when the bus routes were going to change.

Public comment:

David Keppel stated his support of the proposed legislation.

Ilana Stonebraker expressed her desire to allow more public comment on this legislation before it was adopted.

Greg Alexander stated that EDIT revenues should fund public transportation.

Daniel Bingham stated the Ordinance 20-16 did not give the commission enough power to dictate how revenue from an EDIT would be spent on climate change.

Alex Goodlad stated his support for the legislation because it was better than no additional public scrutiny.	<u>Ordinance 20-16</u> as amended (cont'd)
Rosenbarger thanked Flaherty for <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> and commented on the focus of the proposal.	Council comments:
Rollo thanked Flaherty for <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> and stated his support.	
Rollo made a motion and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 03 to <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> .	Amendment 03 to <u>Ordinance 20-16</u>
Amendment 03 Synopsis: <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> shall be amended in Section 6, by adding text that defines that a ranked-choice vote will be done by the mayor and councilmember commissioners if they cannot agree on a city resident appointment(s) to the commission.	
There were no council questions.	Council questions:
Randy Paul was in favor of the proposal before the climate action funding was removed.	Public comment:
There were no comments from the council.	Council comments:
The motion to adopt Amendment 03 to <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 2 (Sandberg, Sims).	Vote to adopt Amendment 03 to <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> (8:45pm]
Piedmont-Smith stated her support of <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> and stated that there would be public input via the advisory commission and commented on the need to mitigate climate change impacts.	Council discussion:
Sandberg stated her appreciation of the proposal and said that a broader conversation could be done in the future but more time was needed. She said she would vote against <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> .	
Flaherty expressed his reasons for bringing the legislation to the council.	
Smith thanked Flaherty for <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> stated his support of the ordinance and believed it increased public participation. He would support the legislation.	
Sgambelluri stated her support of the ordinance and thanked Flaherty for his work on <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> . She believed it was important to require input.	
Sims was concerned about the trust with expenditure of funds. He believed the efforts needed to be broader with neighboring counties in order to impact climate change. He thanked Flaherty for his efforts but stated that he would not support <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> .	
Volan stated his interest in the council and the public being involved in spending decisions. He described council's role in budget and spending and his concerns with the process. He urged the mayor and city staff to accept the input from council and the public. He provided additional examples.	
The motion to adopt <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Sandberg, Sims), Abstain: 0.	Vote to adopt <u>Ordinance 20-16</u> as amended [9:01pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Resolution 20-13 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 20-13 - Resolution Proposing an Ordinance to Modify the Monroe County Local Income Tax Rate, Allocate the Additional Revenues to Economic Development and Cast Votes in Favor of the Ordinance

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Resolution 20-13 be adopted.

Mayor Hamilton presented the Resolution 20-13. He explained the need to adopt an EDIT to offset losses in revenues due to the effects of the pandemic.

Sandberg asked about the meeting with state legislator Ron Thompson.

Council questions:

Hamilton responded that he had been briefed in the meeting. He was pleased to continue to collaborate with the General Assembly who would likely consider the LIT issues. He opined further about what could be forthcoming but there were many unknowns.

Rollo asked if the draft capital plan was only for considering possibilities.

Hamilton confirmed that was correct and described the process.

Rollo stated that it would be difficult to marshal some of the proposed plans.

Hamilton stated that was correct.

Bolden read a comment submitted via Zoom chat from Bryony Gomez-Palacio expressing her support of adoption of the tax due to the effects of the pandemic and provided reasons.

Public comment:

David Keppel expressed his support of the adoption of the tax.

Bolden read a comment submitted via Zoom chat from Dave Askins of B Square Beacon where he explained that state statutes regarding LIT revenues. He wondered what type of distribution each council member would prefer if the proposal passed.

Randy Paul spoke in opposition to the tax being adopted at the time and provided reasons.

David Warren spoke in opposition to the tax being adopted and listed multiple reasons.

Alex Goodlad spoke in favor of funding public transportation in Bloomington regardless of the passing of Resolution 20-13.

Erin Predmore, President and CEO of The Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, appealed to the council to oppose the tax. She advocated for public engagement when contemplating adoption of future taxes.

Ross Mead spoke in favor of the tax and the proposed commission.

Jill Thurman, Office Administrator for The Greater Ellettsville Area Chamber of Commerce, spoke in opposition to the tax, and stated that the Chamber's Board of Directors voted to oppose the tax.

Geoff McKim, Monroe County Councilor, opposed the proposed tax and provided reasons.

Ilana Stonebraker spoke in opposition to the tax.

Claire Cumberland spoke in favor of the tax and stated that she supported progressive use of revenues from the tax.

Tyler Cain wondered if the proposed tax would address emissions produced by busses in the city.

Daniel Bingham spoke in favor of cutting carbon emissions, and of adopting the tax to make a step toward the goal.

Natalia Galvan urged the council to adopt the tax due to the climate emergency.

Ann Hedin spoke in favor of addressing climate change and supported the tax.

Novella Shuck supported the proposed tax and spoke in favor of funding climate solutions.

Jacob Schwartz spoke in favor of funding climate solutions and he stated his support of the tax.

Rollo addressed the question about using income taxes for public transportation.

Council comments:

Hamilton confirmed that the funding could be used for public transportation and that the county could use their portion for it too. He reminded council and the public that Bloomington Transit (BT) received about \$8 million in federal dollars in response to the Covid-19 crisis which allowed BT to not have immediate cash needs. Hamilton stated general obligation bonds would increase taxes though the city had been adverse to use bonds to fund operating expenses. It was not an approach that he felt was prudent for anything other than capital expenses and projects.

Piedmont-Smith asked Hamilton his opinion about the two ways of allocating revenue from the tax.

Hamilton anticipated that the Indiana state legislature may be changing rules around income taxes in the near future. The Local Tax Council could take a look at the way revenues would be distributed if the tax is passed. He described the two options of allocating the revenue.

Piedmont-Smith asked Hamilton to explain the standard further.

Hamilton said the simplest description was that it was the same split as the Public Safety LIT (PSLIT). He provided additional information pertaining to the four recipients of the funding; Bloomington, Monroe County, Ellettsville, and Stinesville.

Piedmont-Smith asked if, given the current legislation, the other option was to divide the funds by population.

Hamilton said that the Local Tax Council could opt to distribute based on population but would have to be done August for the following year.

Rollo asked Hamilton to elaborate more on the potential legislative impact on local income tax.

Hamilton stated that, based on past history, he was not optimistic about rules being set in favor of municipalities. He provided examples.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the tax could potentially be used to address emissions from buses in the city.

Resolution 20-13 (cont'd)

Hamilton stated it could potentially be used for that purpose and provided additional information pertaining to federal grants to BT and its plans moving forward.

Rollo spoke in support of the tax and provided reasons. The pandemic would cause a drop in revenues to the city resulting in a lack of funds to address climate change. He felt a sense of urgency regarding climate action.

Flaherty thanked members of the public who had shared their opinion. He commented on previous LITs and collaborations with the city and county, and also on the lack of a plan to reduce emissions by the county. He stated his support for the tax in the interest of the common good and provided additional details.

Smith felt the proposed LIT and its uses of revenues from the income tax were too broad. He stated his opposition to the tax and provided reasons including his consultation from community members.

Piedmont-Smith stated her decision was one of the hardest in her tenure. She spoke in opposition to the tax because there was more opportunity to address climate change than through an imposed tax. She expressed a desire to have more support if a tax was going to be adopted especially the private sector and business leaders. She commented on the General Assembly's actions.

Sandberg stated she would oppose the LIT and acknowledged that in order to recover, the city was going to need more revenue. She provided additional details. She felt there was not a consensus between the county and city council which was problematic. She opined that collaboration, and coalition-building, was necessary. Sandberg stated that the proposed LIT was different from the narrow scope of the PSLIT.

Sgambelluri discussed her reasons in opposition to the proposed LIT. She supported the values listed by the mayor, but did not feel there was a clear spending plan in place for revenues generated from the LIT. She stated that it was important to consider the pandemic and economic downturn and think ahead. She explained her reasoning for supporting the Recover Forward plan. She also applauded the previous PSLIT but stated that the proposed new tax without a sunset date was not like the PSLIT. She provided additional details against the proposed LIT.

Rosenbarger thanked everyone who engaged in the process. She wished a progressive tax, or refunds for low income families, could be proposed along with the LIT but Indiana restricted that action. She commented on other restrictions created by the state legislators. She expressed interest in funding climate change actions and helping citizens who were struggling financially. She commented on the timing of the LIT and said there was not a perfect time to ask community members for additional revenue via a tax. She also commented on the struggles that community members faced and hoped it was just the beginning of a robust conversation.

Sims reflected on his time on the council and stated that his decision to support the proposed LIT or not was the hardest decision to date. He commented on reasons that weighed on his decision including conversations with community members, the greater good, processes, and meaningful feedback from the community. He

commented on the interconnectivity of social justice and the good efforts of Bloomington. He stated his opposition to the tax.

Resolution 20-13 (cont'd)

Volan commented on the excellent feedback from the public though he was astonished at the non-city community members' opinions on how Bloomington should behave. He explained that the notion of cutting taxes to help combat poverty was a talking point used by Republicans for years. Volan commented on the restrictions set forth by the state as well as the LIT process submitted by the mayor. He stated he felt that if this tax was proposed to fund public transit, it would have had more support. He provided additional details on his reasoning.

Rollo appealed to his colleagues who were in opposition to work on other forms of revenue to replace what will be lost due to the pandemic. He stressed the need to address climate change immediately.

Sandberg said she respected her colleagues. She thanked members of the public who reached out to her regarding the proposed tax. She was committed to looking for other solutions and explained her position.

Flaherty thanked his colleagues as well. He hoped that in the future the county and city governments would collaborate on climate crisis actions. He reiterated that all climate crisis actions should include substantial equity and social justice and be aimed at helping disproportionately affected groups. He provided additional details.

Smith followed up on his earlier comments, asserting his opposition to the tax and detailing his reasoning. He said that his concerns pertained primarily to the process.

The motion to adopt Resolution 20-13 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 4 (Flaherty, Rollo, Rosenbarger, Volan), Nays: 5, Abstain: 0. FAILED.

Vote to adopt Resolution 20-13
[11:07pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to reconsider the motion to adopt Ordinance 20-16.

Motion to reconsider the motion to adopt Ordinance 20-16

Flaherty explained that the commission that was created by Ordinance 20-16 was not necessary because Resolution 20-13 was not adopted.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

The motion to reconsider Ordinance 20-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to reconsider the motion to adopt Ordinance 20-16 (11:11pm)

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

David Keppel stated that if the commission was in place, it might encourage public engagement on the adoption of local income taxes in the future.

Public comment:

Alex Goodlad also spoke in favor of allowing the commission created by the ordinance to remain.

Flaherty responded to public comment saying that he felt that Ordinance 20-16 should be repealed and potentially revisited in the future.

Council comment:

Volan agreed with Flaherty’s statement. He stated his opposition to adopting Ordinance 20-16.

Reconsider the motion to adopt Ordinance 20-16 (cont’d)

Bolden received a Zoom chat message and Volan agreed to allow it.

Public comment:

Bolden read a Zoom chat message from Dave Askins from B Square Beacon that said given that the vote for Resolution 20-13 was not a simple majority, does the ordinance still go to the rest of the tax council for consideration or does the resolution putting the ordinance in front of the rest of the tax council not need to succeed on a basic majority in order to go forward.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 20-16 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 0, Nays: 9, Abstain: 0. FAILED

Vote to adopt Ordinance 20-16 as amended [11:20pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [11:21pm]

David Keppel commented that he appreciated the work that went into the deliberation.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [11:22pm]

Lucas reviewed the council schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [11:24pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to hold a Special Session of the Council on Wednesday, September 23, 2020 at 6:30pm. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to hold Special Session [11:25pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adjourn. The motion was approved by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT [11:26pm]

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 15 day of February, 2023.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

Sue Sgambelluri, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington