

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana, on Wednesday, September 7, 2016 at 7:33pm with Council President Andy Ruff presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
September 7, 2016

Roll Call: Granger, Mayer, Sandberg, Ruff, Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra, Rollo (7:42pm)
Absent: Sturbaum

ROLL CALL
[7:34pm]

Council President Ruff gave the Agenda Summation

AGENDA SUMMATION
[7:34pm]

Ruff proposed that the Council amend the Agenda for the meeting to include time for the Council to make appointments to Boards and Commissions.

It was moved and seconded to so amend the Agenda.

The motion to amend the Agenda to include appointments to Boards and Commissions received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0.

Vote on Motion to Amend Agenda
[7:39pm]

It was moved and seconded to appoint Ron Bronson to the Bloomington Digital Underground Advisory Committee. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS
AND COMMISSIONS
[7:40 pm]

Councilmember Alison Chopra noted the good experience she had during a recent visit to Lower Cascades Park, thanked the Parks staff, and remarked on the quality of Bloomington parks.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS
[7:41pm]

Councilmember Steve Volan expressed his best wishes to those injured during a recent accident that occurred on State Road 37. Volan complimented Mayor Hamilton for bringing attention to the public-private partnership that had failed to complete renovations of the highway in the time-frame promised, which Volan said was at least an indirect contributor to the problems like the recent accidents on the highway.

There were no reports from the Mayor's office.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES
- COUNCIL COMMITTEES

There were no council committee reports.

Ruff called for public comment.

- PUBLIC [7:43pm]

Marc Cornett spoke about on-street public parking and the importance of such parking in creating a healthy retail environment in the community.

Daniel McMullen spoke about the importance of properly maintaining the American flag and commented on Colin Kaepernick.

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND
READING AND RESOLUTIONS

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-19 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Ordinance 16-19 - To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) - Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner)
[7:53pm]

Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation and synopsis, giving the committee recommendation of do pass 6-2-1.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-19 be adopted.

Eric Greulich, Zoning Planner, provided information regarding a request to rezone 3480 W. Runkle Way from CG to CA to allow for a new hotel. He displayed and described 2014 aerial photographs of the proposed sight. He said the location of the property made it attractive for use as a hotel, but the current zoning designation did not allow that type of use, so the Petitioner, VMP Development, LLC, was asking for a rezone. Greulich said the property was designated as a community activity center, and other nearby property was designated as a regional activity center. He displayed the thoroughfare plan for the area. He pointed out that the Petitioner was voluntarily excluding certain uses normally allowed in CA zoning, which would be addressed through a zoning commitment to be recorded after the rezone was passed. Greulich displayed the site plan filed by the Petitioner. He reviewed the level of service rating for Third Street, explaining the street had an E level of service ("LOS") rating. He displayed renderings of the intended look of the exterior design and commented on walking distances to surrounding locations. Greulich estimated 12-15 restaurants within walking distance of the site, and said there were also many shopping centers in the nearby area. Greulich said the surrounding area had been heavily developed, but that the property in question had sat empty since 2009. He said the rezone would allow development, bring jobs, and serve travelers. Greulich noted that the request was heard at the Plan Commission hearing in August 2016, and the commission voted 7-0 to pass along a favorable recommendation to the Council. Greulich said he was available for questions.

Ordinance 16-19 – To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) – Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) *(cont'd)*

Councilmember Dave Rollo asked whether E was the second lowest LOS rating and whether F was failing.

Council Questions
[8:02pm]

Greulich said yes, E was the second lowest LOS rating, and an F rating designated a street as operating at peak capacity. He said in order to change that rating, one would need to add new driving lanes.

Rollo asked what the occupancy rates were for downtown hotels.

Greulich said he could not testify to that, but he said anecdotally the occupancy rates varied based on the time of year and what events were going on. He said it was market driven and suggested that the Petitioner could speak to market research regarding need versus demand. Greulich said the proposed hotel would be next to the location of Interstate 69 ("I-69"), and given the surrounding land uses, a hotel seemed appropriate. He said hotels are lower traffic generators compared to other businesses.

Rollo asked what opinion the Planning Department had regarding the effect of hotels on the periphery of town on downtown hotels.

Greulich said he did not see that the proposed hotel would negatively affect downtown hotels, as each would be operating in different markets.

Rollo asked if the hotels would compete.

Greulich said he imagined there could be some competition, but there were different markets.

Rollo asked Greulich to explain what the different markets were.

Greulich said it was important to diversify the locations of hotels as there would be use from people using I-69 who would not necessarily want to come downtown.

Rollo asked whether the zoning change would serve sprawl.

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith raised a point of order and noted the Council usually heard from Petitioners before the Council asked questions, and she wondered whether the Council was going to hear from the Petitioner.

Ruff said that Rollo could finish his last related question to the line of questioning he had been making, then the Petitioner could make a statement.

Ordinance 16-19 – To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) – Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) (cont'd)

Rollo asked whether the providers of services that would need to be provided to the site, such as fire protection, police protection, and bus services, had any problems with providing those services to the location.

Greulich said that he was not aware of any problems with police or fire services at that location. He said the proposed zoning change was taken to the Development Review Committee meeting, and none of the representatives from Fire or Police expressed any concern about a hotel at the location.

Ruff asked for comments from the Petitioner.

Michael Carmen, attorney for Petitioner VMP Development, LLC, commented that he did not agree that this development was contributing to sprawl, but was better characterized as in-fill, as the lot was already zoned CG and the surrounding sites were already developed. He said it was disingenuous to blur lines like that. He noted other hotels on Franklin Road and Fairfield Drive that were in CA zones that were farther from Third Street than the proposed hotel. He discussed the design of the hotel, which was meant to encourage walking. He said the location would put a person to within a few minutes of a number of restaurants in the area. He said that strip buildings right next to the proposed site were zoned CA, and that the site could easily have been zoned CA. He thought there would be a lot of synergy between the hotel and nearby businesses. He said that a hotel generates fewer trips than other uses for which the site was already zoned. He said it was a good project and there was every reason to approve it.

Petitioner Comments
[8:08pm]

Hetal Patel introduced himself and his brother, Robert Patel, as representatives of VMP Development, LLC. He apologized to the council for not attending the previous meeting. He provided background information on his and his brother's experiences in hotel management, and noted that the current proposed project had used a local architect, local legal counsel, a local contractor, and a local engineering firm. He wanted the council to understand that although Comfort Suites was a national brand, the management and investment from the project was local. He said the proposed site was close to other locally-owned national franchises. He reviewed the design plans for the exterior of the building, noting that EIFS was a favorable product for hotels. He reviewed the landscape designs for the lot and reviewed occupancy rates for other hotels. He summarized what market he thought the hotel would serve, and what types of guests would stay at the hotel, pointing out that travelers were currently going to other cities. He thanked the council for the opportunity to present.

Volan asked Greulich why hotels are allowed in CA but not CG.

Additional Council Questions
[8:24pm]

Greulich said properties zoned CA were usually properties immediately next to arterial roads, which were designed to handle higher traffic volumes, noting that lots zoned CA were zoned for higher intensity uses.

Volan asked about properties on the other side of State Road 37, and why those properties were zoned CA.

Greulich said it was a carryover from the previous zoning code, and given the proximity to State Road 37 and the proximity to nearby restaurants, that zoning made sense at the time.

Volan asked about non-vehicular traffic and whether the Planning Department had taken any measurement of pedestrian traffic in the area.

Greulich said they did not have counts, but noted that with changes coming to the road, there would be multi-use paths installed.

Volan asked whether there had been an analysis of the distance to the nearest bus stop.

Greulich said bus service was provided along Gates Drive, though not on Runkle Way.

Volan said according to DoubleMap, the nearest bus stop went around the Whitehall Crossing complex.

Greulich clarified that there was a bus stop near David's Bridal on Gates Drive.

Ordinance 16-19 - To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) - Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) (cont'd)

Piedmont-Smith asked about the LOS rating on West Third Street, noting she was shocked to hear it was at E.

Greulich explained that portions of Third Street were INDOT-controlled right-of-way.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether that meant that the City could not improve the roadway.

Greulich said that was correct, but mentioned the City could work with the State by suggesting or recommending improvements needed for the road. He said that the only thing that could solve capacity issues would be to add travel lanes.

Piedmont-Smith asked what portion of Third Street had the E designation.

Greulich said the E designation extended from Gates Drive to State Road 37, noting it was a small focalized area that had high traffic.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the only way to reach the hotel from the future I-69 would be from the Third Street exit.

Greulich said no, a person could reach the hotel from Curry Pike when heading east.

PS asked whether most people using the hotel would be coming from I-69.

Greulich said he could not say that for sure, but it was probable. He noted that people could also come from Bloomfield, or other areas to the west of Bloomington, though I-69 would be the generator of a lot of the traffic.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether interchanges were planned for West Bloomfield Road and Third Street.

Greulich said yes.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether there was a local roadway connection for drivers who exited on Second Street and were heading to Third Street.

Greulich said yes, drivers could take Liberty Drive.

Ruff asked whether the building-forward design was something encouraged by staff or by the Plan Commission, or whether that was how the project was originally presented.

Greulich said the building-forward design was required in the UDO, and noted that parking lots and spaces were required to be 20 feet behind buildings, with the idea being to make it more pedestrian friendly.

Ruff inquired about the building façade materials and whether they were EIFS.

Greulich responded that all materials shown in the plans were allowed. He said that staff had attempted to limit the amount of EIFS that was shown. He noted the Petitioner put forth a proposal that was in the 75-80% range of all stone and which attempted to minimize the amount of EIFS.

Ruff asked whether the project might have included more EIFS without those efforts.

Greulich said that was correct.

Rollo confirmed whether the existing LOS grade was E and what kind of investment it would take to get the road to a satisfactory LOS level, noting that the hotel was sure to add to the traffic.

Greulich said he was not the best person to speak to Rollo's question, but said it would involve adding travel lanes and going through the right-of-way acquisitions process, which would involve significant costs.

Rollo asked whether the costs of extending services to this area had been evaluated.

Greulich said no.

Rollo asked whether the Comprehensive Plan passed in 2002 required evaluating costs of extending services.

Greulich said he imagined there was general language in the Comprehensive Plan to look at those costs as a whole for the city, but said there had not been an impact analysis with individual projects.

Volan asked which side of the hotel was the front.

Greulich said there could be two fronts, one for vehicles and one for pedestrians, noting "front" could be a subjective term. He said the front of buildings were often what people design to look better, but with the UDO requirements, a builder had to have 360-degree architecture, which meant that whatever exterior material used must carry around the entire building. He said the Petitioner had also accommodated a request to make the building accessible by pedestrians on all four sides.

Volan asked Hetal Patel what neighborhood he lived in.

Patel said he lived in Gentry Estates.

Council discussed the propriety of Volan's question.

Volan asked Patel to clarify his earlier comment that ownership of the hotel would be local but that the hotel would also have national obligations to renovate the exterior, and asked whether that was why the hotel was required to use EIFS on top of the building.

Patel said with the particular type of franchise agreement for the hotel, the hotel may have to complete exterior renovations, but that it might be eight years down the road before that happened.

Volan asked how serving pass-through travelers would benefit the community.

Patel said the hotel would create jobs, and the guests that stayed at the hotel could eat locally. He noted the hotels proximity to food, gas, a pharmacy, and grocery stores, stating that the hotel would help those businesses and the employees that work at those businesses.

Volan asked what was, in Petitioner's opinion, the minimum number of parking spaces required, and how the Petitioner determined that number.

Patel said the City had advised that the hotel could only have one parking space per unit. He said the hotel had 72 units, so the hotel could have 72 parking spaces.

Volan asked if they would have preferred more.

Patel said they would have preferred a couple more, but they did not really push the matter, because there was nearby on-street parking available.

Volan asked why they felt they needed more than one space per unit.

Ordinance 16-19 - To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) - Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) (cont'd)

Patel said it could be an issue if the hotel is fully booked, because some employees arrived to work early in the morning, along with an attendant there 24 hours per day. He said he could see a need for a 73rd parking spot, but the available on-street parking was also an option.

Ordinance 16-19 – To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) – Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) (cont'd)

Piedmont-Smith asked what the average pay was for employees.

Patel said starting pay was \$9.50 per hour, and noted that as positions got more technical or professional in nature the pay could go up to \$15.00 per hour. He said there would be some salaried positions, such as director of sales, manager, and revenue managers, which would range from \$30,000 per year and up.

Volan asked how many hotels the Petitioner owned or had been involved with.

Patel said they owned one hotel in Bloomington, but that they had owned many others in the past, which they had bought and sold depending on the market. He noted they had a big down swing around 2007 and 2008, when they had to get rid of some of their hotels.

Volan asked if they had ever owned or were involved with a hotel that had any kind of a café or restaurant on the ground floor.

Patel said yes, they had a hotel in Kentucky that had a bar and a restaurant.

Volan asked what the size of that hotel was.

Patel said 102 rooms, and the hotel was located in Lexington, Kentucky.

Volan asked if they considered a bar or restaurant in the proposed hotel.

Patel said no, but the hotel would have a light bar, and explained what that would entail.

Volan asked where the light bar would be located.

Patel explained it would be in the breakfast area.

Volan asked whether the area would be one that faces the street and welcomes non-guests.

Patel said it would not.

Volan whether the Petitioner would be adverse to such an arrangement, or whether the Petitioner would be interested in doing something similar at the proposed hotel.

Patel said that given the location and proximity to surrounding restaurants, he did not think it would be advisable. He said if the hotel was in an area with a lack of restaurants he would be more interested.

Volan asked whether it was easy to find property for a hotel and whether Petitioner would look for property for a future hotel on the north side of town.

Patel said that if space were available, they might look. He clarified that they were not only catering to I-69 traffic. He said there were multiple markets, including transient, destination, and corporate markets. He said they anticipated a 70% occupancy rate, which was composed of 20% transient market, 25% destination market, and 25% corporate market.

Rollo asked whether the intent of the planning department was to expand economic development in the area.

Greulich said the Planning Department did not develop properties, but that properties were developed for use and as market needs changed, things happened and came forward.

Rollo asked whether the Planning Department was advocating a change in zoning.

Greulich responded that the Plan Commission, at the Planning Department's recommendation, also recommended that the project

be forwarded to the council, so yes, the Planning Department was advocating that the zoning be changed to accommodate the proposed use. He noted that it could spur additional economic activity adjacent to the lot, and also pointed out that there were not a lot of vacant lots in the area, because everything else was developed.

Ordinance 16-19 – To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) – Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) (cont'd)

Granger said she was in support of the project, thought it would improve the area, and that there was a need for it. She pointed out that the interstate was coming through, and the council could not do anything about that. She said the hotel would be perfect for those people who would be looking for a quick on-and-off place to stay, noting the available services in the area.

Final Council Comment
[8:48]

Rollo said the project would encourage more growth in the area, and if that was the council's intent, then the council was facilitating that. Rollo said he believed it was against many of the councilmembers' intent to try to tame growth and prevent sprawl, adding that the project was the epitome of sprawl. He said it was an expressway corridor, with big-box stores, convenience stores, and fast-food restaurants. He expressed his doubt that any pedestrian would walk from the proposed location, and said it was the antithesis of smooth traffic flow because there was already an LOS rating of E. Rollo said that the council should be prepared to allocate more money to renovate Third Street, and also asked the council to consider the cost on services. He said the hotel would present competition for downtown hotels, which had not been evaluated. He would prefer people to stay downtown than on the periphery of the city. He said the project would encourage ancillary services and that one could expect to see more growth along the corridor. He predicted that one day a person would see nothing but sprawl all the way to Indianapolis. He said the council would be part of approving that expansion of sprawl that had been proven to detract from the integrity of commercial activity in city cores. He mentioned the GPP, and noted that the project was a posterchild for the fact that the city never completed the GPP, specifically chapter 8. He said he would have evaluated the cost of extending services to the periphery of the city, and without doing so, did not know what the cost would be. He said he thought the city had other regions for the development of hotels, and could think of many such areas. He posed whether the council was considering the effect on the downtown area when voting to approve the zoning change, which he noted was discretionary. Rollo said for all of those reasons, he believed the council should deny the petition, unless the council was in favor of sprawl.

Piedmont-Smith said she intended to vote in favor of the rezone, and resented Rollo implying that anyone who voted in favor of the petition was voting for sprawl. She recalled the discussions surrounding the GPP and recalled discussing evaluating the cost of services for the periphery of the city. She said sprawl had already happened, and the proposed project was not contributing to it. She noted the sight was already zoned CG, and a hotel was not build on the site, something else would go there. She did not see the proposal as a bellwether. She said the sight was already receiving utility services, had a bus stop close by, and that police and fire said they could handle the additional tax on their services. She said that other locations downtown were much more expensive, so it was hard to compare sites. She shared the concerns about the LOS rating and congestion on Third Street, but said that was already an issue whether the council approved the hotel or not, due to sprawl that had

already happened. She said the council did not have a legitimate reason to stop the rezone. She said the Petitioner had a legitimate business plan, and she saw the needs the hotel would be serving.

Volan said he saw two claims that needed to be evaluated, the first being the local-ness of the project, and the second being whether or not the project was sprawl. He said he was satisfied with the local nature of the project. He pointed to discussions he had had surrounding Lotus Festival and said he was aware of the lack of hotel rooms during certain weekends. He felt it would serve a local need for hotel capacity. He noted that nothing said should be seen as a criticism of the worthiness of the Petitioner, except that he would have liked the Petitioner to have attended the previous meeting to be available for questions. He believed the project was sprawl, and it was absurd to think anyone would be walking to the location, unless an employee took the bus to work, which itself might not have been very likely. He did not question the location on the west side, but questioned the form of the building and wondered if the hotel would have been successful if I-69 had not happened. He said he would be complicit in sprawl if he voted for the project, and said mixed-use had been successful and could thrive everywhere, and he saw no reason why the hotel could not have been mixed-use. He responded to Piedmont-Smith's comment that sprawl had already happened, by asking why the council should change the zoning from CG to CA. He thought the concern about the LOS rating was a result of the sprawl and said no effort was made to mitigate the amount of parking demanded or car trips generated as a result of the project. He questioned why the Planning and Transportation Department was recommending the project. He said it was clear that the side of the building that did not face the street was the front. He wondered why the Planning Department did not rethink the whole area when if they admit Franklin Street was a holdover from previous zonings. He commended the Petitioner for trying to build a worthy hotel, but there was failure to mitigate traffic and sprawl, and he could not support it.

Ruff said he was concerned about sprawl when new sprawl areas were created, but that the area in question had been developed. He said not every area could be downtown, and the downtown area could not handle all the demand for commercial activity. He pointed out that the proposed site was about a mile and a half from the heart of the downtown area, and only $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from Patterson, where the council hoped to see a lot of future mixed-use development. He did not agree that the project was classic sprawl, even though he would much prefer a more dense mixed-use type development. He recommended that the council begin figuring out a coherent policy for how it would address I-69-justified development, because he foresaw many such projects. He said he did not agree that the project would require extending services, as services were already provided in that area, even if the project might place more demand on those services. He noted, however, that the project would also generate revenue to help pay for those services. He believed that the proposed hotel might have competed a bit with those downtown, but the proposed hotel would also serve different markets. He said the proposed building was better than a lot of what was out there, and said he would be voting yes.

Rollo said he felt standards had been lowered quite a bit, and pointed out that EIFS had been banned downtown, but not at the proposed location. He said the project was not infill, because infill occurred within the city. He said that perhaps I-69 sprawl was inevitable, but

Ordinance 16-19 – To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) – Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) *(cont'd)*

that he would not participate and would defy it. He noted there were farms less than half a mile to the site, closer to sight than the sight was to downtown. He said no one would walk across I-69 to the proposed site. He said it was the nature of sprawl to aggregate and so rejected the argument that the council should approve the project because sprawl had already occurred in the area. He said the council could look forward to the future expansion of Third Street at the taxpayers' expense. He read a quote from James Howard Kunstler.

Ordinance 16-19 – To Rezone a Property from Commercial General (CG) To Commercial Arterial (CA) – Re: 3380, 3440, and 3480 W. Runkle Way (VMP Development, Petitioner) (*cont'd*)

Volan said the people arguing for the project were apologizing for it, and he was not sure why they would need to apologize if it was such a defensible vote. He said the city was trying to build a cool, hip south side near Switchyard Park, and wondered why the city could not try for a cool hip west side. He wondered why the proposed hotel could not have had a place open for dining, and said he would have given even more density to support that retail and to support that mixed used.

Ruff said it was not realistic or reasonable to bulldoze the entire developed commercial west side to recreate downtown-style development. He did not apologize for his yes vote on the project. He said that regardless of the development aesthetics, the highway was going to be an eyesore. He said he would walk from this type of place to nearby, walkable restaurants. He said he did not think the Planning Department was supposed to be supporting the idea of expansion of Third Street. He said that expanding corridors to allow more capacity induces travel and causes roads to fill with traffic more quickly as a result of the reduced effort, time, and economic impact it took to make the trip. He did not support the expansion of major corridors that already had multiple lanes.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-19 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 2 (Volan, Rollo).

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-08 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Vote on Ordinance 16-19
[9:14pm]

Clerk Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis; there was not a committee recommendation.

Resolution 16-08 – In Support of the Monroe County Community School Corporation's Continuing Funding Referendum [9:15pm]

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-08 be adopted.

Lynn Coyne, co-chair of the Yes for MCCSC committee, introduced himself and the other co-chairs of the committee, including Dr. Judith DeMuth, Superintendent of MCCSC, and Timothy Thrasher, Director of Business Operations of MCCSC. Coyne thanked the council for introducing the resolution. He provided background on the school corporation budget issues that took place around 2008 and the resulting referendum. He spoke about why the current referendum was important to the school system and to the community. He detailed some of the challenges facing the referendum and what the money would be used for. He asked the council to do what it could to help. He thanked the council and said he could answer any questions.

Dr. DeMuth emphasized the importance of the proposed funding, and thanked the council for its consideration.

Jim Muelling thanked the council for its support. He provided detail on how funding for the school corporations of Monroe County and Richland Bean Blossom were in the lower third for Indiana for

funding per student. He said that was due to actions by the state legislature during the 1970s that locked certain amounts into place.

Volan asked whether another referendum would be needed in future years.

Coyne said absolutely, and explained the referendum would last for six years. He explained further that it was intentionally put on an election cycle to lower the cost of administering the referendum.

Volan asked whether that was the price the public had to pay for the state legislature's actions in the 1970s.

Coyne said yes.

Volan asked who did the design work for the Yes committee.

Coyne said they had a wonderful design committee, and commended those committee members, along with other contributors throughout the committee, for their efforts and support.

Ruff asked for more detail about how the action by the state legislature in the 1970s locked the county into certain funding levels.

Muelling said the state legislature, in the 1970s, took a snapshot of all districts around the state and the cost for each district to operate. He said because MCCSC was going through a fiscally conservative period, that process locked MCCSC into a comparatively low funding level. He said recent efforts had somewhat improved things, but he felt it was still not equitable.

Ruff asked whether the funding levels put in place were largely a coincidence based on the level of funding a given school system had at the time the state passed the legislation.

Muelling said yes, but added the state legislature did include other factors in calculating funding levels.

Ruff asked whether a previous, similar referendum failed in 2000. He clarified that he asked so people would not think the present referendum was a foregone conclusion.

Coyne said it was in 1999, and yes, it failed. He said they needed every vote they could get.

Mayer asked whether the money raised by the referendum stayed in the MCCSC system.

Coyne said it would, and pointed out that they had a published budget so people could see where the money would be going.

Ruff reiterated that relevant information was available on the website.

Coyne confirmed, and provided the websites.

Ruff asked whether publishing the budget ahead of time was a response to a common criticism from the previous referendum, which was not knowing where the money was going before voting for the funding.

Coyne said that was correct, and that was why publishing a budget was one of the first things they did.

Tim Thrasher's wife voiced her support for the referendum.

Granger said she was proud and pleased to support the referendum, and hoped the public could see the value in doing so as well.

Mayer said he was in full support of the resolution.

Resolution 16-08 – In Support of the Monroe County Community School Corporation's Continuing Funding Referendum (*cont'd*)

Council questions
[9:30pm]

Public Comment
[9:39pm]

Council Comment
[9:39pm]

Sandberg said she could think of no more important investment than public schools. She said that, although there had been some movement at the state level to provide more funding, the funding raised through the referendum was essential to providing the necessary support for schools and teachers. She thanked the committee for its work.

Resolution 16-08 – In Support of the Monroe County Community School Corporation’s Continuing Funding Referendum (*cont’d*)

Chopra said she supported the resolution and said she was pleased with the education her children get at MCCSC. She thanked the committee for its work.

Rollo said he supported the resolution, supported strong public schools and MCCSC, and thanked the committee.

Piedmont-Smith said the resolution was a no-brainer, and voting for the continued funding would actually be less in property taxes than the public had been paying for the last five years. She said there was no reason not to support the resolution.

Volan said he knew the importance of good schools to the community, and pointed out that, as a result of the last referendum, MCCSC had high quality educational outcomes, and everyone should be supporting the referendum.

Ruff thanked the committee working on the issue, and also passed along Mayor Hamilton’s strong support for the referendum. Ruff said a strong school system was important to a strong community.

The motion to adopt Resolution 16-08 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0.

Vote on Resolution 16-08
[9:46pm]

Ordinance 16-15 - To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code (BMC) Entitled “Administration and Personnel” – Re: Amending BMC Chapter 2.02 (Boards and Commissions) to Provide for the Common Council Appointment of No More than Four Non-Voting Advisory Members to Certain Boards, Commissions, and Councils

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING

Ordinance 16-15
[9:47pm]

Ordinance 16-28 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016A, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016A Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-28
[9:48pm]

Ordinance 16-29 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016B, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016B Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-29
[9:49pm]

Ordinance 16-30 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016C, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016C Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-30
[9:50pm]

Ordinance 16-31 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016D, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016D Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-31
[9:50pm]

Ordinance 16-32 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016E, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016E Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-32
[9:51pm]

Ordinance 16-33 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016F, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016F Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-33
[9:52pm]

Ordinance 16-34 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016G, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016G Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-34
[9:53pm]

Ordinance 16-35 - To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016H, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Pay for Certain Capital Improvements and Incidental Expenses in Connection Therewith and on Account of the Issuance and Sale of the 2016H Bonds and Appropriating the Proceeds Derived from the Sale Of Such Bonds

Ordinance 16-35
[9:54pm]

Ordinance 16-36 - To Approve Series 2016A Bonds of the City of Bloomington Park District in an Amount Not to Exceed Two Million Dollars to Fund Capital Improvements at Certain Park Facilities

Ordinance 16-36
[9:55pm]

Ordinance 16-37 - To Approve Series 2016B Bonds of the City of Bloomington Park District in an Amount Not to Exceed One Million One Hundred Thousand Dollars to Fund Improvements to the City's Trail Infrastructure and Other Park Improvements

Ordinance 16-37
[9:56pm]

Ordinance 16-38 - To Approve Series 2016C Bonds of the City of Bloomington Park District in an Amount Not to Exceed One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars to Fund Capital Improvements to the City's Parks

Ordinance 16-38
[9:57pm]

Ordinance 16-39 - To Approve Series 2016D Bonds of the City of Bloomington Park District in an Amount Not to Exceed One Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars to Fund Capital Improvements at Lower Cascades Park

Ordinance 16-39
[9:58pm]

Ordinance 16-40 - To Approve Series 2016E Bonds of the City of Bloomington Park District in an Amount Not to Exceed Two Million Dollars to Fund the Purchase of Equipment for Facilities Operated by the City of Bloomington Parks Department

Ordinance 16-40
[9:59pm]

Council Administrator/Attorney Dan Sherman reminded the council that that night was the last opportunity for the council to offer review of questions that remained unanswered from the budget hearings, or to raise new questions that would be answered by the administration.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE
[9:59pm]

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00pm.


ADJOURNMENT

APPROVE:

ATTEST:



Andy Ruff, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council



Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington