In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, September 21, 2016 at 7:33 pm with Council President Andy Ruff presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
September 21, 2016

Roll Call: Granger, Sturbaum, Mayer, Sandberg, Ruff, Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra, Rollo
Absent: None

ROLL CALL
[7:33pm]

Council President Ruff gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[7:34pm]

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of August 31, 2016.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
[7:36pm]

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith noted that there had been a correction to the minutes sent to all of the councilmembers via email earlier that day, which had already been incorporated.

August 31, 2016 (Regular Session)

The motion to approve the minutes of August 31, 2016 as corrected was approved by voice vote.

Councilmember Steve Volan said he and the other councilmembers appreciated the new chairs that were recently purchased. He thanked the ITS Department for repairing a screen in Council chambers that had not been working. He welcomed Lisa-Marie Napoli and her Political and Civic Engagement (PACE) class to the meeting. He noted that the Chicago Cubs had clinched the National League Central Division and expressed his support for the team.

REPORTS
- COUNCILMEMBERS
[7:37pm]

Councilmember Tim Mayer noted that September 21, 2016 was the International Day of Peace, something he suggested everyone keep in mind. He mentioned that the Bicentennial torch had been passed to Monroe County from Brown County to celebrate Indiana's Bicentennial birthday, and noted that people could find more information about upcoming events online. He also expressed his appreciation for the new chairs.

Ruff reported that a large number of black cats had been imported into cities with major league baseball teams potentially headed for the playoffs.

There were no reports from the Mayor.

- THE MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES

There were no Council Committee reports.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Ruff called for public comment.

- PUBLIC
[7:40PM]

Gabe Rivera spoke about the war on drugs.

Lisa-Marie Napoli introduced herself and thanked local politicians and police officers for the good work they do. She mentioned that she was involved with the Community Justice and Mediation Center, which was engaged in a series of discussions on homelessness, safety, and civility issues in Bloomington. She commended those discussions and the individuals involved with those discussions.

There were no appointments to Boards or Commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:46pm]

Resolution 16-09 – To Support Fair and Nonpartisan Redistricting Reform

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-09 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-09 be adopted.

Councilmember Susan Sandberg introduced Resolution 16-09.

Councilmember Dorothy Granger and Councilmember Dave Rollo read Resolution 16-09 in full.

Kate Cruikshank, President of the League of Women Voters of Bloomington and Monroe County, spoke about Resolution 16-09. She thanked the Council for the development of the resolution and explained how the current method of drawing districts lines presented a number of threats, many of which were enumerated by Resolution. Cruikshank enumerated another threat – the harm done to representative democracy. She displayed a map that showed the districts in Monroe County, and pointed to those districts as examples, stating that the lines drawn in 2011 raised serious questions about whether basic democratic processes and genuine representation were currently possible in Indiana. She said counties provided both political and cultural context, with which voters identified and within which they formed associations and communicated. She said local bonds formed network from which communities relate to representatives. Cruikshank referred to the Indiana Constitution, Article 1, Section 31 and described what she saw that section protecting. She said the district lines were inadequately embodying the principles protected by the Indiana Constitution. She said taking the drawing of district lines out of hands of legislatures would help to remove the inherent conflict of interest present when legislatures picked their voters. Cruikshank said drawing district lines should be turned over to a nonpartisan commission. She thanked the Council, commended the Council for contributing to the movement for redistricting reform. She provided a history of the movement for reform, summarized the meetings of the special interim study committee of redistricting, and said that continued public pressure and involvement were needed. She said the Council's resolution came at an opportune time and would be appreciated by the Indiana Coalition. She noted that there was no guarantee that the final report would contain a recommendation to establish such a nonpartisan commission.

Council Comment:

Sandberg thanked Kate Cruikshank and the League of Women Voters. She mentioned she was a fan of and had been following the blog of Sheila Kennedy, who served on the Interim Committee, and had been following her comments. Sandberg provided the web address of a website that included more information. She noted the issue of redistricting affected both major parties, and said such low voter turnout in the state in recent years was an embarrassment. She said that was in part due to partisan districting and that people did not feel that their voices were being heard. Sandberg said it became impossible for there to be robust competition, and that she was highly in favor of the resolution and the work of the interim committee.

Rollo thanked Stacy Jane Rhoads, Deputy Administrator/Research, for her research and help drafting the resolution, as well as her work with the League of Women Voters. Rollo said gerrymandering

Resolution 16-09 (*cont'd*)

was a cynical and disrespectful way of treating citizens. He said districting should not be a partisan issue, but there should be a nonpartisan, objective approach.

Council Questions:

Rollo asked Cruikshank what arguments were offered in objection to the proposal to have an objective, nonpartisan approach to redistricting.

Cruikshank said there were objections to the idea that there could be such a thing as an objective nonpartisan commission. She said both democrats and republicans engage in horse trading for noncompetitive races.

Volan pointed out that the current situation in the Indiana state house was lopsided in Republicans' favor. He asked Cruikshank what incentive Republican state representatives had to approve such a nonpartisan commission.

Cruikshank said there was some recognition that being a supermajority was not all good, and could lead to problems. She noted that part of the argument was also an appeal to conscience and that the existence of an inherent conflict of interest should persuade them.

Public Comment:

Rachel Guglielmo commended the Council for supporting the resolution. She said she came at the issue of redistricting from the point of view of a citizen advocate for a single issue – gun violence. She described her frustration with the state legislature for failing to pass legislation she supported related to gun control, despite what she described as widespread support from citizens for such legislation. She concluded this failure to act was directly related to the issue of redistricting. She said legislatures only had to compete against more extreme views in their own districts, and that the problem was not limited to only gun policies. She said the public needed a congress and state legislature that would be accountable to those they purported to represent. She said there was a need for an independent, citizen-led, bipartisan commission. She thanked the Council for its time.

Council Comment:

Volan spoke about the local redistricting that the Council undertook in 2012, and described how the local city Council districts were drawn, noting that the presence of students complicated the process. He described the difficulty in reconciling the obligation to draw district lines according to population but to draw precinct lines according to the number of voters in the precinct, which created a natural conflict. He pointed out that the residence halls could be their own precincts, with a population of 1,000, but with only ten voters. He said some Bloomington Council districts looked gerrymandered, but it was because the Council had to figure out how to accommodate the dormitories. He said it ought to be a surprise to everyone that there was not a college student on the city Council, and said there were lots of reasons why that was the case. Volan said the fact that dormitories were split among four districts should give everyone pause. He said each district had about 13,000 people, in a city of 85,000 people. Volan said that there were 12,500 people living on IU property and that there was no reason why there was not a student on the Council. He suggested that redistricting commissions could go to the local level as well, and said the city Council should think about endorsing that in addition to supporting the change at the state level. He suggested that the Council could create a nonpartisan redistricting commission for the 2022 redistricting. Volan pointed out that West Lafayette was the newest second class city in the state, which was accomplished by essentially

annexing students and student housing. Volan said West Lafayette was about half the size of Bloomington, but there was a student that sat on the city council in West Lafayette. He noted he did support the work of his colleagues, but urged people to think about the college town realities, and how best to take students into account.

Resolution 16-09 (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith said she endorsed the resolution, and thanked her colleagues, Stacy Jane Rhoads, Kate Cruikshank, and the League of Women Voters, for putting the resolution together. She said the current way districting was done was a violation of democracy. She said the United States held itself up as a bastion of democracy, and although we knew how to let everyone participate, we did not do that in Indiana. She said she appreciated Ms. Guglielmo, and said her points were well taken. Piedmont-Smith said she agreed with Volan that Bloomington should practice what it preached, and should have a nonpartisan commission handle redistricting in Bloomington. She said she would be voting in favor of the resolution.

Ruff thanked the League of Women Voters for its efforts, and thanked colleagues and staff as well. He said gerrymandering contributed to cynicism and disillusionment with democracy and was clearly a conflict of interest. Ruff said dealing with the issue was important to address so many problems with participatory democracy, and he thanked everyone for the work.

The motion to adopt Resolution 16-09 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 16-09 [8:23pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-28 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Bolden read Ordinance 16-28 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 3-1-5.

Ordinance 16-28 – To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016A, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to [illegible] 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 [8:24pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-28 be adopted.

Jeffrey Underwood, Controller, provided information about the general obligation bonds and corresponding ordinances that were being presented to the Council for approval that evening. He thanked the Council for its conversations and questions surrounding the bonds and noted that staff would be available to answer additional questions that evening. He provided historical information about the bonds, along with a summary of the total amounts requested for the bonds, which was a maximum issuance of $11.95 million total for City bonds and $8.4 million total for Parks bonds, which would be authorized through 13 different Ordinances, with maximum interest rate of 6%. He noted the proposal was to sell bonds in such a way that would keep level the current tax rates for the repayment of those bonds, which was 2.55 cents for City bonds, 1.19 cents for Parks bond, for a total 3.74 cents. He said the proposal was to sell the bonds prior to the end of October, with the closing in mid-November, which he acknowledged was a fairly aggressive schedule, but noted that bonds tended to not sell well during the holiday period. He said the market was favorable, and with Council approval, the administration would report back after the sale. Underwood then turned the presentation over to staff to discuss the specific projects being proposed.

Council Questions:

Rollo asked Underwood what Bloomington's bond rating was.
Underwood said AA or A+, which was a good bond rating for a municipal government.

Ordinance 16-28 (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked for more contextual information about how Bloomington compared to its peers regarding debt load, assets and liabilities, and revenue and debt.

Underwood said the Fiscal Task Force examined the City's debt program, and it noted Bloomington ranked very well among its peers in debt per capita. The Task Force recommended to continue using debt judiciously, but also said it was an important tool the City had in financing long-term assets. Underwood described how the City paid for different assets based on the life expectancy of the asset, noting assets could be paid for in the annual budget, with a lease purchase, or with debt to finance the asset, which matched the life of the debt with the life of the asset. Underwood gave a summary of the debt held by Utilities Department and the City in general. He said Bloomington ranked favorably, and would continue to use a conservative approach to debt.

Rollo noted that as long as interest rates were low it was a good time to be in the bond market.

Underwood concurred.

Piedmont-Smith asked for more information regarding how capital investments are categorized and funded.

Underwood provided examples of assets with different asset lifespans and how those assets were typically purchased and financed.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the bonds were dealing with assets with asset lifespans of seven years or longer.

Underwood said yes.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum asked how much variation there was in bond rates, and how the City was ensuring that it was getting the best rates available.

Underwood said it was a competitive sale, so the City would go with the best proposal. He said the City was getting a lot of interest, and Bloomington generally did very well with bond issuances, because Bloomington had an excellent repayment history, strong reserves, and strong revenue streams. Underwood also noted that people just liked to invest in Bloomington.

Piedmont-Smith asked Underwood to repeat what the bond rating was for Bloomington.

Underwood said it depended on the bond and revenue stream, but ratings were generally AA to A. He said property tax bonds tended to get a higher rating, due to the strong backing.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the Parks and City general obligation bonds were property tax based.

Underwood said yes.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the tax would be 3.74 cents per $100 of assessed value.

Underwood said yes, and added that, depending on the interest rate, the city would stay within that tax rate so there would not be any change in the tax rate.

Volan raised a point of order and stated that the Council was considering Ordinance 16-28, the first of many bond ordinances. He asked Andrew Cibor, when presenting, to stop with the content of the ordinance at hand so the Council could follow along.

Ruff added that the hearing constituted the statutorily required hearing for the bond ordinances.

Ordinance 16-28 (*cont'd*)

Dan Sherman, Council Attorney/Administrator, confirmed that was the case, and said when the Council reached the public comment period on each item, the public would be invited to address the Council on that item.

Ruff and Sherman had additional discussion on the best approach to invite public comment for each item.

Andrew Cibor, Transportation and Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and gave a brief overview of his presentation. He said there were 15 projects between the four transportation-related bonds, which included a mix of traffic signals, pedestrian improvements, the Jackson Creek path, and other multiuse paths. He summarized the project lifecycle, noting projects typically, but not always, involved design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and construction inspection. He said the City would attempt to leverage the bond funding with federal funds as often as possible. He anticipated some increase in federal money for some of the projects. Cibor provided some general follow-up information on items from the previous meeting. He said the City did not have a true prioritization matrix for all transportation projects. He said it was a work in project, something that had been talked about, and something that would be prioritized moving forward. He said the City anticipated proceeding with a thoroughfare plan update next year, which would help with the prioritization process. He said such a plan set long term goals and helped create a framework to help prioritize projects appropriately. He said the City would also focus more on traffic signal prioritization, primarily replacement projects, which were easier to bite off. He hoped to have a prioritization matrix in the next few months. He said all projects being proposed were inherited from previous capital improvement plans, were included in a number of adopted plans, and came from feedback from the Council, the mayor, the public, and from certain ADA requirements. He said some facilities were just old and needed maintenance. He said all of those considerations fed into the projects.

Cibor then addressed comments from the previous meeting regarding designing projects with Complete Streets in mind. He said any project receiving federal funding through the MPO did have a Complete Streets policy that was required to be followed. He said the policy was very process oriented, and meant to accommodate all users. He noted designs were context sensitive, focused on public participation and open communication with stakeholders. Cibor said transportation staff was aware of and used many different references and resources, one of which was the comprehensive plan, both the existing plan and the draft plan. He said staff used those documents to inform decisions on projects.

Cibor followed up on a discussion from the previous meeting regarding solar power for pedestrian beacons. He said solar power could be used, though he did not necessarily recommend using solar on the devices, as there was an additional cost of approximately $14,000 for using solar power on those projects. He suggested that the money could be used on different projects to get a greater and more sustainable benefit, such as projects that connect to the greater electric grid. He said using solar on similar projects might make sense, but it depended on the context of the project.
Cibor addressed pedestrian push buttons and accompanying signs. He displayed a picture of a recent traffic signal with a push button and sign, similar to the devices he expected to be installed with all

Ordinance 16-28 (*cont'd*)

new projects. He said the push button is an accessible pedestrian signal, and he described the features of the button and signage.

Cibor said there were no specific projects proposed that focused solely on sidewalks. He noted, however, that all transportation projects were focused on pedestrians or improving pedestrian facilities. He said the proposals were centered on projects that provided a benefit to the larger population, including pedestrians and cyclists, while trying to promote system-wide connectivity.

Cibor noted that he would begin discussing the specific projects proposed to be paid for by the bond contained in Ordinance 16-28, which projects were focused on traffic signals.

Cibor presented the first project, located at the intersection of 17th Street and Dunn Street. He said that, like many of the signalized intersections he was presenting, it was an old intersection, over 30 years old, and had many accessibility issues for pedestrians.

Cibor presented the next project, located at Third Street and High Street/Bryan Avenue. He said the project would look to realign High Street to intersect with Bryan Avenue to create a more traditional four-legged intersection. He said the project would improve the operation of those facilities without adding additional traffic lanes. He said the City did look at potentially adding a sidewalk on Bryan Avenue. He noted the additional cost to build that sidewalk from Third Street to Seventh Street was estimated to be $250,000 to install the sidewalk on one side of the road, though there may have been some wiggle room in the bonds to include that as part of the project.

Cibor reviewed another project, located at Third Street and Lincoln Street, which involved another old traffic signal and street scape improvements. He said the intersection would be torn up as part of the CBU Jordan River Project, which he expected to come within the next few years as CBU was able to finalize funding for it. Cibor said that would be a good time to modernize the signal.

Cibor reviewed the next project, which was a traffic signal project located at Third Street and Woodscrest Drive/Hillsdale Drive. He explained the project was already in process and in the right-of-way acquisition phase. He said he anticipated construction by next year. He said the project would involve realigning Woodscrest Drive and Hillsdale Drive. He noted the project was receiving federal funding, so the bond money would help leverage the federal funding on the project.

Cibor reviewed the last project covered by Ordinance 16-28, which involved the Allen Street/Walnut Street intersection. He said the project would make it easier for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Walnut St, explain the project was in the design stage and he anticipated construction beginning next year.

Council Questions:

Rollo asked if the Third Street and High Street/Bryan Avenue realignment would involve striping and lane widths to match High Street to Bryan Avenue.

Cibor said he anticipated Bryan Avenue would continue operating as a local street, noting that High Street and Bryan Avenue would still act and feel distinctly different. He said Bryan Avenue did not go through to Tenth Street, so people trying to get north and west would be likely to use Union Street, or other streets to the west. He said there may be some increase in traffic on Bryan Street, but it would not be significant.

Ordinance 16-28 (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked whether the Planning and Transportation could collect data before and after the project to track the traffic count and speed.

Cibor said they could.

Volan asked why anyone would need such exhaustive instructions on how to follow a crosswalk sign and asked whether there was a sign in the MUTCD manual that explained that the button was for ADA users and not all pedestrians.

Cibor said he was not aware of any signs that would indicate a button was only for ADA purposes and that other users would not need to push it. He said although it might be intuitive to many people, others might not understand when or how the crosswalk worked, and some intersections operated differently than others.

Volan asked whether a small sign could be added that explained when the button actually affected the signal, and asked whether he was the only one that thought it was a problem that there was no such sign that did so.

Cibor said he would look into that further and would follow up.

Councilmember Allison Chopra clarified that the Council was considering Ordinance 16-28 and asked whether the bond currently before the Council included any of the pedestrian crossways that she had concerns about.

Cibor said the Allen Street/Walnut Street project was included.

Chopra asked Cibor to explain the reliability justification previously provided to the Council as one of the reasons why the Transportation Department was not recommending solar powered pedestrian crosswalks.

Cibor said a solar-powered crosswalk might be shaded at times, or might receive insufficient light, and it would not have sufficient battery power. He said because the projects were aimed at safety and improving the experience for pedestrians and cyclists, reliability was critical. He said he might install such devices with solar panels if that were the only option, because the benefit could outweigh the issues.

Chopra asked whether the pedestrian crosswalks that used solar power were unreliable.

Cibor said they were not necessarily as reliable as those connected to the larger electrical grid.

Chopra asked whether there were times when the crosswalks would not operate due to insufficient power.

Cibor said he had seen some solar-powered devices have reliability and maintenance issues.

Chopra asked how much more maintenance a solar-powered device required.

Cibor said he could not provide a definitive answer, but as something incorporates more complex technology with solar batteries and more equipment, the more problems could arise and the lifespans of the devices could be shorter.

Chopra asked why a hybrid approach, using primarily solar energy with electric power as a backup, would not work.

Cibor said he was unaware of any solar-powered beacons of that nature, where it was designed for solar power to feed the greater electric grid.

Chopra clarified that she was asking whether the crosswalk could run on solar power, and then run on electric power if solar failed.

Cibor said he would have to investigate further.

Ordinance 16-28 (*cont'd*)

Mayer asked Cibor if the potentially-changing traffic patterns were considered when thinking about the changes proposed for the Third Street and High Street/Bryan Avenue intersection.

Cibor said design for the project had not begun, nor had a thorough engineering investigation been completed. He thought there was the potential for increased traffic on Bryan Avenue, but not on the same level as High Street. He said as the project moved forward staff would look at it in much more detail and would include the residents and those impacted before finalizing anything.

Mayer asked whether the intersection would include a full complement of bicycle and pedestrian amenities.

Cibor said yes, and as it was then configured they could not provide those amenities.

Granger asked Cibor to comment on the same intersection, and pointed out that the city had previously attempted to work with the church located nearby to buy part of the property to do work at the intersection, but the church was adamant that it would not sell the property.

Cibor said he could not comment on that, as he did not have firsthand knowledge of the previous discussions, but noted the proposed project would involve reaching out early and often to stakeholders, and working with stakeholders to create a solution for everyone.

Piedmont-Smith asked what would happen if one of the intersection improvement projects could not be done and where the money for those projects would go.

Underwood said the money could be used for a different project if priorities changed or if costs for a given project were too high.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the Council had any oversight for changes to the list of projects.

Underwood said no, but said the administration would report back to the Council and tell the Council where things ended up with the proposed projects and expenditures.

Volan asked whether a roundabout, similar to those in the near west side neighborhood, would be feasible for the intersection at Third Street and High Street/Bryan Avenue.

Cibor said that those types of roundabouts would not be suitable for the volume expected at that intersection.

Volan asked whether a traffic signal at Third Street and Grant Street was on the list for future projects.

Cibor said no, although he was aware of concerns some people had expressed regarding the intersection. He suggested that the thoroughfare update might be a good chance to look at the overall vision for Third Street, but more vetting would need to be completed at that particular intersection.

Volan asked if there would be a central island included in the design for the Third Street and Woodscrest Drive/Hillsdale Drive intersection.

Cibor said probably not for that intersection, describing when such features would be appropriate. He said there would be some new space created with the realignment, and staff would look at adding sod or trees. He said there might also be a small island added on the south leg to shorten the crossing for pedestrians.

Volan asked whether there would be pedestrian piano keys going across Third Street.

Cibor said yes, on both sides.

Ordinance 16-28 (*cont'd*)

Chopra asked how bond counsel was paid.

Underwood said that cost was part of the closing costs that were paid for by the bonds.

Rollo asked whether the multi-use pathway connectors and the Jackson Creek trail project would be similar in specifications.

Cibor confirmed both would be similar in width, and said some previous paths adjacent to roads had been constructed at eight feet in width, but he anticipated moving to ten feet in width moving forward so as to be in line with the Complete Streets plan.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith asked for more information regarding the island Cibor had mentioned at the intersection of Third Street and Woodscrest Drive/Hillsdale Drive.

Cibor described the intended island, and said councilmembers could get more information online, including concept designs.

Rollo said he supported the projects, and he especially appreciated the Jackson Creek Trail project.

Chopra said she would vote no for a single issue, which was not using solar power for pedestrian crosswalks. She said she was disappointed that they could not get that done.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the Jackson Creek Trail project would be included in Ordinance 16-30 and that the Council was discussing Ordinance 16-28. She said she was voting yes on Ordinance 16-28.

Volan said he had previously recommended do not pass due to the omnibus nature of the bond ordinances, and reiterated that he would prefer to be able to more surgically address and vote on some of the projects. He said he agreed that the projects were very worthy and needed attention. He said he shared some of the concerns voiced by Mayer regarding the project at the intersection of Third Street and High Street/Bryan Avenue and the possible increase in traffic. He commented on the high cost of building sidewalks and said that was why developers were now required to build sidewalks as part of development, as it was very expensive to do it afterward. He supported Ordinance 16-28 and looked forward to the projects.

Mayer thanked staff for looking at Third Street and High Street/Bryan Avenue intersection. He responded to Volan's comment about why sidewalks were not originally included, and noted that area was a cow pasture at the time of construction, adding that Union Street used to be a dirt road.

Ruff said although the projects were still general ideas, he appreciated the upfront engagement with the Council. He said that, should there be concerns about changes to the projects, the Council meeting would serve as a clear record of the administration's intent, what Council was told, and what the feelings and interpretations were of the Council in hearing and accepting the projects.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-28 [9:21pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-28 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Chopra).

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-29 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Martha Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-29 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 4-1-4.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-29 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance covered six different pedestrian projects, with a maximum bond request of $1.8 million.

Ruff gave a reminder that the meeting served as the public comment portion for that item.

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
[9:22pm]

Cibor said the first project covered by the ordinance was a new traffic signal at the intersection of Walnut Street and 11th Street, which had no traffic signal, but had a transit stop with many crossing pedestrians. He said the traffic signal would be placed there mainly for the safety of pedestrians, at the request of Bloomington Transit, and after a thorough investigation. He said the area had experienced development recently, and the project would not have a significant impact on vehicle traffic.

He said the next project was located at Third Street and Indiana Avenue, and described the reasons for including that project.

He summarized the next project, which was at the intersection of Fourth Street and Rogers Road, saying it would be a pedestrian rapid flashing beacon enhanced project, not a traffic signal. He said the project had already involved extensive public outreach and expected construction to start next year.

He said the next project was located at the College Mall Road/Moores Pike intersection, which was a 25-year-old intersection. He said the intersection had old equipment, lacked ADA equipment, and was not pedestrian friendly.

He said the next project involved installing ADA ramps at a number of locations around the City, which would be built in phases.

He said the last project covered by the ordinance was a pedestrian countdown and push button signal project, located at existing signalized intersections, which would enhance those intersections. He noted the project had federal funding as well.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked if there were any plans to narrow Fourth Street west of Rogers Road while completing the project at the intersection of Fourth Street and Rogers Street.

Cibor said no, but staff was looking to add bulb-outs to narrow the pedestrian crossing.

Piedmont-Smith asked Cibor to explain how the Council might go about doing it if the Council wanted to narrow the street, and asked whether there was sufficient public right-of-way to do that

Cibor said he believed the City would have sufficient right-of-way to the narrow road. He said the City had done extensive public outreach and had communicated with a number of businesses on the road. He said they had received a mix of feedback about what to do at the location. But, he said, the focus of the project was to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection and he wanted to avoid project creep.

Volan asked whether the slides being presented had changed from the previous week, and if so, asked Cibor to provide the changed slides to the Council.

Cibor said he would.

Ordinance 16-29 (*cont'd*)

Volan asked how many of the intersections were timed and would not be interrupted by the push button signals.

Cibor said he did not know.

Volan asked whether the Council could be provided with a list of which intersections were not affected by a push button signal.

Cibor said he would work to provide that information.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith said she seconded Volan's concerns regarding the confusion surrounding push buttons, and encouraged Planning staff to look into adding something to the signage to indicate whether or not pushing the button impacted the changing of the signal or whether it was just for ADA purposes. She said it created frustration for pedestrians who thought pushing the button impacted the changing of the signals. She said, other than that, she was happy with the projects.

Volan said he appreciated Piedmont-Smith's concurrence on the topic. He said he would be willing to propose amendments to future projects to cut line items by the amount of cost of signage for such buttons, because it went to a larger concern about public acceptance of signalization. He described issues with signage that did not do what it purported to do. Otherwise, he said, the ordinance was great and he wanted to see all of the changes made.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-29 [9:36pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-29 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Chopra).

Ordinance 16-30 – To Authorize the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016C, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to for Certain Capital Improvemer 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 [9:36pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-30 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-30 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 7-0-1.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-30 be adopted.

Underwood explained the bonds in the ordinance were for the extension of the Jackson Creek Trail, with a maximum bond amount of $2 million.

Cibor said the project involved a combination of a multiuse path in addition to a traditional trail through a park system. He said the project would be led by the Planning and Transpiration Department, which would work in close collaboration with the Parks Department. Cibor described the location of the current path and the intended path of the extension. He noted that the project was also receiving federal funding and said he was available to answer questions.

Council Questions:

Chopra asked what the total distance of the trail would be.

Cibor estimated 1.5 miles total.

Piedmont-Smith clarified whether the planned extension would be 1.5 miles or the total trail would be 1.5 miles once completed.

Cibor clarified that the extension would be about 1.5 miles, and the total finished trail would be about two miles.

Council Comment:

Chopra expressed her excitement about the project.

Rollo said he was also excited, and said he would like to see the trail along Sare Road completed as well, to complete a loop. He understood the difficulties in getting an east to west connection.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-30 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-30 [9:41pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-31 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-31 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 7-0-1.

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
[9:41pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-31 be adopted.

Underwood summarized the projects covered by the bond ordinance, which included a multiuse path of three different projects and a maximum bond amount of $1.2 million.

Cibor said three projects were covered by the ordinance. The first was along East Rogers Road, and Cibor described the location and scope of the project and the multiuse path. He said the project was a part of the MPO program, and would be receiving federal funding. Cibor said the other two projects were in close proximity to each other, and he described the locations of the paths.

Council Questions:

Chopra asked how the city directed cyclists to behave on roadways and side paths, and how those multiuse paths operated when bicyclists were supposed to be riding on the road and operating like a motor vehicle.

Cibor said there were many different types of bicyclists, such as families with children on smaller bicycles. Cibor estimated that the vast majority of cyclists would feel more comfortable on the paths, while the more serious cyclists could ride in the roads.

Chopra asked what the safest approach would be as far as road versus path riding.

Cibor said some research had shown that safety was in numbers, so one goal was to promote cycling in general, thereby getting more people out riding and making them feel comfortable.

Piedmont-Smith asked how the path along East Rogers Road would be constructed given the grading issues at the location.

Cibor said there would be some grading work that needed to be completed, but not all the details had been worked out.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the design of the project had been completed.

Cibor said the federal funds just became eligible, so the design would start early in 2017.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether additional funds had been budgeted with the grading issues in mind.

Cibor said yes, there were conceptual cost estimates used to develop the budget estimates, which were revised as projects moved forward.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether there would be public input sessions for the project.

Cibor said yes.

Volan asked whether it was more expensive to build a mile of sidewalk or a mile of multiuse path.

Cibor said multiuse paths were generally more expensive.

Volan asked why paths could not be built into the road, with pylons to separate bicycle and vehicle traffic, which would narrow lanes and slow down traffic. He asked why different forms of traffic were segregated, and wondered whether the City could experiment with an integrated, slower street that would also be cheaper to build.

Ordinance 16-31 (*cont'd*)

Cibor said as the project was designed, staff would look at that as one of the options.

Volan pointed out that storm water runoff was typically considered when building sidewalks. He asked whether an integrated street, such as the one he suggested, would require building up the curbs to handle storm water, or could the City build a sidewalk that was not elevated, which would cost less and be more effective.

Cibor said it depended, but even if a street did not have curbs, storm water issues would not necessarily have to be addressed if the sidewalk or path was far enough from the road.

Rollo asked whether Cibor anticipated the multiuse path on Rogers Road to extend from Winding Brook to Spicewood Lane, then to Sare Road.

Cibor said that was a definite possibility, and as the thorough fare plan was updated, that would be looked at closely.

Volan asked when and where people could voice suggestions or concerns for the designs of the projects.

Cibor said he estimated that all three projects would begin early in 2017, and said councilmembers could always check in with him and said he would reach out to the Council as well.

Piedmont-Smith brought up situations when there was a path or sidewalk on one side of a street but not the other side. She asked whether part of the consideration and design took into account how people would cross the street to get to the sidewalk or path, noting she was specifically worried about Rogers Road.

Cibor said he anticipated that concern would be a part of the projects and something they would look to improve at that location.

Council Comment:

Chopra said she agreed that many bicyclists did not feel comfortable riding with traffic, and she thought it was a good idea to have multiuse paths removed from traffic.

Volan said he took Chopra's point, but questioned why streets had become devoted exclusively to cars, and said that had not always been the case. He said streets were public spaces and should be for all kinds of traffic, providing an example of the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. He said they had designated bicycle paths with pylons on the road. He said if lanes were demarcated, different traffic could all be in the same right of way. He also pointed to Bardstown Road in Louisville, which had narrow lanes that slowed traffic, and compared it to Atwater Avenue in Bloomington. He said narrowing the lanes would slow traffic, and he did not believe the City should allow all of its streets to be for cars first. He said there was a way to make people feel safe, and looked forward to future plans for the idea to make it safe for all kinds of traffic.

Piedmont-Smith encouraged staff to look at the examples that Volan brought forward. She said it was true that it would be more physically and environmentally sound to use existing paved surfaces for pedestrians and bicyclists if they could find a way to do so and also have people feel safe. Other than that, she supported the ordinance.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-31 [10:01pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-31 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

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
[10:01pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-32 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-32 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 1-1-6.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-32 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance was for the replacement of seven sanitation trucks, with a maximum bond of $2 million.
Adam Wason, Director of Public Works, introduced himself and addressed concerns that were brought up at the previous meeting. Wason said he hoped the Council would support the request, and noted that he did not intend to imply the Council had already given its consent to sanitation automation. He said he understood moving forward with any major changes to delivery of sanitation services would require the future support of the Council. He said the administration would announce the creation of an advisory committee or task force to explore any changes in the proposal put forward. He said the administration intended to involve the Council, with the Council having a representative on that group. He said there would be formal opportunities for public input. He clarified that he should have been using the term staggered implementation of a fully automated system to describe the proposal, instead of pilot, during the last meeting. He hoped to eventually move forward to bring the fully automated system to as many household as possible, and had many reasons why that was the approach the administration wanted to take. He said one reason was for the sake of employee safety, noting that there were significant injuries and costs associated with the current system. He said an automated system would require an automated truck, whether that truck was side-loading or rear-loading, along with specific carts. But, he said, any way the City moved forward with delivering sanitation services would still require the replacement of the aging vehicles in the fleet. He said he appreciated the chance to talk to some of the councilmembers leading up to that night's meeting.

Council Questions:

Volan asked Wason to verify the difference in cost of an automated side-loading truck compared to the replacement cost of one of the current trucks in the fleet.

Wason said the difference was between $50,000 to $100,000, depending on the style, model, and different features selected.

Volan asked what the cost of workers' compensation was to the City, and how much was incurred because the City did not have automated trucks.

Wason said historically most injuries had been related to loading trash into the back of the trucks.

Volan asked to what extent injuries had been incurred due to home owners not complying with City ordinance, by overstuffing trash cans. He asked whether the City was doing a good job of enforcing weight limits.

Wason said the current trucks had scales, and if the weight was close, staff would probably load it. He said if a trash container was well over the weight limits, staff put a sticker on the container explaining why collection did not occur.

Volan asked whether Wason could establish to what extent workers were being injured due to noncompliance and wondered whether it was a big problem.

Wason said he did not have specific data to address that.

Volan asked whether the primary reason for moving to an automated system was the well-being of workers.

Wason said yes.

Ordinance 16-32 (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith referenced a recent letter to the editor she had seen, which she said was ostensibly from an employee in the Sanitation Department complaining about the proposed changes. She asked Wason whether he knew of any reason why someone might complain.

Wason said he did not think staff was fully against the proposal, but said that whenever there was a serious change there would be concerns. He said he could not speak to the operation of sanitation services in the past. In his discussions with employees, the concerns were related to a reduction in the workforce. He had told staff that he wanted them to be a part of the proposal and wanted their input. He said there were a lot of long-time employees and a major change was difficult.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether any sanitation employees would be part of the task force.

Wason said they would certainly consider that idea.

Ruff asked whether other comparable municipalities, in good fiscal health, were moving in the same direction when they purchased trucks.

Wason said it had been the trend for the last 20 years in the industry.

Ruff asked whether the manual-load trucks would even be around in financially healthy communities.

Wason said he did not think so. He said industry wide, whether public or private, people have been moving toward automated services.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether side-loading trucks could be used without automation if the task force or the Council decided not to go automated.

Wason said the bond allowed the City to purchase sanitation vehicles. If the task force or Council did not approve any measure to move toward an automated system, the City could still purchase sanitation service delivery vehicles.

Underwood confirmed that was correct, and noted that no purchase would be made before the process outlined by Wason was completed, meaning the purchases would be a result of the process, not the purchase of the trucks followed by a discussion. There would be no purchase until after the conversation around the type of delivery system.

Council Comment:

Granger said she appreciated Wason's efforts to clarify the situation, and noted language was important. She thanked the mayor for reaching out and explaining his vision.

Volan thanked Wason for his candor and how he clarified the administration's presentation of the proposals. Volan clarified that the question of acquiring new equipment should be separate from the question of what new revenue scheme the City might choose to adopt in the name of sanitation, saying that the two were not related. Volan said the best argument for Ordinance 16-32 was that the City would reduce money paid for workers' compensation while preventing injuries. He said it was a matter of basic health and said he could endorse automatic trucks without necessarily knowing what the plan was for revenue. But, he said, the administration should know full well that a change in how revenue was generated does not necessarily follow. He said the administration had indicated it intended to plan, in a consensus driven way, how to pay for sanitation. Volan said he would vote for the ordinance.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-32 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-32 [10:20pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-33 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-33 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 2-0-6.

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 [10:20pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-33 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance would be for the replacement of two trucks, with a maximum bond amount of $750,000. He added that no purchase would be made until the process outlined by Wason had been completed.

Wason said the request was for two automated rear-loading trucks, which would replace some of the current fleet. He anticipated that certain areas of the city would not be able to be served by the automated side-loading trucks. He said it was also possible to retrofit some of the current fleet. He said there would always be a need for some of the rear-loading trucks, even when the City had moved to a fully automated system.

Council Questions:

Volan asked why the request was for $375,000 per truck, noting the total bond request was for $750,000. He asked whether the rear-loading trucks were more expensive.

Underwood replied that the request was the maximum bond amount, and the City anticipated the trucks would cost about $250,000 each. He said the request allowed for interest rate changes, and added that all the bond requests being made were at the maximum amount, even though many projects would come in less than that amount.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-33 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-33 [10:24pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-34 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-34 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 0-2-6.

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 [10:24pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-34 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance was for the purchase 32,000 solid waste and recycling carts of various sizes, with a maximum bond amount of $1.7 million, noting that no purchase would be made until the end of the decision-making process.

Wason said that in order to move to automated system, the City must also move to a cart-based system. When it came to size and color of the carts, staff would discuss that throughout the process. He said the City would like to offer three different sizes for solid waste carts. He said that the proposal the administration would bring forward contemplated a higher price for a larger cart, which was taking a volume-based pricing approach. With recycling carts, Wason expected the vast majority of residents to go with largest cart, and said the City would work with residents to get people the size cart they wanted and needed. He said the City had not looked much into yard waste, thought it may do so in the future. Under the proposal being brought forward, Wason expected the City to continue picking up yard waste as it did, minus the sticker system.

Ordinance 16-34 (*cont'd*)
Council Questions:

Granger asked Wason to clarify the pricing plan, noting that right then sanitation was subsidized. She asked whether the administration expected that to continue.

Wason said, for the next several years, sanitation would continue asking for similar levels of support from the general fund for the services it provided. As the City moved toward an automated system, he hoped that that support would decline. Wason said that with a fully automated system he expected to see cost savings, and as those cost savings become apparent, sanitation would hopefully need less support.

Underwood noted the 2017 budget request included that allocation in the general fund budget. As the City moved to an automated system, he expected further discussions about the subsidy for sanitation and how to use that money.

Granger asked whether the 2017 budget request was at the same amount.

Underwood said it was the same as the approved 2016 amount.

Volan asked whether Wason knew how many households were served by City sanitation trucks.

Wason said approximately 15,000.

Volan asked how he knew that.

Wason said the information came from the GIS mapping system. He noted the City served single-family residential units, along with any apartment unit with up to four units.

Volan asked if Wason knew the average weight of the trash and recycling the average household put out in a year.

Wason said he did have that information, though not on hand, but could provide it to the Council.

Volan asked whether the City would swap out a larger bin for a smaller bin if someone were not filling up the bin.

Wason said yes, though as the City moved to the new system, the City would want to avoid multiple swap-outs per household. He said the City would work with citizens to figure out upfront what size best worked for a household. That was why there were additional carts being requested.

Volan asked Wason to clarify what he meant by swap-out.

Wason said that, if a household realized it did not need a 65-gallon solid waste container, it could be exchanged for a 35-gallon container. With recycling, the City would encourage people to use the larger containers because Bloomington households loved to recycle.

Volan asked whether the City would only swap out containers if the household requested it.

Wason said yes.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the administration intended to include a small capital fee in the per-month cost of sanitation pickup to eventually cover the cost of the carts.

Wason said yes, they hoped to include a small portion of the monthly sanitation fee to help pay for capital recovery, whether carts or vehicles.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the bond issuances were based on property tax income, not based on fees.

Underwood said that was correct, noting that the bond being discussed was essentially a subsidy to the sanitation program. He said what the City wanted to look at in the future was a model similar to the water and wastewater utilities, which had a capital replacement element in their fees.

Ordinance 16-34 (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the intent was to have sanitation, just like water utilities, paid for entirely through fees.

Underwood said that would be the model for which he would advocate. He said it could become self-sufficient, and would be a consumption-based fee, and explained how that might work.

Piedmont-Smith noted the task force would have a lot to consider.

Underwood concurred, and said he expected it would be a project that took several years.

Piedmont-Smith asked what an RFID system was.

Wason said it was a radio frequency identification system. He explained that, when moving to a cart based system, the RFID system allows the City to track bins and track various data.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether it was similar to a bar code that went on each cart that could be scanned.

Wason said yes.

Underwood added that there was software that could be purchased that would attach to the truck that would allow the workers to scan the bins to review the data.

Wason said he had discussed that technology with retailers and hoped to consider it in the future.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether funding for the RFID system was included in the bonds.

Wason said the RFID tracking systems would be included in the carts, though there might have been some additional costs for software, but he expected to be able to pay for that with other funds.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the carts budgeted for would have the RFID system.

Wason said yes.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-34 [10:41pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-34 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0; Abstain: 1 (Volan).

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 [10:41pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-35 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only.

Volan asked that a roll call vote be taken on whether to introduce the item, as it was after 10:30 p.m. local time and no legislation could be introduced for Council action after 10:30 p.m. local time without a two-thirds vote of the members of the Council.

The Council and Council attorney/administrator Dan Sherman had additional discussion and clarification on the proper procedure and vote before the Council.

The motion to introduce Ordinance 16-35 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Volan, Chopra). Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-35 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 7-0-1.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-35 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance was for two requests. The first request was the replacement of the exhaust systems at all of the fire stations. The other request was for the replacement of guard rails along Old State Road 37. Underwood said the maximum bond amount was $600,000.

Jason Moore, Fire Chief, introduced himself. He said the exhaust removal systems being requested were an upgrade to what was currently in place. He said there was evidence of diesel soot and

exhaust that had entered into the living spaces at the stations. He explained the importance of the system to the health of fire fighters, and to the health of community members that visited the stations. Moore said it was his responsibility to minimize the risks to the health of fire fighters and said he was available for questions.

Ordinance 16-35 (*cont'd*)

Volan asked how much exhaust the existing systems were removing and how deficient the current systems were.

Moore said the current system was used only when they were sitting in the station during vehicle checkouts. The systems captured zero emissions as responders pulled out of stations to go on calls. The systems required manual connections and did not break away as trucks left the station Moore explained the proposed new system and the difference between the two systems.

Volan asked whether there was the future possibility of not using diesel trucks, instead using something like electric vehicles.

Moore said there were some options available, but none of them offered enough power or reliability to make sense. But, Moore said, if the technology improved, he would be more than willing to consider such trucks.

Volan asked how long the exhaust systems lasted.

Moore said 15-20 years, which was why it was appropriate to pay for it with the bond.

Council Questions:

Granger asked whether there were data on Bloomington's firefighters showing illness or more health problems due to the exhaust.

Moore said fire service in general was heavily reliant on third party data, and never had great information on the causes of cancer. He said that people were starting to narrow down the types and sources, though Bloomington had no data capture on that question at all. But, he noted, most agencies did not collect such data either. He said it was something that had become important, and noted recent efforts to begin addressing the issue and gathering data. He said given the other carcinogens that firefighters were exposed to, Bloomington should do what it could to limit fire fighters' exposure to this one.

Wason presented the North Walnut guard rail replacement project. He explained the location of the guard rails, explained the history of the existing stretch of guard rails, and detailed the process of replacing said rails. He explained what leftover funds could be used for.

Volan asked whether the process of guard rail replacement offered the opportunity to do any other kind of transportation modification to a street like the one under consideration.

Wason said, during any transportation related project, they could consider other modifications.

Granger asked whether the east side of the road up against the Blue Ridge had issues with landslides, or items falling.

Wason said he did not think so.

Granger asked if the City could look at that, as it seemed like it could happen.

Wason said the City could look at that with any installation project. He also noted City staff would not be installing the guard rails, as the City would need a certified guard rail installation company to do that. He said Granger's concern would be part of that company's analysis and installation process.

Ordinance 16-35 (*cont'd*)
Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith said she was glad the City was doing something for the health of the fire fighters.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-35
[10:56pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-35 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

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
[10:57pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-36 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra). Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-36 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 7-0-1.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-36 be adopted.

Underwood explained ordinance covered projects for various facilities, with a maximum bond amount of $2 million.

Paula McDevitt, Acting Director of the Parks and Recreation Department, introduced herself, and noted there were 24 sites where the projects would be located. She provided a quick summary of each of the projects encompassed by the ordinance. She addressed questions about the Frank Southern Ice Arena regarding the ammonia callout system. She said that the system was last replaced in 1999, said it was working well, and said the ammonia was recycled through the system. She said the backup system that had been proposed would allow for a communication to go out after hours if there was a problem with the main system. She also said the IU Hockey group did not have a partnership agreement with arena and said they were a user group, just like any other user group, and had to rent ice time. She addressed a question about the Goat Farm project, noting that the cost to paint the silo was estimated to be between $3,000 and $4,000.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked what the ammonia system was for.

McDevitt said it was the system that created and maintained the ice.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the proposed capital improvement would not be a new system but would be a way to alert staff if something happened to the current system.

McDevitt said yes.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-36
[11:03pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-36 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

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 Capital Improvements at Certain Park Facilities
[11:16pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-37 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only.

Council and staff had discussion regarding compliance with public notice and open door requirements, along with extended discussion about how a delay in acting on the bond ordinances would impact the issuance of the bonds and the Council agenda.

The motion to introduce Ordinance 16-37 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra). Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-37 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 8-0-0.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-37 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance included five projects and a maximum bond amount of $1.1 million.

McDevitt summarized the projects to be funded by the bond.

Ordinance 16-37 (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked where the fishing pier to be constructed at Griffy Lake would be located.

McDevitt said the exact location had not been determined.

Rollo asked whether it would be easily accessible to anyone that would be parking there.

McDevitt said yes.

Council Questions:

Sturbaum said the Griffy Lake fishing pier looked cool.

Council Comment:

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-37 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-37 [11:19pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-38 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra). Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-38 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 7-0-1.

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 [11:20pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-38 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance was for improvements to various parks, encompassing seven projects, with a maximum bond amount of $1.5 million.

McDevitt provided a summary of the proposed projects to be funded by the bond.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the work at People's Park would affect the mosaics located there.

McDevitt said there would be work done on all of the surfaces there.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the mosaics would go away.

McDevitt said no, the project was more focused on the concrete walk.

Volan asked where he could find a breakdown of the cost of each specific project included in the bond.

McDevitt said the projects came off of the 5-year capital improvement project list. She said the estimates for the projects were constantly updated, and those cost estimated were shared with the Controller's Office.

Volan asked where one could find that document.

McDevitt said it was a document maintained by the Parks Department, but she could share that with the Council.

Volan asked whether the Board of Park Commissioners handled claims for money actually spent on each project, and whether there was a way to find out how much the projects actually cost.

McDevitt said yes, and said that was part of the large project plan. She said projects were tracked, along with the date it was done, and the final cost of the project.

Chopra asked when the improvements proposed for People's Park were scheduled to be completed.

McDevitt said there would be a strategy session in the fall of 2016 for all of the projects, to outline what needed to be done and the status of each project, so she could better answer that question as that process was completed.

Ordinance 16-38 (*cont'd*)

Sturbaum asked whether the possible Portland Loo would be under the purview of the Parks Department.

McDevitt said she was attending the national conference in two weeks, and she suspected there would be materials available at that conference. She said the Department would take it under consideration and look at other examples.

Ruff asked whether the projects listed for each location were comprehensive or whether other improvements or projects might be undertaken at a given location.

McDevitt said the lists of projects were comprehensive. She said the City maintained the capital improvement list, which was a working document that was continually updated.

Ruff clarified that the items presented were not necessarily exhaustive of the changes that could be done at a given location.

McDevitt said the items presented were the top priorities, but that if another priority came up, staff would look at that, especially if it were a more immediate need.

Rollo mentioned a constituent had complained to him about the resurfacing work previously completed at a tennis court, and asked whether the resurfacing of the tennis courts would be completed by a preferred contractor or if it would go out for bids.

McDevitt said it would be bid out, and there would due diligence to get quotes, background, and experience information for a given contractor.

Ruff asked if McDevitt had obtained any information about the contractor that had completed the previous resurfacing work.

McDevitt said she had not, but would obtain that information for the Council.

Chopra asked about the extent of the resurfacing work to be completed and what the proposed project would entail.

McDevitt said the proposed work was a complete resurface that was more extensive that previous resurfacing work.

Council Comment:

Volan said it would be good to be able to see how much the projects ended up costing compared to how much they were estimated to cost. He said he would like to receive a report for the projects included in Ordinance 16-36 to Ordinance 16-40 to be able to track costs from cradle to grave.

Chopra said she would encourage the Parks Board to talk to the local business owners along the Kirkwood Avenue and Dunn Street area prior to any work at People's Park. She said she met with a couple of business owners that day and said those owners could provide insight and may have helpful requests or ideas to solve some of the issues at the park.

Granger urged the Parks Department to look into the Portland Loo.

Ruff suggested that, if the City was going to invest such a large amount in the Bryan Park tennis courts for resurfacing, the City should reconsider lighting at the courts.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-38 [11:35pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-38 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-39 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra). Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-39 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 8-0-0.

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
[11:35pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-39 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance dealt with a number of projects at Lower Cascades Park, and had a maximum bond request of $1.8 million.

McDevitt detailed the proposed projects covered by the ordinance.

Council Questions:

Granger asked how old the nets located at the park were.
McDevitt said the playground opened in 2006.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-39
[11:38pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-39 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

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
[11:39pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-40 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra). Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read Ordinance 16-40 by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 8-0-0.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-40 be adopted.

Underwood said the ordinance involved the replacement of equipment at nine different facilities, with a maximum bond request of $2 million.

McDevitt listed the proposed projects.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the HVAC replacement at Twin Lakes Recreation Center would involve changing to a high efficiency system.
McDevitt said yes, the Sustainability Office had been consulted, and the new system would be energy efficient.

Rollo asked how long the pumps to be replaced at the pool would last.
McDevitt said she did not know, but would obtain that information.

Council Comment:

Mayer thanked McDevitt for her presentation, thanked the Parks staff and Parks Board for their work.

Sandberg said she echoed Mayer's comments, and said she thought it was a good use of the funding to maintain the assets the City had while also making improvements where it could.

Granger said she was excited about the water fountains.

Volan said he supported the items in the ordinance, as well as the other projects presented, but said he was voting no on the ordinance as a protest vote for the way the meeting was scheduled. He said there was no reason the Council had to take up the ordinances in the order they were numbered, and he said the Council should have considered the easy ordinances first. He said it was not true that the Council made decisions just as well late in the

evening as the Council did early in the evening, and said the Council should rethink the way it did business.

Ordinance 16-40 (*cont'd*)

Rollo said he would have voted to postpone had a councilmember described specifically what was lacking, or what questions would remain unanswered if the Council continued, but did not hear that explanation.

Ruff said he knew it was late, but had confidence that the majority of councilmembers were thinking clearly and would have asked any questions they felt were appropriate. He said he did not see a drop-off in questions asked. He thanked the Parks staff and Parks Board for the capital plan they had in place.

Piedmont-Smith explained why she voted against continuing the meeting, saying it was the principle of the matter and there was no reason the Council should have such long meetings. She said the Council should better control the calendar so it did not happen.

Chopra said members of the public might not attend council meetings because the meetings were often lengthy. She pointed to the student group that had left the meeting earlier in the evening.

Volan said he found it ironic that a sponsor of legislation that did not need to be heard that night and that took 40 minutes at the beginning of the meeting was then criticizing colleagues for complaining about the Council schedule and the rules by which the Council abided. He acknowledged it was up to the supermajority of the Council to continue hearing items, but echoed sentiments of colleagues who had voted to not continue. He said the Council would not have to keep having the debate if it respected the 10:30 rule.

Ruff said he was in communication with the PACE class that was in attendance earlier, and the class was scheduled to leave at 9:30pm.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-40 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-40
[11:53pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-15 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only.

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

Volan noted the ordinance was not part of the bond legislation, but was an ordinance proposed by Councilmember Sturbaum.

Ruff said he would not vote to extend the meeting because the same justifications for extending the meeting for the bond ordinances did not exist for Ordinance 16-15.

Sturbaum said the ordinance could wait.

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 1 (Granger), Nays: 6, Abstain: 2 (Sturbaum, Mayer).

Vote to postpone consideration of Ordinance16-15
[11:54pm]

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING
[11:54pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-20 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 16-20 – To Amend the Zoning Maps from Residential High-Density Multifamily (RH) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) as well as Approve a District Ordinance and Preliminary Pla Re: 405 E. 17th Street (RCR Properties, LLC, Petitioner)

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-21 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 16-21 – To Vacate A Public Parcel - Re: A 50-Foot by 120-Foot Segment of North Grant Street Located South of 18th Street and East of 1313 North Grant Street (RCR Properties, LLC, Petitioner)

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-23 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 16-23 – To Amend Title 8 of the Bloomington Municipal Code, Entitled "Historic Preservation and Protection" to Establish a Historic District – Re: 2233 East Moores Pike Historic District (Terry L. Kemp, Owner and Petitioner)

There were no comments in this segment of the meeting.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMEN

Sherman reminded the Council of the meetings schedule for the following week.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE
[12:05am]

It was moved and seconded that the Council hold a Special Session instead of a Regular Session on Wednesday, September 28, 2016.

Following discussion, the motion to change the Regular Session to a Special Session received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Sturbaum).

Vote to change Regular Session to a Special Session
[12:07am]

The meeting was adjourned at 12:07am.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVE:

Andy Ruff, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington