In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, November 2, 2016 at 7:32pm with Council President Andy Ruff presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
November 2, 2016

Roll Call: Granger, Mayer, Sandberg, Ruff, Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra, Rollo
Absent: Sturbaum

ROLL CALL
[7:32pm]

Council President Andy Ruff gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[7:32pm]

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes from October 19, 2016.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
[7:34pm]

The motion to approve the minutes was approved by voice vote.

October 19, 2016 (Regular Session)

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS
  [7:34pm]

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith reminded the public that they could vote early or on Election Day. She added that it was one of the most important elections ever, and asked people to vote.

Councilmember Steve Volan acknowledged with a heavy heart that the Cubs were playing in game seven of the World Series that evening and he was in a council meeting. He added that there were several important issues on the agenda and he was doing his duty that night. He finished by saying "Go, Cubs. Go".

Councilmember Dorothy Granger reminded everyone of the task of the month for the Monroe County Energy Challenge, which was to turn one's water heater down to 120° degrees.

Councilmember Tim Mayer reminded the public to enjoy the beautiful weather.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES
  [7:35pm]

Jacqueline Bauer, Sustainability Coordinator, gave an update on the projects that she was working on, which included:

- Green Building Ordinance planned for next year: Allison Jukebox, the Animal Shelter, and Buskirk Chumley were first on the list to determine whether LEED certification was possible. In addition, City Hall would be re-evaluated for certification. Bauer noted that the Guaranteed Energy Savings Contract that was on the agenda for later that evening tied directly into the evaluation process.
- Solar project/Solarize Bloomington: hoped to have the project launched for the public portion sometime in December.
- Monroe County Energy Challenge: Activities supporting the Energy Challenge continued, and included a Workplace Partners Program (25 partners, 55,000-person reach, including clients, staff, and tenants), Energy Leaders (25 community members), more than 400 home assessments completed, 22 low-income household attics insulated, 14 child care center assessments completed, and more then 1000 LED bulbs distributed in October.
- Team Green grant: launched second round of internal sustainability grants, with money coming from Hoosier to Hoosier Community Sale.
- Community sustainability plan process to be launched the next year - would dovetail with the comprehensive plan, and

would develop specific goals and strategies for advancing sustainability in the community. Details of the process were still being worked out, but would be a joint effort between ESD and Planning, and would involve ample opportunity for public participation.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*contd*)

Piedmont-Smith asked for more detail on the Solarize Bloomington project.

Bauer responded that the project was a way for residents to purchase solar panels in conjunction with the city so that they could enjoy a lower price to install solar panels.

Councilmember Dave Rollo commented that there was a lot of good news, and asked if there was a way to get an estimate on CO_2 reductions.

Bauer affirmed that it was possible and said that they were working on a final draft of the city's energy inventory. She added that the Energy Challenge would also have numbers and that she would be able to get more as they came in.

Councilmember Allison Chopra asked if there were a limited number of stakes that could be passed out to households.

Bauer responded that they made a commitment to recognize one household per week but they had plenty of space for more.

Ruff asked for clarification of how many low-income homes were insulated.

Bauer clarified that the 22 homes were insulated over a six-week period in July and August.

There were no council reports.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Ruff called for public comment.

- PUBLIC

Dr. Mary Howard-Hamilton, President of the Bloomington Alumnae chapter of Delta Sigma Theta (DST), spoke on behalf of the chapter. Howard-Hamilton noted that the chapter came every year to provide a small reception for the council, and to talk about the mission of their organization. She thanked the council for its hard work, and addressed some concerns that the sorority wanted to see the council address in the year to come which included:

- Encouraging everyone to vote.
- Collaborating with their DST to encourage women and minorities to file for office.
- Maintaining a civil, caring community devoted to social justice and welcoming all populations.
- Issuing more resolutions recognizing minority populations in the community.

Howard-Hamilton the council to reach out if they needed anything and invited them to their annual pancake breakfast on February 4, 2017.

Ruff asked if the council could get an email reminder for the breakfast, and inquired if the breakfast was a fundraiser.

Howard-Hamilton responded yes to the email, and that the breakfast was a scholarship fundraiser.

- PUBLIC (*contd*)

Cindy Rhodenbaugh, a resident in Ridgefield neighborhood, spoke about an issue with a storm drainage pipe that was open and flowing in the neighborhood. She asked the council for assistance.

Ron Chatlos, a resident in Ridgefield neighborhood, also spoke about the storm drainage pipe. He also asked the council for assistance.

Michael Hibbard, a resident in Ridgefield neighborhood, spoke about the need for city assistance in correcting the problem with the storm drainage pipe.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
[8:00pm]

It was moved and seconded to appoint Steven Bryant and Michael Burton to the Telecommunications Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote. [1]

It was moved and seconded to appoint Kurt Seiffert and Eric Dockendorf to the Bloomington Digital Underground Advisory Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote. [2]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS
[8:01pm]

Ordinance 16-24 – To Amend the Zoning Maps from Residential Single Family (RS) and Residential High-Density Multifamily (RH) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) as well as Approve a District Ordinance and Preliminary Plan – Re: 600-630 E. Hillside Drive (Dwellings LLC, Petitioner)

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-24 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, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 1-4-4.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-24 be adopted.

Volan explained that after the last committee of the whole meeting the petitioner asked for more time to gather answers for the council.

Volan also explained that the petitioner, staff, representatives from the Bryant Park neighborhood association, Councilmember Piedmont-Smith and himself met earlier in the day to ascertain the forward motion of the PUD. The result of the conversation was that the petitioner and the neighborhood cautiously agreed that they could work out some details of the proposal before it came to the council again in regular session.

Volan thought the issues came down to the massing of the buildings as opposed to the density, whether greater parking could be established on Henderson, and whether the main buildings could be built at grade. He thought the meeting did a good job of narrowing the issues and postponing consideration of the ordinance would give the parties more time to work things out.

Piedmont-Smith added that the petitioners submitted two preliminary renderings of changes to their plan that they would like to further hone before presentation to the council on November 16, 2016.

Volan added that the petitioner asked him to sit down again, and encouraged other members of council to join him if they would like.

It was moved and seconded to postpone consideration of Ordinance 16-24 until the Regular Session on November 16, 2016.

Vote to postpone Ordinance 16-24
[8:08pm]

The motion to postpone consideration of Ordinance 16-24 until the Regular Session on November 16, 2016 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0

---

[1] Corrective action needed-Steven Bryant was already a Mayoral appointee

[2] Corrective action needed-Council appointed two people when there was only one space available.

Resolution 16-17 – To Approve the Interlocal Agreement Between Monroe County, Town of Ellettsville, and the City of Bloomington for Animal Shelter Operation for the Year 2017 [8:08pm]

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-17 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Bolden read Resolution 16-17 by title and synopsis.

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-17 be adopted.

Virgil Sauder, Animal Care and Control Director, introduced the resolution. He explained that the percentage of the shelter operations budget for 2017 was figured from the percentage of intake of animals from 2015.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked if the euthanization rates were going down.

Sauder replied that they were going down, and that they had hit a plateau around 11-12% total based on intake of animals to the shelter. He said that many of those were severe injuries and aggressive animals.

Chopra asked for clarification as to whether the agreement was identical to the year prior, with the exception of the changed percentages per entity based on how they were serviced.

Sauder agreed that was correct.

Chopra asked whether the percentage change was large.

Sauder said it was a 1% decrease from the previous year.

Chopra asked from where and to where that 1% change took place.

Sauder said there was a 1% decrease in the total number of animals taken in from the Town of Ellettsville and Monroe County from 2014 to 2015.

Chopra asked whether each entity paid a proportion based on number of animals taken in.

Sauder said each entity paid a different percentage, and the total figure was calculated for Monroe County, and Monroe County then worked with Ellettsville for reimbursement of its portion.

Chopra asked for more specific information regarding the percentages that each entity was paying.

Sauder said the percentage of operations from Monroe County, including the Town of Ellettsville, was down 1% from 2014 to 2015. He added that the total number of animals brought into the shelter increased by 19, while the number of animals coming from Monroe County, including the Town of Ellettsville, decreased by 54 between those two years.

Chopra asked about the difference between the number of animals brought in by the City, Monroe County, and the Town of Ellettsville. She asked whether each entity paid a proportion based on the number of animals brought in from that entity.

Sauder said that was correct.

Chopra asked whether those numbers had changed since the last agreement.

Sauder said yes, the last agreement was at 44%.

Chopra asked what 44% represented.

Jeffrey Underwood, Controller, said 44% of total intake. He said the amounts were calculated by looking at the total amount of animals taken in combined, and the number brought in from the City, Monroe County, and the Town of Ellettsville.

Chopra asked Underwood to provide those numbers.

Underwood it was 43%.

Chopra asked what 43% represented.

Sauder clarified the total number of animals the shelter received was 3,793 animals, with 1,637 coming from the County and Town of Ellettsville. He said Monroe County took in 1,522 animals, while the Town of Ellettsville took in 115.

Resolution 16-17 (*contd*)

Chopra asked if Sauder had those numbers in terms of percentages.

Sauder said the County and Town of Ellettsville made up 43% of total animal intake, and that Monroe County accounted for 40% of the total animals coming into the shelter, while Ellettsville accounted for 3%. He said 42% of the total intake came from within City limits, while the remaining 15% came from outside the county.

Chopra asked whether those figures were from the current agreement or the previous agreement.

Sauder said they were from the current agreement.

Chopra asked Sauder to provide those percentages for the last agreement.

Sauder said he did not have those specific figures for each entity in front of him, but he could provide them.

Chopra asked if there was a time consideration with the resolution, or a date by which it had to be passed, because she was uncomfortable with the lack of answers. She noted that there had not been a work session on the resolution either.

Adam Wason, Public Works Director, answered that the current agreement expired at the end of the year, so there was a time consideration to allow the other entities to pass the agreement before the end of the year.

Council Comment:

Mayer thanked Sauder for following up on stray animals.

Chopra expressed surprise at the level of scrutiny that the agreement was receiving. She said that, as council members, they were asked to oversee such matters, and that there was a reason they were voting on the issue. She said that if they did not have the numbers to be informed voters, they should not be voting on the issue that evening.

She commented that many times when people heard about fraud and mistakes, it stemmed from places where no one was watching. She thought it was their responsibility to take a more careful look at the issue.

It was moved and seconded to postpone consideration of Resolution 16-17 until a later date.

Granger thanked the staff for bringing the issue forward, and said that she was pleased with the way the shelter treated animals.

Councilmember Susan Sandberg said that it was not the first time the members of the council who had been on it for several years had heard the interlocal agreement presentation. She assured the public that there was a process and procedure that was agreed upon by all of the parties. She stated that she was very comfortable with the information that had been provided, and she was prepared to vote on it that evening.

Volan commented that he understood Chopra's desire for more information, but that it had been a largely uncontroversial decision in the past. He pointed out that just because they could legally adopt the resolution with one hearing did not mean that they could not have a second hearing to make their decision. He said that he had no objection to the agreement itself, but that he did not think another hearing would cause undo problems.

Chopra commented that when people rested on their laurels and said they had heard something several times was when mistakes were more likely to be made. She stated that it was not a reflection

Resolution 16-17 (*contd*)

on her time on council, but was a reflection of how the council was doing its duties and how much scrutiny it should be putting into local agreements. She added that there was a reason other government bodies had problems with their finances and said that it was because people did not check and were not doing the things they needed to do to ensure that everything was tight. She hoped that she would not decrease the level of scrutiny she gave to items like this the longer she was on council. She said that it was not a lack of understanding or that she thought it was controversial. She said that she did not feel that the answers she was given made her comfortable answering to the people who elected her to take care of the city's coffers.

Councilmember Dave Rollo stated that he did not see the need for more information, and asked Chopra what information she was looking for exactly.

Chopra responded that she wanted the answers to her questions in a public hearing.

Wason commented that the problem was that Sauder did not have the answers right in front of him, and that they were able to pull up the numbers.

Dan Sherman, Council Administrator, commented that the paper he handed out to the council a few minutes prior was a listing of reimbursements based on previous year's statistics.

Chopra stated that they were the numbers that she had been looking for.

Piedmont-Smith said that the information was available to make an informed decision, and that she did not see a problem with passing the resolution.

Vote to postpone Resolution 16-17 [8:27pm]

The motion to postpone Resolution 16-17 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 2 (Volan, Chopra), Nays: 6. FAILED

Vote to adopt Resolution 16-17 [8:28pm]

The motion to adopt Resolution 16-17 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Chopra).

Resolution 16-19 – To Seek Proposals Regarding Conservation Measures Through a Guaranteed Savings Contract [8:28pm]

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

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

Bauer introduced the legislation and explained that the administration was asking the council to authorize staff to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a guaranteed savings contract. She explained that the contracts were authorized by state statute, and enabled public entities to enter into contracts with private entities in order to pay for conservation measures. She said that it was a way to make extensive improvements on city buildings without an additional burden on the city's debt limit. Bauer noted that the city had completed a similar plan in the past, and that the savings were realized earlier than expected.

Council Questions:

Mayer asked for examples of what the savings might be used for this time.

Bauer responded that LED lighting and solar power were two examples of new opportunities. She pointed out that aging infrastructure would also be addressed.

Resolution 16-19 (*contd*)

Piedmont-Smith expressed surprise that the city had not done a guaranteed savings contract since 2003.

Bauer noted that it was explored at the time of the green building ordinance in 2009, but noted that there was not support for the idea at that time.

Piedmont-Smith asked if retro-commissioning would be on the list in the RFP.

Bauer responded that the RFP would list a full investment grade audit on City Hall (which would include retro-commissioning), less detailed audits of several other buildings, and a project concept list from each agency. She explained that it was a multi-step process to choose a firm and then make a list of projects for the council's further approval. She estimated that the list would come back to council in the fall of 2017.

Rollo clarified that a lot of things were done in-house after the green building ordinance, and then asked if the council would have to make an appropriation when the contract came before the council again.

Sherman replied that the resolution started the process, and the council would approve the contract next year. He stated that after the approval, the appropriations would just appear in the annual budget.

Rollo asked if the city was liable for any expenditures other than the savings over a ten year period.

Sherman responded that the guarantee was that the savings would at least equal the costs over a period of time.

Bauer confirmed that there was some flexibility on the number of years, usually around 10-15 years, and added that any savings not realized were paid by the firm, not the city.

Rollo clarified that the terms and contract would be brought before the council the following year, at that time the council would be able to review the time schedule, savings, and implementation.

Chopra asked for more detail on how the contract would not impact the debt obligation of the city.

Bauer explained that the type of funding was governed by state statute and was exempted from the debt limit of the city. She added that it was a more flexible tool for funding.

Granger asked if the contract was similar to what the county did a few years earlier.

Bauer confirmed that it was.

Granger asked how it differed from the request for qualifications that was issued in July, and why the RFP was then necessary.

Bauer explained that the city had introduced that extra step in the process in order to have more control and to reduce the burden on staff. She also explained that the firms who were working on the initial audit of the building would still participate in the RFP, but staff was complying with the notice period required by the state.

Granger then asked if the city would get proposals from several other companies.

Bauer explained that it was possible that other firms would respond to the RFP.

Piedmont-Smith confirmed whether that meant the city was most likely to choose one of the two companies.

Bauer agreed that was case.

Council Comments:

Piedmont-Smith said that she thought it was a great idea.

The motion to adopt Resolution 16-19 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 16-19 [8:48pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-22 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Bolden read Ordinance 16-22 by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 16-22 – To Amend Title 2 (Administration and Personnel) of the Bloomington Municipal Code (To Establish a Parking Commission) [9:36pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-22 be adopted.

Volan introduced the legislation to the council by reading the following statement:

> "We have no Parking Department. In fact, as many as eight city departments have some say in the management of parking since the meters went in and departments were reorganized to make transportation policy more coherent (Whereas #2). There is no one person tasked with parking, no parking "czar." And no one department has authority over the others to oversee the wide range of policies that parking touches on. Parking has no obvious point person.
>
> Parking in District 6 is a bigger deal than noise; it's bigger than trash. It's bigger even than the most recent intractable social issue of vagrancy downtown. All of seven and parts of two more of the eleven parking zones are in District 6. You know that I'm working on a new parking zone for Garden Hill, which wants enforcement on evenings and weekends. All 14 municipal parking lots and all three city-owned garages are in District 6. Since 2013, the entire parking meter zone is in District 6. The existential issue of District 6, for as long as I have served, is parking.
>
> Frankly, I have every right to claim to be that person, or at least the city's go-to authority on parking. Instead, I am proposing Ordinance 16-22, to devote a nine-member commission to parking, and all the impacts it has across the city.
>
> The primary goal of that commission would be to develop a comprehensive policy towards the use and management of parking. Because we've never had such a policy, we've made ad hoc decisions on parking that have sometimes conflicted with each other (Whereas #3).
>
> Parking is a significant use of land locally. We've had a comprehensive land-use plan, the Growth Policies Plan, to guide our policymaking for 25 years. Parking significantly impacts five of the seven pillars of the GPP, which we still use. Most of the impacts of parking create negative externalities (Whereas #4):
>
> - Compact urban form: Parking lots are antithetical to "compact" form.
> - Nurture environmental integrity: Parking lots and facilities take up space where trees and buildings used to be or could be, and increase stormwater runoff.
> - Leverage public capital: Parking lots take up space that could be used for almost anything else; parking garages are very expensive. Every dollar the city spends on car parking is a dollar not spent on sidewalks, trails, public transit, or bike parking.
> - Mitigate traffic: perhaps the most important principle, specifically calls for "expanding public transit, bike

Ordinance 16-22 (*contd*)

and ped facilities," as well as implementing strategies to manage traffic." It specifically does not call for "more free parking," or "more convenient parking."

- Conserve community character: The GPP calls, under this heading, for "protecting and enhancing neighborhoods, improving downtown vitality, and maintaining Bloomington's historic character." Unchecked parking construction destroyed a great deal of this community's character in the 50s, 60s and 70s.

Many people have asked why parking issues can't be taken up by, say, the Traffic Commission. The simplest reason is: it would easily double their workload. But a more important reason is that Traffic's reason for existence is to consider the movement of vehicles. The storage of vehicles is a very different matter, and at least as important (Whereas #5). Vehicle storage generates revenue, something Traffic was not designed to consider. There's dispute about which types of users should be using which type of parking, an economic and sustainable development issue that Traffic was not engineered to tackle, nor is Traffic designed to consider the bureaucratic problems of managing permits, tickets, or appeals.

The easiest way to think of this proposal is that if the question involves a vehicle in motion, it's the domain of the Traffic Commission. If the vehicle is at rest, it's the domain of the Parking Commission.

The new Commission's purpose is modeled on, but significantly different from, the Traffic Commission, which was created in the 70s and predates the GPP. Its purpose in city code is to "improve traffic conditions," not to "mitigate traffic" like the GPP calls for.

Thus, the main point of the Parking Commission is not simply to "improve parking conditions," but, rather, to achieve the city's comprehensive plan objectives through parking policy. To that end, one of its primary goals will be to develop that comprehensive policy on parking that would function as an attachment to the GPP, just like Master Thoroughfare Plan.

The ordinance creates a new §2.12.110 in Bloomington Municipal Code, which describes the composition and duties of the new Parking Commission. Because parking is an economic development issue, the Commission would have three representatives from organizations: two merchants with addresses in the meter zone, and a representative from a not-for-profit organization that owns or leases space in the meter zone. Because parking generates a great deal of revenue, there would be four citizens, at least one of whom would have to be a resident of the meter zone, and another one of the four a resident of either the meter zone or a neighborhood parking zone. And because parking generates bureaucratic concerns, there would also be a Councilmember and a staffer from Planning & Transportation. All nine commissioners, five Mayoral and four Council appointees all together, would jointly be concerned with overall policy: Council would appoint a councilmember, a merchant and two citizens.

The new Commission would have access to all parking data, after it was anonymized. It would regularly review the

Ordinance 16-22 (*contd*)

performance of all parking facilities, and any statistics about services and enforcement provided by various departments. It would produce an annual report. And it would make regular recommendations on pricing, hours, locations of spaces, neighborhood parking zones, bureaucratic concerns, and similar parking-related matters.

Without this new commission, we as a city will continue to make parking decisions arbitrarily, in fits and starts, and without coherent rationale. This is why we plan, and why we make subplans. There ought to be a written policy for how parking is used, and there are many other ongoing considerations regarding the management of parking. I ask your support for a Parking Commission to tackle these objectives."

Volan finished his statement by saying he welcomed questions, and noted that there was a member of the Traffic Commission in the audience to answer questions as well.

Ryan Cobine, Traffic Commission member, commented that the Parking Commission proposal illustrated a clear lack and presented a straightforward remedy. He said that the current proposal would have a minor impact on the existing Traffic Commission, and did not think there would be a great deal of overlap.

Council Questions:

Rollo asked for clarification between the duties of the Traffic Commission and the Parking Commission because he felt that there would be some overlap.

Volan explained, using the example of the proposed PUD on Hillside and Henderson, that the questions of the number of spaces and whether or not they should be metered would fall to the Parking Commission. He further explained that the question of whether they would have angled, back-in parking would be a question for the Traffic Commission, since it dealt with the question of vehicle movement and traffic flow.

Rollo followed up by noting that angled parking could potentially end up in front of both the Parking and Traffic Commissions.

Volan said that he did not think there was any harm in having recommendations from both.

Cobine added that plans for development that included parking did not, as a matter of course, go before the Traffic Commission. He added that the question of angled, back-in parking was initially presented to the Traffic Commission as an idea that staff wanted some feedback on, with no recommendation added. Cobine thought that the current practices would continue, with only new or unusual traffic flow issues coming before the commission.

Rollo asked if moving from parallel parking to angled parking usually came to the Traffic Commission.

Cobine replied that it had not in the past and that the only parking issues the Traffic Commission had dealt with in the past were either moving parking from one side of the street to another or eliminating parking altogether.

Chopra asked for clarification for how the meter zone was defined.

Volan answered that it was defined in the city code.

Chopra followed up by asking if that meant members could be on the commission if they lived or worked on either side of the street if it was on the border of the meter zone.

Volan answered that it did not, that the zone had clearly defined boundaries in the code, and the membership was tied to those

Ordinance 16-22 (*contd*)

boundaries. He noted that this held true for neighborhood residential areas as well.

Granger asked what the administration's position was on the proposed commission.

Volan answered that they believed all of the boards and commissions should be reviewed. They had suggested merging Traffic, Bike and Ped, and Parking into one commission. Volan thought the administration's idea was a good thing that would take a long time. He added that he thought there was a compelling reason to make a Parking Commission immediately.

Chopra asked who would appoint each of the members of the commission and when they would be appointed.

Volan explained the appointments, which were also listed in the ordinance. He added that it would follow the same appointment schedule that other commissions followed, with appointments made in January.

Chopra asked what the powers of the commission would be.

Volan answered that the commission would have the power to recommend only, not to veto or overrule.

Piedmont-Smith asked if Volan envisioned the commission being regularly consulted when parking issues came up as a matter of course.

Volan answered yes, but he also thought practices would have to be established. He thought that staff should see it as an additional resource.

Rollo asked if the commission would set meter rates.

Volan replied that it could make recommendations on meter rates.

Rollo asked if it could make recommendations on use of funds derived from meters.

Volan affirmed that it could do that also, and could take a broad view on how those funds could be appropriated as it worked with the administration.

Rollo asked about revenues generated from parking citations in non-meter zones.

Volan said that those would fall under the commission's purview as well, to make recommendations to the city.

Granger asked for more clarification on the proposal, since it seemed to be focused on the downtown area.

Volan answered that the goal was to have a diverse group of citizens looking at the issue, but the majority of the appointees would come from the areas where the most parking happened. He added that there was room on the commission for people from all over the city.

Rollo asked if there would be an annual report brought to the council.

Volan replied that there would, and added that he was trying to get a schedule of reports from all of the boards and commissions on the council agenda.

Public Comment:

Kaleb Crane, citizen, spoke about supporting the legislation, but asked the council to table discussion until more information could be included about disability rights and concerns.

Ordinance 16-22 (*contd*)

Morgan Taylor, student, asked why a member of the Economic and Sustainability Department was not a part of the commission.

Clerk Bolden spoke about a person with accessibility issues who asked the city to do some to make parking more accessible, and who supported the proposed legislation.

Council Comment:

Volan said that the administration's department heads were not inclined to be on the Parking Commission, and that the membership would remain a citizen group.

Volan said that the point of the commission would be to look at issues of parking as they impact disabled people, and that there was also the Council on Community Accessibility. He said that he was open to amending the membership list if anyone on the council was inclined to do so.

Chopra said that she was happy to hear from students and citizens. She said that she thought the commission was a great idea and thanked Volan for bringing it forward. She noted that Volan had done a lot of work and that the legislation had gone through numerous drafts and that it was very well thought out.

Rollo said that it was a great proposal and that the city needed the commission. He said that he thought there could be a potential conflict between the Traffic and Parking Commission, and suggested a liaison between the commissions. He noted that the staff member on the commission could have an impact based on their area of expertise, and really encouraged the appointment of an alternative transportation planner.

Piedmont-Smith said that it was a good proposal that was overdue. She noted that parking was something that came up in the Planning Commission often, and thought their guidance would be welcome. She thought the public comment issues could be brought to the commission, and reminded people that the meetings would be public like all commissions. She added that she thought all of the city departments involved in parking would be reporting to the commission, and was happy to support it.

Granger appreciated Volan's thought in the process, and dittoed the comments of Chopra. She said that she was not completely happy with it, but that she would vote yes because it created an avenue to look at parking throughout the entire city.

Mayer said that he was uncomfortable with the ordinance and wished that he had more time to talk with the administration. He said that there could be a merger between the Traffic and Parking Commission that he thought could be beneficial. He preferred to continue the discussion. He did not think that a complete review of the boards and commissions was necessary.

Sandberg said that she supported the commission, and that membership diversity was important. She looked forward to the coordination with the council on parking issues and said that it would be interesting to see how the commission evolved over time.

Ruff thanked Cobine for providing input. He noted that the idea of the commission had been around for some time, and was grateful to Volan for taking the time and effort to bring it forward. He said that he shared Mayer's concerns about the administration, but believed that Volan had spent time working with the administration and the

prior administration on the issue. Ruff noted that the administration would always be leery about making a process more complicated, but he liked the idea and thought that the time had come. He said it could increase transparency, increase citizen participation, help with policymaking, and called it a very Bloomington idea. He noted that it might need to be tweaked in the future, but that was part of the democratic process. He ended by saying that he appreciated the public comment that night, but said he thought that the local government did a good job of addressing accessibility issues even if they made mistakes.

Ordinance 16-22 (*contd*)

Volan said he was grateful for the kind words for the proposal. He said that the idea of the liaisons was a good one, since it would enable commissions to work together. He pointed out disabled parking was something the commission should be thinking about. He said that the fact that the administration was not present should point to the idea that they did not object too strenuously to the commission, and added that the Mayor had five appointments on the commission, which would allow the administration to retain some control. He said that it was a citywide, citizen commission whose time had come.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 16-22 [9:42pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-22 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Mayer).

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [9:42pm]

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-41 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. Clerk Bolden read the legislation and synopsis.

Ordinance 16-41 – To Establish the Housing Development Fund

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-42 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. Clerk Bolden read the legislation and synopsis.

Ordinance 16-42 – To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" –Re: Amending BMC 2.04.050 (Regular Meetings) and BMC 2.04.255 (Committees – Scheduling) to Start Common Council Regular Sessions and Committees of the Whole an Hour Earlier – at 6:30 p.m.

Ruff called for any additional public comment. There was no additional public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [9:43pm]

Granger noted that the score in the Cubs game was 5-1 for the Cubs.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45pm.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 16th day of November, 2016.

APPROVE:

Andy Ruff, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington