

**Plan Commission Special Hearing (2040 Comprehensive Master Plan—DRAFT PLAN)
City of Bloomington Council Chambers – Room # 115
April 24, 2017 @ 5:30 p.m. - Summary Minutes**

These minutes are transcribed in a summarized manner. Video footage is available for viewing in the (CATS) Audio-visual Department of the Monroe County Public Library at 303 E. Kirkwood Avenue. Phone number: 812-349-3111 or via the following website: catstv.net

ROLL CALL:

The Plan Commission met in the Council Chambers Room #115, City Hall at 5:30 p.m., members present: Cibor, Hoffmann, Stewart Gulyas, Kappas, Maritano, Neher, and Wisler.

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Hoffman said the meetings that were scheduled for next week to further amend and potentially adopt an amended draft of the comprehensive plan, will not take place as scheduled. After input received from the last meeting (4/20/17), and after canvassing members of the Plan Commission, the clear consensus is that we should take more time. We've decided that after the 4/25/17 meeting, there will be a number of amendments that will be made to the plan. Staff will put those amendments together into a new draft of the Comprehensive Master Plan. We'll call it the "Adoption Draft" perhaps. That draft will go public ASAP, hopefully by the end of the week but at the very latest by the beginning of next week. We want to give people a full month to hold their board and commission meetings, and various other organizations as well as members of the public to have another month to look at the new draft and propose further amendments or make comments. The (NEW) new draft will be available by roughly May 1, 2017 (Monday). We're going to give it a full month for people to look at the (NEW) new draft. We're working on a plan to hold three (3) meetings in June; two meetings for further amendments to be considered and a third meeting to adopt or deny the plan. Originally, we thought about doing the amendment meetings on the 5th and 12th; however, because of travel plans of some of the commissioners it isn't possible. If possible, I really want every commissioner to be able to attend at least one of the two amendment meetings. I will turn it over to staff to start with Amendment #1.

PLANNING STAFF:

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, said I would classify this as corrections for some typos, clarification on punctuation and some general edits. They are fairly detailed on the page, column, and paragraph numbers. Generally that's all this amendment is to deal with some corrections throughout the document.

PLAN COMMISSION:

Hoffmann: So we have Amendment #1 which is a long list of typographical corrections. Any questions?

Cibor said I was just curious on Exhibit #2 it states that Exhibit #2 is updated and I didn't know how or what the change actually was.

Robinson said if you look at Exhibit #2—the graph, the percentages add up to more than 100%. We corrected that and used the appropriate percentages on the bottom of those charts. You'll see new charts to reflect the actual 100% values rather than what they add up to.

Cibor: If I have a few things to tag on to some of the things, would this be the time to suggest amending the amendment or is this time for questions on the list?

Hoffmann: You mean things of similar nature, typographical corrections and the like?

Cibor: Within the same sentence as what's listed.

**Plan Commission Special Hearing (2040 Comprehensive Master Plan—DRAFT PLAN)
City of Bloomington Council Chambers – Room # 115
April 24, 2017 @ 5:30 p.m. - Summary Minutes**

Hoffmann said I'm going to suggest that if anyone has typographical corrections; I'm encouraging staff to be more proactive in recognizing certain things as friendly amendments that don't need Plan Commission action. We shouldn't have to vote on replacing a letter in a word or something like that. Staff will recognize it as a friendly amendment and they will put it into the next draft. Staff will give us a list of friendly amendments. They will be non-controversial corrections.

Cibor: One other question on this amendment. The last three items are changing the statement that says, "Utilities should be located essentially underground" and we're changing it to "Utilities could be located underground", but then there are other land use categories where we're not changing it. Sometimes we're keeping it "should" and sometimes it's "could". Was there a thought process on which ones should be a "should" versus "could"? Sometimes burying utilities for the purpose of placing trees within certain areas poses challenges because trees can't really go over a lot of utilities.

Robinson said regarding the first question. We missed two. All of them should be replaced to "could be" rather than "should be" to recognize the difficulties with placing utilities underground. The intent was that we will consider it but it's not "should" they "could be" placed underground.

Cibor said I counted four statements that still say "should" on pages 83, 84, 85 & 89.

****Wisler moved to adopt Amendment #1. Maritano seconded. Motion passed 7:0—Amendment #1 adopted.**

Hoffmann: Can we take Amendment #2 by voice vote? This is to correct Carol's (Stewart Gulyas) spelling of her name. All those in favor? **Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #2 adopted.**

Hoffmann: Does staff want to say anything about Amendment #3?

Robinson said this was submitted by commission member Hoffmann. This has to do with formatting and organizing the programs within each chapter. He suggested adding headings to help people find programs within each chapter. The intent is to help identify groupings of programs that might fall within those areas.

****Stewart Gulyas moved to adopt the headings as proposed. Neher seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #3 adopted.**

Hoffmann said Amendment #4 is the deletion of the word "but".

****Stewart Gulyas moved to adopt Amendment #4. Neher seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #4 adopted.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #5

Robinson said this is an amendment that was submitted by commissioner Stewart Gulyas. Again, she's looking at rewording goal 1.2.

Hoffmann said Darryl is correct. Amendment #6 deals with the exact same sentence. Can you do that one as well and take these two up together?

Josh Desmond, Assistant Director, said if you adopt Amendment #5 it basically renders Amendment #6 moot.

Hoffmann said Amendment #6 is complaining about the existence of the word "business" before partnerships, and Amendment #5 is moving the word "businesses" to a different location to make clear that some partnerships are with businesses and some partnerships are with other kinds of partners.

Desmond: Correct.

****Neher moved to adopt Amendment #5. Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #5 adopted.**

Hoffmann said Amendment #5 is adopted and that moots Amendment #6. It solves the same problem. Let's go to Amendment #7.

Cibor said the first part says "adding and plan for", so it says "commit to and plan for transparency". If you commit to it you don't need to plan for it, you're doing it. Maybe those words don't add much value. Also at the end where it says "and also to promote more participatory citizenship", you could just say "and visitors promoting participatory citizenship."

Neher said I would argue that in the history of politics we've seen movements to commit to ideas that go off without planning, so I actually support the idea of putting the word "plan" into this section.

Maritano: I agree with the "plan" part.

Stewart Gulyas said I agree with Andrew's point that we don't need "and also" in the last phrase. It needs some grammatical work if we keep the "plan" part in.

Hoffmann: Would someone like to make a motion for how it will be phrased?

****Neher moved to adopt Amendment #7 as revised to read "commit to, and plan for, transparency, open government, and effective assessable and inclusive public engagement so that exemplary services are provided to our residents, businesses, and visitors" striking the words and also "to promote more participatory citizenship." Maritano seconded.**

Wisler said if you delete the words "and also" you probably need to delete the comma that goes before it.

Neher: Correct.

Hoffmann said that would be considered a further friendly amendment. So we're adding commas in the first line, removing a comma and the words "and also" in the last line.

Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #7 adopted.

Hoffmann said on to Amendment #8.

Robinson said this is an amendment that was submitted by a member of the community. This person provided a synopsis on the background to slightly change the language in policy 1.5.3. I think it's clearly stated in the amendment so it's up for your consideration.

Hoffmann said the main point is adding the word "assess" to develop and operate and then there is a language clarification. The consensus of the commission is also to add a comma after the word "operate".

Maritano said it might be simpler to say "government services to maximum transparency" instead of "in ways that maximize transparency."

Hoffmann agreed. Fewer words are always better. Everyone in favor of that? OK. It now reads "develop, operate, and assess government services to maximum transparency and public engagement."

****Neher moved to adopt Amendment #8 as amended. Stewart Gulyas seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #8 adopted.**

Robinson said Amendment #9 was submitted by a member of the community to further clarify some of the language that was discussed under government services and transparency. Proposed is a new policy about education and competency of staff in sharing our ideas to make sure that these things are learned across all departments as far as transparency. Again, it's fairly detailed in the proposed synopsis behind the amendment.

Wisler said I think the wording is a little bit awkward. The first four words really promote staff public engagement. It was just unclear as to what's modifying what here. I'm assuming this means to promote public engagement among staff.

Hoffmann agreed. I think what they're saying is that staff has engagements with the public all the time. What they want to do is develop a knowledge base. A way for staff to talk to each other and learn from each other's experiences engaging with the public, and thereby improve the competency of staff in dealing with the public. The focus isn't on the engagement as such but on the staff sharing their experiences and building knowledge about that. If we like it, we can always ask staff to re-draft it in a better way. I don't think we need to do all of that tonight.

****Wisler moved to table Amendment #9 and ask staff to rephrase the wording so it's clearer. Maritano seconded.**

Neher encouraged staff to integrate the word "training." I think that's also implied in that first section. I would also ask staff to talk to HR as well about the language that says "document" because it can become a very problematic term when we talk about something like this.

Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #9 tabled so that staff can work on this one further.

Hoffmann: We're now up to Amendment #10.

Robinson said this amendment was submitted by a member of the community. Looking at effective local self-governance in general and suggesting a new proposed policy of 1.55 that draws upon the roles of capacities of boards and commissions within the City.

Stewart Gulyas asked if all of these amendments are amendments the Plan Commission have sponsored.

Hoffmann: Yes. At least one member of the commission sponsored them.

Hoffmann said my comments are similar to the last one. I kind of understand what the point is here but I think the phrasing is unfortunate. What they're saying is, "include City boards and commission members in discussions about how to increase public engagement." And that very well may be a program as well, as opposed to a policy. It's not a bad idea but it should probably be stated simply and straightforwardly as a program.

****Neher moved to table Amendment #10. Kappas seconded.**

Kappas said I think this is a great one because boards and commissions are not utilized enough in the City.

Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #10 tabled so staff can work on this one further.

Hoffman: Amendment #11.

**Plan Commission Special Hearing (2040 Comprehensive Master Plan—DRAFT PLAN)
City of Bloomington Council Chambers – Room # 115
April 24, 2017 @ 5:30 p.m. - Summary Minutes**

Robinson said Amendments #11 through #22 were submitted on behalf of the Environmental Commission. I apologize for some of the confusion in the packet because some people are numbering their own amendments, and for clarity I had those outlined in the red. The first amendment, Amendment #11, is looking at the beginning of the CMP about the 16 concepts and they want to provide a change to the language as detailed in the amendment.

Hoffmann: So it's changing "are supported by" to "support"?

Stewart Gulyas: Yes.

****Maritano moved to adopt Amendment #11. Wisler seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #11 adopted.**

Robinson said Amendment #12 is a clarification. Their justification is to clarify the intent of the environmental chapter. They proposed some new language as identified in the amendment.

Neher: Does staff believe that language such as "forward thinking" and "innovative" in that sentence are problematic? Would it provide greater clarity to eliminate those words and instead just say, "This chapter introduces ways to ensure that the current, natural environment is not only protected but nurtured and enhanced for the future?" I raise that question because of some of the issues we've had recently where words like this can't be clearly defined and measured. It just seems like we risk recreating more problems.

Desmond said I think we'd be fine with that change. You're right; we don't want to set ourselves up for grey areas that are going to be difficult to administer later.

****Neher moved to adopt Amendment #12 with the amendment as discussed. We strike the words "forward thinking and innovative", and instead the language would read "This chapter introduces ways to ensure that the current, natural environment is not only protected but nurtured and enhanced for the future."**

Steward-Gulyas said it shouldn't say "environmental" but "environment."

Hoffmann: I'd also like to suggest an insertion of a comma after the word "now" in the next sentence.

Hoffmann so we have a motion to approve Amendment #12 with three changes: deleting "forward thinking," and "innovative." Replacing "environmental" with "environment" and adding a comma after the words "how it is accomplished now." **Kappas seconded.**

Cibor said it's not always clear to me who "we" is and I don't know if it's necessary but we use words like "we" and "our" throughout the document. I would propose striking "we" and saying something along the lines of "there are ways of thinking about environment."

Kappas said I think "we" is in respect to the City itself. I believe if we were to change it we would have to change the sentence because it's written in a way that; I think it would change the intent of that sentence.

Hoffmann said I have a feeling you're right and that's it a collective "we"—it's the community, it's the City of Bloomington, it's our citizenry as you will. Obviously, that doesn't speak for everyone but it's some kind of sense of the community. Can we take that one under advisement as a more general thing to think about?

Cibor: Absolutely.

Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #12 adopted, as modified.

Hoffmann: Amendment #13. It's a significant map change.

Robinson said Amendment #13 is suggesting there is a need to add a new district, an agricultural district. The justification does talk about rezoning to agricultural. I do want to point out that the land use map is not intended to be a zoning map. The proposed amendment doesn't provide any detail, it just says to add a zoned area to agricultural land. Furthermore, there was no information or details as far as creating this land use district. No additional language that would define what that land use district is; how we would deal with enhance, transform and maintain in that chapter. I would suggest that this amendment is inadequate for consideration.

Hoffmann said usually we think of Master Plan maps as being sort of a down the road version. It's not what we would necessarily zone things as today because that depends on a lot of issues, but we might think of the Master Plan map as being a vision that's from today to 20 years out.

Desmond: That's right.

Maritano asked if we are getting back with the people who have submitted these amendments.

Hoffmann said they will find out because the staff is going to post...

Maritano: And they can submit again with larger clarification?

Hoffmann: Of course.

Kappas: So it's currently zoned neighborhood is residential?

Robinson said the land use map is not a zoning map. Its future land use is being proposed as Neighborhood Residential, it's currently zoned Business Park (BP).

Kappas: So the Environmental Commission is saying to zone it as future agriculture instead of future residential?

Robinson said a portion of that area.

Hoffmann said they want the map to reflect the current usage as agriculture and perhaps to signify that it will stay that in the future, which is a meaningful question.

****Neher moved to table Amendment #13. I would ask staff to contact the submitter and request greater context clarification and the direction for this amendment. Maritano seconded.**

Hoffmann said as part of reaching out to the proposer, I think you're going to have to explain what the purpose of this map is and that it's not in fact a zoning map. It's really a projection of maybe 20 years into the future of what the land should be. They may want us to say the land will never change from agricultural and we should put that on the map. If that's what they mean to say, then it's not zoned agricultural it's just—we put a new thing on the Master Plan map saying we anticipate it will always stay agricultural.

Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #13 tabled, with instructions to staff to contact the submitter.

Hoffmann: Amendment #14.

Robinson said this amendment was submitted on behalf of the Environmental Commission. Threats and opportunities—about the built environment. I think they're looking to change the

**Plan Commission Special Hearing (2040 Comprehensive Master Plan—DRAFT PLAN)
City of Bloomington Council Chambers – Room # 115
April 24, 2017 @ 5:30 p.m. - *Summary Minutes***

language around the natural environment. This amendment would change the wording on the intent behind the chapter.

Hoffmann said because the threats and opportunities are not to the built environment but to the natural environment because of the built environment.

Desmond: Right.

****Stewart Gulyas moved to adopt Amendment #14. Neher seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0—Amendment #14 adopted.**

START with 1:09:45 LEFT on recording

Public Comments:

Meeting adjourned.