

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: catsfv.net

The Plan Commission met on June 5, 2017 in the Council Chambers at 401 N. Morton St. at 5:30 p.m. The members present: Cibor, Hoffman, Kappas, Kinzie, Maritano, Piedmont-Smith, Stewart Gulyas, and Kappas.

ROLL CALL

REPORTS, RESOLUTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Hoffmann: Per staff request, Amendment #25, which was originally on the Consent Agenda, shall be pulled from the Consent Agenda and continued to the June 19 session.

Terri Porter, Director of Planning and Transportation, would like to take a moment to introduce the new Clerical Assistant present, Olivia Salzano, and another whom the commissioners will meet later, Liz Carter. In my memo sent to you all this afternoon, I wanted to remind you of the Mayor's guidance shared on April 17. Between May 1 and May 31, 172 amendments were submitted, 142 of which were sponsored.

PETITIONS CONTINUED TO: June 19, 2017 Special Session

MP-12-17 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington
Amendments to the May 2017 draft:
144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159,
160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, and 172

CONSENT AGENDA:

MP-12-17 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington
Amendments to the May 2017 draft:
5, 8, 14, 19, 20, 24, ~~25~~, 26, 27, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47,
51, 54, ~~55~~, 56, 57, 67, 86, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109,
110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, ~~447~~, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 128,
129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143

Case Manager: Scott Robinson

Hoffmann said that these amendments were compiled after having been reviewed by staff, seen as straightforward and non-controversial. Members of the Plan Commission are welcome to pull any of these from the Consent Agenda to be reviewed tonight or later on. Another category of amendments are those we will hear tonight, that staff felt merited more discussion. Finally, Amendments #144 -172 will be delayed for June 19 due to scheduling needs. In addition, Amendment #25, originally on the Consent Agenda, has been pulled from there and placed for review on June 19. Though the public deadline for submission of amendments has passed, Commission members may choose to add amendments to be reviewed on June 19. Are there amendments that the Plan Commission members would like to remove from the Consent Agenda for individual discussion?

Piedmont-Smith asked to remove Amendment #55 from the Consent Agenda.

Kappas: I would like to pull Amendment #117.

Wisler asked if there would be anything lost if the Commission waited to vote on these amendments at the June 19 meeting.

Hoffmann said that these are in the Consent Agenda packet precisely because Staff had reviewed them and they were found to be non-controversial. The commission has also had a chance to see if that is agreeable. However, the Commission may agree to vote to postpone the vote of this Consent Agenda. The advantage of voting on the Consent Agenda tonight is that the draft will reflect these changes to move the process forward on June 19.

Kinzie asked when any amendments pulled from the Consent Agenda would be discussed, tonight or June 19?

Hoffmann said that amendments could be removed from the Consent Agenda tonight; they will be discussed tonight or at the next Master Plan meeting.

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, said that staff could not commit to integrating the Comprehensive Master Plan draft by the June 19 meeting.

Hoffmann said that the vote should ideally happen tonight so that Staff will have time to start incorporating the many amendments in preparation for the vote on June 26.

No public comment.

****Vote on the Consent Agenda, minus amendments #25, 55, and 117. Roll Call vote passed 7:0:1.**

PETITIONS:

- **MP-12-17 Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Bloomington**
Amendments to the May 2017 draft:
2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, **25**, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 42, 43, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, **55**, 58, 59, 63, 65, 66, 75, 77, 79, 83, 90, 115, **117**, 124, 127, 132, 133, 137, 139

Case Manager: Scott Robinson

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, presented the Amendments. He thanked the commission members and the members of the community. There were 172 proposed and 142 sponsored. Staff recognizes the challenge of submitting amendments in the correct format appropriate for staff to consider. Staff will present its opinion for amendments seen as unfit for adoption. Amendment #2 on page 11 had to do with Objective 6. This was the Vision Statement adopted by City Council. It does not seem to be appropriate to amend what was adopted with the original Council resolution. Staff recommends a vote of no.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there was a sponsor.

Kinzie said that she has reconsidered her desire to sponsor this amendment, given that City Council had already been voted on and approved. There should, however, be a statement in the current plan to show the source of these objectives and which sections were already voted on. There should be more context.

Piedmont-Smith said that she thought that one of the items on the Consent Agenda was a proposal by a Council member that would insert the entire resolution passed by the City Council verbatim, without all of the divisions as shown in this amendment. That would help.

Hoffmann agreed that it would seem to show the relationship between what is on this page and what was adopted by the City Council.

Wisler asked staff to insert something in the introduction after the mention of resolution 1301, with a parenthesis or footnote to reference the entire text of the resolution.

Hoffmann: I'm sure that the staff would see that as non-controversial and would agree to do so.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to deny Amendment #2. Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #2 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #3.

Robinson: Amendment #3 essentially intends to do the same as Amendment #2, trying to amend the Vision Statement bullet points.

Hoffmann said that there were objectives in the Master Plan that were taken directly from a resolution in the City Council adopted in 2013. A question arose regarding these amendments (after sponsoring decisions were made) whether those objectives could be changed after they had been adopted by City Council. The answer was that we could not change what had been adopted by City Council. That would be reason for staff to recommend denying these amendments. This has no reflection on the sponsor of those amendments.

No public comment.

****Kinzie moved to deny Amendment #3. Piedmont-Smith seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #3 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #4.

Robinson: Amendment #4 falls into the same category, warranting rejection.

No public comment.

****Kinzie moved to deny Amendment #4. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #4 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #6.

Robinson: Amendment #6 provides suggestions for new policies on page 25. It identifies changes to Goal 1.3 and the possibility for combining policies, and suggests new policies. The amendment submitted was unclear regarding what should be substituted and added. It seemed incomplete because there were outcomes and indicators, as opposed to policies or goals. Staff recommends no for this amendment.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith would be happy to work with the Jackie Bauer, the submitter, to improve the language, since it has merit.

****Stewart Gulyas moved to deny Amendment #6. Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #6 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #7.

Robinson: Amendment #7 does not necessarily use a format for a proposed amendment. Instead, it is more of a comment about the language in the plan, asking for a clarification in the terminology “traded/basic.” The question is whether it is a standard term. Usually it is used in economics as a way to bring dollars into the community. This concept has been around since the 1920s. This is not a clear amendment. Staff recommends no on this amendment.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said that she also did not know what it meant, and assumed that most people would not know either. She asked if Staff would be opposed to inserting a definition. Are you opposed to adding a definition because we don't have the exact text at this moment?

Robinson asked if she was asking staff to propose an amendment on June 19 to include this definition.

Hoffmann said that it was a planning term that most educated people would not be familiar with.

Robinson said that they could have used the term “location quotient.” I'm sure we could list it in the commentary, shift-share, or other things that have been done. There are similar amendments about form-based code where terminology is used in the document. I want to caution about how much terminology should be identified and defined in the Master Plan. Staff would be happy to work with Commissioner Piedmont-Smith to draft a new amendment.

Hoffmann agreed that this amendment was not acceptable as an amendment. The question was whether it should be fixed in a different way before this becomes a final document.

Kinzie agreed that terminology should be clarified.

Hoffmann volunteered to revise Amendment #7.

****Kinzie moved to deny Amendment #7. Stewart Gulyas seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0. Amendment #7 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #9.

Robinson: Amendment #9 was on page 28 of the plan. This was not submitted in an appropriate format for staff to evaluate. It looks at outcomes and indicators and mentions policies and goals related to public safety. Staff found it difficult to see what was being proposed and amended. Staff recommends denial of this amendment.

No public comment.

Hoffmann said that when he read this amendment, he initially thought that the outcome for public safety first seemed disconnected. On second thought, however, he thought that some of the achievements of these outcomes, like quality of life, health, and income aspects of the plan, it would positively affect crime rates and other measures. It was not meant to be a policy or goal, but rather an indicator that staff thought would indirectly be affected by some of what's in the plan.

Robinson agreed that there was not always a 1-to-1 relationship between policies and goals, and outcomes and indicators. Yes, public safety is important and it's reflected in many of the other chapters. There aren't specific outcomes and indicators for that one item in the chapter. But your understanding of that relationship is correct.

Piedmont-Smith said that it seemed to be covered in Goal 1.1, which promotes prioritizing programs and strategies that sustain the health, well-being, recreation and safety of residents and visitors.

****Stewart-Gulyas moved to deny. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 - Amendment #9 denied.**

Hoffman: Amendment #10.

Robinson: Amendment #10 is a recommendation to reorganize all of Chapter 3 according to another example submitted. Given this is the third draft of the plan, staff recommends denial on this amendment. The format of this submission makes it difficult to see what is proposed as an amendment. Staff recommends voting no on Amendment #10.

No public comment.

Steward Gulyas moved to deny Amendment #10. Maritano seconded.

Piedmont-Smith said that she can touch base with Jackie Bauer to see if there is something to add.

Hoffmann: If there is something specific that can be done...

Piedmont-Smith: Without re-writing the whole thing.

Wisler said that it seemed that there were more changes that could be made with specific language. He would be happy to collaborate to propose a specific amendment.

Hoffmann: I'm hearing offers to work on specific language.

Voice vote passed 8:0 - Amendment #10 denied.

Hoffmann: I encourage all commissioners who volunteer to draft new amendments to work swiftly and draft amendments in the appropriate format, the type that staff could support as a consent item. Next on the agenda is Amendment #11.

Robinson: Amendment #11 refers to page 40, narrative language about energy and environmental protection. This started out with suggested language, then general guidance on what to change. It was not clear exactly what was proposed with this amendment.

Hoffmann asked if the first section of this amendment would be accepted if it had omitted the last part of the amendment.

Robinson: If it had been that way, it would have been included on the Consent Agenda. But it concludes with, "as written, the section provides a fairly one-sided argument for..."

Hoffmann: This one is a hybrid; it is a very specific suggestion that the staff finds non-controversial, followed by a commentary on the section as a whole and its tone.

No public comment.

****Wisler moved to adopt only the first part of the amendment with specific language. Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 - Amendment #11 adopted only to the extent of the specific language substituted in the opening sentence.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #12 on page 51.

Robinson: Amendment #12 is on page 51, looking to delete goal 4.2, and include 4.3 into one goal that addresses transportation issues. I am not sure if this is a necessary or justified framework, but rather just an opinion. There is not much justification as to why this is needed. Staff is interested to see what the Commission thinks.

No public comment.

Hoffmann: This seems to be an organizational matter, not one which will take language out from the plan, but rather move the goals into a policy. But would that not leave the policies currently under 4.2 dangling without a goal?

Robinson said it does not state that. It would just delete the goal and delete including that goal as a policy under goal 4.3 but it does not address what should happen with the policies in that section.

****Kinzie moved to deny. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #12 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment 13.

Robinson: Amendment #13 is also on page 51. It was not submitted in a necessary format for staff to evaluate. It suggests additional goals: emphasize enhancing downtown, about the importance of it being the center of the community. Provide some examples, but it is not clear what is being amended or changed. Again, this does not follow a format that facilitates staff's determination of the specific changes to make.

No public comment.

****Kinzie moved to deny Amendment #13. Cibor seconded.**

Piedmont-Smith: I volunteer to work with submitter to improve a goal or a policy. I like statement A, which could add to the document. Obviously we're not ready right now. There's no point in adding it as a goal if we have no policies to put under it.

Hoffmann said that if Piedmont-Smith agreed to take on the revision, he asked if Goal 4.1 could remain the general goal, with the other current goals becoming policies under goal 4.1. I wonder if this couldn't be done as a more specific. Goal 4.1 is in some ways the most generic goal in this chapter. The others are more specific and could perhaps be stated as policies.

Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #13 denied.

Hoffmann: Amendment #15.

Robinson: Amendment #15 falls in the same context. Again, it was more commentary about the Transportation Chapter, to include education encouragement components as well as adding those components to the environmental chapter. Since it is not specific, staff recommends denial.

I would further add that this chapter has the most programs. I'm certain that there are programs that we have dealing with enforcement in education.

No public comment.

***Steward Gulyas moved to deny Amendment #15. Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #15 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #16.

Robinson: Amendment #16 looks at pages 68-69. This amendment was not specific in terms of what to change or amend. It looks at re-wording goal 6.1, possibly 6.2 identifying some other ways to have priorities with public transit in 6.5. I would classify this amendment as incomplete. Staff would recommend to deny this given its generic nature.

No public comment.

Hoffmann said that he saw this amendment as a concern with the word "efficient" in goal 6.2. Everything else in the amendment circles around this issue.

Cibor suggested modifications of 6.2 and volunteered to work on it. He said he was already working on the language in goal 6.2.

****Stewart Gulyas moved to deny. Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #16 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #17.

Robinson: Amendment #17 is on page 69, stating that policy 6.2.4 is unclear as to what it tries to solve. Then it provides a couple of questions. It isn't necessarily an appropriate amendment form as far as what needs to be changed in 6.2.4 regarding public rights-of-way and parks, encouraging more construction and maintenance in these areas.

Hoffmann: Could you clarify what type of construction and maintenance activities are being referenced in 6.2.4?

Robinson said that it has to do with private building construction, street construction and other things that occur in the right-of-way (ROW). That happens all the time. Utilities that come into town, like recent gas lines being installed, conduit for high-speed internet. A lot of these happen in the ROW. How do we permit the use of that, being sure that these activities are being done appropriately? It also encompasses special events, parades, races, etc. It is a fairly broad policy but it has to do with how we look at the city managing, maintaining and operating our ROW.

No

Kinzie said that she understood the confusion with the word "desired," which makes it seem like we are encouraging construction and maintenance. I understand that the "desired" activities are probably the special events as appropriate. She proposed the wording "necessary, activities (such as construction and maintenance) and desired special events as appropriate."

Hoffmann said that Kinzie's reasoning was clear. He proposed adding the adjectives at the end... "permit the use of public right-of-way and parks for activities such as construction, maintenance and special events when appropriate, necessary and desired." This is to indicate that we're not

giving up control over these choices. We're saying that we need to make allowances for that kind of use when we think it's appropriate and desirable.

Wisler suggested getting rid of the words "necessary and desired." I think "appropriate" encompasses both of those.

Hoffmann: I like that. I don't want to do this all night, playing with words. But this one seems like an easy fix.

No public comment.

****Wisler moved to strike the words "necessary" and "desired" from policy 6.2.4 which would read "permit the use of public right-of-way and parks for activities such as construction, maintenance and special events as appropriate." Cibor seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 - Amendment #17 passed.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #18 on page 72. This is rather specific. Staff must have another reason not to like it.

Robinson: Yes, this one is fairly specific. For the third bullet point on page 72, it proposes amending it to include a reference to solar panels for electric charging vehicle stations to ideally pair with solar panels to minimize the use of coal-based electricity. Programs are things that the city staff would be doing. We have a sustainability coordinator, so this would be easily done. I don't believe it's necessary to include that in this bullet. It's overly detailed and specific and does not seem necessary. It seems to be well within what the city would be doing already.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said that it did seem necessary to include this, since people have the mistaken idea that are really environmentally friendly, yet when you plug them in to charge, you are using coal-based energy in Bloomington. Unless it's paired with solar or another renewable energy, it's not that great. I think we should adopt this amendment.

Kappas: I agree that we should adopt this. It's just that "ideally" does not sit well with me. I would move to strike that word out of it, but keep "paired with solar [sic] panels and minimize use of coal-based electricity."

Piedmont-Smith said that the word "preferably" would substitute the word "ideally."

Wisler said that he was concerned about being so specific about electric vehicle charging stations, since other initiatives like ride-sharing and autonomous vehicles were mentioned more generally. There are certainly many suggestions we could insert here to clarify how ride-sharing and autonomous vehicles could also be more effective. If we really want to make this point about electric vehicles, maybe that should be a separate bullet point altogether, instead of giving it a lot more weight in this list.

Cibor agreed that this additional language detracted from the initial part of this statement about the emerging forms of transportation. Not that I am opposed to the additional language, but maybe that would be better suited for its own bullet or in the environmental chapter. I think it is taking away from the original intent of this program.

Hoffmann asked if there was another part of the document that referred to electric vehicle charging stations.

Maritano said that she thought that it was mentioned elsewhere.

Robinson said that it seemed that the city would already be looking at alternative fuels. If it were a city initiative, there was no reason why the city wouldn't be looking at alternative fuels. Today coal-based electricity probably doesn't have a very long life, at least that's what is anticipated with natural gas and other forms of electricity. Staff does not believe that this is necessary.

Piedmont-Smith said that the term did not appear in any other section of the document except for in the index.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve Amendment #18, substituting "preferably" for "ideally." Steward Gulyas seconded. Roll Call vote 4:4 – Amendment #18 failed for lack of majority vote. Cibor, Kinzie, Maritano, and Wisler voted no.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #21 on page 72, which suggests adding some outcomes.

Robinson: Amendment #21 proposes new outcomes under the transportation network supports all travel modes for people of all ages and abilities, including three new bullet points. There is concern that staff would have difficulty trying to collect this data. Typically, journey to work is what is collected. It would be very difficult for staff to calculate the percent of people going to places of worship, service, and to locations of shopping and other personal business. To my knowledge, you could do that if you had a local travel survey. They are very expensive, and it is a sample set. The U.S. Census typically monitors journey to work. That is the best proxy that we could use.

Hoffmann: So staff isn't opposed in theory. It is just difficult to implement.

Robinson: It would be very difficult for staff to calculate.

Public comment:

Phil Stafford said that this comment is related to other indicators. It is possible that it may not be necessary for the Planning staff to collect all of the indicators. There might be outside parties that would be willing to take ownership of the gathering of indicators. In this case that might be the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission. It would be unfair to expect the Planning Department to collect data on all of the indicators in the Plan. Secondly, I think the wording they use is confusing. "Percent of people walking, cycling, taking transit, or driving to places of worship." Don't they mean the relative percentages? Because the answer to this would be 100%, wouldn't it? I think that this needs to be re-worded to explain that it is categorical gathering of data.

Wisler said that he agreed that it needed work. I'm also not comfortable with the phrase "percent of people." It should probably be saying, percentage of which people? The local population, students, visitors? I think this section needs some work and is not quite ready. I would volunteer to put some work into this to improve the wording if staff believed there is merit.

Hoffmann: I hear you suggesting some revisions to parts that are already on the list. This amendment asks to add these ones that staff says they can't commit to measuring. We've had the comment that other people might measure it, but if it's in the document, then we're saying that we'll try to measure our success or failure based on something that staff doesn't believe they're going to be able to acquire.

Wisler: I think that regardless of who's measuring it, the way that it's worded now doesn't give sufficient direction to whoever might be measuring it.

****Wisler moved to deny amendment #21. Piedmont-Smith seconded.**

Piedmont-Smith said that not all outcome-indicators needed to be included in this plan. Even if an outcome/indicator is not in the Plan, that doesn't mean that it cannot be used later. If, for instance, the Bike-Ped Commission provides this measure, then of course we can use it to gauge our progress.

Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #21 denied.

Hoffmann: Amendment #22. This one is specific.

Robinson: This amendment should be on page 59. It looks to amending 5.2.4 by adding some additional language that says “after the daily needs of neighborhood residents and support their physical and mental health per the concept of the 20-minute neighborhood.” Staff's concern regards the environment with physical and mental health. We certainly talked about the 20-minute neighborhood in the Plan. Staff understands the intent of the amendment, but the city won't have much control over supporting the physical and mental health. Access and mobility, and transit and other things can be in control of, as well as access to parks and other services. But it would be difficult to venture into “physical and mental health” for everybody.

Hoffmann asked if staff was opposed to the entirety of the amendment. If it only said “reasonable access to local small-scale commercial developments that can serve the daily needs of neighborhood residents per the concept of the 20-minute neighborhood...”

Robinson: That's something that staff would support.

Hoffmann: The 20-minute neighborhood is okay. It's the reference to whether this will actually help physical and mental health.

No public comment.

****Stewart-Gulyas moved to support the amendment with the elimination “and support their physical and mental health.” Piedmont-Smith seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #22 adopted as modified.**

Hoffman: Amendment #23.

Robinson: Amendment #23 is on page 24, looking to amend goal 1.2. They wanted to add some additional language to identify the acronym SSNREs or Safe, Sustainable, Nurturing Relationships and Environments for all ages. This seems unnecessary since the goal seems to embody that concept as is. Based on some of the conversation from other Plan Commissioners, there is concern about introducing acronyms, terminology and other language that isn't very well defined, even though this is referenced here. The goal seems to embody that concepts as is.

Hoffmann: Staff's concern is that the concepts are already implicit or explicit in other ways, but the language proposed is more technical.

Robinson: Especially in the context of the goal, it introduces some challenges.

No public comment.

****Kinzie moved to deny Amendment #23. Wisler seconded. Voice vote passed 8:0 – Amendment #23 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #28.

Robinson: The following 28, 29, 30, and 31 all touch on Chapter 7, the Land Use chapter with the southwest quadrant of the community. The land-use map that designates that area as an employment center, is brought under question to change language included within that guidance, really to single out that area as more of a mixed-use district instead of employment district. Staff is concerned that this carves out perhaps a different sub-set within the area in identifying details that are too specific for that land-use area within that quadrant of the area, that will create a critical sub-area or focus area within that employment center. It doesn't exclude the fact that you could have mixed-uses in retail. The focus of the employment center is largely employment. These amendments seem to be favoring other uses above the intent of that district. There was detailed information that was submitted along with this which I did not include in the packet but I can bring it up with the discussion of these amendments. It is just the concern about the broad general policy guidance of this area. When we're looking at land-use categories and zoning code, these are things we would take into consideration. Some of these amendments seem to feel like zoning approval guidance and recommendations.

[Stewart Gulyas left at 6:45 pm].

Hoffmann said that he understood staff's concern with suggesting these land use ideas in this section, which should be discussing in general terms what an employment center is. It looks like what is being suggested here might have fit in the Plan in the area on pp. 89, 90, 91 and 90, etc. where we talk about focus areas. One could imagine taking what is proposed in these four amendments and writing them up as a separate focus area like we did with the Bloomington Hospital area, with I-69, Gateway North, etc. Does staff oppose the merits of this argument or just whether it should be inserted in another section?

Robinson said that that was up to the commission. The general concern along the I-69 corridor, especially given how much available vacant land the community has, and considering the overall goals of the community with employment, would staff want to shift this away from economic employment purposes to possibly larger retail-focused development and residential development? Second, what was submitted could perhaps fit in a focus area instead. But this community has been contentious with the I-69 process and access SR 37. That's something that could transpire through the zoning process or something beyond that. It's open to discussion from the Commission.

No public comment on Amendments #28, 29, 30 or 30, all addressing the southwest part of the community.

Hoffmann found the merits to be plausible. It was meant to recognize that the employment centers of the future will not be factories, but rather tech parks that might include retail and other services to serve that area.

Robinson said that this type of idea was already included with the intent of employment centers. Those types of uses are already identified and supported. The purpose of the retail would be to serve the employment center, not the larger community. I think that the intent of this amendment is the potential for that employment center, that retail and residential uses to serve the larger community. Residential would be more challenging to serve the employment center; that's the live-work aspect. The discussion would look at what was proposed could provide the information provided on some of the drawings, but I think that what was submitted in amendment form was fairly straightforward in terms of their intent.

Piedmont-Smith asked to see the images that were included in this amendment.

Wisler said that his intent in sponsoring this was that the definition of employment center brought to mind "office park" which would not attract the type of development desired for that area. I am

not dead-set on the specific language, but I feel that the amendment is very important, that we make a statement that we expect mixed-use development. If we are not clear about what our vision for these areas is, we will not see our ideal developments.

Hoffmann agreed with Wisler, and meant to sponsor it if he had not already. He agreed with Robinson in that the employment center section as written mentions “commercial” and, for example, “development phasing must emphasize the creation of the office, research and light manufacturing base before or concurrently with the commercial areas that will serve them.” That is correct, but what is proposed here is that it should be more specific that employment centers of the future will include residential, commercial, and retail, serving the employment center. I also agree with staff concerns about the necessary order of development. He suggested that Wisler re-draft a paragraph in the definition of employment centers. Instead of focusing on the southwest specifically, the addition could be what “Employment of the future will have to be designed in such a way to include housing for the people who work there, shopping, other commercial opportunities,” something to that effect.

Wisler: I would be more than happy to do that. If staff’s main concern rooted in the reference to the southwest portion of town and feeling like this is just too specific to a particular subset of properties, I would be happy to insert this definition of “employment center” on page 86.

Robinson said that staff was concerned because it was too specific. Also, it seemed to diverge from the intent of what an employment center would be. I can’t remember the amendment number, but when we talk about the phasing, it says that the employment center coming first is not realistic. It says that residential and retail come before employment. That feels like the situation we’re seeing in the downtown: first-floor commercial that doesn’t work, so let’s put an apartment in there, so when does that change happen? That is the slippery slope that this type of amendment creating an imbalance that would allow commercial and residential instead of an employment center.

Kinzie agreed that the amendment had merit for the future and thought that it could be amended to strike the references to the southwest area of the community because it sounded too much like zoning.

Kappas agreed.

Piedmont-Smith asked to see the image submitted. Is this an example or is it an actual place?

Josh Desmond, Assistant Planning Director, said that it was the southwest area in question. It was just an example of how it might be developed.

Piedmont-Smith: So that roundabout is on Tapp road?

Desmond: Fullerton Pike.

Hoffmann: My understanding is that the group that submitted these amendments submitted a color map with a very traditional-looking industrial park and a second version that we are looking at now, showing how an employment center might look in the future, with residential, retail and employment opportunities.

Piedmont-Smith: I really appreciate that these memos were brought forward. I think this is a good point. We talk about mixed-use downtown but it would be great if that were the kind of standard for most of Bloomington, as long as employment uses aren’t manufacturing toxic chemicals or something. There have been some problems with the Carlisle factory and where it is currently and I don’t want to repeat that.

Hoffmann: I thought this set of amendments had a core of something pretty important. I think we should do them as a paragraph in the employment center definition that captures the idea of employment centers and how they will be in the future.

****Wisler moved to deny amendments #28-31 with the understanding that Wisler will work with staff to craft another amendment that will implement the spirit of this into the definition of employment centers. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendments 28-31 denied in current form.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #33.

Robinson: Amendment #33 is on page 28, looking at outcomes and indicators. Just for clarity, staff is open to refining this, but it is unclear what is being proposed. One possibility suggested that was as amended: “opportunity for community involvement, a number of civic, social, religious, political and business organizations per 10,000” people is fine. The social involvement index might be hard to measure. The extent to which individuals eat dinner with household members, see or hear from friends or family, talk with neighbors, for example, are indicators that would be hard to measure. As submitted, staff has concerns with what is proposed.

Hoffmann asked what had an X through it.

Robinson said that Isabel (Piedmont-Smith) had made an amendment to what was originally submitted. I think that what she was amending the original submission by deleting the last two bullet points.

Piedmont-Smith: I just don’t think that we can measure perceptions very easily.

Hoffmann: The suggestion is that the other two are better placed under a difficult outcome than the one that was proposed.

Piedmont-Smith also wanted to see if the members of the public wanted to speak.

Public comment:

Phil Stafford spoke as a member of the Commission on Aging. The social involvement index was selected because there is a measure available through the AARP mobility index project. That is retrievable but has probably been misplaced. It should not be part of civic engagement. The measures of perceptions could be let go, yet they could be gathered through the biennial community survey that Mayor Hamilton anticipates. So, indicators related to perceptions could be theoretically included on that basis.

Hoffmann asked if the social involvement index is an existing measure done by AARP. Is that something that exists on the community level?

Stafford said that it exists at the block group level, or perhaps not. He would need to look.

Hoffmann: Is that something against which we could measure our performance?

Stafford said that he thought that it was perhaps on the county level.

Hoffmann: Do they conduct their own surveys and data?

Stafford: yes, or they use validated surveys in existence; it does not carry out all of the surveys.

Hoffman said that he understood that the current version of the amendment would add two of the indicators to the outcome: “community engagement is strong.” That is the third outcome listed under “outcomes and indicators.” The amendment was proposed to go under outcome 2, but outcome 3 says “civic engagement is strong.” That is “civic engagement” as opposed to “community engagement.”

Piedmont-Smith asked to change the term in the outcome to “community” instead of “civic” and add the two additional indicators from the box to that outcome.

****Kinzie moved to approve the amendment as modified. Piedmont-Smith seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #33 adopted.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #42.

Piedmont-Smith: Did someone else sponsor this? It was not my intention to sponsor this. That is why there is a big X there.

Hoffmann: So this one may not be sponsored at all.

Desmond: Yeah, that shouldn't have been on there.

Hoffmann: On to Amendment #43.

Robinson said that Amendment #43 is on page 45 in the environmental chapter. It proposes a new outcome and indicator relating to air quality. The intent was to have a discussion about this with the sponsorship about air monitoring stations and other things looking to measure asthma rates and hospitalization and deaths from pulmonary diseases. Staff is concerned about measuring some of these things with our limited resources to monitor air quality. There is one air monitoring station in the community. I think it measures particulate matter, run by the DNR perhaps, or maybe IDEM at Binford-Rogers Elementary School. The two bullets suggested (asthma rates and hospitalization rates) are certainly things about which we could get information and might fit under a different [inaudible]. For example, the first outcome, “detrimental environmental impacts from the built environment are reduced” is something that might allow for the two proposed outcomes to fit under. Asthma is not necessarily related to all built environment aspects as sell pulmonary diseases. Again, the difficulty is to quantify this information, especially as it relates to air quality or air pollution.

Phil Stafford, from the Commission on Aging, said that they are not experts on how to measure air quality. However, it seemed to them that any section on the environment should have outcomes and goals related to air quality. It is an important issue to older adults, as well as for children. Indiana is not known for having very good air quality. Any way it could be incorporated would be appreciated by the Commission on Aging.

Piedmont-Smith wanted to clarify that the text in blue is what she added. The second bullet would be phrased as “hospitalization and deaths from environment-related pulmonary diseases. That's not phrased very eloquently but I think people know what I mean. The next one adds another bullet about air quality index values.

Hoffmann: There were meant to be three.

Piedmont-Smith: I agree with the Commission on Aging that the environment section should have something about air quality as an outcome.

Hoffmann: I, too, agree with you on this. I regularly travel to large cities like Beijing and Delhi and I know that they have more resources in some ways, but on my phone an app tracks the air quality so I can be careful about what I am doing on a particular day. I think that if it's hard to do this because we don't have an air quality index monitor in town, then we need to get one. If City Council is willing to think about doing this, then that would be great. If we already have one at Rogers-Binford...

Kappas: [Inaudible]. Plus, if you take into consideration that all of this is based on the fact that we are growing as a community, and we are including traffic from I-69, we would definitely have an increase in need. In northwest Indiana we have issues; we have to have emission status every two years. We have monitors up there because of the high traffic, and steel mills but mostly due to the high traffic. I foresee that happening with I-69 as well, as we become more of a commuter community to Indy, potentially.

Hoffmann: I think we should push ourselves on this one.

Kinzie: The air quality and emission section of the Plan states that "air quality is possibly the most important of all environmental issues facing humankind." Given that first sentence, I think it's an oversight not to have any outcomes or indicators in the plan.

****Kinzie moves to support Amendment #43 as revised.**

Hoffmann: Before we move any further, I need to know exactly what the indicator was that we're not seeing on this page.

Kinzie: "Air quality index values are consistently below 50." That's the proposed third bullet.

Hoffmann: That's the indicator?

Piedmont-Smith: I couldn't make a bullet point. The two dashes are meant to be a bullet.

Hoffmann: Most of our indicators are actually not linked to a specific target number. They just say what we are going to measure and track as our indicator. We can just say "air quality index as measured at relevant locations within the community. We can say something like that and obviously we'll know what a good measure is.

Piedmont-Smith: So just "air quality index measurements."

Hoffmann: Yes, that would be more consistent with what we've done with the indicators. (To Kinzie): Are you willing to accept that change?

Kinzie: That's acceptable, yes.

****Kinzie moved to adopt the amendment with the third bullet point being "air quality index measurement." Maritano seconded.**

Cibor: To me, the most important indicator is the air quality index measurement. Knowing that as asthma rates and the number of hospitalizations and deaths may be a burden on staff, I might propose eliminating the top two indicators and modifying the third bullet point to avoid ambiguity. The "high" level of air quality with a low value of the index may be too confusing. It could be more along the lines of making sure we have acceptable air quality...air quality is sustained in the community.

Hoffmann: I think the phrasing of the outcome is a little awkward. It might be better just to say that the outcome is to maintain a high quality. "Acceptable" is probably too low of a bar because you can get by with a mask on. Let me ask: What is the sense of the commission. It's been suggested that we stick with just one indicator, that of air quality.

Wisler agreed with keeping only the third indicator of high air quality, particularly because asthma rates are too vague. Asthma can be hereditary. Would we want to cut down on asthma attacks or the number of instances that are triggered? I think that's too vague. As Andrew (Cibor) said we get to the core by saying that we want to measure air quality.

Hoffmann cautioned to measure as many indicators of air quality (including ozone, particulate matter, the particulate 2.5, etc.). If we're going to drop the references to diseases, which I accept, we need to be careful to measure as many of these things that we can feasibly measure and that affect health. That probably includes ozone, large particulate, small particulate, etc.

Maritano: Something like "all air quality index measures are consistently in the good or better range?"

Hoffmann: I think we agreed not to go with a target number. Just say, "Relevant measures of air quality" to indicate that it's not just the AQI that we want; it's all relevant measures of air quality. I think we can use that as the indicator. "Relevant measures of high air quality" or a few other suggestions. What is the sense of the commission? We have a proposal to change the indicators from what's shown in the amendment to a simpler version that says "relevant air quality measures."

Piedmont-Smith: Don't we also have a proposal to change the text of the outcome?

Hoffmann: Yes, I was going to get to that. I was just going one at a time. Is everyone okay with the indicators, going down to one simple indicator?

Kinzie: yes.

Hoffmann suggested denying it. Do we want to state the outcome more clearly? "Air quality is maintained at a high level?"

Wisler: Air quality is consistently measured and rated as good.

Piedmont-Smith: But then again there are different measurements: low particulates, high quality... "good" may be just reflective of one scale. What about just...what did you say, Joe (Hoffmann)?

Kinzie: Can't we say "air quality is increased?" There are others that indicate "increase" as a goal.

Hoffmann: I have a feeling that we're not going to get to closure on this, at least not in a way we'll be proud of. I will try to rephrase this and come back at the next meeting.

****Kinzie withdrew her motion.**

****Kinzie moved to deny amendment #43. Piedmont-Smith seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #43 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #48.

Robinson: With Amendment #43 the goal that discussed might fit under the first bullet; while it doesn't acknowledge air quality, it still looks at the detrimental impacts of the built environment, which embodies what you're looking at.

Hoffmann: Thank you, Scott.

Robinson: Page 61 is the next amendment. It was submitted by the Commission on Aging, sponsored by Piedmont-Smith. This is further amended. It's not necessarily clear what is being proposed and changed. The exact direction of the Amendment was unclear and warrants discussion by the commission. The original submission had a lengthy description of the outcome. I think the commentary that Piedmont-Smith provided with the outcome should be fairly short, phrased...

Piedmont-Smith said that just the highlighted part should be the outcome.

Robinson: There was the addition of some new measurements and some that have been suggested to be deleted. We just wanted to present this for your consideration and discussion.

Hoffmann said that there is an Amendment proposed and a significant suggestion for changing it.

Public comment:

Phil Stafford, from the Commission on Aging: We are fine with the highlighted portion. As for changes to indicators, we were suggesting changing the portions crossed out by Isabel (Piedmont-Smith). Local inclusive design laws would be a "visitability" ordinance. One of the problems with design in a community as it affects older adults and people with disabilities is that the ADA only relates to public places. There is significant development taking place with inaccessible environments. Communities have become aware of this in the last 10 years and have developed regulations regarding basic accessibility requirements in residential housing. Yet recent inclusive design laws regarding basic accessibility requirements in residential housing. I won't go into the details, but it has been successful in increasing the number of visitable houses in communities. Manufactured housing is an area in which older adults and people of all ages that are lower-income and living in the city are threatened with eviction through the redevelopment of manufactured housing communities. These communities can be purchased by private developers and people can be evicted essentially without notice. There are examples of ordinances in communities that require longer periods of notice, sometimes provide require relocation assistance on the part of the developers, or give manufactured home community residents a right of first refusal, banding together to purchase the property themselves so that they won't be evicted. We are unaware of exactly how many developments of manufactured housing are within the city limits – there are a few. I also suspect that they are occupied by a fair number of low-income individuals and families. I believe it is an important issue. Perhaps Isabel (Piedmont-Smith) was thinking that it could go under another outcome or what, but it's an issue that was discussed and approved by the Commission on Aging.

Piedmont-Smith said that she crossed out the indicators here, because it seemed that it was not the appropriate place to put legislation. It is the outcome of the legislation; maybe legislation is the tool to get to the indicator we want to see. It did not seem like the appropriate place for ordinance to be listed. However, the issues have merit. I think that the added indicators, the blocked group measures of housing cost burden, blocked group measure just refers to the census block, so it's a way to geographically analyze the ratio of income to housing costs, the availability of subsidized housing, that's related as well, housing units with no stepped entrance, I believe that's important for the aging as well as the population with disabilities. And then housing type diversity index. You'll see later on in the list of amendments that we need more diverse, different types of housing so I supported that one as well. I noticed that they crossed out 10-year

affordability. I don't think I noticed that the first time. I can take that or leave it. If someone wants to put that back in, that's fine.

Hoffmann agreed that even if these laws were agreeable for adoption, they should not be placed as indicators. Maybe it's something to address in the zoning code. We have a version of Amendment #48 that has been modified by greatly reducing the length of the outcome statement and tweaking the list of indicators.

Kinzie asked if the outcome revision intended to include the asterisk.

Hoffmann: I think not.

Piedmont-Smith: I don't actually know what that asterisk goes to.

Hoffmann: That asterisk drops down to the definition of "university design." I think the intent is to drop all of that, including the asterisk.

Piedmont-Smith: I want to elaborate a little bit on that. I think that it broadens it to "affordable and well-maintained. Well, that's important. But universal design that makes the built environment accessible to people as well as environmentally-sustainable design are also important, so let's measure that as well.

Hoffmann: I understand and I agree. Any other comments?

Wisler: I think I support most of this. As a goal to expand this to include universal design, I support that. I'm not sure that the second bullet point here, "availability of subsidized housing by block group..." That's proposed to be a new bullet point, correct?

Hoffmann: Correct.

Wisler: A couple thoughts on that. Number one, that does not fit with the others; it's not with the category of expanding this goal. Second, as a long-term goal, which is not necessarily a goal; affordability is the goal, and measuring affordability as it's relative to income, as in the first bullet point, makes perfect sense. With the second point here, we're saying that we want more subsidized housing. To me, the goal should be that it's preferable that it become affordable because income goes up rather than more housing...

Hoffmann: Or the cost goes down.

Wisler: Or the cost goes down. Subsidizing is not necessary (to me, anyway), the outcome we want. We want it to be affordable but I don't know that we specifically want to say that by having more subsidized housing. We might agree in the short-term that is what we need, but this is a document that is intended to guide us for many years. So I am just not comfortable with adding that second bullet point there. I am supportive of everything else.

Kinzie: This isn't really stating an increase or a decrease. This is just looking at the current rate of availability to find subsidized housing. So you could look and say, if the indicator of subsidized housing goes down, that it not necessarily a bad thing. It could be that income has gone up or housing has been made more affordable. The indicator is just a measure. It has to be interpreted.

Hoffmann: Although "availability" suggests that you want it to be available. What I hear Brad (Wisler) saying is that maybe it would be a good thing if there were none available because we didn't need any of it.

Kinzie: But I think it's a useful measure of that type of housing.

Hoffmann: How about just "amount of" instead of "availability of."

Wisler proposed saying "availability of and demand for subsidized housing by block group." Bringing in both sides of the equation, I would be comfortable with it.

Hoffman summarized the suggestion: modifying that indicator by making it "availability of and demand for" to indicate that it is a more complex question than simply "we want more." Anything else? Or a motion.

****Wisler moved to adopt Amendment #48 as amended. Kinzie seconded.**

Public comment:

Anahit Bejhou from City of Bloomington Legal Department said that it would not be permitted to enforce affordability or require affordable housing. Anything that we put in the Comp Plan or a plan for the future, we cannot require that.

Hoffmann: It will have to be achieved by means other than requirements. So we have a motion to approve Amendment #48 as modified by Isabel (Piedmont-Smith) and Brad (Wisler)

Voice vote passed 7:0. Amendment #48 approved as modified.

Hoffmann: Are we at Amendment #49 now?

Robinson: Amendment #49 is on page 61. It looks to modify the language of the outcome as well as some of the indicators included in the draft. Again, the difficulty is for staff to measure these indicators. Private indoor spaces and socialization spaces, I'm not aware of how staff would possibly measure that. Perhaps in the future we could. When I've used block score, we usually do it by address. I'm sure it's fine by block route and I know it's done by community. Again, there are concerns with staff's ability to measure these indicators.

Public comment:

Phil Stafford, from the Commission on Aging, proposed saying "improved access" instead of "improve access" so that it sounds more like an outcome than a goal. I understand what Scott (Robinson) was saying about block scores and that's fine. We also agree that whenever it refers to "block groups" it should also say "U.S. Census block groups" in order to make it more user-friendly. We don't disagree with Isabel's (Piedmont-Smith) recommendation to remove the library indicator.

Piedmont-Smith: I like the rephrasing of the outcome to be include "community amenities" so it's broader; it's not just the parks and open space. It's also the Twin Lakes Recreation Center, the Buskirk-Chumley, all the amenities in our community. I also like the last one. It's particularly important. Adding the annual comprehensive inventory of sidewalks by neighborhood. This was also proposed by Rob Fischmann in an amendment that didn't get a sponsor. I think we definitely need to talk about sidewalk inventories.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve Amendment #48 as modified. Kinzie seconded.**

Hoffmann said that staff's concern about the first indicator was legitimate. On the other hand, the word private should mean non-governmental, but not things inside a home. If it is a center that is

easily identified as a private indoor or outdoor recreation or social space, a meeting house or meeting room, it will be more manageable to approach.

****Voice vote passed 7:0. Amendment #49 adopted as modified.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #50.

Piedmont-Smith asked staff to remove the apostrophe in “Farmer’s Market.”

Hoffmann: Amendment #50. This is again adding some proposed indicators and modifying the language on the outcome.

Robinson: Amendment #50 had to do with the same theme, modifying some existing language, adding some new indicators that the staff was concerned with being able to measure. The understanding is that this type of information may or may not be available. For example, the range of income levels in a neighborhood is difficult to determine. The information to which I have access is very difficult to isolate on a neighborhood scale, the block scale. The direction that the census has gone since 2010 is drastically different. It is moving toward estimates from the American Community Survey, which samples surveys. There is no longer the long form. Currently, the funding from the 2020 census may be limited and there’s concern about the type of information that could come from it. Again, we just caution about the level and detail staff is able to get to, especially with blocks and neighborhoods. Generally, county and city information is available. Again, generally we don’t disagree with the intent, but we have concerns about what staff is able to measure.

Kinzie said it seems like the modifications to the indicators seem like modifications of existing indicators. Do they just add clarity? Do those seem objectionable? I see the one that is indeed new, range of income levels. But the others seem like they’re modifications of previous, current ones.

Robinson: Yes, some of those are clarification.

Public Comment:

Phil Stafford, Commission on Aging: I think we just wanted to put some meat on the bones. Neighborhood diversity has increased and could be enriched by talking about what kind of diversity we would like to see as a community. When the Planning Department said “Index of housing by category” we weren’t quite sure what that meant, which is why we changed it to neighborhood housing type diversity index. That’s a phrase we made up. The idea was to look for a way to understand the diversity of housing types in neighborhoods. One of the recommendations of the Commission has been to increase the range of housing options. And this is mentioned in other parts of the plan with respect to co-housing, accessory dwelling units and so forth. If that’s what the Planning Department was referring to, I think that would be fine. Income levels...Again I’m not a Census expert but I thought that the American Community Survey would have imputed income levels at the block group level, but I defer to Scott (Robinson’s) expertise. Non-monoculture neighborhood characteristics was a little uninterpretable, so we rephrased that to refer to an intergenerational diversity index. I would guess that the U.S. Census age ranges by block group would be the best way to measure that at a local level.

Hoffmann said that rephrasing the outcome with specific parameters for diversity will be more dangerous when spelled out. I can think of things like family versus single, religion, political diversity. It would be better to mention a desire for diversity within neighborhoods. That’s kind of my feeling. I appreciate the effort to clarify a couple of the other outcomes. If Staff is okay with

changing phrasing, and deleting the mention of income levels as non-measurable at the present time, I would be okay with adding those other two or replacing two with the other two.

Kinzie said that any time specifics are listed, groups that should be included are inevitably excluded on accident. Notably, it doesn't include socioeconomic status, yet there was an indicator that included an measure of income level. It's probably better to go back to the clunky "neighborhood diversity has increased" for that very reason because we risk omitting a group that we might want to include. I'm also concerned that none of the indicators directly address those issues either. So we might be creating a bigger problem.

Hoffmann: I like the way the amendment phrases it, saying "increase diversity within neighborhoods" which sounds better than "neighborhood diversity has increased." It might be diversity between neighborhoods. We really want diversity within neighborhoods. I would just drop "cultural, racial, gender, age and ability."

Piedmont-Smith said that the most important part to change was "non-monoculture neighborhood characteristics." I just don't think that anybody knows what that means. I don't know what it means. But I'm happy to work on this further if people think it needs more tweaking.

Robinson said that that bullet point had already been changed in the consent agenda.

Hoffmann: This amendment wasn't on the Consent Agenda.

Robinson: No, the one bullet point on diversity.

Hoffmann: I see, there was an amendment to change that one bullet point. So that one's already been changed.

Piedmont-Smith: No wonder it seems so familiar.

Robinson: Looking at diversity from the built environment from types of housing. That is one way to address some underlying social aspects that some Commission members might be concerned about. That would be something a little easier to evaluate than when you start getting at gender and the other things, we start spelling out. I would appreciate the friendly amendment suggested by Hoffmann.

Hoffmann: Given that the monoculture one has been dealt with separately, is there anything that we really want to adopt as an amendment? Perhaps the phrasing of the outcome, just flipping the language around.

Wisler said that it was worthwhile to mention some type of economic diversity. Whether that would address income levels, or something else, I think it really needs to be in the document explicitly.

Hoffmann: Can we measure it? Is that something that is possible to measure?

Wisler: Yeah.

Hoffmann: Staff is saying that they have no way to measure income levels within neighborhoods at that level.

Robinson: The challenge with Census boundaries and neighborhood boundaries is that they don't follow the same geographic areas. When you start getting at income, race and gender, they have to protect the identity of individuals. So depending on what variable you're looking at, it might be a

much larger geographic area because if you happen to be a very small minority within that geographic group, if it is an acute minority, it would be easy for somebody to identify that individual. It gets challenging when you start getting to that level of detail at the block level. And since 2010 that information is getting harder to come by because it's typically dealt with surveys and estimates, which are a very small sample of our community. Those values fluctuate pretty widely from year to year.

Piedmont-Smith: What about just looking at home prices and lease rates?

Kinzie: Were those incorporated into the housing type diversity index or the one that was originally written?

Hoffmann: Staff's original proposal would have looked at costs of housing.

Robinson said that looking at p. 28, and Amendment #126 was the consent agenda that amended this particular one. It included three bullets. The first was "index of housing by category cost by neighborhood- or census-determined geography." The second would be "diversification of characteristics such as age, professions and income levels."

Piedmont-Smith: What amendment number is that?

Hoffmann: #126. It's the amendment we approved earlier as part of the consent agenda.

Robinson: It's dealing with the non-monoculture characteristics. It would be replaced with "diversification of demographic characteristics such as age, profession and income levels." The third bullet would be ratio of ownership to rental units by city and neighborhood. This amendment somewhat conflicts with what was already adopted on the consent agenda.

Hoffman said that he would be happy if the Commission tweaked the outcome language by flipping it around, saying "increase diversity within neighborhoods. That would be fine with me. I'd be happy to just leave it there.

****Kinzie moved to change only the phrasing as the outcome, and adopt the rest of the indicators as already adopted. Piedmont-Smith seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #50 adopted as modified.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #52.

Robinson: This is on page 72, again dealing outcomes and indicators. This is the second outcome with public streets and rights-of-way. This proposes adding some new indicators and removing some... this is the recurring theme of staff's difficulty to measure some of these things. For example, the percentage of streets that meet the complete streets criteria. Currently the city doesn't have any criteria for complete streets. We're not sure how we would measure that.

Piedmont-Smith: The MPO does.

Robinson said that it was a process, not a standard. There would be no way to evaluate a facility in that manner. It's a process on how projects are approved. Again, there is concern regarding our ability to measure some things that are being proposed.

Public comment:

Phil Stafford, Commission on Aging: We suggest that city-wide obesity levels be moved to the Community Services... and that was on the Consent list.

Hoffmann: So we've already gotten rid of that one here.

Stafford: We didn't feel it should be reflected in this particular outcome. Isabel (Piedmont-Smith) had noted that we had added an indicator to try to incentivize more benches on sidewalks. We agree that this could perhaps only apply to some areas in some neighborhoods, although more than we realize. The wording could be changed to "the number of age-friendly benches by block in targeted neighborhoods" or some qualification so that we could keep the incentives in and attention to the benches as well as shade and other forms of street furniture to enhance the pedestrian experience for older adults and others because it's so closely related to public health, particularly for older adults.

Hoffmann: Thank you. The comprehensive inventory of sidewalks conditions has already been addressed by a different amendment that we approved a minute ago, so we don't have to worry about that bullet point here. Also, the citywide obesity indicator had already moved per the amendment that we approved earlier. So we're down to the three bullet points, one of which was crossed out by Isabel.

Cibor: I think that the addition of percentage of transit stations and (I'm assuming) transit vehicles that are ADA accessible – that's a wonderful bullet of which I would be very supportive. Echoing Scott's (Robinson) concern that the "complete streets criteria and percent of streets that meet that" would be an extremely challenging thing to meet. Even if we did have a design guide, there's often conflicting criteria for a "complete" street.

Hoffmann: Do you mean it's in the eye of the beholder?

Cibor: If you're a semi driver, you might have a different perception than someone in a wheelchair. I'm not saying that the city shouldn't develop a complete street... As for benches and more shade, that's something to think about.

Hoffmann said that accessibility for walking was already mentioned elsewhere. The question is whether it needs to be a specific indicator. Is it a measure that we want to have in the document: The number of benches per block, or especially if it's more complicated and specific with shaded benches. At a more general level, it has already been addressed, not at this level of specificity.

Piedmont-Smith said that she would be willing to revise the bullet point that says "percent of streets that meet the complete streets criteria." That could be changed to "percent of streets with dedicated bicycle lanes or bicycle paths." I know that's only part of complete streets but I think that's measurable.

Hoffmann: Right, if it's going up, that's a good thing.

Cibor: I'll just echo that in the outcome above, one of the outcomes is "number of miles of sidewalks, paths, trails and bike lanes" and I think that would already be captured. I think that this bullet point may essentially be captured in a previous indicator.

Piedmont-Smith: Oh, what page is this on?

Cibor: This is on page 72 of the draft. It's the last bullet on the first outcome.

Hoffmann: Right, motor vehicle lane, sidewalk, path, trail and bike lane mileages. It's just a different way of measuring, by mileages instead of percentages. I think I am okay with that. It's a different measure but it achieves the same thing.

Maritano said that benches should be specified. She asked where it was alluded to elsewhere. The inability to take a pause for families, the elderly, the obese, handicapped, does impede your desire to go out and take a first step out the front door if you know that there's a long span before you can have a pause. I think it's an important, specific issue.

Cibor: I'm looking at a program in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation section, that states "support the creation of a pedestrian environment for all ages and abilities through improvements in accessible curb ramps, elimination of tripping hazards, landscape maintenances, lighting, benches and other innovative strategies."

Hoffmann: There seems to be consensus that the Transit Station bullet point is one worth adding. Am I hearing a motion for that or any others?

****Cibor moved to add the Transit Station and Transit Vehicle ADA Accessible bullet point and to strike the city-wide obesity levels since that has been moved. . Kinzie seconded.**

Wisler said that these points should always cite, "percentage of" instead of "percent of."

****Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #52 approved as modified.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #53

Robinson: Amendment #53 on page 11 was proposed by the Chamber of Commerce. This is very similar to some of the earlier amendments we've heard this evening. This looks to add another statement reflecting what was adopted with the vision statement. Staff recommends voting no on this because it simply reflects what City Council has already approved.

No public comment.

****Cibor moved to deny Amendment #53. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #53 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #58.

Piedmont-Smith: Should we go ahead with Amendment #55 since the representative of the Chamber is here?

Hoffmann: Thank you. I need to ask staff whether you're prepared to discuss Amendment #55 tonight or whether you would rather have two weeks to do that.

Robinson: We're prepared to talk about Amendment #55. This is on page 78 looking at modifying some language that replaces the use of "WWII" with "compatible." Again, we're looking at the Mixed Urban Residential areas and their description. The intent of the Amendment is that WWII is too limiting and doesn't reflect some of the characteristics in these areas of the community. Originally staff supported this as a consent agenda item, then it was requested to be removed.

Public comment:

Anne Bono of the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce said that the suggestion of removing "Pre-WWII" and replacing with "compatible" was because the phrasing of "must continue" is very limiting and doesn't allow for any flexibility. We believe that we can still be respectful of our past but not be so closed-minded as to not allow other styles beside Pre-WWII architecture. Thank you.

Hoffmann: Thank you. We are back to the Commission for discussion and/or a motion.

Piedmont-Smith: I want to explain why I wanted to pull this. The paragraph talks about site design in the Mixed Urban Residential land use district. It does not talk about architecture, so we're not saying that you have to stick to Pre-WWII-style architecture. Instead, it's talking about building mass-scale landscaping, how the buildings are set on the sites. I think Pre-WWII is a good reference point because mixed urban residential that mainly corresponds to the residential core that we have now, so these are the older neighborhoods that were existent before WWII that established form-based code, so to speak, just by the way they were built out. I think that the form of these neighborhoods should be protected because it makes these neighborhoods special and characteristic and makes it part of Bloomington's character.

Hoffmann said that there is a difference between the previous sentence, which is about architecture, and this sentence, which is not about architecture. The sentence before it talks about redevelopment and rehabilitation of existing structures that must respect a unique character, etc. So I think it implies there that it has something to do with architecture. But the subject which is the focus of this amendment really isn't about the architecture. It is about other characteristics. What I would suggest is that there are other people who might not catch that, just as I did not. Maybe there's a way to emphasize more clearly that when we say Pre-WWII, we are not saying that the architecture has to necessarily be Pre-WWII, because the previous sentence might mislead people to think that we are talking about architecture.

Piedmont-Smith: But even in the previous sentence, the word "architecture" is not used.

Hoffmann: I know, but it talks about structures. I think that's where I got misled, thinking that this was referring to structures as well. Maybe there's a way to fix it so that it doesn't seem like we're limited the architecture to Pre-WWII. Could we make the change to clarify this for readers? An example could be "while recognizing that various kinds of architecture might be compatible with existing neighborhoods, the district must continue to emphasize Pre-WWII neighborhood characteristics" and continue exactly the way it is. Just put an opening clause to indicate that we're not talking about the architecture as such but about other characteristics.

Piedmont-Smith: I'm not interested in making that change but if you'd like to do that, maybe we can vote on that separately.

Hoffmann: I agree. The amendment as proposed would be to replace "Pre-WWII" with "compatible." Do we have any other comments or a motion?

Kinzie asked the staff position.

Robinson said that staff supported it originally on the consent agenda.

Hoffmann: And even with Isabel's explanation of why she didn't think that had to be changed, the staff would still support changing it? Isabel's point is that is isn't about architecture at all. It's about other characteristics. And that "Pre-WWII" was meant to capture grid pattern, massing of buildings, that kind of thing

Robinson said that the beginning of the sentence says "neighborhood characteristics" in the district. If it implies architecture, maybe there's a need for clarification. But staff was fine with "compatible."

Piedmont-Smith: I guess you're right, Joe, it's not clear.

Hoffmann: Apparently staff thought it meant architecture, too.

Kappas: [Inaudible]

Robinson: If you look at the reference in context of the land use map, in the geographic areas of the community we're looking at, it does reflect that context mentioned by Isabel (Piedmont-Smith) but it's the older neighborhoods with the gridded streets, etc.

Hoffmann volunteered to devise better wording.

Piedmont-Smith: I'd like to try to vote on it.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve Amendment #53.**

****Piedmont-Smith moved for denial of Amendment #53 in its current form. Kinzie seconded.**

Wisler: We mention that mass-scale landscaping and so forth Pre-WWII but we don't really say anywhere what that means. I'm inclined to support this amendment but in the event that it is denied and re-worked, I would say either eliminate the phrase or give context for what it means.

Cibor was also supportive of the proposed amendment as written using the word compatible. It seemed that those two referred to the same thing. Like Brad (Wisler) said, "Pre-WWII" isn't clearly defined. I'm supportive of everyone's intent as we're talking about it but I think "compatible" hits on everything I'd be looking for.

Maritano said that "compatible" was like "innovative" (too vague). Instead, "Pre WWII" is more measurable. "Compatible does not clarify anything.

Piedmont-Smith: I think "compatible" is too vague and could be interpreted in a way that does not respect the historic fabrics.

Wisler: I think the right answer's somewhere in the middle, maybe saying "historic characteristics" or something of that nature. I understand that "compatibility" can change over time. We want to respect the history here. I understand that, but I think that something in-between would be best; something more specific than "compatible" and less specific than "Pre-WWII."

Kinzie: We definitely lose something with just "compatible."

Roll call vote to deny Amendment #53 in its current form on the understanding that Hoffmann will take time to re-work this amendment: Amendment #53 denied 5:2. (Cibor and Wisler voted no).

Hoffmann: Amendment #58.

Robinson: This looks at page 86 in the first bullet point dealing with land use development approvals. Again, it looks into variety and quality of architectural styles that allow for innovative design. This proposes to change some of the language included in that bullet to "site and architectural design should embrace functionally at varied styles to reflect the diversity of our community." Given that this is general wordsmithing, staff would like to know how long we would continue to discuss minor changes in words.

Anne Bono, with Bloomington Chamber of Commerce: With the consistent language, we feel that when we talk a lot about wanting innovation in design and architecture, then we should be able to allow for that. We shouldn't, just because if another building wants to come into an employment center, they shouldn't necessarily have to build exactly to what the previous building is, that they

should be allowed to incorporate what works for them and materials, which can add to these funky characteristics that I think define Bloomington. We just want to allow some flexibility for this.

Hoffmann said that there does not seem to be a difference between what staff recommended and what was in the text, with one exception: The term “vanilla community” is one that I would prefer not to use. It now says “consistent style.” This is a substantive point. Staff, I take it, believes that consistency is better than saying “compatible” or “diversity.”

Robinson: This is a policy guidance. If it were to translate into changes in the zoning codes, it would perhaps change the flexibility in the code that currently exists. There has been concern about the size, scale and the other characteristics in some new developments. The current language is very supportive of the flexibility. We’re just looking at the consistency.

Hoffmann asked where the language supports flexibility. He can see where it talks about consistency.

Robinson said that “consistency” was a general term that allowed for flexibility. It can be a marketing and branding term. If an employment center has a “funky” aspect, it can be developed as “funky” in that way. That is consistent. If you have an employment center that might have the characteristics of the Cook campus, and something comes in that is drastically different, it would be inconsistent. We would be looking at the consistency of what the district is trying to establish.

Wisler said that he supported the amendment. If it doesn’t pass, I think we should take another look at this. Many commissioners are concerned with how similar all of the new buildings look. What gives character to Bloomington is the eclectic nature of the built environment. Consistency in the built environment is not what Bloomington is known for. If this is not approved, something else should be proposed.

Kinzie: I agree with that sentiment and wonder whether looking at revisions for this amendment falls under the same changes that we’re proposing making changes to the employment centers that we agreed to review in previous amendments in the batch that included Amendments #28 and #29 and the whole batch. I wonder, if we amend those to really reflect mixed use, then we might want this to be more expansive in terms of diversity.

Maritano said that she hoped the building codes would prevent cookie-cutter disasters. I tend to support our codes preventing us from allowing disasters, but we should have some flexibility for the innovative design we say we want.

Kappas said that is easy to look at the term “consistent” and think of bland, negative, vanilla... or the adjective you want. But if we are unique and different as we say that we are in Bloomington, couldn’t you say that there is consistency in that as well? Our downtown is consistent in that every building is unique, and we can keep that moving on. This discussion of semantics is too specific. I am okay with the term consistent because it seems that we’re saying that we’re trying to embrace functional yet varied styles, especially when we’re about to go into code-based zoning where we’re allowed to have some freedom. I don’t care which way we go, but I believe that what’s currently there suffices.

****Wisler moved to adopt Amendment #58.**

Piedmont-Smith: Is the proposal to delete the entire paragraph and insert that one sentence?

Hoffmann: That is correct. The proposal is to delete the entire bullet point and replace it with the sentence that’s under the heading proposed amendment. The sentence that reads “site and

architectural design should embrace functional, yet varied styles to reflect the diversity of our community.” And that would replace the entire paragraph or bullet point.

Cibor said that he struggled with the proposed language. I’m probably somewhere in between all of this. Maybe my desire would be to have this looked at more closely as we’re tweaking other sections of this code. Just what is a functional, yet varied style? Maybe it’s the functional site design and the varied architectural design. I don’t know if I’m quite ready to be supportive of the amendment as currently proposed, but I’m not saying “no” to it altogether.

Wisler volunteered to re-work this wording.

Hoffmann: Brad (Wisler), I’m supportive of your position that we ought to have more flexibility, and that this goes too far tonally. I understand your point that at the code is written, there will be flexibility and that funkiness can be a style of its own. But the language as it’s currently written seems to say, we want the employment centers to be basically consistent, replicating architectural styles. That, to me, doesn’t sound right. I think I prefer language that’s more open to different possibilities.

Kappas: If we’re looking to redraft this, I’m all for that. Not as proposed.

****Kinzie moved to deny Amendment #58 with understanding that it will be re-written. Cibor seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #58 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #59.

Robinson said that Amendment #59 is on page 52. It seeks to add another bullet point for the downtown environment is vibrant and sustainable.

Hoffmann: Presumably, the third line would go right after retail and restaurant to add office and professional services revenue.

Robinson: Correct. So it would create a new outcome and then office and professional.

Hoffmann: ...and a new indicator. And staff’s position on this?

Robinson: Staff is generally supportive of it.

Public comment:

Anne Bono, Chamber of Commerce: We submitted this with the support from CFC properties as well as DBI. It has an outcome for retail and restaurant revenue but there is much more than that. In the downtown, there are professional services, office space, companies like Envisage, things like that. We feel that it’s another outcome that should be included.

Hoffmann: Or in our phrasing, an indicator under that outcome.

****Piedmont-Smith moved for approval. Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 6:0- Amendment #59 approved.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #63. It’s more of an instruction than an amendment.

Robinson: This is a general amendment looking at the photographs and images included in the plan. Generally, it is not in amendment form. There are many pictures included in the plan. They are all given photo credits. I would say that sometimes the intent of a photograph is to invoke

creativity and imagination, without a specific purpose behind the photographs. The way I interpret this request is that these photos needed to be labeled to indicate what they are and where they're taken. Some of the photographs should be easy to determine where they're taken. The intent behind some of them is to provide a visionary outlook without having much of a purpose beyond that. Generally, the amendment is not in a format of which pictures need to be referenced and included.

No public comment.

Hoffmann: It's clear what's being requested. I'm just not sure that every photograph in the document needs a label.

****Cibor moved to deny amendment #63. Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #63 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #65.

Robinson: On page 15, Amendment #65 looks at Exhibit #1. Staff has corresponded with Commissioner Piedmont-Smith. We will clarify the exhibit in the next draft. Staff recommends no. There is concern about what kind of information we will provide. To provide some background information, this graph simply shows relative population between the city and county and how it's grown in the last 10 years.

Hoffmann: So what you're saying is that there will already be a change made that will clarify this graphic.

Robinson: At least the percent change lines. This amendment suggests just deleting the whole exhibit 1. I think there is value to provide this information because it gives an idea of how quickly we've grown.

No public comment.

Hoffmann: Staff has agreed to change the graphic to hopefully clarify what the amendment author says was confusing about it.

Piedmont-Smith: I don't know what amendment we're voting on.

Hoffmann: The amendment is to substitute a metric or delete exhibit 1.

****Kappas moved to deny Amendment #65. Cibor seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #65 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #66.

Robinson said that this is on page 16. Andrew Cibor may have a similar amendment regarding the info-graphic on page 16. I think the intent of the infographic is like some of the pictures in the plan. It's projecting into the future. Projections are never very accurate. These numbers are just to portray how we could be growing into the future as we start thinking about some of these things. As I understand it, the amendment is to eliminate it or provide more detail. It is essentially a picture. It would be difficult for staff to edit. This was provided by our consultants, Ratio architects. The source of the information is noted at the bottom. This is difficult to change. Our questions is whether this provides helpful information at face value. If not, you can consider this amendment. I think Andrew (Cibor) had submitted a similar amendment.

Cibor: I had a very similar proposed amendment on the agenda for the next meeting two weeks from now. It was unclear what value this adds. A lot of this information is already in the report in other graphs or maps are more obvious in their meaning. It was confusing. Looking at new units that are needed. Does it say that both are needed? 8,500 of new multi-family and 4,600 of new single family? Or one or the other? It isn't clear. And if we can't easily modify it, I would just suggest deleting it.

Kappas asked how to modify it. Would you have to renegotiate it?

Robinson said that there was no longer a contract with Ratio Architects. This graphic is meant to be a thought-provoking idea that may provide an idea of how Bloomington may look in the future. Some people may look at it too literally. If it creates too much confusion, I know there is a tendency of citing sources and understanding what some of the values are. But the intent of this infographic, like many, is to provide thought-provoking ideas. If the commission wishes, an overlay could be added to explain more. However, staff cannot open this document or change anything. If the wish is to amend this, staff suggests either leaving it alone or removing it.

Piedmont-Smith: What does it represent? Does the 9,912 creative professional jobs mean that how many we will have in 30 years?

Robinson: It is a projection into the future.

Piedmont-Smith: Couldn't you put something across the top about, "In the next 20 years, we will need..."

Robinson: I cannot edit this document. There is a caption that explains what the infographic is about. Staff has very limited ability to edit the infographic itself. There are some font overlays that we can touch.

Piedmont-Smith: It wasn't explanatory enough for me either.

Robinson: I'm suggesting that if it's the desire of this group to edit it, I suggest that it will be difficult for staff to do. We are no longer under contract with Ration Architects to make them revise it. The information that is included at the bottom is about the best that I can provide.

Kappas: So, at the bottom you could say, "This infographic illustrates the potential future of the major social, economic..." Because it provides hope, it's exciting stuff to come, but I agree that it seemed like we already had 9,000 jobs. It think that if we played with the language at the bottom, it would be easier to explain.

Robinson: Since the April draft, staff has already changed the narrative at the bottom.

****Maritano moved to eliminate the infographic. Cibor seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #66.**

Robinson: Andrew, I can't remember what amendment you submitted but we'll keep that in mind later.

Hoffmann: Amendment #75.

Robinson: This is on page 26. The amendment mentions the programs of affordable housing. With goal 1.6 on page 27, the proposed amendment is to add another goal or to add this component to one of the existing goals. It is not in amendment form. Under the programs for municipal services programs, the mention of affordable workforce housing is not identified in any

of the goals. I would say that goal 1.6 looks at economic development. Part of that would be workforce housing.

Hoffmann: In any event, you've made it clear that these are not meant to be in a one-to-one correspondence anyway.

Robinson: And the amendment seems to think that it isn't in the context, at least as I would interpret it.

Piedmont-Smith said that she believed she may have tried to amend that. It says, "as amended by I.P.S, goal 5.1 should cross-referenced on page 26." There have been so many, I don't really remember now. But I believe that what I meant was that on page 26, there is a program that mentions affordable housing. I am saying that at that point, we could say, see goal 5.1 on page 58.

Hoffmann: Would staff consider that a friendly...?

Robinson said that there should be caution when considering cross-referencing. We start opening ourselves up to expectations of consistency. In the programs, in the policies, not everything is necessarily a one-to-one relationship. I would caution you on how far we will continue to look at cross-referencing.

Hoffmann said that he is not super excited about this point. I don't think we need an amendment here.

Kinzie moved to deny. Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 6:0 – Amendment #75 denied.

Hoffmann: Amendment #77.

Robinson: On page 27, under the economic development heading. This suggests that some of the bulleted items overlap and create redundancy. The suggestion is to consolidate bullet 1 under local government partnerships and bullet 1 under annexation.

Hoffmann: Can we go back and see what those were?

Robinson: The amendment is not in an amendment form. I think that annexation and combining the first bullet under local government, "coordinating with Monroe County and the town of Ellettsville with respective plans for future growth and services..." I don't think that necessarily has to do with annexation. We coordinate with them on a lot of other related stuff.

Hoffmann: Right, so they're addressing two different things. Back to the commission. Staff says that actually these two bullet points address slightly different points. I agree.

****Kinzie moved to deny. Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 - Amendment #77 denied.**

Hoffmann: #79.

Robinson: Amendment #79 looks at pages 38 and 42. This idea references the forthcoming environmental sustainability program. It is not in an amendment format. It does not propose which language to change. We have not necessarily acknowledged any forthcoming plans in generally. We have acknowledged the need for a sustainability plan. Providing that is a goal in here. I think they're suggesting that goal 3.1 would change drastically.

Hoffmann: I read them to say that there should be a policy added under 3.1 to say “develop an environmental sustainability plan for the city.” This would be under goal 3.1

Robinson said that this amendment was not an amendment but more of a commentary.

Hoffmann: Let’s address the one specific thing they ask, which is to add a policy under goal 3.1 to read “develop an environmental sustainability plan for the city.” Does the Plan deal with this anywhere else?

Robinson: I think we talk about a program regarding that. Goal 3.1 looks at energy. The sustainability plan would look at much more than just energy.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said that it seemed like a good point, but it was much broader than just energy. Sustainability is so much more than even environment. Since this plan is being developed and I assume it’s going to be used, this is probably an unnecessary amendment.

****Kinzie moved to deny. Maritano seconded.**

Hoffmann: Obviously we’re not disagreeing with the idea of having an environmental sustainability plan. Any final comments?

Kappas: It talks on page 38 about developing a sustainability plan. I think they’re just looking for a more actionable policy from it. It says that in the text. That can be summarized from that standpoint. It could potentially be on the horizon. I agree with denying this amendment.

****Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #79 denied.**

Robinson: Amendment 83 looks to modify goal 3.2 related policy 3.2.2 to change the greenspace area per capita goal and revising policy 3.2.2 to increase the overall greenspace by developing a greenspace per capita goal.

Hoffmann said that the amendment seemed to be to adding the words “by developing a greenspace per capita goal.” That’s the essence of this amendment. And Isabel, you’ve suggested that this be done elsewhere, is that correct?

Piedmont-Smith: Let me just take a look here. Under goal 3.2, policy 3.2.2, “increase the overall greenspace and increase...” 3.2.2 says “increase the overall greenspace and increase protection for environmentally sensitive areas.”

Hoffmann: Yes, and the amendment is proposing adding the words “by developing a greenspace per capita goal” to that policy.

Piedmont-Smith: I’m a little confused why this is being presented without my amendments because I sponsored these. It seems like it should be as amended. That’s probably just because of the time it takes to type it out. I recommended that we add a program point on page 44 under Urban Ecology. We add “develop a greenspace per capita goal.” and actually “increase protection for environmentally sensitive areas” is a little vague, but anyway...

Hoffmann: So rather than modifying 3.2.2, you’re suggesting taking the greenspace per capita goal, making a program, and adding it under Urban Ecology.

Robinson said that it seemed more like a program, not a policy.

No public comment.

****Kappas moved to approve Amendment #83 as amended by Commissioner Piedmont-Smith.**

Hoffmann: The motion is, instead of doing what Amendment #83 says to do, to add “develop a greenspace per capita goal” as a new program on page 44 under Urban Ecology. We have ...

****Kinzie seconded.**

Cibor: “Increasing overall greenspace...” does that mean that we’re going to be removing parts of the build environment?

Piedmont-Smith: That’s not part of the amendment anymore.

Cibor: The only way to increase it if we’re not destroying built environment would be by growing as a city and not spatially, while not building and developing in that growing area. Am I off base?

Wisler: I don’t think so. I think that to make it a per capita goal, it’s saying that we’re either going to grow our boundaries or destroy our built environment faster than the population growth. I’m not sure if we want to specifically say that.

Kappas: That is also something for 20 to 40 years. We’re not growing in space right now, but in the future we very may well. That would provide an avenue – for that greenspace to be developed.

Hoffmann: This is getting beyond the scope of the amendment we’re discussing. Let me just point out that increasing greenspace would not count as someone’s yard. It would be possible for the city to acquire areas that are presently privately owned and add them to the total greenspace total. That’s a plausible way to interpret what’s going on here with the per capita and the total number, is to increase the public greenspace, as opposed to people’s private greenspace. You’re right, in the aggregate, in the private greenspace, we’re limited by the boundaries of the city.

Cibor said that it mentioned overall greenspace.

Hoffmann: I know. But we don’t normally use “greenspace” to refer to people’s back yards. In any event, that’s not the amendment we have before us. This one is to add a new program on page 44. We have a motion and a second. Any final comments?

Wisler: I obviously supports the idea of increasing greenspace but I don’t think I can support this amendment in its current form. If we have trouble interpreting it, the casual reader will also have trouble interpreting it. I think it needs more work, and I’ll vote against adoption in its current form.

Piedmont-Smith: I thought that the problem we were having her in the Plan Commission in interpretation was the phrase “increase the overall greenspace” which is not even part of the amendment. The amendment is to develop a greenspace per capita goal. Is that something that is unclear to people? Brad, is that what you meant, that that’s unclear.

Hoffmann: Right, because overall greenspace and greenspace per capita, both run into Andrew’s (Cibor) objection, unless you define it as public greenspace, in which case, you can get out of that bind. If you define it as all greenspace, then unless we grow, it’s the same problem.

Piedmont-Smith: I see what you mean.

Hoffmann: I think it's meant to refer to whatever we call or think of as public greenspace, in which case that gets you out of the conundrum.

Piedmont-Smith: And what Nick said, we will in the future annex and grow, probably. So we want to keep more of the annexed area green, and that would improve our per capita...

Kappas: Also, I don't know if it is defined in our current UDO what greenspace means. And I haven't researched that. Maybe staff knows?

Desmond: If you look at page 45, highlighted on the screen one of our outcomes is "greenspace has increased." It better defines what the intent behind what greenspace is. Parks and greenspace area, vegetative cover in the downtown, percent of tree canopy coverage, community garden plots, square footage of green roofs.

Hoffmann: ...which notably doesn't include people's yards. I think that's the way out of the conundrum of, are we limited in the total amount of space we have, versus people. It gets us out of that bind. If the city buys some land and makes it a park, then it becomes public greenspace and changes the dynamics.

Desmond: It is reasonable to assume that it means to be public/protected greenspace.

Kinzie: It would seem to me that a program that would develop a greenspace per capita goal would help us further enumerate what this is and set a goal. I'm still in support of the motion.

****Roll Call vote: Amendment #83 - Amendment #83 adopted. (Wisler votes no and Cibor abstains).**

Hoffmann: Amendment #90. What's the other one that we took off the consent agenda?

Robinson: #117.

Hoffmann: So we haven't gotten to it yet. We are now to Amendment #90.

Robinson: Amendment #90 is on page 52 under the section "Downtown." This is another general request for terminology. Staff cautions against how much terminology we provide. Form-based code is referenced several times in the Plan. Again, this is planning terminology. I think it's something that generally, if you look in the Land Use chapter, there is a little more discussion on Form-based things, so generally this is commentary, not an amendment. We are certainly open to guidance from the Plan Commission.

Wisler: This seems like something that, even if we agree with the sentiment, I don't know how we could actually adopt it because it doesn't suggest an amendment. It just says to define it but doesn't suggest how.

Kinzie: For the public consumption and clarity, one of the ways to address several of the suggestions in here would be to add a glossary or an appendix. Even adding a supplement to this could be helpful. It could be done after. And some of these terms may change. In general, I think a glossary would be helpful. In general, I'm in support of definitions.

No public comment.

****Cibor moved for denial of Amendment #90. Maritano seconded.**

Piedmont-Smith agreed with the suggestion for a glossary.

Wisler: I don't disagree with the sentiment here, and I think that recently we've had issues with the term form-based code. This is well-intentioned and could be done through a glossary or even through the narrative somewhere, saying what form-based code is. Clearly, there's not anything to adopt here. We have a motion and a second to deny Amendment #90.

Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #90 denied.

Hoffmann: We are now at Amendment #115. What is the rule to not starting new petitions after 9:00 or 9:30?

Piedmont-Smith: 9:30.

Hoffmann: Okay, Amendment #115.

Robinson: This is on page 80. The justification is looking at allowing heights in the downtown that are great. There needs to be further discussion, suggesting just changing the word from "encourage" to "discuss" regarding building heights in the Downtown Core character area. This is in the top bullet. Staff's opinion is that this is a first step. The discussion will happen when dealing with zoning ordinances and approvals in the downtown. I'm not sure what kind of guidance that provides, to say "have a discussion." We're looking at new ways to calculate density. We've talked a lot this evening about how to deal with growing population, we're going to protect green areas, the ability to grow and densification. Again, it is a minor amendment and a big policy change.

No public comment.

Hoffmann said that he supported it.

Piedmont-Smith: I worked with Jan Sorby on this amendment.

Hoffmann: This is a tonal thing. Instead of "encourage," which sends a message, I would even prefer "should be considered" as opposed to "should be discussed." I think it might be simpler to say "increased building heights and diversified density calculations for new unit types should be considered in the Downtown Core character." That doesn't signal that we're going to do it in the way that "encourage" does. I just think that tonally, a document with all of the complaints of big student apartment buildings developed downtown, having something in the Master Plan saying that we'll encourage increased building heights downtown, I'm not sure I'm ready for that. Especially because I have a strong sense that what we need to do is to migrate the student developments away from the downtown towards more campus-proximate areas. We may not need more height downtown; we may need transition of buildings to other uses, and so forth. This sounds stronger than what we should be saying.

Kinzie said she does not support "encouraged." Instead, write "should be discussed" as the amendment suggests or "should be considered" in the Downtown Core.

Wisler: I think "considered" is more concise and feels a little more definite than "discussed."

****Maritano moved to accept Amendment #115 with the language change of "should be considered in the Downtown Core character area." Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #115 passed as amended.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #124. Sorry, #117. Is staff ready to take that one up at this time? This is one staff supported?

Robinson: Amendment #117 was one staff originally supported on page 83. It looked to delete “consider sustainable storm water management strategies such as rain gardens that can also be landscape as amenities for plazas and spaces for public art”, and replace with “Encourage underground solutions for storm water management.” Again, staff had it on the consent agenda.

Hoffmann: This is specifically about a particular land use area called the Urban Village Center.

No public comment.

Cibor said that the proposed amendment does more than we are realizing. By deleting the fact that sustainable storm water management strategies need to be considered. We are looking at some where there are maybe green roofs or other ways to implement storm water management strategies that are desired, I think, and replacing that with “underground pipe it,” just the traditional thing. I am not disagreeing that much may be underground or that urban village centers need to be considered urban. We want that. But I don’t want to delete the fact that sustainable strategies still need to be considered.

Hoffmann: Why aren’t we saying encouraged? I flipped “encourage” to “consider” a minute ago. I think here I want to say “encourage sustainable storm water strategies.” Is there a reason not to want sustainable storm water management solutions?

Piedmont-Smith: Yes. There is a certain amount of greenspace required in these urban centers. And we’ve seen it taken up by storm water management, like at Park South, where that greenspace is passive, it can’t be used. People can’t run around there or play Frisbee because it’s a swale for the storm water runoff. It seems to me like it’s a low-cost solution for developers. If it’s an urban village center it should be urban. It should feed into the current existing storm water grid. Now, if green roofs are considered a sustainable storm water management strategy, then I think I’d like to specifically call out green roofs and say that we want that. But I don’t think rain gardens and such are the best solution for this type of development.

Cibor: Right now, the city is designing the Trades District Infrastructure project with what we would traditionally call a tree plot, some innovative sustainable storm water methodologies that can fit within an urban context. Maybe rain gardens are still desired. I agree that we do not want large swales in an urban context.

Hoffmann said that we should say that we do not want drainage swales. Why don’t we just say that? Then that leaves open the rain garden, the green roof, and the underground piping. If what we don’t want to do is take green space out of the usable category by turning it into a drainage swale. When we refer to a rain garden, I don’t think of drainage swale. I think of a garden with flowers that happen to absorb a great amount of water. It’s not the same as a drainage swale and wouldn’t be a replacement or a substitute for usable green space.

Piedmont-Smith: Maybe this is an amendment that can be worked on.

Hoffmann: I know where you’re going. I like where you’re going. We just need to be clear and say what we don’t want. We don’t want to use green space in this way.

Wisler said that it seemed that this was already the intention. Instead of saying that it “can also be landscaped” perhaps it should just say, “storm water management strategies should be landscaped so as to make them public amenities instead of passive...” something along those lines. My objection here is just saying, we want it to be underground. I don’t think any of us would say we should cover up Miller-Showers Park and put it underground.

Maritano: I think Miller-Showers Park is one of those situations. And it’s attractive.

****Maritano moved to deny Amendment #117 to re-draft and re-submit it. Kappas volunteered. Kinzie seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #117 denied.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #124.

Robinson: Amendment #124 looks at page 59. It discusses the idea that we do not want to encourage vacant land development except for when it's fully or partially surrounded by development. The idea is the green-filled leapfrog type of development in some communities. I proposes to amend goal 5.3 to add some language at the end of the goal to direct that development of land for housing and developments on vacant land if it is partially surrounded by existing development. If you see the ways the goals are organized in Chapter 5 around the 5.1 through 5.4, 5.1 looks at affordability. 5.2 looks at the idea of new housing developments' design preservation. 5.3 looks at supply. I'm not sure if, given Bloomington's jurisdiction, there would be many situations in which we would have outposts of new development. Most of what we're seeing is infill development or already adjacent to built-out areas. I'm not really confident that this provides additional guidance. If the city were to annex areas in the future, maybe that would come into play. Looking at many of the areas that the city was considering for annexation, most of those are already developed at some level.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said that she already stated her views, why she thinks it's important. Scott (Robinson) was probably correct in that this point would not frequently be relevant.

Hoffmann said that there were a few places where it could come up. I agree with you, Scott (Robinson) that it's not likely to be a big deal. But one place is the Huntington Farms that comes to mind, where you could see a development there, depending on where it was located. It may not be surrounded by other developments. For that reason, I suppose it's worth saying what we mean.

Cibor: As I read the proposal, if it is at least partially surrounded by existing development, we would more likely approve it.

Hoffmann: That's right. If it was more or less contiguous to already built-out area, as opposed to leap-frogging.

Cibor: I'm asking how I would apply this to a recent case at 17th and Crescent, where it's adjacent to a built-out environment, but there are environmental or other issues. But it is partially surrounded so we should probably do it, because it meets the "if" statement.

Hoffmann: I don't see this as changing the dynamic on that; it's a negative statement. It's saying, in general the consideration would occur as it always has. However, if a development were leap-frogging, going out into green area without anything already around it, then we're not likely to like it. It's more of a negative statement about what we don't want to see, rather than saying yes, we want it anywhere else.

Kinzie: I prefer the qualification for vacant land development. I think the qualifier is good.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve Amendment #124. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 -- Amendment #124 adopted.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #127.

Desmond: I just want to let you know that we're approaching 9:30.

Hoffmann: Until we're past 9:30, I don't have to suspend the rules. So we can get one more in.

Robinson: Amendment #127 is on page 70. It looks at Goal 6.4, which it says is not related to the policies listed under it. "Balance the demands of public parking and the function it serves in transportation and economic development with other community needs."

Hoffmann: That's the existing language?

Robinson: That's the existing language. The proposed language is "Plan and develop on-street parking for cars and bicycles with a focus on efficiency and equity." Staff believes that the current goal is broad and general enough that it embodies what this says. It is generally supportive of what's currently in there.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said that the current wording is confusing. The new wording is more direct. And if you look at the policy points under this goal, it's not really about balancing demands with economic development, etc. It's all about implementing parking strategy, encourage environmentally sensitive parking, provide on-street parking for equitable use. It's not about balancing things. It's about parking. Let's just say it.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve. Wisler seconded. Roll Call on amendment #127. 4:2:1. (Hoffmann and Kappas voted no, Maritano abstained) - Amendment #124 approved.**

Hoffmann: Moving on. Amendment #132.

Piedmont-Smith: Mr. Chair, it's 9:31.

Hoffmann: Thank you. I'll need a motion to suspend the rules so that we can finish the agenda, which is only four more amendments.

****Wisler moved to suspend the rules to continue hearing amendments. Maritano seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0.**

Hoffmann: Okay, rules are suspended. We can proceed with Amendment #132.

Robinson: Amendment #132 looks at page 80. It asks us to only allow the creation of new parking garages and lots in the context of travel demand management system. It proposes new text to provide that new parking garages or lots should only be approved in the context of transportation demand management system while also encouraging more active transportation. I think the concern would be in the context of parking garages and lots in the downtown currently, surface lots are not permitted in the downtown. Parking garages would generally be provided by the city. I'm not aware of any developer proposing to build a parking garage for private use or economic reasons. I think that, looking at the ability of the City to manage or require transportation demand management on the private sector on their parking facilities might be challenging, at least as I interpret the proposed amendment.

No public comment.

Hoffmann: Can I ask a question? Staff's proposal for the downtown starts with the phrase "as an alternative to surface parking lots." But as you said, Scott, we don't presently allow that anyway.

Robinson: That's correct.

Hoffmann: So it's not as an alternative to surface parking lots since we don't allow those already. It's almost superfluous. It's not an alternative to parking surfaces since the surface parking is already not an option. We want multi-story parking garages and, I assume that by active transportation services you mean alternatives like biking, pedestrian, right? What you're saying is that we want multi-story parking garages and active transportation services. We want more of both of those things so that we can have more mixed-use buildings.

Piedmont-Smith: And I'm saying that we don't want multi-story parking lots/garages unless we've exhausted all the other options as far as getting people to use other modes to come downtown.

Hoffmann: I take it you were objecting to the idea of encouraging more multi-story parking garages. We're saying might, but we don't know that until we've tried other things and evaluated demand and all that.

Piedmont-Smith: In general, I think that this plan should embrace transportation demand management and I'm surprised it's not in there. I think that, in principle, the city has done that without maybe using that term. But it's a concept that's been around for decades and has shown to work well as far as mitigating the need to construct more auto lanes. Constructing more is like saying build it and they will come. I think it's a smart strategy and we should acknowledge it. There's at least one other amendment of mine that has TDM in it, so this wouldn't be the only mention of that in the document. I might come up with more mentions of it this summer.

Kinzie said that there are conflicting views expressed in the current bullet point. It's all about preserving and desiring more land to be developed as mixed use and about allowing parking structures and expanding transportation services. I find the current bullet a little bit confusing as to what's the most important aim here. If it is important to do both, to allow more land to be developed as mixed use, then that could be inserted in the front of the new text as proposed.

Hoffmann: Could I make a suggestion? The one concern I have is that we're flipping from encourage them to discourage them. Would it be okay to say, "Use a transportation demand management system to determine the need for any new multi-story parking garage while also encouraging..." continuing exactly the way you had it? To make it a little more neutral but emphasize the transportation demand management system part and leave the question of the multi-story parking garages a little more neutral. Neither pro nor con. Would that be alright?

Piedmont-Smith: Yeah.

Kinzie asked about the loss of the end statement, "allowing for more..." So you would keep that?

Hoffmann: Sorry. We can keep that, or not. It doesn't matter to me either way. Well, it wouldn't fit with the rephrased version. It's a rationale for what the staff proposed. But the staff's version encourages more multi-story parking garages. Isabel's original language discourages it. And I'm trying to come out somewhere in the middle and leave it value-neutral, but say, let's determine it based on the transportation demand management system. I'll say it again: Use a transportation demand management system to determine if there is a need for new multi-story parking garages while also encouraging more active transportation (bicycling and walking). I assume that we will still decide on a case-by-case basis.

Piedmont-Smith: As far as Jillian's (Kinzie) point, I think that the mixed use is encouraged in enough other parts of the document that it wouldn't be lost.

Kinzie: [simultaneous utterance renders speech unintelligible]

Wisler said that there were a couple of concerns. This is another proper noun that is not defined elsewhere in the document. I'm not comfortable with that. I'm not sure what it means in a specific context. What would that mean if someone were proposing a garage? What does it mean to apply a transportation demand management system to it? Another point is that I'm not sure if that first line is completely superfluous because surface parking lots are not allowed as a "use" but doesn't mean that surface parking is banned entirely within the downtown. We could still have surface parking as long as it meets all of the other requirements. You could have spaces behind a building that are surface parking.

Desmond: We are not developing new surface parking lots as an independent use.

Wisler: Right, you can't have a lot as a use. But you can certainly still have surface parking. It just can't be the primary use of the development.

Hoffman: Taking out the word "lots" would solve that problem, as an alternative to surface parking.

Desmond said that to answer the first part of Wisler's questions, about defining TDM. If you look at Amendment #131, which was adopted as part of the Consent Agenda that actually does have some language that was added to the text of the plan that will further define that. You may have to decide whether that's adequate enough for you. That was the explanation that we added.

Cibor: The challenge of using a transportation demand management system to determine if a parking garage is needed is... not providing a parking garage is a form of transportation demand management so I don't think that can be used as a way to evaluate it. The best way to manage that would be to

Hoffmann: So you are saying is that what you really do is that you use transportation demand management as an alternative to building a parking garage. What you are really saying is to consider whether demand can be managed as opposed to building a parking garage. This is beginning to sound like it will not be resolved tonight. I'm willing to try it but I don't want to take it away from you, Isabel.

Piedmont-Smith: I'll do it. I'll rework this one, after talking to Andrew about it.

****Cibor moved to deny Amendment #132 knowing that it will come back after revision.
Kappas seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #132 denied.**

Robinson: Amendment #133 looks at page 83. It deals with the Urban Village Center concept and building heights. There are concerns about whether these heights are appropriate to adjacent residential areas. It provides new language to the step down to the surrounding residential land uses, not to overshadow those areas. Generally, I think that with the intent behind these neighborhood centers, since most of these places are 2 to 3 stories, which probably wouldn't be overshadowing since many residential houses are two stories. So stepping down is not that much. Again, this amendment looks at providing additional language. I think that the direction we are looking at, especially given the context of the downtown and heights in the downtown, where will Bloomington grow? If we continue to talk about growth and infill, recognizing that there is not much vacant land, height is the direction in which to grow. 2 to 3 stories might be appropriate in these locations. I'm not sure stepping down would achieve much, but that is staff's position. We are trying to find those appropriate areas to allow for height to see where we can grow.

No public comment.

Piedmont-Smith: I would be willing to pull this. The more I think about it, the more it seems like a UDO issue rather than a Comp Plan issue.

****Piedmont-Smith withdraws Amendment #133 with no objection from the Plan Commission.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #137.

Robinson: Amendment #137 is on page 85, looking at the regional activity center. There are only a few of them identified in the land use map. This is a very minor change in text, using the concepts of “maintain,” “enhance” and “transform.” It suggests replacing “enhance” development theme to the “transform.” Staff’s opinion is that using “enhance” is relevant to these areas’ ability to redevelop. For example, are the changes at College Mall enhancements or transformations? The relevance of the difference is that a transformation would be to greatly change the guidance of the decisions affecting existing areas.

Hoffmann asked what the significance of changing the term would be.

Robinson said that “transform” suggests drastically changing an existing contexts. Some people have envisioned some of these regional activity centers to become a mini downtown for lack of a better room. Enhancement could be seen as diversification

Hoffmann: I’m asking if this is a purely semantic issue or if it really matters which one we call it.

Robinson: It’s semantic in that it could have an impact on your policy guidance on maintain, enhance, and transform. This is taking the regional activity centers and saying, “we were proposing that it would use the enhance development theme, It’s being proposed to be more aggressive, saying they should maybe be more aggressive and saying they should transform. I guess that’s essentially what’s being proposed.

Maritano: Looking at the hospital area, you would be “transforming” that as opposed to “enhancing” what is already there. Is that the kind of thinking behind that terminology?

Robinson: Yes, the terminology is defined in the Land Use chapter.

Maritano: It seems like they’re asking that in the language now, getting out of the “enhance” “transform,” mixed uses is not a significant change and they’re saying, we propose that it is a significant change and they’d like that not to be struck.

Piedmont-Smith: That “they” is me.

Maritano: That seems very significant.

Piedmont-Smith: Yea, I think it’s significant. It’s aspiration. Yea, I agree that it would be difficult to change College Mall into an actual mixed-use area. But I think it would be great if we could and if could make some small steps and eventually have it more mixed use than it is now, it would be a good thing, it’s a transformational thing.

Wisler: I would hate to see something like that be shut down on the grounds that it’s too radical according to our guiding documents, only when it’s to enhance that area instead of transform it. I like it

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve. Wisler seconded. Voice vote passed 7:0 - #137 adopted.**

Hoffmann: Amendment #139.

Robinson: Amendment #139 is on page 89. This looks to clarify some of the guidelines to be considered in the focus areas. There are several proposed changes. Generally, staff is fine with these changes. The idea is for the Plan Commissioners to discuss what is necessary to provide this additional guidance.

Hoffmann: So staff is more or less okay with these?

Robinson: Yes.

Hoffmann: I noticed that this adds at least a sentence of definition of form-based code. That's a good thing.

No public comment.

****Piedmont-Smith moved to approve Amendment #139. Kinzie seconded.**

Hoffmann: This seems to me to be good language.

Voice vote passed 7:0 – Amendment #139 adopted.

Meeting adjourned.