In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, August 9, 2017 at 6:30pm with Council President Susan Sandberg presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
August 9, 2017

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

ROLL CALL
[6:30pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[6:31pm]

Councilmember Dorothy Granger moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of June 28, 2017. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Councilmember Steve Volan moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of July 28, 2017. The motion was approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
[6:33 pm]
June 28, 2017 (Regular Session)
July 28, 2017 (Special Session)

Granger reminded people about the upcoming Hoosier to Hoosier resale event.

Councilmember Dave Rollo announced that Geoff Wilson from the Ploughshares Fund would be speaking at Universalist Church about nuclear policies and advocacy in October.

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith reminded folks that it was the three-year anniversary of the shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri.

Volan spoke about his college visits with his nephew and how West Lafayette was converting all of its one-way streets to two-way streets. He suggested that it was time for Bloomington to do the same.

Sandberg announced that the last Public Safety Local Income Tax Committee (PS-LIT) meeting would be held on August 10, 2017, and spoke about its importance. She also announced an upcoming concert that her band was hosting with guest stars Councilmember Ruff and his talented son Hank.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:34pm]

Adam Wason, Public Works Director, gave the Council an update on the new sanitation fees and schedule. He gave an overview of the changes.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [6:44pm]

Volan asked if there were any numbers for the recycle bin size.
Wason said that more people chose the smaller carts for the solid waste carts, but he did not have the same information for the recycling bins.

Piedmont-Smith asked about placement of the bins.
Wason said that they would have to work with households that had limited placement options.
Piedmont-Smith asked about large cardboard boxes that would not fit into recycling bins.
Wason said that people would have to break them down to fit them into their carts.

Councilmember Andy Ruff asked for clarification about weight limits.

Wason said that as long as it fit into the bin, and the bin could shut, there was no weight limit.

Rollo asked if smoke detectors were considered hazardous waste.

Volan said that the solid waste district had a list of items that were hazardous.

There was no public comment.

- PUBLIC

There were no appointments to boards or commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 17-34 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. City Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [6:58pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 17-34 be adopted.

Resolution 17-34 -- To Approve a Guaranteed Savings Contract - Re: Installation of Solar Panels by Energy Systems Group, LLC

Jacqui Bauer, Sustainability Coordinator, Economic and Sustainable Development, introduced the legislation. She explained that the City was specifically interested in beating the deadlines set by the state legislature in Senate Bill 309 in order to maximize the financial benefits of solar panels. She said that the administration wanted to increase the City's solar capacity to five total megawatts in city facilities by the end of the year. She said that the legislation that evening would allow the contracts to be signed so the work could start on installing solar panels on all of the City facilities by the end of the year.

Council Questions:

Volan asked if there was a plan for storage of energy, such as batteries.

Bauer said that it was something they were looking into for the future, but their current focus was on getting the systems up and running.

Volan asked if the contract rates would apply for city installations completed after December.

Bauer clarified that the project implementation for the solar piece would be completed by December, and that the other dates noted in the presentation referred to the larger energy savings contract.

Volan asked for more information on the required timeline for paperwork.

Bauer said that residents had a deadline of September 15, 2017 to get signed up so that the City could make sure all of their paperwork could be processed with Duke Energy. She noted that the Solarize Residential component was available to all of the surrounding counties as well as Monroe.

Volan asked if there was a limit to the number of installations the City could do.

Bauer said no, but it was possible the availability of panels could be a problem.

Volan asked how long the information sessions for Solarize Bloomington were and for confirmation of the upcoming session dates and times.

Bauer answered that they were an hour long and noted the dates and times.

Resolution 17-34 [*cont'd*]

Rollo asked how long the estimated payback time would be from the City's net metering program.

Bauer said that they were still working on the numbers, but estimated about 20 years.

Rollo asked if the City had explored the idea of owning its own utilities as other municipalities had done.

Bauer said that it had not been explored in great detail and that it was a very difficult process.

Piedmont-Smith asked for a review of the financing for the project.

Jeff Underwood, City Controller, explained that the City would enter into a financing agreement with Energy Savings Group (ESG) that would have ESG pay the upfront costs, and the City pay them back through a variety of financing tools over 20 years. He said that every energy project would have a measure to make sure that the savings equaled the payback.

Piedmont-Smith asked if what the City paid ESG back over time could exceed what the City gained in energy savings.

Underwood said that what ESG guaranteed was a minimum savings amount that would then go to pay the debt service. If the savings amount did not reach the minimum promised by ESG, the City would not owe the shortfall.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that, at minimum, the City would break even on the deal, and asked if ESG had something in the contract to benefit its own financial interests.

Underwood said that ESG did and agreed that it was built into the financial agreements.

Granger asked if this was similar to what Monroe County did in the previous year and if it was with the same company.

Underwood said that it was the same type of agreement but a different company.

Public Comment:

Jean Capler asked the Council or staff to comment on the life expectancy and maintenance costs of the solar panels.

Underwood said the panels had a 25-year warranty that included maintenance.

Council Comment:

Councilmember Allison Chopra said she thought it was a great program and thanked staff for their hard work.

Granger thanked Bauer for spearheading the project.

Volan said that it was a good time for the City to go solar and that he liked the idea of a City-owned utility.

Rollo said that it was a wonderful program with great potential.

Vote on Resolution 17-34 [7:23pm]

The motion to adopt Resolution 17-34 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 17-28 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 17-28 -- To Adopt the City's Comprehensive Plan

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 17-28 be adopted.

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, introduced the Comprehensive Plan. He said the Council could adopt, reject, or amend the plan. Staff recommended approval of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the discussion for that evening was for the scheduling of the review of the plan.

Sherman explained that there were three proposed tracks[1] that were presented to the Council for their consideration of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Chopra moved and it was seconded to adopt the schedule referred to as Track Three for review of the Comprehensive Plan.

The motion to adopt the schedule referred to as Track Three for review of the Comprehensive Plan received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Resolution 17-28 [7:41pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-23 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 3 - 3 – 3, the Do Pass recommendation of 9 - 0 – 0 on Amendment 01, and noting the Motion to Postpone to August 9th Regular Session was adopted 7 - 0 – 0.

Ordinance 17-23 – To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Vehicles and Traffic" - Re: Adding Active Transportation Facility Definitions; Amending Bicycle Operation Parameters; Deleting Prohibitic of Coasters, Skateboards and Roller Skates on Streets and Replacing It with Regulation of Coasters; Deleting Bicycle License Requirements, Bicycle License Issuance, Bicycle License Records, and Prohibition of License Decal Removal; Amending Bicycle Rentals; Deleting Bicycle Paths Established and Replacing It with Bicycle Lanes Established; Deleting Right-of-Way of Bicycle Riders on Bicycle Lanes and Replacing It with Use of Bicycle Lanes; Adding Penalties for Violations to Bicycle Parking; Amending Violation and Penalties for Bicycles, Skateboards and Other Foot-Propelled Vehicles from a Class E to a Class G Violation; Adding a Vulnerable Road Users Section and Opening Vehicle Doors Section to the Miscellaneous Traffic Rules; Amending the Class C, D, and G Traffic Violation Sections; and, Deleting the Class E and F Traffic Violation Sections.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-23 be adopted.

Andrew Cibor, Transportation and Traffic Engineer, gave a review of the history of the ordinance, and how it came to the Council that evening.

Neil Kopper, Project Engineer, went through some of the definitions in the ordinance, as well as some of the language in potential amendments. He also presented information on other cities that were similar to Bloomington for comparison.

Beth Rosenbarger, Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator, discussed issues of transportation and equity, specifically as it related to cycling on sidewalks.

[1] Attached

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

Council Questions:

Rollo asked if staff had considered limiting which sidewalks bicycles could be ridden on rather than issuing a blanket allowance.

Rosenbarger said that legally there could be some changes to limit riding to multi-use paths only. However, she said that it would be difficult for the average citizen to know which paths to use.

Rollo said that signage would be appropriate.

Rosenbarger said that it came down to behavior rather than location.

Rollo asked about an article he read that suggested cyclists were invisible to motorists when they were on the sidewalk.

Cibor said that generally staff would support having other facilities for bike riding. He said that it would be possible to limit the areas where people could bike on sidewalks and that it would entail a lot of signs and markings. He said that the study suggesting cyclists became invisible to motorists was important to be aware of, and that it might also apply to multi-use paths. He noted that other portions of the code addressed the dangers of approaching driveways and intersections.

Kopper added that people already rode on sidewalks, so the hope was to teach appropriate behavior for cyclists.

Volan asked if it was incumbent upon the cyclists to observe traffic in driveways and alleys.

Staff confirmed that it was.

Ruff asked staff if the same concerns for on-road cycling existed with alleyways and intersections.

Cibor agreed that there were similarities between multi-use paths and sidewalks.

Ruff asked if the proposed restrictions for Bloomington would be as stringent as, or more so than, any other community.

Kopper said that Bloomington would include every provision that had been seen in other communities.

Chopra asked what the current comprehensive plan said regarding cycling and healthy habits for the community.

Rosenbarger said that the Growth Policies Plan had some generalities about health and promoted multi-modal transportation.

Rollo asked what the minimum width was for each type of path or sidewalk.

Kopper said that there were some three or four-foot-wide sidewalks, but most were five or six-feet-wide at minimum. The minimum multi-use path width was eight-feet-wide, which was also true for trails.

Rollo asked if the requirement to dismount or exit the facility when passing a pedestrian allowed cyclists to ride in the grass.

Kopper said that he was not aware of anything that prohibited it.

Volan asked for a more detailed explanation of a presentation slide titled "Pedestrians and Bicyclists on the B-Line, April 2017," which Rosenbarger then provided.

Chopra asked if there was anyone from the City Legal Department who could explain per se negligence.

Barbara McKinney, Human Rights Director/Attorney, explained that if someone violated a rule and caused an injury, the fact that the person violated the rule would contribute to that person being fined or arrested.

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

Ruff asked if people could use the right-of-way or grassy areas when passing on bicycles, just as they do when walking.

Kopper said that he was not aware of anything that prohibited it.

Rollo asked why the City did not limit riding on sidewalks to places that lacked biking facilities, and prohibit it on other sidewalks.

Rosenbarger said that the intent of the proposal was to decriminalize rational and safe behavior. She said that it was not intended to make up for the lack of bicycle facilities but was meant to allow someone who was riding safely to avoid getting ticketed. She said that they did not want to encourage riding on sidewalks, but they recognized that not all riders felt safe on the streets.

Rollo asked how many tickets were issued for that type of behavior.

Rosenbarger did not know, but suggested that leaving the law on the books to be arbitrarily enforced was not good policy.

Volan asked if there was a plan and budget for signage.

Cibor said that if the ordinance passed with some of the proposed amendments, there was funding for ramp decals, but he did not have detailed information.

Piedmont-Smith asked what educational and outreach plans were in place.

Rosenbarger said they planned to use the website, video links, press releases, and bicycle maps. She said the city also worked with IU to make certain that the information was also shared on IU's websites and events. She mentioned bike month, social groups, and other outreach events.

Cibor added that staff would be able to reach out to schools and share information that way as well.

Rollo asked what staff would be needed for enforcement.

Rosenbarger said that there was a grant for targeted enforcement through the fall.

Kopper noted that the legislation would allow police to only focus on behaviors that were problematic.

Rosenbarger added that people would only get ticketed when the violation was directly observed by an officer.

Public Comment:

Jean Capler thanked the Council for its consideration of the ordinance and spoke in favor of being able to ride on sidewalks.

Carol Wise spoke in opposition to allowing bicycles on sidewalks.

Anne Bono, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce Director of Advocacy and Public Policy, spoke in opposition to the ordinance.

David Sabbagh spoke in opposition to allowing bicycles on sidewalks.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 17 3

Granger moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 17-23.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Granger and would replace the word "dog" with the words "service animal" as it appears in BMC 15.56.025 regarding "Regulation of Coasters." This change would be consistent with the use of the term "service animal" as it appears elsewhere in the code (see BMC 15.56.020 - Operating Bicycles).

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 17-23 [8:47pm]

Chopra moved and it was seconded that Amendment 02 to Ordinance 17-23 be introduced.

Amendment 02 to Ordinance 17-23

Amendment 02 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Chopra with Councilmember Granger as co-sponsor. It would prohibit operating a bicycle (and, in other words, require the dismounting of a bicycle) on sidewalks along Kirkwood Avenue from Sample Gates to and including the Courthouse Square. In addition, this amendment states that signage shall be in place before enforcement of this requirement and that it be in the form of markings on the sidewalk (rather than sign placed on a pole).

Chopra explained why the amendment required markings on the pavement for dismount zones. She also explained that the areas in the amendment were very heavily traveled by pedestrians.

Granger added that it was not safe to have bicycle traffic on sidewalks in the downtown area. She said that she was open to expanding the streets as suggested in Amendment 04.

Council Questions:

Volan asked what staff thought of the amendment.

Rosenbarger said that they thought it was reasonable, but were apprehensive about codifying sidewalk marking requirements.

Volan asked the sponsors how they felt about loosening the marking requirements.

Chopra said that she did not want to see more vertical signs in the downtown area.

Sandberg asked if there were other areas in the city that might need dismount zones.

Chopra said that most of the other areas did not have the same level of congestion.

Sandberg said that she would be interested in expanding the dismount zone to include the entire downtown area.

Chopra said that the purpose of the amendment was to address areas of crowding, such as theater exits, not general safety issues, which could occur anywhere.

Council Comment:

Rollo said that he supported the amendment.

Ruff said that he was sensitive to staff's reservations, but he supported the amendment.

Granger moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 02 to Ordinance 17-23 by adding additional streets.

Cibor commented that there were some other differences in the amendment from the proposed Amendment 04 that he did not want the Council to miss in their deliberations.

Piedmont-Smith said that she thought the signage rule was micromanaging, and she could understand a situation where sidewalk markings were not feasible, and did not want staff to have to come back to Council for permission to change it in that case. She said that since the dismount zone was the same as Amendment 04, she would vote against Amendment 02.

Volan clarified a point about signage, and indicated that he was not inclined to support the amendment because of its similarity to Amendment 04.

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

The motion to adopt the amendment to Amendment 02 to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1(Chopra).

Vote to adopt the amendment to Amendment 02 to Ordinance 17-23 [9:05pm]

Volan asked Ruff to comment on the amendment and how it dovetailed with Amendment 04.

Ruff said that it had the same streets listed as a dismount zone, but did not require pavement marking only.

Volan clarified that signage was not required in his amendment.

Ruff agreed.

Sandberg asked if Ruff would be willing to add a friendly amendment to address signage.

Ruff said that if someone wanted to come up with something he would add it to the amendment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 02 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 4, Nays: 3(Sandberg, Volan, Piedmont-Smith), Abstain: 0. FAILED

Vote to adopt Amendment 02 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 [9:05pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Amendment 03 to Ordinance 17-23 be introduced.

Amendment 03 to Ordinance 17-23

Amendment 03 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Rollo and would make it illegal for a person over the age of 13 to operate a bicycle on a sidewalk.

Rollo explained that the provision was meant to replace a past provision based on wheel size with a provision based on age.

Chopra asked if the amendment meant that all of the other restrictions passed that evening would only apply to children riding on sidewalks.

Council Questions:

Rollo said yes, he thought it was a reasonable safety precaution.

Chopra asked if there was any other provision in the city code targeted at people under the age of 14.

Rollo said yes, they were required to wear bicycle helmets.

Piedmont-Smith spoke about the difficulty of the issue, and said that she thought the upcoming Amendment 04 would be sufficient to allay concerns about biking on sidewalks. She said she was not in favor of Amendment 03 because limiting restrictions to children only was not sufficient.

Council Comment:

Chopra said that she was not in favor of the amendment.

Ruff said that he opposed the amendment because it nullified most of the goals of the overall policy change. He added that there was not any evidence that allowing cyclists on sidewalks created a hazard to pedestrians.

Volan said that he was not in favor of the amendment.

Rollo noted that adopting the ordinance as a whole would mean that it applied to all ages, including those under age 13. He also pointed to a study that provided evidence of hazards to cycling on sidewalks.

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

Granger said that she supported the amendment.

Ruff said that his comments were about the safety of pedestrians, not about the cyclists, and the logic of the amendment was flawed. Sandberg said that she understood the intent of the amendment, but thought Amendment 04 could address the same issues in a better manner.

Chopra said that new, progressive policies were scary, and the Council needed to avoid decisions based on anecdotes based in fear.

Volan agreed with Chopra that the Council should not legislate based on fear. He said that he supported the ordinance overall but not the amendment.

Rollo said that a truly progressive policy would be implementing adequate infrastructure rather than offering a poor conflict of cyclists versus pedestrians.

Sandberg said that based on constituent feedback she would not support this amendment, but would support Amendment 04 if it were adjusted.

Vote to adopt Amendment 03 to Ordinance 17-23 [9:43pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 03 to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 2(Granger, Rollo), Nays: 5, Abstain: 0. FAILED

Amendment 04 to Ordinance 17-23

Councilmember Andy Ruff moved and it was seconded that Amendment 04 to Ordinance 17-23 be introduced.

Amendment 04 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cms. Ruff and Piedmont-Smith and has been prepared in concert with the Planning and Transportation staff. It rewrites BMC 15.56.020 ("Operating bicycles") in order to address concerns about allowing the operation of bicycles on sidewalks. In brief, the changes clarify when and how a person operating a bicycle may pass (as opposed to dismounting and walking past) a pedestrian and also identify areas in the downtown where persons must dismount and walk their bicycle.

Ruff explained the amendment and thanked staff for the work that they put into developing the amendment.

Council Questions:

Volan asked for a summary of what the amendment changed in the proposed ordinance.

Kopper said that most of it put the emphasis on giving pedestrians right of way, adding a dismount zone, and prohibiting passing within three feet. He added that there were also some small language changes.

Volan asked for clarification of when cyclists had to dismount.

Kopper said that it was when pedestrians were present and within three feet or if it was in the downtown area.

Rollo asked who would be enforcing the provisions and how many personnel it would take.

Ruff said that the provisions would decrease the enforcement burden and would allow officers to target undesirable behavior.

Rollo clarified that the amendment offered seven specific provisions that were more difficult to enforce than merely riding on the sidewalk.

Ruff said that it was not simpler, but that it decreased the overall scope.

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked how likely it was to be enforced.
Ruff said that officers would have the opportunity to issue tickets just as they could for moving violations.

Chopra added that it would add enforcement opportunity and would provide a legal avenue for pedestrians to sue cyclists who might hit them in violation of the city code.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 04 to Ordinance 17-23 by including additional streets where bicycles would not be allowed on sidewalks. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Granger moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 04 to Ordinance 17-23 by changing the signage requirements. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Council Comment:

Rollo said that he supported the amendment but expressed concerns about enforcement.

Volan said that he supported the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith thanked Ruff and the staff for their work on the amendment. She said that the amendment put the onus on cyclists to act responsibly on sidewalks. She said she thought enforcement would be a problem.

Sandberg said that the issue was something that could be taken to constituents with some responsibility on the cyclist and that she supported the amendment.

Vote to adopt Amendment 04 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 [10:04pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 04 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Amendment 05 to Ordinance 17-23

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Amendment 05 to Ordinance 17-23 be introduced.

Amendment 05 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith. It adds a new part to Section 3 (regarding BMC 15.56.020 ("Operating bicycles") that would, in most circumstances, prohibit anyone over the age of 15 from operating a bicycle on a sidewalk where a bicycle lane is available. The term "available" includes a bicycle lane that is unobstructed, serves the same direction of travel as the cyclists, and is located within the same right-of-way as the sidewalk.

Council Questions:

Volan asked for the opinion of staff.
Rosenbarger expressed concerns about diverse users in the community and different comfort levels.
Kopper added that the amendment was not clear on what was meant by right-of-way.
Piedmont-Smith offered to amend the language to clarify the right-of-way. She also said that she wanted to encourage more usage of bike lanes.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 05 to Ordinance 17-23. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Council Comment:

Ruff said that he did not support the amendment.

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

Rollo asked staff if there were counts of use of trails and paths for bicycle use.

Rosenbarger said they could do some on the streets and they had some installed around the city. She said that temporary counters for bicycles were possible, but pedestrians had to be counted manually.

Rollo said that he supported the amendment because he preferred that people use the bike lanes.

Chopra said that she did not support the amendment because it changed the purpose of the ordinance as a whole. She also noted that the amendment did not specify a penalty for violation.

Piedmont-Smith said that the penalty was listed in section three of the ordinance.

Volan said that he did not support the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 05 to Ordinance 17-23 by changing right-of-way to block. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Sandberg said that she supported the amendment because it encouraged bike lane use.

Vote to adopt Amendment 05 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 [10:23pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 05 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 4, Nays: 3 (Ruff, Chopra, Volan), Abstain: 0. FAILED

Amendment 06 to Ordinance 17-23

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded that Amendment 06 to Ordinance 17-23 be introduced.

Amendment 06 Synopsis: This amendment rewrites BMC 15.56.025 ("Regulation of Coasters") in order to address concerns about allowing the operation of coasters on sidewalks. In brief, the changes clarify when and how a person operating a coaster may pass (as opposed to dismounting and walking past) a pedestrian and also identify areas in the downtown where persons must dismount and walk their coaster.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 06 to Ordinance 17-23 by adding additional streets where coasters would not be allowed on sidewalks, to match the language in Amendment 04. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Piedmont-Smith asked if signage for dismount zones could include coasters.

Cibor said yes.

Granger moved and it was seconded to amend Amendment 06 to Ordinance 17-23 by changing the signage requirements. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Volan asked for the opinion of staff on Amendment 06.

Kopper said that staff was supportive.

Vote to adopt Amendment 06 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 [10:31pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 06 as amended to Ordinance 17-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Council Comment:

Granger said that she voted on the amendments to make the legislation more palatable but she did not support the final product.

Volan said that it was a difficult decision but that he was going to vote yes.

Ordinance 17-23 (*cont'd*)

Chopra said that she was going to vote yes because the ordinance made cycling more accessible. She also thanked staff.

Ruff thanked staff for their work and said that he supported the ordinance.

Rollo explained why he would be voting no on the ordinance.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 17-23 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 2 (Granger, Rollo), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 17-23 as amended [10:50pm]

Chopra invoked the 10:30pm rule of the Council.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-24 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 3 (Granger, Sandberg, Volan), Nays: 4, Abstain: 0. FAILED

Ordinance 17-24 – To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code (BMC) Entitles "Vehicles and Traffic" - Re: Deleting BMC Chapter 15.36 (Resident-Only Parking Permits)

There was no legislation for first reading.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING

Jim Blickensdorf, Bloomington Parking Commission, spoke about Ordinance 17-23.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sherman reminded the Council that budget hearings were scheduled for the following week starting at 6pm.

Volan asked if the Council could schedule the hearings for the same starting time as regular meetings in the future.

Sherman agreed to look into it for the following year.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:55pm]

Granger clarified that the PS-LIT meeting the following night was at 6:30pm not 7:00pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58pm.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 1st day of September, 2017.

APPROVE:

Susan Sandberg, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington

Alternatives to Consideration of the Comprehensive Plan – Modified Track 1 (~ Weekly) and Modified Track 2 (~Every Other Week)			
Day/Date	Modified Track One – ~ Weekly Meetings (along with Deadlines for Submitting Amendments and Distribution of Amendment Packets)	Modified Track Two – ~Every Other Week Meetings (along with Deadlines for Submitting Amendments and Distribution of Amendment Packets)	Track Three – Isabel's Proposal
Note: Meetings are Highlighted in Yellow			
August			
Fifth Week			
Tuesday, August 29th	Presentation Hearing[1] on Chapter 4: Downtown	Presentation Hearing on Chapter 4: Downtown	Presentation Hearing on Chapter 4: Downtown
September			
First Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Regular Session			
Tuesday, September 5th	*(Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on Chapter: 6: Transportation and Chapter 7: Land Use		Deadline for amendments to Ch. 4
Friday, September 8th	Deadline for Amendments – Re: Chapters 4, 6 & 7		
Second Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Committee of the Whole			
Tuesday, September 12th	*(Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on	*(Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on	Consideration of amendments to Ch. 4 Presentation Hearing on Ch. 6 and Ch. 7

[1] Presentation Hearing includes: presentation by staff; questions by Council members; comment by the Public; comment by Council (after possible additional questions by Council); and any formal motions by the Council followed by a Motion to Recess until the next meeting. No formal motions on amendments are expected at these hearings.

	Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods	Chapter: 6: Transportation and Chapter 7: Land Use	
Thursday, September 14th		Deadline for Amendments – Re: Chapters 4, 6 & 7	
Third Week – Other Scheduled Meetings: Regular Session (on Tuesday)			
Monday, September 18th	*Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on Chapter 3: Environment		
Tuesday, September 19th			Deadline for amendments to Ch. 6 and 7
Friday, September 21st	Deadline for Amendments – Re: Chapters 3 & 5		
Fourth Week – Other Scheduled Meetings: Budget Special Session and Committee of the Whole			
Monday, September 25th		*(Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods	Consideration of amendments to Ch. 6 & 7 Presentation hearing on Ch. 5
Friday, September 29th	Distribution of Amendment Packet #1 covering Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7		

October			
First Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Committee of the Whole			
Tuesday, October 4th	*Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on the remaining parts of the Plan: Introduction and Executive Summary; Community Profile; Chapter 1 Community Services & Economy; Chapter 2: Culture & Identity; and Appendix *This will be followed by general comments regarding the Plan and then a Motion to Schedule Consideration of Contents in Amendment Packet #1.*		Deadline for amendments to Ch. 5
Friday, October 7th	Deadline for Amendments – Re: Introduction and Executive Summary; Community Profile; Chapter 1; Chapter 2; and Appendix		
Second Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Special Session (Budget)			
Tuesday, October 10th			Consideration of amendments to Ch. 5 Presentation hearing on Ch. 3
Friday, October 13th	Distribution of Amendment Packet #2 covering Introduction and Executive Summary; Community		

	Profile; Chapter 1; Chapter 2; and Appendix		
Third Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Regular Session			
	Further Meetings and Deadlines will be subject to additional motions by the Council.		
Tuesday, October 17th		*(Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on Chapter 3: Environment	Deadline for amendments to Ch. 3
Thursday, October 19th		Deadline for Submission of Amendments on Chapters 3 & 5	
Fourth Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Committee of the Whole			
Tuesday, October 24th			Consideration of amendments to Ch. 3 Presentation hearing on Executive Summary, Community Profile, Ch. 1&2, Appendix
Thursday, October 26th		Distribution of Amendment Packet #1 covering Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7	
November (and Last Two Work Days in October)			
Fifth Week of October and First Week of November – Other Scheduled Meetings: Regular Session			
Tuesday, October 31st		*(Finish Previous Meeting's Work – if necessary) and hold* Presentation Hearing on the remaining parts of the Plan: Introduction and Executive Summary; Community Profile; Chapter 1	Deadline for amendments to Executive Summary, Community Profile, Ch. 1&2, Appendix

		Community Services & Economy; Chapter 2: Culture & Identity; and Appendix *This will then be followed by general comments regarding the Plan and then a* *Motion to Schedule Consideration of Contents in Amendment Packet #1.*	
Thursday, November 2nd		Deadline for Submission of Amendments on Introduction and Executive Summary; Community Profile; Chapter 1; Chapter 2; and, Appendix	
Second Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Committee of the Whole			
Tuesday, November 7th		*Further Meetings and Deadlines will be subject to additional motions of the Council.*	Consideration of amendments to Executive Summary, Community Profile, Ch. 1&2, Appendix Review of document as a whole
Third Week Other Scheduled Meetings: Regular Session			
Thursday, November 9th			Final document issued on city website (staff will only have to add amendments passed Nov. 7th)
Wednesday, November 14th			Final vote at regular session.
Fourth Week No Meetings - Thanksgiving			
Fifth Week Other Scheduled Meetings – Committee of the Whole			
December			