City of Bloomington Common Council

Legislative Packet

Wednesday, 20 December 2017

Regular Session

For legislation and background material regarding Ordinance 17-45, please consult the 13 December 2017 Legislative Packet.

All other materials and legislation contained herein.

Office of the Common Council
P.O. Box 100
401 North Morton Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47402
812.349.3409
council@bloomington.in.gov
http://www.bloomington.in.gov/council

City of Bloomington Indiana

City Hall
401 N. Morton St.
Post Office Box 100
Bloomington, Indiana 47402

Office of the Common Council
(812) 349-3409
Fax: (812) 349-3570
email: council@bloomington.in.gov

To: **Council Members**
From: **Council Office**
Re: **Weekly Packet Memo**
Date: **December 15, 2017**

Packet Related Material

Memo
Agenda
Calendar
Notices and Agendas:
None

Legislation for Second Readings *(with legislation, materials, and summary to be found in the Weekly Council Legislative Packet issued for the Special Session on December 13, 2017):*

- Ord 17-45 To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Amending Chapter 20.03 "Overlay Districts" to Provide Clear Guidance on Downtown Overlay Development and Architectural Standards
    - *(Possible)* Am 01 (Cm. Sturbaum, Sponsor) - *Forthcoming*

Contact: Terri Porter at 812-349-3549, porteti@bloomington.in.gov

Legislation for First Reading:
None

Minutes

- September 25, 2017 (Meeting of the Special Session for Review of the Comprehensive Plan)
- December 06, 2017 (Regular Session)
- December 13, 2017 (Special Session)

Memo

Internal Work Session on Monday, Last Meeting of the Year on Wednesday (with One Ordinance – Three Sets of Minutes – Scheduling Matters), and Winter Recess

There is an Internal Work Session on Monday and our last Regular Session (and meeting) of the year on Wednesday. Cm. Volan has expressed interest in proposing a Land Use Committee early next year and would like to use the Internal Work Session on Monday to discuss it with Council members who can attend. There are three sets of minutes ready for approval and one ordinance ready for Second Reading on Wednesday. Please know that Cm. Sturbaum may be introducing an amendment to the changes regarding Plan Commission findings when waiving the development and architectural standards for projects within the six Downtown Overlay districts.

The Council will then enter the Winter Recess and return after the New Year for an Internal Work Session on Friday, January 5th and an Organizational Meeting on Wednesday, January 10th.

Changes to Schedule for Consideration of the Comprehensive Plan in January

In all likelihood, the Council will want to revisit the Schedule for Consideration of the Comprehensive Plan at the Regular Session next week before entering into the Winter Recess. Here is a table of what the current schedule calls for and what the Council may want to change. Please pay attention to the last column and think about changes you would want to make (and whether the possible changes conform to your wishes):

Date	Meeting/Deadline/Action	
	Current	Possible Change
Friday, December 15th	Release of updated Comprehensive Plan and amendments adopted as of December 5th	No Change
Tuesday, January 2nd at Noon	Submittal of third-round amendments by Council sponsors	Tuesday, January 9th at noon

Wednesday, January 10th	Reintroduction of resolution under new number (Res 18-01); Affirmation of previous actions taken by the Council; consideration of two carry-over amendments; and consideration of third-round amendments	Same - except consideration of third-round amendments would occur on Wednesday, January 17th
Wednesday, January 17th	Additional meeting to complete review of amendments and consider adoption of the Comprehensive Plan	Move these deliberations to a Special Session later in January (perhaps, the fifth Wednesday).

NOTICE AND AGENDA
BLOOMINGTON COMMON COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION
6:30 P.M., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2017
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SHOWERS BUILDING, 401 N. MORTON ST.

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA SUMMATION

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES September 25, 2017 (Special Session)
December 06, 2017 (Regular Session)
December 13, 2017 (Special Session)

IV. REPORTS (A maximum of twenty minutes is set aside for each part of this section.)

1. **Councilmembers**
2. **The Mayor and City Offices**
3. **Council Committees**
4. **Public***

V. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

VI. LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READINGS AND RESOLUTIONS

1. Ordinance 17-45 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Amending Chapter 20.03 "Overlay Districts" to Provide Clear Guidance on Downtown Overlay Development and Architectural Standards

Committee Recommendation 6-0-3

VII. LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING

None

VIII. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT* (A maximum of twenty-five minutes is set aside for this section.)

IX. COUNCIL SCHEDULE

X. ADJOURNMENT

**Members of the public may speak on matters of community concern not listed on the agenda at one of the two Reports from the Public opportunities. Citizens may speak at one of these periods, but not both. Speakers are allowed five minutes; this time allotment may be reduced by the presiding officer if numerous people wish to speak.*

***Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call (812)349-3409 or e-mail council@bloomington.in.gov.*

Posted & Distributed: December 15, 2017

City of Bloomington
Office of the Common Council

To Council Members
From Council Office
Re Weekly Calendar – 18-22 December 2017

Monday, 18 December

12:00 pm Common Council – Internal Work Session, Library
12:00 pm Bloomington Entertainment and Art District, McCloskey
5:00 pm Redevelopment Commission, McCloskey
5:30 pm Bloomington Human Rights Commission, Hooker Conference Room

Tuesday, 19 December

4:00 pm Board of Public Safety, McCloskey
5:30 pm Animal Control Commission, Kelly
5:30 pm Commission on the Status of Children and Youth, Hooker Conference Room
5:30 pm Bloomington Public Transportation Corporation, 130 W. Grimes Ln

Wednesday, 20 December

4:00 pm Board of Housing Quality Appeals, McCloskey
4:30 pm Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Birthday Commission, Kelly
6:30 pm Common Council – Regular Session, Chambers

Thursday, 21 December

8:00 am Bloomington Housing Authority, 1007 N. Summit, Community Room
5:15 pm Solid Waste Management District – Citizen's Advisory Committee, McCloskey
5:30 pm Board of Zoning Appeals, Chambers

Friday, 22 December

There are no meetings scheduled for today.

*Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please contact the applicable board or commission or call (812) 349-3400.

Posted & Distributed: Friday, 15 December 2017

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 06, 2017, at 6:35pm with Council President Susan Sandberg presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
December 06, 2017

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

ROLL CALL
[6:36pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[6:36pm]

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of November 15, 2017. The motion was approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 15, 2017(Regular Session)
[6:38pm]

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:39pm]

Councilmember Dave Rollo spoke about the importance of net neutrality.

Councilmember Jim Sims encouraged citizens to continue to approach him for impromptu discussions and thanked those who had already done so.

Councilmember Steve Volan wished everyone happy holidays.

Sandberg spoke about the importance of the recent Time magazine designation of "The Silence Breakers" as the annual persons of the year.

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

Shelley Sallee, Chair of the Commission on Hispanic and Latino Affairs, presented the commission's annual report to the Council. Sallee asked if there was anything that the Council would like to see more of from the Commission.

Sandberg said that the Council would like to see more opportunities for engagement with the Council, and thanked the Commission for its work.

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, introduced Gerry Salzman of Desman Design Management (DDM). Salzman said that the city started its parking study that day and would be working on it for several months with staff and local partners.

Councilmember Dorothy Granger asked if DDM would use the parking commission report that the Council had recently received.

Salzman said that part of the agreement was to use information provided by staff and the commission report to conduct the study.

Volan asked how the counts of services and parking spaces that were not metered would be conducted.

Robinson said that staff provided neighborhood counts and that parking enforcement was conducting survey information.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum asked about downtown church parking.

Salzman said there was a wide spectrum of solutions, and DDM would be looking into them.

- PUBLIC [7:07pm]

Elizabeth Cox-Ash spoke about the Comprehensive Plan.

Brian Hancock spoke to the Council about the need for students to have more interactions with city government.

For Approval

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:14pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to appoint Julian Carillo to an advisory seat on the Commission on Hispanic and Latino Affairs. The motion was approved by voice vote.

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:15pm]

Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 – To Specially Appropriate from the Police Education Fund, Alternative Transportation Fund, Cumulative Capital Development Fund and Rental Inspection Program Fund Expenditures Not Otherwise Appropriated (Appropriating Various Transfers of Funds within the General Fund, Parks General Fund, Fleet Maintenance Fund, Police Pension Fund, Public Safety LIT; and, Appropriating Additional Funds from the Alternate Transportation Fund, Cumulative Capital Development Fund, Parking Meter Fund, Police Education Fund, Rental Inspection Program Fund)

Volan moved and it was seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 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, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of 8-0-1.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 be adopted.

Jeff Underwood, Controller, presented the legislation to the Council. Underwood explained that there were a number of transfers in the departments to keep the overall impact to the general fund at zero dollars. He gave an overview of the various requests, and explained that the overall total request was $750,800.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment corrects typographical errors in "Whereas" clauses 4-7 by shifting the word "desire" to "desires" and by adding two missing words in "Whereas" clause 8.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 17-06.

Piedmont-Smith explained that the amendment was intended to correct grammatical errors.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 [7:20pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Council Questions:

Rollo asked if there was a timetable for evaluating the fee for the rental inspection fund.

Underwood said the goal was to review all of the fees in 2018 and bring them before the Council all together rather than one at a time.

Rollo asked if Underwood knew the longevity of the radios being purchased with monies from the parking meter fund.

Underwood said that Chief Moore said five years, and that the goal was to standardize the equipment in all of the departments.

Rollo asked if they would be a recurring expense.

Underwood said they would be replaced regularly, and that the city tried to apply for grants to help defray the costs.

Granger asked if there was a list of vehicles that would need to be replaced in the following year.

Underwood said that the next batch of vehicles would be replaced in 2019, not 2018.

Volan asked how long the city expected cars to last and how long the cars being replaced had been in service.

Underwood said cars should last five to seven years, sometimes less because of wear and tear. The cars being replaced had been in service for seven years.

Council Comments:

Piedmont-Smith thanked Underwood for his work and for bringing a visual for the Council.

Vote on Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 as amended[7:25pm]

The motion to adopt Appropriation Ordinance 17-06 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

For Approval

Ordinance 17-42 – To Establish the Common Council Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Program Non-Reverting Fund [7:25pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-42 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 9-0-0.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-42 be adopted.

Underwood presented the legislation to the Council.

Vote on Ordinance 17-42 [7:27pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 17-42 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Ordinance 17-43 – To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" – Re: Amending Chapter 2.26 (Controller's Department) by Inserting Section 2.26.120 (Fire Instruction Fees)

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-43 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 9-0-0.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-43 be adopted.

Jason Moore, Fire Chief, presented the legislation to the Council. Moore explained that the legislation would allow the Fire Department to recoup some of the costs for providing specialized training.

Council Questions:

Volan asked if the fire department was generating any revenue from the special training that it provided.

Moore said it was not.

Volan asked if the fire department was just trying to recover the costs of the training that it had to provide or chose to provide.

Moore said that was correct and that some of the training was required and some was a matter of choice.

Volan asked how large the fire instruction fees portion of the budget would be in three to five years time.

Moore said that he did not know.

Piedmont-Smith asked why the instructor fees were calculated based on overtime rates.

Moore said it was the highest price that he would have to pay to provide instruction, although the goal would always be to avoid doing so when possible.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the department would charge less if there were enough advance notice to schedule staff to do the training as part of their normal work hours.

Moore said that the department would charge less.

Piedmont-Smith asked how the department differentiated everyday training versus specialized training that would generate a charge.

Moore said that if the department had to bring in special instructors or equipment it would qualify as specialized training. He noted that the instructor rates were aimed toward future trainings for city staff to teach classes rather than bringing in outside instructors.

Piedmont-Smith asked how the city would recoup the cost of an outside instructor from partner organizations.

Moore said that it could be charged under a facility-use fee.

For Approval

Ordinance 17-43 [*cont'd*]

Councilmember Allison Chopra asked if there was another department that had fees for training.

Moore referred to his previous community and to Jasper. He said that it was fairly common practice for fire departments who did not want to pass the burden of trainings on to the taxpayers.

Chopra asked what would happen if area fire departments chose to hold their own trainings.

Moore said that the department was building the plan to minimize the cost to the city.

Sims asked if there were certifications involved with the trainings.

Moore said there were both state and national standards for trainings.

Sims asked if there were any other facilities like the city's in the area.

Moore said the city was aiming toward making its training facility a regional training center.

Sims asked if the goal was not to make money but to mitigate costs.

Moore said that was correct.

Sims asked who the anticipated customer base would be for the facility.

Moore said that it would be some of the smaller departments, businesses, and local leaders.

Council Comment:

Volan said he was pleased with the progress of the fire department and hoped the department would develop a fire school.

Granger said it was smart business and was glad to take the burden off of the taxpayers.

Vote on Ordinance 17-43 [7:47pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 17-43 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Sturbaum of the room)

Ordinance 17-34 – To Amend Ordinance 16-25, which Fixed the Salaries of Officers of the Police and Fire Departments for 2017 – Re: Increasing the Salary for Probationary Officers in 2017 to Coincide with the Increase for Firefighters under the Collective Bargaining Agreement

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-34 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 9-0-0.

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

Underwood presented the legislation to the Council.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked why it took until December to fix the problem.

Underwood said that it was discovered earlier in the year, but the decision was made to bring the legislation along with the the other appropriation ordinances.

Piedmont-Smith said the officers had been underpaid.

Underwood said that was correct, but it was a small amount, and they did not notice it.

Vote on Ordinance 17-34 [7:51pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 17-34 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Sturbaum of the room)

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-44 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 9-0-0.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-44 be adopted.

Ordinance 17-44 – To Amend Ordinance 17-37, which Fixed the Salaries of Appointed Officers, Non-Union, and A.F.S.C.M.E Employees for All the Departments of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana for the Year 2018 – Re: Adjusting the Non-Union Salary Ranges Set Forth in Section 2.A. as the Result of Recommendations from a Salary and Benefits Study

Mick Renneisen, Deputy Mayor, presented the legislation to the Council.

Council Questions:

Chopra asked if there were any liability issues with someone making less than the corresponding job grade range.

Renneisen said that someone at the bottom of the pay grade in 2017 they would be moved up to at least the minimum amount of the new pay grade in 2018.

Chopra asked if anyone on staff had checked every salary to ensure that it would not be a problem.

Underwood said that it appeared the two percent raise would take care of almost every city employee. He said if an employee who fell below the minimum of his/her salary range he/she would be given priority in adjusting his/her salary, and the raise would be retroactive.

Chopra asked when the legislation would go into effect.

Underwood said that it would go into effect on January 1, 2018. He said that anyone who fell below the job grade minimum would be made whole within the first quarter of the year and there would be no action to take against the city.

Renneisen said that in practice very few people are at the minimum level of their job grades.

Granger said that she had the same concern and that she would feel better if she knew there was not anyone who would fall below the new job grade minimum.

Renneisen said he did not think anyone would fall below the new minimums. He also said that if there was anyone who fell in that position, the city would make that person its first priority in bringing his/her salary up to the appropriate level.

Volan asked if all salaries would be reviewed and adjusted by the end of the first quarter if necessary.

Underwood said that was correct and that anyone who was below the minimum for their job grade would be brought up to the minimum for their job grade.

Volan asked if the ranges would have a cost of living increase every year.

Underwood said that the ranges would be reviewed on a regular basis, but likely not every year.

Sims asked if the city had enough money to adjust salaries with the money set aside in the 2018 budget.

Renneisen said there was enough to get the salaries up to the minimum, but it would take several years to get all of the salaries up to market rates.

Chopra asked why the city could not wait to proceed until the salaries had been reviewed.

Renneisen said that this legislation was the first step to allow for the salaries to be reviewed.

Pre-Approval

Ordinance 17-44 [*cont'd*]

Chopra asked what the biggest salary jump the city would have to make to correct any issues would be.

Renneisen said that he could not answer the question as posed, but the city was prepared to bring people up to their minimum salary grade.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith said that she was confident in the work of the consultants and staff.

Granger said that she supported raising staff salaries and saw the legislation as a good first step. She was concerned about voting in favor of the legislation because she did not know if anyone fell below the minimum job grades.

Chopra said that she would vote yes because her concerns had been allayed.

Vote on Ordinance 17-44 [8:16pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 17-44 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Granger).

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING

There was no legislation for first reading.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE

Volan moved and it was seconded to hold a Special Session immediately before the Committee of the Whole on Wednesday, December 13, 2017. The motion was approved by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18pm.

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this ____ day of _____, 2017.

APPROVE:

_____

Susan Sandberg, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

_____

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington

For Approval

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 13, 2017, at 6:31pm with Council President Susan Sandberg presiding over a Special Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL SESSION
December 13, 2017

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

ROLL CALL
[6:31pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[6:31pm]

Councilmember Dave Rollo moved and it was seconded to appoint Cynthia Bretheim to the Bloomington Commission on Sustainability. The motion was approved by voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [6:32pm]

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to appoint Amy Oakley to the Commission on Hispanic and Latino Affairs as an advisory member. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Councilmember Steve Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 17-42 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
[6:33pm]

Resolution 17-42 – To Approve an Amendment to the January 1, 2017 Interlocal Cooperation Agreement Between the City of Bloomington and Monroe County for the Operation of the Monroe County Central Emergency Dispatch Center (Extending the Agreement from December 31, 2017 to February 28, 2018)

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 17-42 be adopted.

Michael Rouker, City Attorney, presented the legislation to the Council. Rouker explained that the amended interlocal agreement would extend the termination date of the contract to allow the City and County more time to complete negotiations on a new interlocal agreement.

Piedmont-Smith thanked Rouker and staff for their work on the agreement.

The motion to adopt Resolution 17-42 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Resolution 17-42 [6:36pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 17-45 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.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING

Ordinance 17-45 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Amending Chapter 20.03 "Overlay Districts" to Provide Clear Guidance on Downtown Overlay Development and Architectural Standards

There were no changes to the council schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE

The meeting was adjourned at 6:41pm.

ADJOURNMENT

For Approval

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this ____ day of _____, 2017.

APPROVE:

_____
Susan Sandberg, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

_____
Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington

For Approval

The following minutes are from a
25 September 2017 Special Session
to consider the Comprehensive Plan.

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Tuesday, September 25, 2017 at 6:33pm with Council President Susan Sandberg presiding over a Special Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL SESSION
Tuesday, September 25, 2017

Clerk's Note: On August 29, 2017, the Common Council called to order a Special Session, which began the Council's consideration of Resolution 17-28 to be completed over a series of meetings. Please refer to the minutes from that meeting for a description of the procedure for consideration of the resolution and amendments thereto.

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

Roll Call: Sturbaum (left at 8:58pm), Ruff, Chopra, Granger, Sandberg, Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Sims, Rollo

ROLL CALL

Members Absent: None

Council President Susan Sandberg gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION

Scott Robinson, Planning Services Manager, provided an overview of Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan (Plan). The chapter focused on housing and affordability. He explained the goals of the chapter and highlighted the fifteen respective policies that were embedded in the four overarching goals. He drew attention to the outcomes and indicators section of the chapter, which could be used to measure future success. He asked the Council to clarify how the public would be able to submit amendments.

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods

Councilmember Dave Rollo commented that nationally, Bloomington was seen as affordable even though incomes did not match housing costs, which created an affordability issue. He pointed out that he saw no mention of how to increase incomes in the Plan. He asked the presenters to address this disparity.

Robinson questioned to what extent the Council could mandate incomes, should it be instructed to do so by the Plan.

Rollo said that incomes could be addressed in a later chapter which dealt with economics.

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith referred Rollo to Goal 1.6 in Chapter 1. She said if Rollo wished to enhance the Plan with further discussion on incomes, Goal 1.6 would likely be the best location for those remarks.

Rollo acknowledged that Goal 1.6 would be a good place on which to build.

Councilmember Steve Volan asked Robinson to define AMI.

Robinson responded that it stood for Area Medium Income.

Volan asked if it was for the city or the metropolitan area.

Robinson said that his understanding was that the number was calculated at the county level, but he was not certain.

Volan asked if there would be a conflict of interest in trying to make metropolitan housing more affordable based on an AMI which included those outside of the area in question.

For Approval

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods (*cont'd*)

Robinson stated that Volan was reading too much into the terminology. He said while defining affordable housing was difficult AMI was a barometer to help measure success depending on which target area was set by the Council.

Volan said he did not intend to belabor the point but expressed concerns with AMI measurements considering that the student population of Bloomington did not report income.

Robinson understood Volan's concern about skewed data.

Volan asked if a true Bloomington AMI had ever been calculated.

Robinson did not believe the Plan was the appropriate place to outline how to find the correct AMI.

Volan agreed and said he just wanted to call attention to the issue.

Councilmember Allison Chopra voiced her approval of the emphasis on affordable housing in the Plan. She asked if the Plan included any guidelines on upkeep and repair of buildings.

Robinson referred her to some of the action items enumerated in the program section.

Chopra stated she did not see her concerns addressed in the document.

Robinson said that the programs and goals did not have a one to one relationship, so there might not be a goal addressing Chopra's concerns. He pointed out that licensing and inspections were currently conducted by the city.

Piedmont-Smith noted that enforcement of the city's ordinances related to weeds and trash were often in response to a complaint.

Chopra expressed concerns about passing the Plan in 2017 using census data from 2010. She wondered if more current data could be used.

Robinson responded that the data were intended to be used as a benchmark only.

Chopra asked if more current data could be obtained. She said that the housing market was vastly different in 2017.

Robinson stated that the data used were from the most up to date census.

Chopra asked if the same data could be provided by the local board of realtors.

Robinson clarified that some of the information in the document was provided by the board of realtors which was from 2015.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum questioned several of the key assumptions that he found in the Plan. He was distrustful of the desire to upzone single-family neighborhoods. He stated that in the past he had seen single family zoning help evolve neighborhoods in a positive way. Sturbaum asked if he was off base in his interpretation of the text.

Robinson responded nothing in the document contemplated upzoning single-family neighborhoods. He said the chapter dealt with land use, not zoning or rezoning processes.

Sturbaum asked where, given limited real estate and the fact that 90% of Bloomington was built-out, the innovative initiatives and diverse housing types called for by the Plan would be located. He said the open-ended interpretation of the document concerned him.

For Approval

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods (*cont'd*)

Robinson stated that the Plan was the first stage and he could not necessarily answer Sturbaum's question. He said that the intent was not to upzone single-family neighborhoods. Several concepts in the Plan, he said, could be seen as competing and there would have to be some give and take. He viewed the chapter as pertaining to undeveloped zones of Bloomington or areas which could be redeveloped. He affirmed that any zoning decisions would come before the Plan Commission and would ultimately need approval from the Council.

Sturbaum said he would work on sections he thought might be misinterpreted. He said he felt reassured by Robinson's remarks.

Rollo asked how form-based zoning would challenge single-family zoning, wondering if there was something specific in the chapter that concerned Sturbaum.

Sturbaum answered that some communities rewrote their zoning codes to be purely form-based, which could encourage the types of intrusions on single-family neighborhoods which concerned Sturbaum.

Rollo asked if it was the intent of staff to encourage rezoning.

Robinson said that was not the intent.

Sturbaum wondered if certain initiatives would make housing less affordable to the single-family property owner. He warned that loose language could open doors that Bloomington had not intended when it completed its Envision Bloomington process.

Rollo asked Sturbaum to point to the loose language he was referencing.

Sturbaum read excerpts he viewed as loosely worded.

Volan pointed out that the Council had the amendment process for that reason and Sturbaum should work on amendments to the chapter.

Public Comment

Sandberg called for public comment.

Deborah Myerson expressed her concerns about the broad language of the Plan and the absence of specific recommendations. She proposed an amendment to the Plan.

Council Comment:

Volan agreed that the Plan was too vague. He stated that the devil was in the details and that the Council should take more time to address the housing crisis. He stated that it was a shame that homelessness was not addressed in the chapter. He believed the Council needed more time to fix these issues.

Rollo agreed with Volan and Myserson that the chapter had issues that needed to be addressed. He did not feel the 120% of AMI criteria was necessarily a precise measurement. He also thought the Plan should address wage growth in the community.

Granger said there should be more focus on home ownership and first-time home ownership because she felt owner-occupied homes helped to stabilize neighborhoods.

Sturbaum said that he felt the chapter took several steps away from home ownership. He was still confused about where new housing initiatives would occur as Bloomington was primarily built out. He asked why the chapter seemingly strayed from encouraging single-family housing.

For Approval

Presentation, Discussion, and Public Comment on Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith stated that both occupancy and rental rates were extremely high in Bloomington in part because there was a lack of supply. Density, she said, should be at the center of the community where residents could access services and jobs. She did not feel that allowing different housing types would necessarily have to be a negative on older neighborhoods. Increasing density, Piedmont-Smith said, was an essential part of encouraging affordable housing. She also cautioned the Council to keep in mind that the Plan was not codified law but rather a general plan for the Council moving forward.

Sturbaum said he remembered before there was zoning, when single-family neighborhoods were over-occupied and were being run into the ground by multi-family rentals. He was concerned about opening up the gates of densification.

Volan stated that he took both Sturbaum and Piedmont-Smith's points. He thought adding definitions to the document might help clarify some of the vague vocabulary.

Sandberg and Council Attorney Dan Sherman clarified how members of the public would be able to submit proposals for amendments.

Motion to amend agenda

Volan moved and it was seconded to amend the agenda for the meeting.

Vote on motion to amend agenda [7:37pm]

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

<u>Amendment 06</u>

Sturbaum introduced and summarized Amendment 6. He highlighted some wording adjustments made by the amendment.

Council Questions:

Rollo asked what staff thought of the proposed amendment, especially regarding the use of the term "compatible" instead of the original wording "innovative".

Robinson responded that staff did not support the changes being proposed. He thought the amendment would slow down the process of updating the city's UDO. He also said staff did not support the wording change from "investigate" to "create", as there could be additional considerations to be addressed before creating an architectural review committee. Staff did not have a preference between "innovative" and "compatible".

Volan asked if the "investigate architectural review committee" language left open the possibility of not creating such a committee.

Robinson said doing nothing was always an option. He said using the word investigate would leave that option open, while still allowing for other options.

Volan asked Robinson to elaborate why he felt that an architectural review committee might not be worth forming.

Robinson speculated that investigating would allow the community to choose between the tradeoffs of action or inaction.

Granger asked for the reasoning behind creating an architectural review committee.

Sturbaum answered that projects which came forward often had controversy that centered on design. The amendment was intended to increase the transparency behind project design. He felt such a committee would help create better design.

For Approval

Volan added that public conversation earlier on would reduce contentious meetings later in the process.

Amendment 06 (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the committee being discussed would only review development downtown or if it would review all planned unit developments (PUDs).

Volan thought such a committee would be used to review requests for PUDs.

Rollo said that, that having served on the Plan Commission, he felt architecture was not a preeminent focus in discussions. He supported an architectural review committee to increase the attention devoted to each project.

Piedmont-Smith thought part of the problem was that the UDO lacked architectural standards, which she said could be addressed when the city later updated the UDO. She confirmed with Robinson that the city was trying to address concerns related to architecture by utilizing an architectural firm as a consultant.

Councilmember Andy Ruff asked staff to explain the effects of the proposed amendment.

Robinson explained the difference between investigating the formation of a committee and actually forming it. Staff did not feel comfortable creating the committee without gathering further information. Staff wanted to keep investigating options instead of being told to take a course of action which might not be ideal.

Ruff asked how this amendment would interfere with the current process staff was undertaking.

Robinson answered that evaluation and consideration was important. He felt the purpose of the Plan was to be a guiding document and a first step, not a mandate.

Ruff asked if staff viewed the proposed amendment as a directive.

Robinson said yes, if the expectation from Council was to form the committee.

Volan commented on the tone of the Plan and his desire for it to be more direct and more specific.

Council Comment:

Granger said it seemed most effective to go ahead and create a committee to help the council analyze issues it would have to face.

Sturbaum stated that the idea of such a committee had been under discussion for over a decade in a constant state of investigation. He recognized that it might be cumbersome to staff and developers but he felt that the design improvements would be worth the extra step. He pointed out that the wording did not contain a date or preclude staff from investigating the committee before creating it.

The motion to adopt Amendment 06 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 4 (Ruff, Chopra, Piedmont-Smith, Sims), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 06 [8:02pm]

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 08.

Amendment 08

Council Questions:

Sturbaum presented and described the amendment, displaying an example of a Nolli map he thought could be a useful planning tool.

Volan asked what staff thought of the amendment.

Robinson answered that staff did not object to the idea but was concerned about the wording of the amendment which Robinson felt served as a directive that would require mapping before the approval of any project.

Sturbaum responded that he thought the map should be part of the planner's presentation as another communication tool.

Ruff asked to hear more from staff.

Josh Desmond, Assistant Director of Planning and Transportation, responded that the only concern with the amendment was the phrase "prior to approving developments," which he interpreted as stopping any development approval until such a map had been created.

Sturbaum suggested that there might be more appropriate language to use in the amendment as the intent was not to stop development.

Volan pointed out that the original phrasing of the amendment did not contain the wording that staff was concerned about. He suggested changing the wording from, "prior to approving" to "as a development review tool".

Sturbaum said he would support such a change.

Chopra asked what the effect would be of including something so direct in the Plan.

Robinson responded that the wording created a new tool that could be used as an action item.

Chopra asked whether adding a new program would be simply a mere suggestion and wondered what would happen if it were not followed. She said the Plan seemed like the wrong place for such a directive.

Sturbaum said that such initiatives were common in the document.

Chopra asked staff if they found the amendment to be consistent with the document.

Robinson said he thought the amendment as reworded was an appropriate program to include in the downtown chapter.

Public Comment:

Phillip Stafford voiced confusion as to where the responsibility would be for creating the map. He supported the amendment.

Council Comment:

Volan stated that the text in the document was critically important, even though it was not code. He said that he firmly believed in legislative intent and the plan would be a significant tool for the Council in creating future code.

Piedmont-Smith said she supported the amendment.

Sherman reminded the Council about the voting process.

Rollo appreciated the amendment and thought it was crucial for reviewing development proposals.

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 08.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 08

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 08 was approved by voice vote.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 08 [8:19pm]

Volan expressed his disappointment that Sturbaum struck the original text of the amendment. He hoped that if Sturbaum brought it forward as an ordinance he would utilize the original text.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith explained that she had requested Sturbaum reduce the lengthy text.

The motion to adopt Amendment 08 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 08 as amended [8:21pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 21.

Amendment 21

Volan introduced and summarized the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith asked how the streetscapes and public improvements mentioned in the amendment would be financed.

Council Questions:

Volan stated that the Plan was a resolution, not code. He said his intent was to create a more directive document even if it was not technically a mandate.

Piedmont-Smith asked what the difference was.

Volan said Piedmont-Smith was underscoring the issues he had with the document as a whole.

Piedmont-Smith stated that the amendment read as a directive to make streetscape improvements. She said she was uncomfortable with the wording as the Council was not yet aware of what funding it would have to make such improvements.

Volan stated that he would prefer to strike the phrase altogether as it said something already being done.

Councilmember Jim Sims asked if Volan was offering to strike the phrase entirely.

Volan said he would entertain such a proposal. He thought that if the phrase was going to be in the document, it should be more direct.

Sims said he supported directness in the Plan but was concerned with taking out language encouraging innovation. He thought the effect of some amendments would be to encourage the city to keep doing the same things it had done in the past, which would not lead to any change.

Volan responded to Sim's concerns by giving specific examples of streets that needed more attention.

Rollo thought it would be generally agreeable and not controversial that streetscapes for the city's gateways should be improved. He said the amendment was meant to create a directive to accomplish that goal.

Granger supported the amendment and noted opportunities for streetscapes to be improved, if funds were available to do so.

Council Comment:

Sims thanked Granger for her comment as it helped clarify the intention of the amendment for him.

Sherman and the Council discussed how to reconcile Amendment 21 with a previous amendment.

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 21.

Amendment 01 to Amendment 21

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 21 was approved by voice vote.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 21 [8:34pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 08 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 1 (Sims).

Vote on Amendment 21 as amended [8:34pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 07.

Amendment 07

Sturbaum briefly described the amendment.

Council Questions:

Chopra asked Sturbaum if he saw the amendment as a directive to be addressed in the city budget or in the transportation budget.

Sturbaum said that the issue sometimes came up in development proposals. He thought the amendment could help provide direction during consideration of such proposals.

Piedmont-Smith thought the amendment was covered in Chapter 6 and would be better placed there. She asked Sturbaum how he felt about placing the text there.

Sturbaum stated he did not see a problem with having the text in Chapter 5.

Volan asked if Sturbaum did not advocate for having bus shelters outside of the downtown area.

Sturbaum said no and that the Council could include the language later in the Plan.

Chopra asked Sturbaum if he would be willing to move the language to the transportation chapter.

Sturbaum stated he would. He asked staff if they had an opinion on the placement of the amendment.

Robinson said the amendment would be more appropriate in Chapter 6. He also voiced concerns with the phrase "create funding" in the amendment.

Council Comment:

Chopra stated she would be voting no due to the placement issue pointed out by Piedmont-Smith.

Piedmont-Smith said she could not in good conscience vote for something that directed the city to create funding. She also felt the amendment would be better placed in Chapter 6. For those two reasons she planned to vote no.

Volan agreed with the criticisms. He also felt shelters were more necessary outside of the downtown area. He felt it was appropriate to create more shelters, using the phrase "identify funding", in Chapter 6.

Rollo said he did not mind the redundancy and viewed the downtown as a special case. He supported the amendment.

Chopra thought the Plan should encourage people to use bus transportation throughout the entire city, not just the downtown. She thought the amendment put too much emphasis on the downtown area.

For Approval

Amendment 07 (*cont'd*)

Rollo commented that the amendment did not preclude creating shelters in other parts of the city. He felt that the language belonged in the downtown chapter as that area needed shelters.

Chopra did not see the point of putting a special emphasis on the downtown area if people agreed that shelters should be a priority at all bus stops.

Sturbaum commented that he would support putting the amendment into another chapter but, regardless of where it was located in the Plan, the city needed more bus shelters.

Vote on Amendment 07 [8:44pm]

The motion to adopt Amendment 07 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 2 (Sturbaum, Rollo), Nays: 7, Abstain: 0. FAILED.

Amendment 22

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 22.

Volan and Rollo described the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith pointed out that Amendment 22 and Amendment 12 each dealt with the same language in the Plan. She explained the differences between the two amendments.

Volan pointed out other differences between the two amendments.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked if Mr. Robinson had anything to add.
Robinson raised some concerns with Amendment 22.

Volan commented that concern about section four of the amendment revolved around the same semantic debate regarding active versus passive language. He said he would be willing to change "task" back to "work with" but wondered who the Plan was meant to direct.

Sandberg asked if Volan would be willing to accept a friendly amendment to change the wording of "task".
Volan asked again who was supposed to take direction from the bullet point in question.
Sandberg said everyone would look at the Plan as a framework going forward.
Volan said he was unsure who was supposed to be leading the development of the parking management plan.

Rollo said he felt that the council should remain open to the language "coordinate with". He asked if Volan objected to that.
Volan pointed out the department controlled a majority of the seats on the parking commission, one of which remained unfilled.
Rollo asking if the ordinance creating the Parking Commission gave the commission the responsibility of leading development of a parking management plan.

Robinson answered Volan's earlier question about the intended audience for the Plan, which included city officials, business leaders, community organizations, and residents.
Volan read from the ordinance that created the Parking Commission and said it was clear that the intent of the commission was to develop policy. He suggested that staff should support the amendment as the seats on the commission were filled by the administration instead of the Council.

For Approval

Sandberg stated that she was more comfortable with the language "coordinate with" than "task".
Volan agreed that "task" might have been an unfortunate word but he did not feel that the word "task" was an inappropriate choice.

Rollo moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 22.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 22 was approved by voice vote.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 22 [9:02pm]

Piedmont-Smith stated she was comfortable with the amendment.

Council Comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 22 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 22 as amended [9:03pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 12.

Amendment 12

Piedmont-Smith pointed out that Amendment 22 had made much of Amendment 12 moot. She pointed out relevant portions of the amendment.

Sherman confirmed that the amendment addressing public restrooms downtown had been previously defeated.

Piedmont-Smith asked if she could amend her own amendment to discard the last two bullet points pertaining to public restrooms.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 12.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 12 was approved by voice vote.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 12 [9:05pm]

Sherman clarified the sections of the amendment that were being removed.

The motion to adopt Amendment 12 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 12 as amended [9:07pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 23.

Amendment 23

Volan pointed out that Sturbaum had sponsored the amendment so Volan could not fully speak to it, but provided a brief description.

The Council, Robinson, and Sherman discussed whether to consider Amendment 23, along with Amendment 35 and Amendment 39, as part of a consent agenda. The Council decided to take up each item individually.

The motion to adopt Amendment 23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 23 [9:13pm]

Granger moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 35.

Amendment 35

Granger described the amendment and explained why she favored it.

The motion to adopt Amendment 35 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 35 [9:15pm]

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 39.

Amendment 39

Volan asked if Phillip Stafford would discuss the amendment in light of Sturbaum's absence.

Stafford presented the amendment and explained how the concept of a lifetime community district could help provide a framework for redevelopment of the former hospital site.

Granger asked Robinson to clarify a portion of the language in question.
Robinson clarified that "maintain" was one of the development themes discussed at a previous meeting.

Council Questions:

Sandberg asked if staff had any concerns with the amendment.
Robinson said that staff was fine with the amendment.

Volan said he supported the amendment and appreciated Stafford's efforts.

Council Comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 35 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 35 [9:21pm]

The Council had a discussion of whether to continue considering amendments or to go into recess.

Chopra moved to go into recess.

Amendment 24

Volan moved and it was seconded to introduce Amendment 24.

The motion to introduce Amendment 24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 2 (Ruff, Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on motion to introduce Amendment 24 [9:27pm]

Volan described the amendment.

Sandberg asked for staff's response.
Robinson said staff was fine with the amendment.

Council Questions:

Volan moved and it was seconded that Amendment 24 be adopted.

The motion to adopt Amendment 24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 24 [9:29pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 25.

Amendment 25

Volan described the amendment.

Sims asked Volan about the intent of the amendment.
Volan said the amendment encouraged people to think about streets as public spaces, not simply roads for cars.

Council Questions:

The motion to adopt Amendment 25 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 1 (Grange).

Vote on Amendment 25 [9:31pm]

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 26.

Amendment 26

Piedmont-Smith introduced and described the various parts of the amendment, stating that the overarching rationale behind the changes was to reorganize the passages in question.

Piedmont-Smith and Sherman clarified that Amendment 26 would need to be reconciled with Amendment 25 if they were in conflict.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 26.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Amendment 26 was approved by voice vote.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Amendment 26 [9:36pm]

Piedmont-Smith invited any questions or feedback to section one of the amendment.

Sandberg asked for staff response.
Robinson stated that staff was in favor of the amendment.

Council Questions:

Piedmont-Smith and Granger discussed adding additional language about bus shelters to section two of the amendment.

Sandberg asked for staff feedback.
Robinson said staff supported the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith described sections three and four of the amendment.

Volan thanked his colleagues for their work in crafting the amendment. He wished the amendment had been broken down further.

Council Comment:

Rollo commented that the section of the amendment describing the platinum distinction was extremely well written. He appreciated Piedmont-Smith and Granger's efforts in crafting the amendment.

The motion to adopt Amendment 26 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 26 as amended [9:46pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 27.

Amendment 27

Volan introduced the amendment and said he understood that the amendment was confusing due to the changes made by former amendments.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Amendment 27 be withdrawn.

Motion to withdraw Amendment 27

The motion to withdraw was approved by voice vote.

Vote on motion to withdraw Amendment 27 [9:50pm]

For Approval

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 28.

Amendment 28

Granger described the amendment.

Volan commented that he was in support of the change and also said that, as a point of order, he would not introduce Amendment 29 for the same reason that he withdrew Amendment 26.

Council Comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 28 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote on Amendment 28 [9:52pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 30.

Amendment 30

Volan introduced the amendment and described his reasons for introducing it.

Rollo said that, if parking lots were going to exist, there were ways to make them more environmentally sensitive. He asked if Volan did not see that possibility.

Volan thought the unamended policy called for things the city was already doing and did not need to be in the Plan.

Council Questions:

Sandberg asked for staff's opinion on the amendment.

Robinson answered that staff generally agreed with the idea of parking maximums but said the intent of the original language was to apply to public parking spaces instead of private ones. He felt that Volan was looking at it from a private sector viewpoint.

Volan said he thought that the section was referring to private parking spaces due to the word choice of "encourage". He thought the city had control over making its parking facilities environmentally sensitive, so it would not need to merely encourage that action.

Rollo commented that he liked the original language as he thought calling for environmentally-sensitive parking areas was a good thing. He did not see how parking maximums tied in with the original text.

Volan said that if the text referred to public parking spaces then it should not say "encourage", as the city would not need to encourage itself. He wanted the policy to say something different than what the council was currently doing. He felt that the terms "parking" and "environmentally-sensitive" created an oxymoron. He said that if the city were truly concerned about being environmentally sensitive it would be doing anything it could to discourage more parking areas, such as establishing a maximum amount of parking allowed as proposed by the amendment.

Piedmont-Smith asked how the proposed amendment fit under Goal 6.4.

Volan said the amendment would tell people to plan for parking maximums. He said that parking took up space that could be used for other, more desirable uses.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith said she agreed with Rollo that the Council should encourage environmentally-sensitive parking areas. She did not feel that simply because the city already encouraged such parking that the text should be omitted from the document. She was not satisfied with Volan's response to her question regarding the relationship of the proposed amendment and the goal it would fall under.

Not Approval

Rollo agreed with Piedmont-Smith in total. — Amendment 30 (*cont'd*)

Volan said he understood the amendment might not pass but stated that he might create another amendment that would not eliminate the original language. He asked the Council to do further research into parking.

The motion to adopt Amendment 30 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 1 (Volan), Nays: 7, Abstain: 0. FAILED. — Vote on Amendment 30 [10:04pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 31. — Amendment 31

Volan described the amendment.

Sandberg called for response from staff.
Robinson responded that the amendment would entail a significant policy change.

Piedmont-Smith asked what "improve system legibility" meant. — Council Questions:
Volan responded that it referred to the signage on or the design of the streets that made it easy for people to interpret what they should do.

Piedmont-Smith commented that the amendment deleted a valuable policy statement about educating bicyclists and drivers. She felt that education was incredibly important, and even if the city already had educational efforts, she felt those deserved inclusion in the Plan. Piedmont-Smith also remarked that the decision to restore one-way streets to two-way streets should not so quickly be decided or with little public notice. — Council Comment:

Volan commented that the language regarding two-way streets included the caveat, "wherever possible". To him, that did not indicate any type of mandate. He also said that the amendment should receive the same consideration as others, even though it was being addressed late at night. He wanted to know if it would receive support if it was recrafted.

Sims said he would not support such a change even if it were reworded.

The motion to adopt Amendment 31 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 2 (Ruff, Volan), Nays: 6, Abstain: 0. FAILED. — Vote on Amendment 30 [10:13pm]

Sandberg and Sherman reviewed the upcoming council schedule. — COUNCIL SCHEDULE

The meeting went into recess at 10:14pm. — RECESS

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this ____ day of _____, 2017.

APPROVE: ATTEST:

_____ _____

Susan Sandberg, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington

For Approval