



# **City of Bloomington Common Council**

## **Legislative Packet**

**Wednesday, 30 January 2019**

## **Special Session**

**For consideration of Resolution 19-01  
To Adopt the *Transportation Plan*, as an Amendment to the  
*City's Comprehensive Plan***

**For legislation, the *Plan* and background material, please consult the  
Council Proposed Transportation Plan page:  
<https://bloomington.in.gov/council/plan-schedule>**

*For a schedule of upcoming meetings of the Council and the City's boards and commissions, please  
consult the City's [Calendar](#).*

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



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

To: Council Members  
From: Council Office  
Re: Weekly Packet  
Date: 25 January 2019

**LEGISLATIVE PACKET CONTENTS**

**SPECIAL SESSION**

**WEDNESDAY, 30 JANUARY 2019**

- Memo from Council Office
- Agenda
- Minutes (for 12 December 2018 Special Session and 05 December 2018 Regular Session)

**SPECIAL SESSION, AT-A-GLANCE**  
**WEDNESDAY, 30 JANUARY 2019**

- **Resolution 19-01** – Adopting the City’s Transportation Plan as an Amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan (new material in this packet)  
Contact  
Beth Rosenbarger, 812-349-3473, [rosenbab@bloomington.in.gov](mailto:rosenbab@bloomington.in.gov)
  - For the above legislation, please see the legislation and supporting material issued in the packet for [16 January 2019](#).
  - Please also use this link (<https://bloomington.in.gov/council/plan-schedule>) for the Council webpage dedicated to deliberations on Resolution 19-01 (Adopting the City’s Transportation Plan). This webpage includes the:
    - Schedule for Deliberations (with day/topics and deadline/sponsorship/consideration of amendments);
    - Presentations (as they are provided to the Clerk/Council Office);
    - Statement of Procedure (as an attachment – which includes rules for public comment);
    - Weekly Council Legislative Packet issued for the 16 January 2019 Regular Session (with a copy of the legislation, memo, and summary) (also linked at above →); and
    - Amendment Form

**SECOND MEETING OF SPECIAL SESSION TO CONSIDER RESOLUTION 19-01 (ADOPTING THE CITY’S TRANSPORTATION PLAN) – STAFF SUMMARY**

The Council will meet next week for the second of three consecutive Wednesdays devoted to the initial review of the Resolution 19-01 (Adopting the City’s Transportation Plan). This meeting will

cover *Chapter 3: Street Network and Classifications* and any Appendices that are related to this chapter. Here are the sections and page numbers for that chapter, along with notation of some of the sub-sections and some of the key tables and figures (in italics) provided by the Council Office.

<b>3.</b>	<b>Street Network and Classifications .....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Transportation Planning Approach .....	18
	Urban Grid Network, Coordinated Land Use and Transportation & Complete Streets.....	18-19
3.2	Street Typologies ( <i>with associated cross-sections</i> ).....	20
	Shared Street .....	21
	Neighborhood Residential Streets .....	22
	Main Street .....	23
	General Urban Street.....	24
	Neighborhood Connector Street.....	25
	Suburban Connector Street.....	26
	<i>Table 3: Street Typology Summary</i> .....	28 – 29
	<i>Figure 18: New Connections and Street Typologies (Map)</i> .....	30
	<i>Table 4: Roadway Zone Design Parameters</i> .....	31
	<i>Table 5: Pedestrian Zone Design Parameters</i> .....	31
3.3	Bicycle Facility Types .....	32
	Multiuse Paths & Trails, Protected Bike Lanes, Buffered Bike Lanes, Conventional Bike Lanes, Neighborhood Greenways & Advisory Bike Lane/Shoulder....	32-34
3.4	Bicycle Network .....	34
	Rails with Trails	
	<i>Figure 19: Bicycle Facilities Network (Map)</i> .....	36
	<i>Figure 20: Priority Bicycle Facilities Network (Map)</i> .....	37
3.5	Pedestrian Network Assessment .....	38
	Pedestrian Facility Types, Improving the Pedestrian Network, New Streets, Retrofitting and Filling in the Network Gaps on Existing Streets, Pedestrian Priority Areas, Pedestrian Access to Transit & Uncontrolled Crossings.....	38-40
	<i>Figure 21: Pedestrian Priority Areas (Map)</i> .....	41
3.6	Key Treatments and Supporting Guidance .....	43
	Circulation, Modern Roundabouts, Protected Intersections, Grade Separated Intersections, Loading Zones, Alleyways, Traffic Calming, Horizontal Elements & Vertical Elements.....	43-47

**Any Appendices (where applicable)**

**Next Meeting: 06 February 2018 – to cover the remainder of the Plan.**

**NOTICE AND AGENDA  
BLOOMINGTON COMMON COUNCIL  
SPECIAL SESSION  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2019  
6:30 PM  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
SHOWERS BUILDING, 401 N. MORTON ST.**

**SECOND MEETING OF A SPECIAL SESSION  
TO CONSIDER**

**RESOLUTION 19-01 – TO ADOPT THE CITY’S TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT  
TO THE CITY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (ALONG WITH OTHER BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL)**

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. AGENDA SUMMATION**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

12 December 2018 – Special Session  
05 December 2018 – Regular Session
- IV. RESOLUTION 19-01 – TO ADOPT THE CITY’S TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**
  - A. REVIEW OF THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**
    - 1) CHAPTER 3: STREET NETWORK AND CLASSIFICATIONS  
(and Portions of the Appendices where Applicable)**
      - 3.1 Transportation Planning Approach
      - 3.2 Street Typologies
        - Shared Streets
        - Neighborhood Residential Streets
        - Main Street
        - General Urban Street
        - Neighborhood Connector Street
        - Suburban Connector Street
      - 3.3 Bicycle Facility Types
      - 3.4 Bicycle Network
      - 3.5 Pedestrian Network Assessment
      - 3.6 Key Treatments and Supporting Guidance
- V. OTHER BUSINESS**

*Motion authorizing joint statement regarding hate crime legislation anticipated.*
- VI. COUNCIL SCHEDULE**
- VII. RECESS** *until Wednesday, February 06, 2019 to continue these deliberations.*

Notes:

*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](mailto:council@bloomington.in.gov).*

Posted and Distributed: 25 January 2019

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 05, 2018, at 6:32 pm with Council President Dorothy Granger presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL  
REGULAR SESSION  
December 05, 2018

Members Present: Piedmont-Smith, Granger, Volan, Sandberg, Sturbaum, Rollo, Ruff  
Members Absent: Chopra, Sims

ROLL CALL  
[6:33pm]

Council President Dorothy Granger gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION  
[6:33pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilmember Steve Volan announced that Resolution 18-24 and Resolution 18-25 would be postponed.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS  
[6:36pm]

Councilmember Dave Rollo asked what the appropriate method was for public comment on Resolution 18-24 and Resolution 18-25 since it was not appropriate to speak on items on the agenda before the Council did.

Volan said he wanted citizens to still be able to speak on those resolutions.

Rollo asked if it would take council action to allow the public to speak about the resolutions.

Dan Sherman, Council Attorney, said the motion to postpone could allow public comment.

Brian Payne, Assistant Director of Small Business Development, gave a report on food trucks.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [6:39pm]

Rollo asked if the city had looked into a designated area for food trucks to operate.

Payne said there were possibilities for food truck pods.

Rollo asked if the food trucks were subject to inspections by the county health department.

Payne said food trucks had to have an active county health permit that was renewed every year.

Councilmember Andy Ruff asked what the city could do to improve food truck enforcement and complaints.

Payne felt the system worked well and said he worked on enforcement with parking enforcement. He visited the most popular spots for food trucks once a month. Payne noted the application process was going to transition from paper to digital, as well as streamlining any other processes the business owners may have needed.

Ruff asked if the ordinance that passed in 2015 needed changes.

Payne said there was room for improvement in the ordinance.

Volan asked Payne how after-hours violations were handled.

Payne explained that parking enforcement handled parking-related violations for the food trucks.

Volan asked if most of the food truck complaints related to issues other than parking.

Payne said most complaints were related to parking, although there were complaints related to other issues as well.

Volan asked how violations were enforced if parking enforcement could not write the citation.

Payne explained the citation and appeals process for those violations. He said that no violations had been written yet.

Granger asked Payne if he foresaw the Night Ambassador having a role in the process.

Payne said he thought that person would be uniquely suited to help enforce that aspect of the code, and also to work with the food trucks to help them be more successful during nighttime hours.

There were no reports from Council Committees.

There was no public comment.

Councilmember Susan Sandberg moved and it was seconded to appoint Quinton Stroud and Elizabeth Licata to the Bloomington Arts Commission. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-24 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 and gave the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 4, Nays: 1, Abstain: 4.

Volan moved and it was seconded to postpone further discussion of Resolution 18-24 until a special session to be scheduled for December 12, 2018 at 6:30pm.

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith commented on the postponement of Resolution 18-24. She said Council had not gotten all the guarantees it wanted on what the parking structures will include.

Volan preferred that the Council wait to vote on the garages until December 19, 2018.

The motion to postpone Resolution 18-24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-25 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Volan moved and it was seconded to postpone further consideration for Resolution 18-25 until a special session scheduled for December 12, 2018 at 6:30pm.

The motion to postpone Resolution 18-25 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

- The Mayor and City Offices  
(*cont'd*)

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES

- PUBLIC [6:59pm]

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:00pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:00pm]

Resolution 18-24 – Approving the Issuance of Tax Increment Revenue Bonds of the City of Bloomington Redevelopment District to Finance the Costs of Acquisition and Construction for Two Parking Garages in the Bloomington Consolidated Economic Development Area and Costs Incurred in Connection with the Issuance of Such Bonds

Vote to postpone Resolution 18-24 [7:05pm]

Resolution 18-25-Approving the Issuance of Tax Increment Revenue Bonds of the City of Bloomington Redevelopment District to Finance the Costs of Acquisition and Construction of the Trades District Parking Garage in the Bloomington Consolidated Economic Development Area and Costs Incurred in Connection with the Issuance of Such Bonds.

Vote to postpone Resolution 18-25 [7:07pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-24 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis and gave the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adopt Ordinance 18-24.

Caroline Shaw, Director of Human Resources, presented the legislation to the Council. Shaw gave a brief overview of the dispatch training program.

Piedmont-Smith asked how long the training program lasted.

Shaw said there were sixteen weeks of formal training and that it took up to a year for a dispatch employee to feel comfortable in the job. She added that there was also a supervisor who was certified in emergency medical dispatch.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the additional pay was for more experienced employees who would mentor employees after the sixteen weeks.

Shaw said yes.

Ordinance 18-24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0

Volan moved and it was seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 18-06 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis and gave the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 18-06 be adopted.

Jeff Underwood, City Controller, presented the legislation to the Council. Underwood explained that the legislation was the annual year-end appropriation ordinance and that a number of departments requested transfers or additions to their budgets.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the cost of the HAND rental inspection program and associated fees.

Underwood said the 2019 budget had \$509,000 for expenses and \$282,000 in revenue for the program. He noted that the numbers varied from year to year depending on the number of inspections. He said the city was well below fully funding the program.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there would be a fee structure study for the entire city to try to bring fees in line with actual costs.

Underwood said the city was getting new data analysts in January to conduct a review and would then ask the Council to amend the fees accordingly.

Ordinance 18-24 An Ordinance to Amend Ordinance 17-37, Which Fixed Salaries for Certain City of Bloomington Employees for the Year 2018 – Re: Additional Pay for Dispatch Employees Who Assume Training Responsibilities

Council Questions:

Vote on Ordinance 18-24 [7:05pm]

Appropriation Ordinance 18-06 – To Specially Appropriate from the, Cumulative Capital Development Fund, Municipal Arts Fund and Rental Inspection Program Fund Expenditures Not Otherwise Appropriated (Appropriating Various Transfers of Funds within the General Fund, Parking Facilities Fund, Risk Management Fund, Police Pension Fund, Alternative Transportation Fund; and, Appropriating Additional Funds from the Cumulative Capital Development Fund, Municipal Arts Fund and Rental Inspection Program Fund)

Council Questions:

Rollo asked if the fee structure study would be completed prior to the budget advance meeting.

Underwood said staff would try, and that it depended on how long it took to gather all of the data and to do a cost-of-services study.

Rollo asked about \$80,000 that was being transferred to Information and Technology Services (ITS) for servers and wanted to know the longevity of those servers.

Underwood stated that the equipment had a life span of three to seven years and that servers would cover what was currently needed.

Volan asked if the cost of the rental inspection program was included in the fee review.

Underwood said the fees would be reviewed, but he anticipated incrementally raising them over time. He said staff would study all of the city fees to make a fiscally responsible recommendation.

Volan asked if there was a discussion to add more rental inspectors.

Underwood said it had been discussed, assuming it could be worked out within the budget.

Volan also asked if there was any money going towards digitizing paperwork.

Underwood said staff was looking into multiple programs to help automate and digitize.

There was no public comment.

Volan said that he would like to included in the discussion to get more inspectors and modernize the program.

Rollo hoped the salaries of the inspectors would be included in the review of the fee structure for the rental program.

Appropriation Ordinance 18-06 received a roll call vote Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-21 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis and gave the Land Use Committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 1, Nays: 0, Abstain: 3.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-21 be adopted.

Eric Greulich, Senior Zoning Planner, presented the legislation to the Council. Greulich explained that the ordinance would allow for the expansion of a previously approved assisted care living facility. He said the petitioners were requesting an expansion of the original 60 beds to 75 beds. He said the request also included an additional 1.25 acre plot of land that would allow for 20 new townhomes.

Marci Reddick, Attorney for petitioner, explained in greater detail what the townhomes would look like.

Appropriation Ordinance 18-06  
(cont'd)

Public Comment:

Council Comment:

Vote on Appropriation Ordinance 18-06 [7:21pm]

Ordinance 18-21 To Rezone a Property from Residential Estate (RE) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and to Amend the Associated PUD District Ordinance and Preliminary Plan - Re: 800 E. Tamarack Trail (Meadowood Retirement Community, Petitioner)



Piedmont-Smith asked how the city would make sure Meadowood met the LEED silver criteria if it would not be receiving a certification from LEED.

Ordinance 18-21 (cont'd)  
Council Questions:

Boz Lundgren, Architect for petitioner, said the request to remove the certification requirement was due to administrative costs. He said Meadowood worked with the Planning Department to develop a list of requirements that were necessary to obtain LEED silver. Meadowood proposed meeting with city planners three times throughout the course of construction to identify LEED silver requirements to ensure all of the benchmarks were met.

Piedmont-Smith asked if Linda Thompson, Senior Environmental Planner, would be included in the meetings.

Lundgren said yes.

Rollo asked about the stormwater runoff mitigation for the project.

Greulich stated that there would be a large detention pond and rain garden.

Jordan Baker, Civil Engineer for petitioner, stated that the project also had a storm water quality unit and a hydrodynamic separator.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there would be a revision to the landscaping plan, because the intital one had invasive species in it.

Greulich stated that it had been revised several times.

Rollo asked Volan about the Land Use Committee's deliberations and findings.

Volan stated that it was a cut and dry issue and addressed in a reasonable condition. Volan said that it had not been clear to the Land Use Committee that the houses on Dunn Street would be an issue until after the ordinance was sent back to the full Council.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Reasonable Condition 03 to Ordinance 18-21.

Reasonable Condition 03 to  
Ordinance 18-21

Reasonable Condition 03 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith and would remove the rezoning of Lot 4 (just north of Tamarack Trail, remove the authorization for the additional townhomes within this PUD (which would have been authorized for Lot 1 [north] and Lot 5 [south] of Tamarack Trail), and retain the existing Residential Estate (RE) development standards for Lots 1 and 5. The intent of this reasonable condition is to allow the Petitioner to go forward with the Assisted Care Living Facility on the interior of this PUD as proposed, but defer consideration of the townhomes for a future amendment of this Planned Unit Development.

Piedmont-Smith explained the reasonable condition. She said it was proposed in response to neighborhood concerns about how the townhomes would change the character of the neighborhood. She said there was also some concern that at least one of the structures on the parcels might have historic value. She noted the reasonable condition did not prohibit the property owner from demolishing the two homes on Dunn Street. However, she said that since the zoning would remain as Residential Estate, the only thing that could be built was another single family home.

Rollo asked Greulich to show what in the area was being removed.

Greulich explained what the plans were for the area.

Skila Brown spoke in favor of the reasonable condition.

Ordinance 18-21 (cont'd)  
Public Comment:

Julia Livingston urged the Council to support the reasonable condition.

Jim Hart stated that he supported the reasonable condition.

Johnathan Elmer stated that he wanted the Council to support the reasonable condition.

Nels Gunderson urged the Council to support the reasonable condition.

Jared Brown stated that he wanted the Council to support the reasonable condition.

Sharon Yarber asked the Council to support the reasonable condition.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum said that he thought the reasonable condition was a good idea.

Council Comment:

Rollo asked Greulich if approval of the reasonable condition would preclude protection of the historic house as a contributing structure.

Greulich said the two structures were not listed as having a contributing, notable, or outstanding historic value. That meant the reasonable condition would not require those structures to be saved.

Rollo asked if the company were to sell their assests if there would there be a potential for a different demographic to reside in the proposed development.

Greulich said as long as the property was used as a residence, anybody could live there.

Volan supported the reasonable condition.

Sandberg said she was happy to support the reasonable condition.

Granger supported the reasonable condition.

Reasonable Condition 03 to Ordinance 18-21 received a roll call vote Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0

Vote on Reasonable Condition 03 to Ordinance 18-21 [8:04pm]

Brown commented that the company that owned Meadowood, Five Star, was in financial failure and planned on selling some of its skilled nursing facilities. Brown urged the Council to hold the company to the same environmental standards it agreed to ten years ago.

Public Comment:

Volan asked if the Planning Department had any concerns about the project only being partially built and if there were any contingencies if that happened.

Council Comment:

Greulich said there were procedures to make sure the project looked and was built the way it was intended. He said there was no mechanism that required someone to build any structure but he stated he had never seen a project go unfinished.

Sandberg asked if the city insurance or bonds to cover costs for unfinished projects.

Greulich said there was bonding in place to make sure that all public improvements, roads, sidewalks, and trees were installed. On the private property side of that there was no bonding that required someone to finish a project.

Sandberg asked what would happen if the company fell on hard times and sold the property to the highest bidder, who might want to use the property for student housing.

Greulich stated that the PUD was for an assisted living facility, not a dormitory or student apartments.

Rollo asked if the PUD could be repurposed.

Greulich stated the owners would have to come back to the Plan Commission and the City Council to amend the PUD.

Sturbaum said he supported the PUD.

Piedmont-Smith stated she supported the PUD, but also expressed concerns about the wages employees would be paid. She also wanted to make sure the construction met LEED silver standards.

Volan was surprised that a living wages were not a condition of the PUD. He was also concerned about the financial situation of Five Star.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 18-21 subject to Reasonable Conditions received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1(Rollo), Abstain: 0

Ordinance 18-21 (cont'd)

Vote on Ordinance 18-21 subject to Reasonable Conditions [8:18pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-22 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis and gave the Land Use Committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 1, Nays: 2, Abstain: 1.

Ordinance 18-22 To Rezone a Property from Planned Unit Development (PUD), Business Park (BP), and Residential Single Family (RS) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and to Amend the Associated District Ordinance and Preliminary Plan – Re: 1550 N. Arlington Park Drive & 1723 W. Arlington Road (Trinitas Development, Petitioner)

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-22 be adopted.

Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager, presented the legislation to the Council. She explained the new layout for the PUD and displayed renderings of different kinds of duplexes that would be built. Scanlan said the project lacked mixed use, was inconsistent with neighborhood residential design, was not an ideal location for student housing, and lacked green design.

Terry Porter, Director of Planning and Transportation, said the project should be voted down due to all the revisions it had undergone. Porter said the project could go through the planning process again. Porter said staff advised the petitioner early in the process that substantial changes needed to be made. Porter listed the deficiencies in the project and how they ran counter to the city's comprehensive plan.

Travis Vencel, Petitioner representative, spoke about the efforts Trinitas made in order to meet the criteria necessary to start the project. Vencel listed several reasonable conditions that Trinitas was willing to deploy in order to secure approval.

Rollo noted that the project was located in a high karst area and asked if it had been site inspected.

Scanlan said it was inspected by Linda Thompson, Senior Environmental Planner, who believed that the area was known for sink holes and springs. Scanlan said Thompson did not know if the spring was being protected. Thompson was not satisfied with Trintas's plan for dealing with any karst finds during construction.

Jeffrey Fanyo, engineer for petitioner, said an electromagnetic survey and core boring had been done to find karst features, but none were found.

Rollo asked if the petitioner gave the riparian features a proper buffer.

Scanlan said there were aspects of the new layout that did not meet the standards for riparian buffers.

Fanyo said their ordinance dealt with intermittent and perennial streams. He said there were not any perennial streams on the site and only three intermittent streams.

Scanlan said it was not clear which streams were the intermittent ones.

Fanyo said they were marked on the paperwork sent to Planning.

Scanlan restated that the copy Planning received did not have any markings.

Sturbaum said Reasonable Condition 01 required petitioner to submit its environmental report to the Environmental Commission and the city's senior environmental planner for final review and approval. He said the condition would give veto power to the city over putting a building in the wrong place.

Vencel stated that the petitioner put a mechanism in the final plan to make sure that the Environmental Commission, petitioner's engineer, and petitioner's staff were all on the same page.

Sturbaum asked about the single family development, the expense of those lots, and the practicality of developing the site in the alternative vision that the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) provides.

Fanyo believed that the site would not turn into a single family residential area due to the extreme expense of the conditions on the site.

Scanlan stated that the comprehensive plan did not call for the area to be entirely single family residential. Scanlan also noted that the previous sale of topsoil from the property was a self-inflicted expense that the developers would have to deal with.

Piedmont-Smith asked if duplexes and triplexes were considered single family homes.

Scanlan said if the building had its own lot it was single family but if it shared a lot it did not meet the definition of single family.

Vencel said that Trintas owned multiple properties that were listed as condominiums, but did not meet the technical definition. In that way, the properties that were proposed could be listed as single family despite not meeting the exact definition.

Granger asked if Trintas had sold off the topsoil Scanlan referred to, and if not why they being punished for something they did not do.

Scanlan explained that Trintas did not own the land, but had been working with the landowner to develop the area. She clarified that the city did not intend to punish the petitioner, but recognized the self-inflicted harm on the part of the landowner.

Vencel stated that laws were different 50 years ago and that the topsoil would never have been sold today. The loss of topsoil made the land more expensive to develop.

Ordinance 18-22 (cont'd)  
Council Questions:

Volan asked if Trinitas was in the business of building and selling off properties or in the business of renting properties. Ordinance 18-22 (cont'd)

Vencel said they were in the business of building and selling off properties. He added that was not the intent for the property in question.

Sturbaum moved and it was seconded to adopt Reasonable Condition 01 to Ordinance 18-22.

Reasonable Condition 01 to Ordinance 18-22

Reasonable Condition 01 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition is sponsored by Councilmember Sturbaum and imposes the following conditions on the PUD: 1) a reduction in bedroom count to 825 bedrooms; 2) provides that structures may include single, duplex, or triplex buildings; 3) provides that the maximum number of 4-bedroom units shall be no more than 20% of all bedrooms; 4) allows that units may be divided in the future to reflect market demand; 5) requires that the maximum off-street parking ratio shall be no more than 50% of all bedrooms; 6) requires that the petitioner continue to work with Bloomington Transit to provide improved public transportation to the property; and 7) requires the petitioner to submit its final site plan, including Redwing Environmental's Report, to the Environmental Commission and the City's Senior Environmental Planner for final review and approval.

Volan asked how many three bedroom units there would be.

Vencel stated that he could give a range, but said that there would not be more than the number of two bedroom units.

There was no public comment.

Public Comment:

Volan said he had some concerns about the proposal itself.

Council Comment:

Sturbaum supported the reasonable condition.

Sandberg supported the reasonable condition

Piedmont-Smith supported the reasonable condition.

Reasonable Condition 01 to Ordinance 18-22 received a roll call vote Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0

Vote on Reasonable Condition 01 to Ordinance 18-22 [9:54pm]

Sandberg asked when the reasonable condition regarding the housing fund contribution was added and what the rationale was for it.

Council Questions:

Vencel said it was added after talking to the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department 30 days previously.

Granger asked if Trinitas would have to pay another fee if the project was not approved.

Scanlan said Trinitas would be able to refile. She said the city would determine whether the project was substantially different and that the city had the option to waive the fees.

Vencel stated he would not resubmit something that was substantially different.

Volan asked if the project was already substantially different due to all the changes.

Scanlan said the petitioner could refile as long as the proposal was not exactly the same.

Sandberg asked if the petitioner was trying to make the project more single family oriented and if there were any other developers lined up who wanted to do that.

Porter stated that there were no other developers trying to do that, but some other creative projects had come up. She said there was a strong demand for single family housing at a modest price.

Ruff asked if the alternative building structures that Porter mentioned were an option for the project.

Vencel stated that the site had challenges that precluded those options.

There was no public comment.

Piedmont-Smith said that she did not want four bedroom units, which she equated with student housing. She was pleased about the idea of the developer providing transit for the neighborhood but said she would be voting no.

Volan stated the environmental issues did not bother him that much and was in favor of more gridded streets. He leaned toward passing the PUD.

Rollo stated he could not tell if the proposal violated riparian code standards. He believed student housing should be located closer to campus. He felt that if Indiana University was trying to increase enrollment then it should provide housing. Rollo said he was voting no on the PUD.

Sturbaum stated that since the petitioner had backed out of most of the four bedroom units and there was access to 17th Street, it would be a very usable rental for many people. He said he supported the PUD.

Granger was disappointed that there were only rental units and that only ten percent of the units were single family units. She planned to vote no on the PUD.

Ruff said the proposal was as close to as good as possible for the foreseeable future. He did not like the student housing component and felt the costs were too great to develop it. He planned to vote yes on the PUD.

Sandberg agreed with Ruff. She planned to vote yes on the PUD.

Volan said the Council could not make a responsible decision without knowing how many students were coming to Indiana University and wanted a report from the university with that information. He said he would abstain.

Piedmont-Smith was bothered that the ordinance did not go to the Plan Commission and by the amount of time the staff was given to evaluate it.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 18-22 subject to Reasonable Conditions received a roll call vote Ayes: 3 (Ruff, Sturbaum, Sandberg), Nays: 3 (Piedmont-Smith, Granger, Rollo), Abstain: 1(Volan). FAILED

Ordinance 18-22 (*cont'd*)

Public Comment:

Council Comment:

Vote on Ordinance 18-22 Subject to Reasonable Conditions [10:41pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-20 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis and gave the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0..

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-20 be adopted.

Scanlan presented the legislation to the Council. She displayed a map of the area that was referenced in the ordinance and explained that the city hoped to have the extension until the end of the following year or until the new UDO was passed.

There was no public comment.

Scanlan clarified that two projects had been approved under the old guidelines since the changes to the overlay districts.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 18-20 received a roll call vote Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-10 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 18-20 An Ordinance to Amend Ordinance 17-45 Which Made Changes to Chapter 20.03 "Overlay Districts" to Provide Clear Guidance on Downtown Overlay Development and Architectural Standards – Re: Extending the Expiration Date from the End of December 2018 to the Earlier Date of December 31, 2019 or the Adoption of a New Unified Development Ordinance

Vote on Ordinance 18-20  
[10:46pm]

#### LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING

Ordinance 18-10 To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code (BMC) Entitled "Administration and Personnel" (Inserting BMC 2.26.200 to Provide for Additional Council Oversight of Intra-Category Transfers of \$100,000 or More within Certain Funds; Inserting BMC 2.26.205 to Require Submittal and Approval of Capital Plans Associated with Such Funds for the Applicable Year and Council Review of Capital-Related Expenditures of \$100,000 or More Not Identified in those Plans; and, Inserting BMC 2.26.210 to Require that Certain Other Expenditures in Such Funds of \$100,000 or More be Identified and, if Not Previously Identified, then be Reviewed by the Council)

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-26 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 18-26 To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled “Vehicles and Traffic” – Re: Amending Chapter 15.08 (Administration) to Extend the Time Period Permissible for Temporary, Experimental, or Emergency Traffic Regulations, Chapter 15.12 (Stop, Yield and Signalized Intersections) to Codify 90-Day Orders, Chapter 15.24 (Speed Regulations) to Codify 90-Day Orders, Chapter 15.26 (Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program) to Add Traffic Calming Locations, Chapter 15.32 (Parking Controls) to Make Changes to No Parking and Limited Parking Zones; Chapter 15.34 (Accessible Parking for People with Physical Disabilities) to Authorize the Transportation and Traffic Engineer to Approve Changes in Accessible Parking; and, Chapter 15.40 (Municipal Parking Lots, Garages and On-Street Metered Parking) to Grant Authority to the Parking Services Director to Modify Parking Fees for Special Events and to Make Changes to Non-Reserved Monthly Garage Permits

Volan moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 18-27 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 18-27 To Amend Title 9 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitles “Water” (Adding Chapter 9.24 – Standards for the Control of Backflow and Cross Connections)

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-26 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 18-26 To Approve an Equipment Lease Purchase Agreement and Other Related Matters – Re: Purchase and Installation of Utility Metering Improvements

There was no public comment.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Volan moved and it was seconded to schedule a Special Session for December 12, 2018 at 6:30pm. The motion was approved by voice vote.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:53pm]

Sherman spoke about the upcoming council schedule.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adjourn. The motion was approved by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT [10:56 pm]



APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dave Rollo, PRESIDENT  
Bloomington Common Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole Bolden, CLERK  
City of Bloomington

For Approval

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 12, 2018 at 6:31pm with Council President Dorothy Granger presiding over a Special Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL  
SPECIAL SESSION  
December 12, 2018

Members Present: Ruff, Sturbaum, Chopra, Piedmont-Smith, Granger, Volan, Sandberg, Sims, Rollo  
Members Absent: none

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Council President Dorothy Granger gave a summary of the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION  
[6:31pm]

Councilmember Dave Rollo explained that the Friends of Lake Monroe asked the Council to send a letter to the USDA Forest Service. He said the letter requested a 30-day extension for a comment period on a management and restoration project called the Houston South Vegetation Management and Restoration Project.

APPROVAL OF LETTER –  
HOOSIER NATIONAL FOREST

Councilmember Susan Sandberg asked if there was a website or some other means for people to express concerns.

Rollo explained how people could submit comments.

Rollo moved and it was seconded to adopt the letter.

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

Vote on motion to adopt letter  
[6:38pm]

Councilmember Stephen Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-24 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Stephen Lucas read the legislation by title and synopsis and gave the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 4, Nays: 1, Abstain: 4.

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND  
READING AND RESOLUTIONS  
[6:37pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-24 be adopted.

Resolution 18-24 – Approving  
the Issuance of Tax Increment  
Revenue Bonds of the City of  
Bloomington Redevelopment  
District to Finance the Costs  
of Acquisition and  
Construction for Two Parking  
Garages in the Bloomington  
Consolidated Economic  
Development Area and Costs  
Incurred in Connection with  
the Issuance of Such Bonds

Alex Crowley, Director of Economic and Sustainable Development, gave a presentation on the proposed 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Trades District parking garages. He described discussions between the administration and the Council that took place to reach agreements on key features of the garages, which were then memorialized by the Redevelopment Commission (RDC). He noted recent economic development trends and emphasized the importance of the parking facilities to development the city was trying to encourage.

Larry Allen, Assistant City Attorney, spoke about the next steps for the project. He gave a summary of each future step of the project, and a timeline of when those steps would take place, assuming the Council passed the resolution.

Volan moved and it was seconded to amend Resolution 18-24 by substitution as it appeared in the December 5<sup>th</sup> Legislative Packet.

Motion to amend Resolution 18-24 by substitution

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith asked Council Attorney Dan Sherman for clarification on the motion.

Sherman explained the need for the motion if the Council wished to address the two garages separately.

The motion to amend Resolution 18-24 by substitution as it appeared in the December 5<sup>th</sup> Legislative Packet received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9; Nays: 0; Abstain: 0.

Vote on motion to amend  
Resolution 18-24 by  
substitution [7:01pm]

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum asked for more information about when the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage would need to be closed.

Resolution 18-24 (cont'd)  
Council Questions:

Adam Wason, from the Public Works Department, stated that there were several steps that had to be taken before demolition could occur. He said the original timeline had been delayed due to the delays in getting Council approval.

Allen stated that the project could start as early as February or March and last as long as 20-24 months.

Piedmont-Smith asked Wason to speak about the possibility of repairing the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage.

Wason said repairing the garage had been thoroughly considered. He said the CE Solutions Structural Report provided three different models for potential repair. He spoke about the different models based on the timeline and cost of each. He stated that there were several reasons why the administration did not believe that repairing the garage was in the best interest of the community. First, he said a new garage would provide an opportunity to add capacity. Second, he noted that there might be unanticipated deterioration that would increase the cost of repair. Third, he pointed out that the planned Convention Center expansion would limit the availability of other parking options in the future. He said the garage would likely need to be closed regardless of whether the city chose to repair it or replace it.

Piedmont-Smith pointed out that the costs for annual maintenance and operation would apply to either a new garage or to a repaired garage.

Wason said that was correct and reiterated that the repair estimates for the garage did not include the cost of ongoing maintenance or operation.

Piedmont-Smith said that that statement would be true for a new garage as well.

Wason said that was correct.

Granger asked what had been budgeted for the maintenance of a new garage.

Wason thought it was around \$63,750.

Rollo asked if the city intended to acquire the property to the south of the garage.

Crowley said negotiations for that property were pending.

Rollo pointed out that the results of the negotiation could impact the size of the garage. More levels would have to be added to accommodate more spaces if the garage were built on the same footprint. He said the garage could be as tall as 108 feet if 550 spaces were built on the same footprint. He asked if that calculation was correct.

Crowley said no. He said that the plan was to work through a design and planning process that helped determine how many spots would be in the garage. He pointed out that the maximum number of spaces was used for bonding purposes.

Rollo asked why a height maximum was not specified.

Crowley said the design and planning process was in place to make those types of decisions.

Rollo said that a height limit could be part of the design process, which could be amended by the RDC if needed.

Crowley said the administration preferred not to specify a height maximum because it could unnecessarily limit the design process that would take place after approval.

Councilmember Jim Sims asked if a broad public notice would be sent out as part of the process outlined by Allen.

Allen said the notice served dual purposes. It was a community-wide notice for the public hearing and also a notice to the interested parties.

Volan asked why an ultrasonic survey had not been completed on the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Garage if the administration had actually considered the repair option.

Wason said the city's structural engineering team did a full assessment, which lead to very detailed cost estimates. He said the survey would be the next step.

Volan said the administration did not give the Council the option to repair the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Garage.

Wason said that the administration made the decision to move forward with a proposal for a new garage.

Volan asked if a story could be added to the existing garage.

Wason said no.

Volan asked who told him that.

Wason said the teams the city was working with at Core Strategic Partners and CE Solutions advised against it.

Volan asked if the administration took into account the impact of Ordinance 18-11 before estimating the need for parking spaces.

Crowley said that the ordinance was passed after the parking study had been completed by Desman Design Management. He said there was a desperate need for parking within the business community.

Volan said there was a demand for parking, but not necessarily a need for it.

Crowley said there was a growing vibrancy in the downtown area. He said many companies were growing, and those employees were driving their cars to work. He said growth would be hindered by a lack of access to parking.

Volan asked if employees currently using the parking garage would be happier if parking was available again at the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage in six months or in two years.

Crowley said employees would most likely prefer parking to be available sooner. He said that replacing the garage would be better in the long run because it could be done while alternative parking locations were available. He also thought that employees would appreciate added capacity.

Chopra asked how the funding for the property adjacent to the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage would be handled.

Crowley said there were accommodations in the bond proposal to acquire access to the property.

Chopra asked if the bond included an accurate estimate of how much it would cost to buy such a desirable property.

Crowley said the bond accommodated a number of scenarios.

Jeff Underwood, City Controller, stated that he believed the price had been accounted for. He said there were a variety of possible ways to acquire access to the property, one of which was an outright purchase.

Chopra asked if there was any possibility that the building would remain at its existing scale.

Underwood said it was a possibility, as the design had not been finalized.

Resolution 18-24 (cont'd)

Sturbaum asked for renderings of the garage to be displayed. He asked why a height limit had not been included in the project review form, given that city developments were subject to the same approval processes as any other development.

Mick Renneisen, Deputy Mayor, said that was exactly what the design discussion was all about. He said the city was not immune to the public process, which was why the administration wanted that process to play out.

Sturbaum asked if small changes, like going from a 70-foot garage to a 72-foot garage, were things the Plan Commission could address, even if a height limit were placed on the project.

Renneisen stated that he assumed everything that had been negotiated with the Council and put on the project review form was a hard number. He assumed that a 70-foot limit would mean nothing taller than 70 feet.

Sturbaum said the city set height limits for everyone else.

Renneisen said those limits were part of the design process. He also pointed out that the diagrams being displayed were only sketches and that nothing had been designed yet.

Sturbaum stated that the point of the renderings was to show the size of the structure in context with the surrounding buildings. He said many councilmembers would be comfortable with a 70-foot height limit.

Piedmont-Smith asked why the deliberations about repairing versus replacing the garage did not include the Council.

Wason said there was a full decision making process within the administration to come up with the recommendation that was before the Council. He said staff used their best professional judgment to come up with the proposal.

Volan pointed out that another project opposed by many councilmembers, the Graduate Hotel, was approved by the Plan Commission even though it was two to three stories higher than the rest of the buildings in that area. He thought the reluctance to set a height limit meant that the administration simply did not want the Council to make the decision on height. He asked for the administration to comment.

Renneisen said the Graduate Hotel had been approved by a different Plan Commission and a different Mayor. He said the administration understood the sensitivity to height but it preferred not to predesign the structure.

Volan said the administration had already indicated its preference by putting an upper limit of 550 spaces on the project.

Renneisen said that number was a maximum and was used for bonding purposes.

Sandberg said Renneisen made a good point about the Graduate Hotel receiving approval from a different Plan Commission and during a different time. She said the current Plan Commission was cognizant of the strong distaste the community had expressed for buildings the size of the Graduate Hotel. She did not think the commission would ignore the lessons learned from the Graduate Hotel.

Rollo asked if there was a minimum number of spaces that would be included in a new facility. Resolution 18-24 (cont'd)

Crowley reiterated that the figure of 550 spaces was simply being used for bonding purposes and was not a goal for the new garage. He said the administration was trying to grow capacity and have the highest bonding capability. He said there was no minimum that had been discussed.

Rollo said he was taking the figure of 550 spaces as a real possibility. He asked if he was misinterpreting the potential for that number of spaces in the garage.

Crowley said yes. He said that number was associated with bonding. He said that would be the maximum number of spaces allowed, but the project would go through a design process that would dictate the final number of spaces.

Rollo said he assumed the new garage would not be smaller than the existing garage, so he thought the range would be from 350 spaces to 550 spaces.

Volan asked why the administration did not bond for less if it did not intend to build 550 spaces.

Karen Valiquett, CORE Planning Strategies, wanted to make it clear that the rendering being displayed was a garage that one architect put together as a concept drawing, which happened to have 524 spaces as shown. She said the final number of spaces was not yet known. She said it would be inaccurate to take the numbers as final because there were many other design options available.

Volan asked how many spaces could fit on each floor if the city wanted to maximize capacity.

Valiquett said if the city wanted to maximize spaces it would not include the retail and commercial space in the garage. She said the garage would not include convertible levels since those took up a lot of parking spaces as well. She said a more traditional garage could accommodate more spaces.

Sturbaum asked about the flexibility of the commitments contained in the project review form.

Crowley said that it would be better to allow for flexibility since there would be give and take as the design was finalized.

Ron Walker of CFC Properties said that CFC Properties was the largest holder of permits in the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage. He strongly encouraged the Council to rebuild and expand the parking garage because they were out of parking. He said they created a plan for their employees to park during the interim period.

Public Comment:

Eoban Binder stated that if more parking was created then more cars would also be downtown. He strongly urged Council to vote against the resolution.

Jessika Griffin stated that the city should be spending money to create other options for transportation.

Mallory Rickbeil discussed her experience living car free in Bloomington. She stated that she needed more transportation options, not a new parking garage.

Talisha Coppock, Downtown Bloomington Inc., argued that parking was a need for many downtown employees.

Abbey Stemler, Assistant Professor at the Kelley School of Business, discussed the need for better infrastructure for other transportation modes. She asked the Council to not waste resources on parking garages. Resolution 18-24 (cont'd)

Daniel Halsey stated that driving was much easier and he would be glad to pay a reasonable rate. He said having available parking was very important to him since he did not live downtown. He said the current garage needed to be replaced.

Tracy Gates, a café owner on the square, thought that the parking garage should only be repaired, not replaced. She thought there was enough parking downtown.

Kate Rosenbarger, Executive Director of TEDxBloomington, urged Council to vote no on the new parking garage.

Matt Flaherty stated that parking prices needed to be increased in order to decrease parking demand. He thought the parking garage should be repaired. He hoped the Council would vote no.

Mark Stosberg recommended the repair option.

Jim Rosenbarger supported repairing the existing garage. He said repairs would cost less per space. He thought repairing would be fiscally sound.

Lynn Coyne, President of the Bloomington Economic Development Corporation, asked the Council to allow employees to get to their jobs and have available parking.

Daniel Bingham stated that infrastructure needed to be built that incentivized walking, biking, and other modes of transportation.

Jaclyn Ray thought that building the new garages countered the city's sustainability goals. She did not support the resolution.

Randy Lloyd appreciated the discussion and dialogue over policy in Bloomington. He supported a new garage.

Scot Davidson asked supported rebuilding the garage.

Erin Predmore, President of the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, stated that people would have nowhere to park if the city did not replace the parking garage. She asked them to remember the working parents that needed the parking.

Greg Alexander discussed his experience as a one car family and how he walked his kids to school everyday. He opposed more cars driving in Bloomington.

Vauhxx Booker was disappointed that the City had not investigated ways to mitigate the parking demand. He stated he would like to see more specifics on the project.

Rollo moved and it was seconded to postpone the consideration of Resolution 18-24 to Wednesday, December 19, 2018. He thought the height and size of the structure needed to be discussed and considered further.

Motion to postpone  
Resolution 18-24

Rollo said he wanted councilmembers to have a chance to comment on the resolution.

Sherman explained how the motion could be withdrawn.

Rollo withdrew the motion to postpone and Sturbaum withdrew his second.

Volan asked how many more non-reserved permits could be sold after the passage of Ordinance 18-11 in the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage.

Council Comment:

Ryan Daley, Parking Garage Manager, said 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage was at capacity. He said 50 spaces were kept open for transient parking ticket holders.

Volan asked what portion of the parking spaces for permit holders were reserved versus non-reserved.

Daley said about 70 permitted spaces were reserved.

Volan asked whether more permits would be sold if the reserved permits became non-reserved.

Daley said he would add more spaces for ticket holders.

Rollo spoke about various considerations that affected his decision to either replace or repair the garage. The considerations included the extent of structural damage to the garage, the impact of each option on downtown businesses, and the sustainability of the two options. He expressed concerns about approving the funding for the garage without knowing the height or size of the structure. He said he would like to delay the vote, but would be unable to support the resolution as it existed.

Chopra moved and it was seconded to limit council comment to no more than three minutes per councilmember.

Motion to limit debate

Ruff stated that he disagreed with the motion.

Volan stated he supported some time limits, but said it was also important that they be able to debate and discuss with each other.

Chopra stated that it was better to listen than to speak. She said that the council meetings lasted too long, which was disrespectful to the public.

Rollo emphasized the importance of the decision on the resolution. He believed councilmembers needed to explain their stance on the matter thoroughly.

Volan said he supported the principle behind the motion.

Sims stated that, as elected officials, their time should not be limited. He suggested that they think about limits in the future.

Sherman stated that the motion needed a two-thirds majority to pass.

The motion to limit debate received a roll call vote of Ayes: 2 (Chopra, Piedmont-Smith), Nays: 7, Abstain: 0.

Vote on motion to limit  
debate [9:07pm]



Resolution 18-24 (cont'd)

Sandberg said she appreciated all the input throughout the entire process. She explained the Council had asked for a rendering that showed the scale of the garage. She reiterated that the rendering displayed during the meeting was not the actual design of the garage. She believed that the public sector had an obligation to support public amenities and infrastructure. She said the city needed to invest in sustainability and the local economy. She urged people to let the design process play out and to not postpone the resolution. She said she would support the resolution.

Piedmont-Smith said there were several reasons to oppose the bond. She said the administration never gave the Council the option of repairing the garage, though she was confident that the garage could be repaired. She encouraged her colleagues to vote to repair the garage because it was more fiscally responsible. She said the city needed to see how parking demand responded to the new rate structure, a new transportation demand management plan, emerging transportation ride-share options, and the new parking manager position. She said the cost difference between repairing the garage or building a new garage would have a large impact on the amount of TIF money available for other infrastructure projects. She thanked the members of the public that spoke out about climate change. She stated that she strongly believed that Bloomington should stop subsidizing fossil fuel use. She said she would not be supporting the bond.

Chopra said she viewed the repair of the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage as a compromise that would address many of the concerns expressed. She stated she would be voting no on the bond.

Sims said the business community had been asking for more parking downtown. He acknowledged that parking was not as urgent a need as other services, like hospitals, but thought there was some need for parking. He said parking needed to be managed so that Bloomington could repurpose its parking structures at a later date if they were no longer needed. He spoke about the importance of alternative transportation and working to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. He said repairing the garage was not the worst option. He noted that Bloomington was a regional hub that attracted drivers for various purposes. He said the Council would decide based on what it believed was best for the community.

Volan said the nature of the proposal meant that the Council only had one opportunity to influence the project, which also limited the opportunity to negotiate with the administration. He said there were many things that could be done to manage parking demand, such as pricing changes, reducing reserved parking spaces, and harnessing of private lots. He spoke about retrofitting the existing garage with solar panels and charging stations. He stated that repairing the garage was the least expensive choice. He believed the concerns about repairing the garage voiced by the administration all had reasonable solutions. He said repairing the garage was the best option, so he would vote against the bond.

Ruff read excerpts from the Intergovernmental Climate Change Report. He asked the Council and the public to take the excerpts literally. Ruff said many of the concerns expressed at the meeting were trivial when looking at the big picture of climate change. Ruff agreed repair of the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Garage was a good compromise. Ruff said he would like more information on repairing the garage. Sturbaum said the Council needed another week to make a decision.

Granger stated that the administration and the Council had worked very hard to get to a place where the Council could approve the garage, but she still had concerns. She did not want a large structure to change the character of downtown Bloomington. Granger said that the city needed to be more responsible regarding sustainability. Granger asked Rollo if he would like to reintroduce his motion to postpone the resolution.

Resolution 18-24 (cont'd)

Rollo moved and it was seconded to postpone consideration of Resolution 18-24 to Wednesday, December 19, 2018.

Motion to postpone  
Resolution 18-24

Chopra said she would be voting no on the motion. She said the council needed to vote on the resolution that evening.

Volan believed the Council needed more time to make a decision.

Granger encouraged a postponement for a week to find the best solution.

Sims asked where the funding would come from if the Council chose to repair the 4<sup>th</sup> Street garage.

Piedmont-Smith said she would support delay in order to understand the funding for repairing the garage.

The motion to postpone the consideration of Resolution 18-24 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Chopra), Abstain: 0.

Vote on motion to postpone  
Resolution 18-24 [9:51pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-25 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Lucas read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 6, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1.

Resolution 18-25 – Approving the Issuance of Tax Increment Revenue Bonds of the City of Bloomington Redevelopment District to Finance the Costs of Acquisition and Construction of the Trades District Parking Garage in the Bloomington Consolidated Economic Development Area and Costs Incurred in Connection with the Issuance of Such Bonds.

Volan moved and it was seconded that Resolution 18-25 be adopted.

Crowley noted that the Council was familiar with the proposed Trades District garage and its importance to the Trades District. He said that he could answer any additional questions councilmembers had.

Volan asked if the end of 2020 was the earliest the garage could open.

Council Questions:

Crowley said that was correct.

Volan asked whether the garage could be build concurrently with developments built in the area.

Crowley said there were both known and unknown developments in the district. He said that the Dimension Mill, the Kiln, the development of the administration building, and a project with TASUS would all require parking. He noted that future tenants moving to the area would also remove some existing surface parking being used by those developments.

Volan asked whether there was any objective justification for the estimated demand for parking in the area.

Crowley said the resolution only asked the Council to approve a bond for a 300-space garage. He said the garage was needed to show developers and investors that the city was committed to activating the district.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the city would be encouraging businesses in the district to implement an employer transportation demand management program.

Resolution 18-25 (cont'd)

Crowley said he expected that would happen. He said the city first needed to develop a transportation demand management plan. He noted that the district would hopefully attract forward-thinking companies who would be open to creative transportation solutions. He said there would still be some need for parking even with such efforts in place.

Piedmont-Smith asked how much TIF revenue the city expected new businesses in the district to generate.

Crowley estimated between \$1 million and \$1.5 million per year, once fully built out.

Rollo asked for the sustainable features of the garage to be displayed.

Crowley reviewed the sustainable features of the garage that were included in the project review form.

Eoban Binder discussed the impacts of climate change and the effect the parking garage could have.

Public Comment:

Mark Stosberg discussed timing of execution for the parking garage.

Jane Martin discussed her support for a transitional parking garage for the Trades District.

Kate Rosenbarger thought building a sustainable parking garage did not correlate to a sustainable city and discussed the effect of subsidized parking. She asked the Council to oppose the garage.

Jim Rosenbarger discussed the supply of parking.

Greg Alexander thought the parking garage would create a greater incentive for people in the city to work in the city.

Matt Flaherty thought the Council should build a surface lot instead of a parking garage. He opposed the parking garage.

Daniel Bingham discussed using the money to update the bus system and the effects the parking garage could have on emissions.

Erin Predmore asked Council to remember that there were people who were attempting to invest in the community and needed the parking garages.

Lynn Coyne discussed the absence of mass transit but still thought the parking garage was needed to support future development.

Sturbaum said he supported the parking garage because it would encourage economic development.

Council Comment:

Rollo said that having a compact downtown was more sustainable than encouraging sprawl. He said Bloomington was promoting other forms of transportation and was making progress, through projects like the recently approved greenway on 7<sup>th</sup> Street. He hoped that the demand for parking in the Trades District could be lowered, and called for the completion of a transportation demand management plan. However, he saw a need for the 300 space garage. He said he would support the resolution.

Sandberg emphasized the importance of balancing economic development and respect for the environment. She said Bloomington did a good job of encouraging sustainability, pointing to the city's commitment to incorporating solar energy whenever possible. She said the Trades District was an investment to attract the kinds of jobs and people Bloomington wanted. She thought it was important to provide parking so that the investors and developers of the district could see the city was committed to the success of the district.

Resolution 18-25 (cont'd)

Chopra said she would vote in favor of the project. She said parking was important to the success of the district.

Volan said the city was overestimating how much parking would be needed in the district. Despite that, he said he could support the project because it only included 300 spaces. He said he would be working hard to lower the total amount of parking spaces built in the district. He also emphasized the importance of setting the price for parking at the correct amount, so that the city was not subsidizing parking. He thought parking revenues could be used to encourage public transportation. He stated he was in support of the garage.

Piedmont-Smith said she wanted to end the practice of subsidizing fossil fuels, which meant setting parking rates at prices that reflected the actual cost of that parking. She said she supported the bond issue but would also support the price increases Volan promised to propose. She also wanted to explore ways to use TIF funding to support public transportation. She said she would support the resolution.

Granger thanked the administration for working with the Council on both parking garage issues. She said it was important that the parking garage be convertible, if the city wanted to reduce the need for parking. She felt very strongly that the city needed to be pushing for alternative transportation incentives.

Ruff thought the proposal was a small, transitional facility. He was not convinced that it was necessarily needed. He still saw the garage as a subsidy that distorted the market and created more parking demand than could be sustained. He said people would choose to park if the city made it quick and easy. He was not in support of the garage.

The motion to adopt Resolution 18-25 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Ruff), Abstain: 0.

Vote on Resolution 18-25  
[10:54pm]

Sherman spoke about the upcoming council schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to approve the 2019 annual schedule. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Approval of Annual Schedule

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59pm.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dave Rollo, PRESIDENT  
Bloomington Common Council

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole Bolden, CLERK  
City of Bloomington

For Approval