

In the Police Training Room of the Police Station held on Thursday, February 23 at 7:00 p.m. with Councilpresident Richardson presiding over a regular session.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
FEBRUARY 23, 1978

Present: Kinzer, Middleton, Blume, Allison, Olcott, Young, Morrison, Richardson and Towell. Absent: None.

ROLL CALL

Councilpresident Richardson gave the agenda summation. For second reading, Resolution 78-6, Interdepartmental Funding Agreement; Ordinance 77-102, To Designate a Building and Site as Historic, re: Illinois Central Freight Depot on W. Morton Street; Resolution 78-3, To Approve the Mayor's and Workable Programs Committee's Recommendations on Allocation of Community Development Block Grant Funds; Ordinance 77-85, Ordinance 77-90, Ordinance 77-101 and Ordinance 78-9, all pertaining to City Employee Residency Requirements. For first reading, Ordinance 78-12, To Authorize Acquisition of Property, and Repeal Ordinance 77-75; Ordinance 78-13, Budget Transfer for Fleet Maintenance Fund; Ordinance 78-14, To Amend Zoning Maps re: Old Monroe County Library BG to BD. Also, the minutes of February 1, 1978 are to be approved.

AGENDA SUMMATION

Middleton reported that he had received a letter from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which explained that it will be quite some time before the City can receive PCB evaluations due to funding difficulties, etc. Secondly, he said that last night a freight train blocked all east/west traffic from 9:15 to 10:20 p.m. The police drove up to issue a summons, but the train pulled out as they arrived. He said that the trains have caused problems for years, and he has asked the City Attorney to investigate the possibility of filing a suit against the railroad to force them to stop this practice. Often the trains are overloaded and they must wait for a pusher. The train has blocked ambulances on their way to the hospital several times.

MESSAGES FROM
COUNCILMEMBERS

Kinzer echoed Middleton's remarks. She urged that the City renew efforts to construct an overpass or underpass to help alleviate this problem. She noted that there are City and State statutes which say that a train cannot block streets for longer than ten minutes (City ordinance, state statute says fifteen). She said these laws must be enforced since the railroad has chosen to ignore the City's requests.

Richardson added that he had recently spoken to Jim Wray about this problem and he informed him that the City has plans for an overpass over West Third Street which were presented recently to the Board of Public Works. He said he hopes that the overpass will solve the problem. He then thanked Mr. Tell from Orion Bus Company for showing the Council their new 30-seat bus. He said Mr. Wray seems to be enthused about the new model, and he urged Bloomington citizens to inform the Council of their preferences for the type of busses they desire. He also reported that the Monroe County Council passed an appropriation last night for the Emergency Housing Program. He added that he has been working with the Human Resources and Parks and Recreation Departments to try to work out a better definition of the function of the Older American Center. He said the Parks and Recreation Board took the first step in this area at their last meeting. Finally, he announced that the Landlord/Tenant bill was defeated in the Statehouse. He said there is much work to be done on the local level, and the Housing Code Committee will discuss possible amendments to City ordinances in this area. He said that they would like to work closely with the landlords and tenants, and he invited citizens to attend their work sessions and submit proposals if they wished.

Mayor McCloskey said he heartily endorses Pat Kinzer's statement on the railroad problem. He said that the Board of Works has received plans for the first time on the possibility of constructing an overpass across West Third Street. He said the Council should be examining these plans soon. Secondly, he said he has spoken to the majority of Councilmembers concerning the CDBG recommendations. He asked for the Council's support in cutting the appropriation for Big Brothers/Big Sisters by \$8,300. He claimed that this would not cause any severe disruption in their program by doing this. He said

that if the program is short of funds at the end of the year, or if their CETA contract is not renewed in September, then the City could help them at that time. He also recommended that the amount recommended for the Senior Citizens Center be reduced by \$3,000, and said he would like to see the program under the Parks and Recreation Department. He would also recommend that the Council add \$4,000 for the westside mural program, which the Redevelopment Commission would administer. He said rehabilitation of the Old Depot would be very good for that area of town, and urged the Council to approve the acquisition. He then addressed the Council on the energy crisis. He explained that 2,142 street lights have been turned off, which easily puts the City into compliance with the 25% cutback order from P.S.I. He noted that the Police Department has increased night patrols and surveillance.

Olcott remarked that the Mayor had made a good choice in appointing Harold Isaacs to the Utilities Service Board.

There were no Petitions and Communications.

PETITIONS & COMMUNICATIONS

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to introduce and read Resolution 78-6 in entirety.

RESOLUTION 78-6
Interdepartmental
Funding Agreement

Clerk Dolnick read Resolution 78-6 in entirety.

Olcott moved and Middleton seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 78-6.

Morrison read the legislative synopsis and gave the committee report, noting a Do Pass recommendation by a vote of Ayes: 5, Abstentions: 1 (Richardson).

Allison said she cannot vote for the present funding agreement unless her vote is necessary for approval of revised water and wastewater rates. She said the amount paid by Utilities seems fair for services rendered, although the method is doubtful. The City can choose "in lieu of taxes" or "services rendered" to justify the payments, but not both. The Franchise Committee has done the best it could, but contended that the figures used for percentage of time spent by various City departments on Utilities matters is just an estimate. She said that more accurate records will have to be kept of time spent in this area.

There was then a short discussion concerning the differences and advantages between "services rendered" and "in lieu of taxes" for payment by the Utilities to the City.

Blume remarked that the new arrangement more efficiently describes the services performed by the City for the Utilities Department. He said that the percentages have been estimated by each department head, who would be the person that would be best qualified to make the estimate. He said the Committee tried to get accurate figures, but it is difficult to compile them; however, next year they will do this. He said it is very important to have these figures for the Public Service Commission as soon as possible. He continued that the Civil City and Utilities have agreed on the \$305,000, even though the new estimates say the figure should be closer to \$315,000 according to David LoCascio's study.

Towell said he agreed with Allison in that a very accurate method of recording time spent by City employees on Utilities matters must be devised and adhered to; these estimates should not be made after the fact. He asked if an accurate accounting system has been implemented, and Blume answered no.

Richardson said that he questioned the percentage under the Legal Department, saying that it may be a little high. He continued that perhaps no money needs to be exchanged at all. He said the City will have to devise a way to keep an accurate record of time spent by City employees on Utilities.

Kinzer said she asked for an accurate accounting of services rendered to the Utility years ago, and she added that the total dollar amount seems to be pretty fair. She said the amount should be devised through consideration of time spent and services rendered. She continued that she questions the amount of time spent by the Legal Department and Council Office on matters that the Utilities Department should be handling.

Young said that the City does own the Utility, and that perhaps the City should not pay for water and other services, with the Utility doing the same. He said he feels that money exchange may not be necessary. He suspected that the time spent by department heads trying to compute how much time their employees spend on Utilities matters may not be worth the time.

Olcott said that the dollar amount in the franchise was used in this year's budget, and cannot be disputed now. The figure was arrived at through the City budget process, and it is a little late to argue about it at this time.

Middleton said that the Franchise Committee was appointed by the USB, and they have come up with an equitable figure and have also done valuable work in determining property ownership by the Civil City and the Utilities Department. He said he would not be in favor of going in the direction of "in lieu of taxes", stating that "services rendered" is more acceptable. He continued that many people may disagree on individual items in the agreement, but everyone agrees that it must be passed so that this year's budget will be sound.

Blume urged the Council not even to consider using "in lieu of taxes" as a basis for payment. He said that the City is too far into the budget year to make changes in the agreement; it must be supported. He explained that the Committee examined records of time spent for a two-week period, and it was an administrative nightmare.

Morrison said there may not be any difference between the two options, since the public is the one who pays the bill anyway.

Resolution 78-6 was then adopted by a ROLL CALL VOTE of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Morrison, Allison and Middleton).

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to introduce and read Ordinance 77-102 by title only.

Clerk Dolnick read Ordinance 77-102 by title only.

Olcott moved and Middleton seconded a motion to adopt Ordinance 77-102.

Morrison read the legislative synopsis and gave the committee report, which reflected a vote for a Do Pass recommendation of Ayes: 4, Nays: 3. He said the committee discussed the lack of response by the railroad to the historic designation request, whether the renovation would help the area, etc. He said his feeling is that this area is in a vital part of the westside, being right in the middle of the shopping pattern. He continued that for the amount of money to be spent, it is a good project, and could be restored to 95% of its original state.

Blume said he questioned the City buying a building to be used for selling produce, but now he understands that the City will not be buying the building with tax base funds, but will receive a grant for the renovation. He said Elizabeth Bridgewater's point about it being a good link to the westside is a good one. He continued that he was against the historic designation, but now is in favor of it.

Young contended that a better link for the westside would be improved streets, curbs, etc. He said the building was used as a warehouse, and has little sentimental or historic value.

Allison remarked that one of the purposes of the CDBG Fund is

ORDINANCE 77-102
Historic Designation of Old Depot

to improve blighted areas, and renovation of the Depot would meet this goal. She said the building has been all but forgotten by the railroad and its condition continues to deteriorate when it could be put to good use.

Pam Service of the Historic Building Committee of the Plan Commission explained that they use several criteria in determining whether a building or site is historic. The Old Depot meets three of them: (1) The date it was built (1906) meets national requirements of fifty years old to be designated historic. (2) Architectural significance; the building is not beautiful or charming but it is typical of construction of that time and does contain some local "folk architecture" similar to that used in building barns in the area. (3) Economic significance. The Depot was used by the Showers Factory to ship their furniture for quite some time; the railroad contributed significantly to the economic well-being of the community. For these reasons, the building warrants historic designation. She explained that they have spoken to the railroad to try to determine whether they would object to historic designation, and they have not objected, although they have not agreed either. The Plan Department has tried repeatedly to get a straight answer from them, but have only received a bureaucratic shuffle so far.

Olcott reminded Blume that although local taxes may not be used for the building, federal grants are also tax dollars, and should be considered as such.

Blume added that he voted on the designation on the Plan Commission, and the Commission added a provision in their approval that in six months the case will come back to them to see what progress has been made on the renovation and in getting a reply from the railroad.

Ordinance 77-102 was then adopted by a ROLL CALL VOTE of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Young and Olcott).

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to introduce and read Resolution 78-3 in entirety.

RESOLUTION 78-3
Mayor's CDBG
Fund Recs.

Clerk Dolnick read Resolution 78-3 in entirety.

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 78-3.

Morrison read the legislative synopsis and gave the committee report, noting the different recommendations on various parts.

Morrison moved and Olcott seconded a motion to approve the "Housing" section of the resolution. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to approve the Health Services Bureau appropriation under "Public Service Programs". Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Blume moved and Olcott seconded a motion to cut the appropriation, as per the Mayor's suggestion, for Big Brothers/Big Sisters from \$21,171.67 to \$12,772.50.

Jan Wagner, Director of the program, explained that she had spoken to the Mayor about the cut and informed him that they could live with the cut, but they would like to have the additional funds if their CETA contract is not renewed this year.

Mayor McCloskey said that he expects their contract to be renewed, but if it not, he now pledges and promises to endorse an additional appropriation at that time.

Middleton said it would not be in order to put this stipulation in the resolution since it is just a dollar amount change.

Towell said that the Council has had the experience before of not spending the money and then having it go back if it is not used. He said it may be easier to pass it and then just

not spend it if it is not needed.

There was then a short discussion about how the Council and Mayor could promise to appropriate additional funds later if needed, and the general consensus was that if the CETA contract is not renewed, the Council and Mayor would support an additional appropriation.

Motion to cut the amount appropriated was then approved by a vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Towell).

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to approve the Weekend Community project as submitted. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Olcott moved and Allison seconded a motion to cut the appropriation for the Senior Citizens Center, as recommended by the Mayor, to \$15,425.

The Mayor explained that the Parks and Recreation Department has considerable expertise in this area, and it could be run for less money if duplication in facilities, staff, etc. is eliminated. He said the City should be concerned with the policy development aspects of the proposal, and should work towards centralization of senior citizens programs.

Morrison contended that the location requested by the Senior Citizens Action Congress on the westside would benefit the elderly in the area better than any other location. He urged the Council to let the program have a trial run of one year and if it does not work out, reconsider the funding next year.

Elizabeth Bridgewaters, petitioner for the request, addressed the Council. She said that there are several things that disturb her about the proposal to put the program under Parks and Recreation. First, the Workable Programs Committee recommended that they have a separate program; second, she resents the attitude that because they are senior citizens, they are not capable of running a program; and third, the center would be an independent organization, not a governmental one. It would advocate the rights of senior citizens. They do not want to undermine the Parks and Recreation program, and they do not want to create another bureaucracy, but she asked, "must we be a part of yours?" She said the program would be run by the Senior Citizen's Action Congress, and noted that the City can facilitate the program, but not destroy it. If they have their own place, it will not be a burden on the government, but a self-supporting, independent unit. In answer to a question from Councilmember Middleton, she said that 90% of the citizens in the program would come from the target area. She continued that with 8,000 senior citizens in the County, she doubts that their program would interfere with or draw people away from the Older American Center.

Richardson explained that the dollar amount is not relevant. He said that her proposal has accomplished a great deal in spurring action on the part of the Parks and Recreation Board in the form of a resolution which addresses long-term plans for senior citizens programs. He went on to say that no one doubts the merits of the program, but he would like to see it under a City department. He said that if they are asking the City for funds for a program, then the City has the right to ask questions and attach strings as they please. The Council is not just looking at their program, but at all senior citizens programs in an effort to accommodate their social and recreational needs. He ended by stating that he supports the Mayor's proposal to cut the appropriation and supports putting the program under the Parks and Recreation Department.

Bridgewaters replied that by putting the program under Parks and Recreation, the Council would be destroying the Senior Citizens Action Congress. She contended that there will never be a good senior citizens program until the program is run by senior citizens.

Middleton said this program is not the sole activity of the Congress. He said the program is coming along, and should be a successful one under the City.

Bridgewaters said their program has nothing to do with recreation, and should therefore not be in the Older American Center. She said that over the years the City has turned down space in the Center for a nutrition site and the drug program; all of a sudden, there is room in the building for the senior citizens center. She repeated that the two programs are just not compatible. She asked why other programs such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters are not forced into City programs.

Richardson replied that the Council has asked BB/BS how they could operate in such a setting. However, they are a national group which must meet certain guidelines. He noted that Number 3 of the Parks and Recreation resolution pertains to the type of activity that the senior citizens program addresses.

Wagner said she agreed with many of Ms. Bridgewater's arguments, but said the Council has a right to question the administrative costs, although this should not be the only consideration in whether the program receives funding or not. She contended that the program could still be semi-independent under the Parks and Recreation Department.

Ed Howell, Director of the Human Resources Department, said that if the program would be good under the Senior Citizens Action Congress, then it would also be a good program under Parks and Recreation. He continued that he has heard criticism that the OAC only provides for recreational needs, but that they are now moving in other directions as well. He questioned why the department should be chastised by Ms. Bridgewater for expanding in this way when in previous years, this is what was asked for.

Les Coyne of the Parks and Recreation Board said that the Board has been aware of the limited focus of the OAC; perhaps this is the fault of the Board or because of staffing problems and high turnover. He said he would be interested in taking charge of re-evaluating the program, and such action can be taken immediately. He said the Bridgewaters proposal is not the main reason that this re-evaluation is being considered; the Board realizes that all senior citizens programs must be broadened and addressed in an organized manner. He contended that the Board is ready to do this. They are opening up their process to facilitate more open access. He continued that Number 3 in the resolution is lifted directly from a federal grant submitted at an earlier date.

McCloskey added that the funds can be administered through Parks and Recreation with the program remaining essentially the same.

Louis Bridgewater said he looks at the proposal to put the senior citizens center under Parks and Recreation as confiscation of a program.

Kinzer said that the Council could consider cutting the amount and letting them operate with this lower amount rather than attaching strings. She asked if they could operate the program with the proposed funding amount?

Bridgewater answered that they could do it, but the dollar amount would dictate the effectiveness and scope of the program. In answer to a question from Councilmember Blume regarding what the funds would be used for, she said that a part-time director and outreach worker would be hired, and equipment would be purchased.

Blume listed his objections to funding an independent program. First, duplication of organization; second, duplication of facilities and space; and third, duplication in staffing since the OAC already has people that are capable of running this type of program.

Towell said that a few years ago, several Councilmembers were interested in seeing the City work in new areas, and the Human Resources Department was formed. At that time, the consensus was that the OAC should be under HRD since they have a much broader range of programs than Parks and Recreation. He said he understands that the staff in Parks and Recreation has different training with an emphasis on recreation, but this cannot change until a better system is devised.

He said he would like to see a delay in adding a new location and staff until the Council can determine that such a system would work.

Morrison noted that the Mayor is now recommending \$4,000 for westside murals. He said he believes that the people on the westside would prefer a senior citizens program over murals. He said the City has gambled more on worse programs, and asked the Council to consider one year's funding to see if the program can be successful.

Allison explained that everyone she has spoken to about this favors consolidation of programs. She said she too would like to see senior citizens increase their income, but the plan to sell crafts and look for part-time jobs is too general, and may not work unless marketing techniques and feasibility are investigated. She said that money should be spent on programs, not eaten up by staff and rent. She suggested that alternative funding sources and grants be sought. She then moved, and Towell seconded, a motion to move the program under the administration of the Parks and Recreation Department. In answer to a question from Ms. Bridgewaters concerning whether she had spoken to members of the Senior Citizens Action Congress about consolidation, Allison said she had, and they favored consolidation.

Les Coyne said additional space may have to be acquired for this program elsewhere, but this could fit into the long-range plan. He said the Board will look for direction from the Council as to how they should deal with the program.

Louis Bridgewaters claimed that there is a market for crafts, mending and alteration services, etc. The Center could perform these services at a much lower cost than others could.

Olcott said he would like to see the program work, and said the Action Congress can work with the Parks and Recreation Department to see that the program is effective.

Young said the program deserves a one-year test. He said for the amount of money to be spent, it is a worthwhile project.

Middleton questioned the Council's power to change programs at this late date. He said that if the Parks and Recreation Department feels they can come up with a similar program, they should do it. He said it is not the Council's prerogative to change the administration of a program at this time, after the Workable Programs Committee has recommended it this way.

Mayor McCloskey said the City should do all it can to avoid fragmentation of programs. He said the OAC Directors are hired for this type of program. He continued that the issue is not the dollar amount but administrative aspects and policy development. He thanked Ms. Bridgewaters for forcing the issue, thereby pushing the Parks and Recreation Board to make a commitment in the area.

Mike Andrews, Workable Programs Committee member, said if the Parks and Recreation Department has been interested in the program, they should have come forward months ago. In the future, they should make their intentions known at an earlier date.

Patterson

Pat V. stressed the importance of proper accounting procedures, with detailed descriptions of services, clientele, who will administer, etc. He said the program could be administered by either group effectively. He reminded the Council that nothing is guaranteed; HUD could declare any of the project ineligible, as they closely scrutinize public service programs.

The amendment to put the program under the Parks and Recreation Department was then approved by a vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Kinzer, Young and Morrison).

The amendment to cut the amount recommended to \$15,425 was then defeated by a vote of Ayes: 4, Nays: 5 (Middleton, Morrison, Towell, Young and Olcott).

Middleton moved and Morrison seconded a motion to specify in the resolution that the Parks and Recreation Department will administer the program only so far as being a fiscal intermediary.

This motion then failed by a vote of Ayes: 4, Nays: 5 (Towell, Olcott, Allison, Blume and Richardson).

The Senior Citizens Center section of the resolution was then approved as amended by a unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Bridgewaters requested that the Council remove the Senior Citizens Action Congress from the resolution, as they will lose \$45,000 in funding if the program is run by the City through various sources.

Blume moved and Morrison seconded a motion to amend the agenda to delete the Residency Ordinances; 77-85, 77-90, 77-101, and 78-9. He explained that it is getting late in the evening, and the ordinances should be discussed later. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

AMEND AGENDA
DELETE 77-85,
77-101, 77-85,
78-9

Towell moved and Middleton seconded a motion to add, as per the Mayor's recommendation, \$4,000 for westside murals.

Paul Solyn of the Bloomington Area Arts Council urged the Council to approve the recommendation of the Mayor. He explained that the original proposal was much more ambitious and included full-time staff, more murals, etc. He said the murals would enhance the appearance of the westside and would be a boost to the human spirit. He added that the total amount requested is less than 1/2 of the total amount in the CDBG recommendations. He said the specific locations for the murals are to be chosen by the residents of the westside neighborhoods involved.

Charles Ansbauch, Director of the CETA program for the arts, added his support of the proposal. He said many community artists do not have work outside the university; this would be a good way to utilize their talents.

Paul Solyn added that some surfaces are better for murals than others; a good, smooth surface would be the best. In answer to a question from Councilmember Young regarding how long the murals would last, Paul said that with exterior latex paint as is used in Chicago, paint peels (they are less concerned with the quality of paint since the murals are usually painted on buildings that are slated for demolition); however, if sealers are used the murals could last for many years.

The Mayor's recommendation for an additional \$4,000 for murals was then adopted by a vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 2 (Young and Allison).

Olcott moved that the \$65,000 designated for purchase and partial renovation of the Old Depot be transferred to Miller Drive Site Improvements. He said this would be a much better use of the funds.

Charles Ansbauch noted that the Council has approved historical designation of the Depot, and the proposal should not be dropped for purchase at this time. He urged the Council to approve the funds for the Depot.

Ed Howell noted that it is uncertain whether the building could be used for a market, but added that the Parks and Recreation Board has been concerned in the past about using City parks for this function. He said the Depot would probably be adequate, and asked that the Council approve the recommendation for purchase.

Blume said that it is vital to get people downtown, and renovation of the Depot as a community market would be a good step in this direction.

Olcott's motion to transfer the funds to Miller Drive Site Improvements failed by a vote of Ayes: 2, Nays: 7 (Morrison, Towell, Allison, Kinzer, Blume, Middleton and Richardson).

Richardson then addressed the Administration section of the resolution. He said that he and Allison had spoken to Pat Patterson concerning the staffing of the Redevelopment Department, and he had conveyed to Pat his feeling that he questioned whether an additional rehab specialist is needed, and whether the rehabilitation technician was a full-time position.

Pat Patterson explained that the rehabilitation technician now works half-time. He said he has taken a close look at this staffing arrangement recently. He noted that there is no guarantee that employees will stay for a long time, and that additional staff is needed to help develop the new staff. He noted that in 1972, the Department employed twenty people, whereas today they employ thirteen even though their work load has increased significantly.

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to approve the Administration section of the budget. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Blume moved and Allison seconded a motion to put the remaining \$4,000 in contingencies. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Towell moved and Morrison seconded a motion to approve Resolution 78-3 as amended. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to introduce and read Ordinance 78-10 by title only.

ORDINANCE 78-10
To Amend Waste-
water Rates

Clerk Dolnick read Ordinance 78-10 by title only.

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to adopt Ordinance 78-10.

Richardson noted that the Council held a public hearing concerning the rate increase and a work session as well. He said that John Scott of Black and Veatch does not recommend alternative "A", which would increase the usage charge from \$1.10 per 1,000 gallons to \$1.19 per 1,000 gallons. Alternative "B", which would develop a different usage charge for each customer class, and Alternative "C", which would develop a block type rate that reflects the different responsibilities of the customer classes, would be other options, but he still favors the original rate structure over any of the alternative proposals. He favors "C" over "B" since "B" may not be very easy to administer for the Commercial Office.

Mike Andrews, who also proposed alternatives, explained that he is also very concerned about holding up construction of the Dillman Road Treatment plant by passing unworkable rate structures. However, he noted that he had spoken to the EPA to find out what their specific objections to removing the \$1.54 service charge would be and they informed him that it would not be illegal under state law. Ted Hornin from the Construction Grant Division of the EPA said that they would have no objection to having a flat rate with no service charge, but they do look at cost of service. He also said that they are not likely to look within the different classes. He continued that 60% of the funding should be completed within fourteen months and it would not affect the bond prospectus as long as the revenue is raised. The EPA could inform the City within a few months if the revised rates are acceptable, and if they are not they can be adjusted at that time with little repercussion. He urged the Council to consider eliminating the service charge for residential customers and to raise the 1,000 gallon charge. His Alternative "A" would provide for no service charge with a charge of \$1.83 per 1,000 gallons. Scott says that the billing department does not determine bills according to class; and Black and Veatch could not obtain these figures for this year's study, although these figures were available for the last rate increase study. He contended that the necessary changes could be done within a month without endangering the bond prospectus.

Richardson thanked Mike Andrews for the extensive amount of time and effort he has spent on examining the rate structures. He then read a memo giving the number of people in Monroe County and in the City below the poverty level according to a 1970 census.

Allison mentioned that Dave Rogers had brought out a good point in that the Council really does not know if low-income families use a lot of water. However, the different alternatives would benefit the low-income, small-family residences.

Blume said that he would be cautious in making such a change; apartment dwellers face an across-the-board increase since they do not have separate meters.

Mike Andrews replied that apartments are not considered within the residential class. His proposal would use the Black and Veatch recommendations for apartments. The decreased rates would affect only residential single-family and duplex units.

Stu McClure, Director of the Utilities Department, said that he agrees that the poorer segment of the community should be assisted, but the department does not know who they are. He noted that no matter how low a family's income, the department still faces the same \$1.75 cost of service per customer per month. The USB strictly considered cost of service.

Richardson commented that the same assumptions must be made with users of water. The Council does not know for a fact that low-income people use less water, but the lower rates for residential customers do have a tremendous effect on single elderly or student customers who are on fixed incomes. He then thanked Mr. McClure for the time he has spent in explaining the rates to Councilmembers.

Jack Martin added that with water rates there is a minimum charge with the amount of water used considered on top of that; and there is the difference.

Olcott asked Jack Martin if he felt that the current proposal by Black and Veatch seemed to be the wisest in terms of the plant, rates, etc.

Jack Martin answered yes. He said the USB needs a model to set up the rates and a justification for changes. To change the rate without a detailed study would be difficult.

Towell said that as a person knowledgeable in computers, programming a computer for different residential classes would not be difficult.

Stu McClure said that Alternative "C" would help the low-income customers and would not create any administrative problems.

Phil Emmi of the Sierra Club said that the Council should adopt a rate that would reward those who conserve water. Progressive rates that would add charges to those who waste water should be considered.

Mike Andrews contended that the City does not have enough information to pass a progressive rate that would pass EPA scrutiny; this could be considered for the 1980 increase.

Blume urged the Council not to adopt a structure that would in any way jeopardize getting the plant built or the bond prospectus. If the Council does not go ahead with letting bids, \$5,000,000 could be lost. He said service charges should not be eliminated completely. He said residents should pay for the right to hook-on to this City service. He said he prefers Alternative "C" and Middleton agreed.

Towell moved and Kinzer seconded a motion to substitute under "residential class" Alternative "A", which establishes a flat rate for 1,000 gallons.

Motion failed by a vote of Ayes: 2, Nays: 6 (Morrison, Olcott, Middleton, Allison, Kinzer and Blume).

John Miller of the USB said that he is not convinced that the philosophy of "pay more, use less" is a valid one. He said there are other methods of assisting low-income people and the Council should consider another way of helping them besides through rate structures.

Richardson argued that when gas prices went up, he definitely did all he could to conserve. Many people are in the same boat just because they need to make ends meet.

Mike Andrews said that Black and Veatch also recognizes this philosophy. They say increased costs cause decreased use.

Towell moved and Morrison seconded a motion to adopt "Alternative B".

Motion carried by a vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 2 (Allison and Blume). (Note, Young had left the meeting before the last vote).

The appropriate numbering of sections was then agreed on, and Ordinance 78-10 was adopted by a vote of Ayes: 7, Nays: 1 (Morrison).

Olcott moved and Middleton seconded a motion to introduce and read Ordinance 78-12 by title only.

FIRST READINGS
78-12 Acquisition
of Property -
Thrasher Bldg.

Clerk Dolnick read Ordinance 78-12 by title only and Richardson read the legislative synopsis.

Olcott moved and Towell seconded a motion to introduce and read Ordinance 78-13 by title only.

ORDINANCE 78-13
Budget Transfer
Fleet Maintenance

Clerk Dolnick read Ordinance 78-13 by title only and Richardson read the legislative synopsis.

Olcott moved and Towell seconded a motion to introduce and read Ordinance 78-14 by title only.

ORDINANCE 78-14
Amend Zoning re:
Old Library

Clerk Dolnick read Ordinance 78-14 by title only and Richardson read the legislative synopsis.

Olcott moved and Morrison seconded a motion to approve the minutes of February 1, 1978 as submitted.

MINUTES 2/1/78

Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was then adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

John F. Richardson
John F. Richardson, President
Bloomington Common Council

Nora M. Connors
Nora M. Connors, Deputy City Clerk