

REGULAR MEETING

THE COMMON COUNCIL of the City of Bloomington, Indiana, met in the Council Chambers in City Hall on Thursday, May 21, 1964, at the hour of seven thirty o'clock (7:30 P.M.) E.S.T. in regular session with Mayor John H. Hooker, Jr. presiding.

Meeting called to order by Mayor John H. Hooker, Jr.

Meeting was opened with invocation by Councilman Johnson.

Members Present: Councilmen - Fee, Johnson, Moulden, C. Day and Faris

Also Present: Mayor - John H. Hooker, Jr.
City Engineer - Raymond Long
City Attorney - James Cotner

Members Absent: Councilmen - Karry Day and Derge

A roll call of Councilmen was taken by Clerk-Treasurer.

Councilman Faris moved, seconded by Councilman Johnson, that minutes of the May 7, 1964 Meeting be approved as distributed and read individually. Motion carried unanimously.

Senator Dave Rogers presented additional petitions to the Council relative to the use of the building on Third Street. Senator Rogers stated there were approximately 82 signatures (actual count 85). In addition for consideration of the Council, Senator Rogers presented a proposal of how the room in the present City Hall could be used if the Law Enforcement Building idea were to go ahead.

CITY HALL
Fourth and Walnut Sts.

Suggested plan for modification and use of present City Hall.

This plan would house all City administrative and utility offices in the present City Hall, with certain exceptions noted in next paragraph.

LAW ENFORCEMENT BUILDING on E. Third St. would be used to house the Police Dept. and City Court as designed and constructed.

EXCEPTIONS Common Council, Plan Commission, Traffic Commission, etc., would use new City Court room. This would in no way interfere with the function of the Court.

CITY HALL, FOURTH & WALNUT

FIRST FLOOR:

Mayor's office ----- same as at present.
Mayor's conference room - present th. of Police office.
Mayor's secretary ----- same.
Clerk-Treasurer - Board of Works ---- same.

SECOND FLOOR:

Engineer's Dept.... Use all of present space (1291) sq. ft. PLUS the present Council room (1721 sq. ft.), a total of 3012 sq. ft. This is almost 1000 sq. ft. more than proposed space in new building. A bare minimum of expense would provide all the space needed for many years.

Park & Recreation Dept.... Allocate all present offices on S. side to provide 725 sq. ft. of space as compared to 341 sq. ft. proposed in new building. Little if any expense to remodel. Offices located near engineer would be decided advantage in completing future park plans.

BASEMENT:

Remodel to house all water and sanitation office facilities. Basement contains 1659 sq. ft. of space. Proposed space in new building is 2393 sq. ft. Present space in use by department is 1000 sq. ft. This plan will gain 659 sq. ft. It has been stated that the new business machines recently purchased by the department will streamline billing etc. and will require one less employee. Therefore,

it is evident that a space (measure of 600 sq. ft. should be sufficient for quite some time. Also this area contains two large vaults that will prove invaluable for the fire-proof storage of departmental records. An outside entrance can be easily arranged. Utility funds can be used for remodeling and as far away as needed. DOWNSTAIRS REFRIGERATOR should also benefit from the gas pipes and pay their water bills daily.

PRESENT WATER OFFICE...it is ideally located and suited for use as the Fire Chief's office and Fire Prevention Bureau.

The above plans were discussed and studied by the previous administrator together with Mr. Ray Long, then City Engineer. The plans were all determined to be both feasible and economical. They will save thousands of dollars of TAXPAYERS MONEY as compared to the proposed plan to remodel and alter two buildings.

In this plan BOTH BUILDINGS will serve the purpose for which they were built and for which they are best suited to be used.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that proposed Ordinance 64-9 be advanced to second reading and read by title only.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 McQuiden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-8 by title only.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that proposed Ordinance 64-8 be adopted.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 McQuiden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that rules and regulations concerning the procedure of ordinances be suspended for this evening.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 McQuiden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that proposed Ordinance 64-12 be advanced to first reading and Clerk-Treasurer be instructed to read proposed Ordinance 64-12. Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-12.

Councilman Johnson moved, seconded by Councilman Paris, to amend Ordinance 64-12 in part of ordinance which says 3rd day of January 1962, to read 4th day of September 1962.

Roll call vote on the amendment.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that proposed Ordinance 64-12 be advanced to second reading and read by title only.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-12 by title only.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Moulden, that proposed Ordinance 64-12 be adopted.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Moulden, that proposed Ordinance 64-13 be advanced to first reading and Clerk-Treasurer be instructed to read Ordinance 64-13.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-13.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman Paris, that proposed Ordinance 64-13 be advanced to second reading and be read by title only.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-13 by title only.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman Paris, that proposed Ordinance 64-13 be adopted.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Farris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Moulden moved, seconded by Councilman Farris, that proposed Ordinance 64-10 be presented for first reading. Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-10.

Councilman Fee questioned Attorney Horace Karsell about the urgency of the passage of proposed Ordinance 64-10 this evening.

Attorney Karsell stated that the people intended to construct a filling station at this site. He further stated that the people in the area were notified and had an opportunity to appear before the Plan Commission and they did not appear to object to the proposal.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman Farris, that proposed Ordinance 64-10 be advanced to second reading and read by title only.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-10 by title only.

Councilman Farris moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that proposed Ordinance 64-10 be adopted.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Farris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Farris moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that proposed Ordinance 64-11 be advanced to first reading and Clerk-Treasurer be instructed to read proposed Ordinance 64-11. Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read proposed Ordinance 64-11.

Councilman Johnson questioned Attorney Karsell on this proposed ordinance.

Attorney Karsell stated there is a job to be done and it provides that this rezoning be approved by the Council. A whole block is involved and all the residents were notified and they showed no opposition to this proposal. This ordinance is for the changing of a single family dwelling to a four unit house.

Councilman Farris moved, seconded by Councilman Johnson, that proposed Ordinance 64-11 be adopted.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Moulden - Aye
 C. Day -- Aye
 Farris --- Aye

Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman Farris, that Resolution 64-8 be read by Clerk-Treasurer. Motion carried unanimously.

Clerk-Treasurer read Resolution 64-8.

RESOLUTION NO. 64-0

WHEREAS, the Clerk-Treasurer reports that by reason of the fact that the Federal Government has not advanced funds with which to pay current obligations of the City University Fire Station Account (APW-196), the Law Enforcement Building Account (APW-206) and Water Construction Funds, and
APW-IND-806

WHEREAS, there are now due contractors for work performed upon such accounts, and

WHEREAS, there is a surplus of funds in the Sewage Works Sinking Fund Account of the City, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature of the State of Indiana for the year 1961 by Chapter 71 approved the transfer to a contemplated fund from surplus funds of the City on a temporary basis and providing that such transfer shall be returned and repaid to the original fund from which it was originally applied within the period of the budget year in which the same is transferred,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Clerk-Treasurer be and he is now authorized and directed to transfer sum of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) of the surplus funds of the Sewage Works Sinking Fund Account to the City University Fire Station Building Account (APW-196), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Clerk-Treasurer be and he is now authorized and directed to transfer sum of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000.00) of the surplus funds of the Sewage Works Sinking Fund Account to the Law Enforcement Building Account (APW-206), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Clerk-Treasurer be and he is now authorized and directed to transfer sum of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000.00) of the surplus funds of the Sewage Works Sinking Fund Account to the Water Construction Account, APW-IND-806

THESE FUNDS shall be returned from the various funds to which they are transferred to the Sewage Works Sinking Fund on or before July 31, 1964.

Dated this 21st day of May, 1964.

John A. Hoeker Jr.

Presiding Officer
Harold A. Young

Clerk-Treasurer

Mayor Hoeker explained this is a transfer of funds for a seventy day period of time in the neighborhood of sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000.00) into three accounts. All of these accounts deal with the Federal Government Projects. We have in our Sewage Sinking Fund, \$100,000.00 that will not be needed until August 1, 1964, rather than keep contractors waiting until we have our distribution from the Government, we felt it would be of the best interest of the City to put these into working accounts, which will be repaid in time for us to meet our obligation.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman Paris, that Resolution 64-0 be adopted. Motion carried unanimously.

Attorney James Nixon, appearing in behalf of Bill Salmon moved to bring his action before the Council at next regularly scheduled meeting of the Council, due to the absence of two Council Members.

Dr. Barton, a citizen in the audience, stated that he had attempted to get data in which to prepare a graph showing the various increases in the use of water in Bloomington - how much water was used by single families, by apartments, by industries, commercial use and institutional use. He stated he was informed that such data did not exist, and he was interested in knowing whether this data was available at this time.

Mayor Hoeker stated that at the present time there was no such data, but in the near future he would call Dr. Barton and have him work with the Water Department in setting up this type of outline.

Councilman Paris presented the following report from the Traffic Com-

mission on the Lusk Corporation on the East side of town.

May 20, 1964

A committee consisting of Lt. Col. Clifford R. Thrasher, Lt. Earl W. Peters, Mr. Ancil Fournet, and Mr. Tim Rose met at the Park Ridge Addition at the northwest corner near the apartment building site for the purpose of study of the proposed layout for the Lusk Corporation. The following recommendations were made by the committee after review of both ends of the proposed new site:

1. Level approach to the #46 Bypass. This would be at the west end of the street making an exit near the St. Marks Church.
2. Acceleration or passing lanes on the east side of the bypass, also passing lanes on the west side of the bypass.
3. Adequate signing and signals for the traffic flow at the bypass.
4. Control at each parking entrance and control at Park Ridge at each of these streets that are near the proposed new 80 foot street.
5. Sidewalks and curbing to be located on both sides of the streets at the edges of the 80 foot right-of-way.
6. The south right-of-way line of the 80 foot street would be the south border of the property.

Approved by Traffic Committee of Common Council.

S/ C. J. Paris
C. J. Paris

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Moulder, that the report of the Bloomington Traffic Commission be received and made a record of the Common Council of the City of Bloomington. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. May, 314 W. 16th Street, a citizen in the audience, stated there was an apartment built on West 16th Street and at the time the apartments were built they were assured there would be off street parking. Mr. May stated that he had given the owner six months and he has still not provided off street parking for his tenants, and he wondered if something could be done about this.

Mayor Mucker stated that this request would be turned over to Councilman Paris and his Committee for further study and they will have an answer for you at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Council on June 4, 1964.

Mr. Mason Atwood, asked that the citizens in Park Ridge Addition would like to have a copy of the proposed Ordinance by the Lusk Corporation.

Mr. William Thompson, another citizen in the Park Ridge area stated that they had three arguments against this proposal. First, it would disfigure the houses, second the traffic hazard, third, it is contrary to a map received by all property owners in the Addition. All lots are reserved for residents and if they let the road go through, it would take up two lots in the area.

Mr. Frank Smith, another citizen in the Park Ridge Addition, stated that his lot was lot 141 and it was next to the proposed lots which would be used for the road. He stated they already had a road going west and he could see no reason or necessity for another road.

Mayor Mucker stated he had instructed City Administration to notify the people in this area because we were concerned with the feelings of the people, and we do not intend to do anything behind anyone's back. We wanted you people to have a warning of what could happen to you so you could object through the Bloomington Plan Commission.

Councilman Johnson presented the following report on Urban Renewal.

To: The Mayor and the Common Council
of the City of Bloomington, Indiana

Subj: Report on an evaluation of Federal
Urban Renewal in Bloomington

Date: 21 May 1964

Because the Committee on Metropolitan Development and Growth of the Common Council of the City of Bloomington has been engaged objectively for many weeks in an evaluation of the Federal Urban Renewal program in this City, and because the citizens should have the benefits of such efforts as promptly as possible, the Committee presents forthwith a brief report and a resolution for adoption by the Common Council.

Urban Renewal was started in this City in 1961 when the newly formed Bloomington Redevelopment Commission passed a declaratory resolution, in August, claiming the need for an urban renewal program in the northwest area of the City. On the basis that "Project One" of the developing program conformed with the overall needs of Bloomington the City Plan Commission quickly gave its approval. Following this the Common Council concurred with the resolution and approved in substance the program that has been in operation virtually since that time. Soon thereafter a public hearing was held to hear arguments based on questions of public utility and benefit. On the claimed basis that the arguments presented failed to deny that there was a substantial need for urban renewal and that such a program would be beneficial to the City generally the Redevelopment Commission proceeded promptly to secure the support and activation of an urban renewal program.

In essence, the program which was quickly adopted obligated the Federal government to provide three-fourths of the net project cost, leaving Bloomington to furnish one-fourth. The newly constructed Dyer School was accepted by the Federal urban renewal agency, Housing and Home Finance Agency, as the "contribution" of the City's share in paying for the program. This "contribution" was reported by the city administration to be more than its required share, by about \$145,000. Since the new school was needed anyway it was widely announced and generally believed that the urban renewal program would not cost the city anything directly.

However, it has been learned that prior to 1964 the city government agreed to provide peripheral streets, purchase a section of the project area to serve as a park, and provide a booster water pumping system. The total costs to Bloomington is estimated to be approximately \$135,000. Thus the program will not be without very substantial direct costs to the city.

In the meantime the Department of Redevelopment has been working toward the completion of Project One, consisting of Phase A (public housing) and Phase B (private housing). The initial purchase of real estate in the Project Area was on 1 June 1962. On 1 January 1964, of the total of 276 parcels to be acquired, 205 (74%) were owned by the Department of Redevelopment while 33 (12%) were under option or being processed in the courts.

The Committee on Metropolitan Growth and Development has made personal contacts with a large proportion of the families who have been directly involved in the relocation program of Project One. At least 50% believe that they have been benefitted and they are in favor of Project One. However a very substantial proportion were opposed to it at the beginning, perhaps in considerable degree owing to misunderstandings and lack of information.

Several individuals and some groups in Bloomington vigorously oppose Project One and they strongly object to any extension of urban renewal in this city. However, a large proportion of the people believe Project One should be continued to its planned completion.

It seems quite probable that without undue interference Project One could be completed by the end of 1965. Such completion with the contribution of peripheral streets and certain other important items by the city, as already indicated, would add greatly to the desirability of the area and thus increase its economic value. Such increases would include elevations in the income of the city through taxes.

If Project One should be abandoned at this time the amount

value of the area and of the surrounding land would remain very low and that part of Bloomington would indeed be blighted. The city would still be obliged to invest substantial amounts of money in the area simply to keep it from becoming unbearably burdensome to the surrounding areas. Therefore Project One should be continued and completed as expeditiously as possible.

Regarding the question of making any extension of Federal urban renewal to any other part or parts of Bloomington, the Committee believes that such extension should be held in abeyance at least until Project One is essentially completed and the city will have had sufficient opportunity to gain first-hand experience with it. However, the city should actively and imaginatively explore other ways of improving its housing, land use, and general appearance.

Finally, no very broad and significant program of action such as Federal urban renewal should be adopted by the city without thorough and deliberate development and widespread release of full information regarding it. Moreover, there should be free opportunity for public discussion, questioning, and public expression of views. This is the essence of good local government and the City of Bloomington should become foremost in the practice of such government.

Councilman Johnson moved, seconded by Councilman Fee that the following resolution be adopted.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Committee of THE WHOLE of the Common Council of the City of Bloomington has reported an evaluation of Federal Urban Renewal in Bloomington, and

WHEREAS the Committee in the report has recommended the continuation of Project One of the current Federal Urban Renewal program, and that it be completed as expeditiously as possible, and

WHEREAS the Committee believes that the extension of Federal Urban Renewal in any other part or parts of the City of Bloomington should be fully investigated, and the following requirements met:

- Submission of a workable plan by the redevelopment commissioners.
- Approval by the City Plan Commission.
- Approval by the Board of Works.
- A Public Hearing.
- Certified by the Common Council.
- Submission to Citizens Referendum, and

WHEREAS the report can constitute a useful basis for further consideration of land use and the improvement of housing in the city; and

WHEREAS the Federal monies advanced constitutes a loan and becomes a grant only upon completion of Project 1 in accordance to approved plans and specifications, and

WHEREAS full faith and credit of the City of Bloomington shall always be maintained by this Administration.

Now Be It Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Indiana, that the report be adopted with the recommendations therein constituting the policy of this Administration regarding Federal Urban Renewal.

Attorney James Regester, informed the Council that the Bloomington Redevelopment Department this afternoon had filed suit in the Monroe Circuit Court, Cause No. 6761, on the closing and vacation of certain streets, and alleys and public ways in the Project A area. Attorney Regester asked the Council to please instruct the City Attorney not to contest this suit. Attorney Regester further stated that if these roads, streets and alleys are not closed then construction cannot take place and it is the desire of Urban Renewal to start the proper construction in this area.

Councilman Paris moved, seconded by Councilman Johnson, that the City Attorney be instructed not to oppose the suit brought by the Bloomington Redevelopment Department, Cause No. 6761, the petition

to vacate certain streets, alleys and public ways on Project One in the Urban Renewal area. Motion carried by four - Councilman Day abstained his vote.

John Snider, a reporter in the audience, asked Councilman Johnson how many people had been contacted in connection with this question.

Councilman Johnson stated that the members of the Council had been given a list of people and they had called and asked persons affected by the renewal and also a number of independent persons not in the immediate area.

John Snider also asked about the tax income from this area. He stated that it was his understanding that nothing over ten per cent after expenses will be paid to the City.

Councilman Johnson stated that the houses will be \$13,000 - \$14,000 to \$15,000 class - about sixty per cent would be in that area.

J. Sean Fitzpatrick, a news reporter asked questions on the following: Paragraph 5 & 6 - page 2 - and paragraph 10 on page 3.

1. Does this imply a tacit acceptance that Urban Renewal was right in the first place.
2. That no further action on Urban Renewal until 1966.
3. Does it mean that Urban Renewal will remain in limbo - in regard to the Council on this construction.

Councilman Johnson stated that there will be no more Urban Renewal by this Council.

Mr. Fitzpatrick asked if this statement made in the report was a tacit acceptance by this Council that Urban Renewal was right in the first place and second if the people had been educated in the first place would they have disapproved.

Councilman Johnson stated not at all.

Mayor Hooker stated that these were mature responsible people and they had accepted this as a fact of life.

City Attorney Cotner stated that our understanding as we investigate Project One (1) the money advanced by the Federal Government at this point was in the nature of a loan to the City of Bloomington, and upon completion this would become a grant. It would be legal for the City to stop this project, but we would be obligated to the Government and the money would not be converted into a grant. You can see what it would do on the sale of bonds, we would be hindered by a debt hanging over our head to the Federal Government, and it might have effect on the other Federal Projects going on in the community at this time.

Dr. Hugh S. Ramsey spoke at some length against the Urban Renewal Project.

The following people directed questions to the Council on the Urban Renewal question.

David Bauer, Mrs. Ruth Figg, Mr. Lloyd Peters and a few other citizens that did not give their names.

Councilman Johnson moved, seconded by Councilman Fee, that the Resolution proposed by Councilman Johnson and his Committee be adopted by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington.

Roll call vote.

Fee ----- Aye
 Johnson - Aye
 Houlden - Aye
 C. May -- May
 Paris --- Aye

Motion carried four to one.

Councilman Fee moved, seconded by Councilman McViden, that claims presented for payment May 22, 1968 be allowed. Motion carried unanimously.

Councilman Paris moved that meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at the hour of ten fifty o'clock (10:50 P.M.) E.S.T.

John H. Hooker, Jr.
John H. Hooker, Jr.
Presiding Officer

Howard A. Young
Howard A. Young
Clerk-Treasurer