

In Bloomington, Indiana on June 02, 2021 at 6:30pm, Council President Jim Sims presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council. This meeting was conducted electronically via Zoom.

COMMON COUNCIL  
REGULAR SESSION  
June 02, 2021

Councilmembers present via Zoom: Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger, Susan Sandberg, Sue Sgambelluri, Jim Sims, Ron Smith, Stephen Volan  
Councilmembers absent: none

ROLL CALL [6:33pm]

Council President Jim Sims summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:33pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to approve the minutes of May 06 and May 20 of 2020. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:36pm]

- May 6, 2020 (Regular Session)
- May 20, 2020 (Regular Session)

Community Access Television Services (CATS) had technical difficulties causing there to be no recording of the meeting for approximately fifteen minutes.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:40pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to remove the time limit set for reports from the Mayor and City offices. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to remove time limit [6:45pm]

Jeff Underwood, Controller, presented the City of Bloomington 2022 Budget Advance summary. He also summarized the 2021 Budget Analysis.

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

Smith asked about reversions and what that meant for departments, services, et cetera.

Council questions:

Underwood explained how reversions worked and said services were not affected. He further explained that the Parks and Recreation department events had fewer attendees resulting in less revenue. He provided some examples from other departments. Underwood stated that, in the past, Mayor John Hamilton had returned half of the reversion amounts back to department heads. Over the previous two years, department heads allowed that funding to go back and that was in part what funded Recover Forward.

Sgambelluri asked if there were other investments being considered in the next year or two.

Underwood stated that the administration was reviewing the list of normal and necessary replacements. He provided additional details and said that more information would be forthcoming.

Sgambelluri asked for updates on the impacts of the pandemic on departments.

Underwood explained that the hardest hit areas were those that residents paid for using, like parks, parking meters, garages, and street department. He described additional information regarding those areas.

Sandberg asked about the pilot programs for police officers including take-home cars and housing vouchers. She asked about staffing levels, attrition rates through retirement, loss of officers to other departments, and recruitment. She explained that she did not need the answers immediately but that those were the questions she would be asking.

Flaherty asked for further clarification on the total amount of reversions and which departments had them.

Underwood clarified that he had presented the major operating accounts, but that there were others.

Flaherty asked when the reversion information was known.

Underwood said it was early March.

Flaherty asked what the typical avenue was for reversions given that 2020 had been affected by the pandemic, and if it would be similar for 2021 and 2022.

Underwood said that it would be in the \$4-5 million range and provided additional information. He summarized average totals in the past.

Mayor John Hamilton added that the reversions were higher than usual and for several years the administration had split that total in half to allow the department to use the funds through special appropriation the following year. He explained how some of that funding assisted with Recover Forward and that the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds contributed too.

Flaherty stated that was all helpful information and per his understanding, there was money that was not used in 2020, and there was a 2021 budget that did not include the reversions in it.

Hamilton confirmed that was correct.

Flaherty asked if the 2021 reversions would also be split with the departments that saved the money.

Hamilton said it depended on the balances and on risk.

Piedmont-Smith referenced the Climate Action Plan (CAP) including building staffing capacity for attaining goals and doing community outreach. She asked if that would be factored into next year's budget.

Hamilton said staff was looking at how the city was moving forward with sustainability, and inclusion, and that feedback was welcome.

Piedmont-Smith spoke about housing and upcoming proposals by the Housing Insecurity Task Force for local government. She commented that the ARPA funds were limited so the city needed to think carefully about how to use the funds for capital expenditures or programs that would be financially stable through other means. She explained that housing for very low-income community members was a worthy expenditure of ARPA funds.

Hamilton agreed that much of the funding being discussed was one-time funding which came with long-term challenges. He said that the administration would be proposing significant investments sensitive to sustainability, inclusion, and one-time funds.

Rollo commented that he was concerned about the public safety budget, and retaining and recruiting sworn officers, given the pending annexation. There was a need for an additional fire station. Rollo asked how inflation would affect personnel costs, et cetera.

Underwood said those issues were always taken into account. He said that the three unions had agreements in place so those numbers were known. He provided additional information and stated that it was early in the process.

Rollo asked if rental and housing costs were factored in, too.

Underwood stated they were as well as many more.

Sims said that council needed to temper suggested increases in the budget with decreases in other areas. He asked for more details about ARPA funds which he recalled would be spent over the next three years.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Underwood confirmed that was correct and that council would receive very specific information.

Hamilton said that the administration projected a twenty-four to thirty month investment of the ARPA funds beginning with specific requests for council approval in July.

Volan asked the administration to consider expanding the area for housing vouchers for police officers if non-city areas were annexed.

Smith asked if councilmembers wanted to initiate a new program, what the best process was.

Hamilton encouraged proposals from council.

Underwood added that if councilmembers and the administration proposed something, then he would design a budget, and the required process would be followed.

Flaherty commented on the budget process and said there were many good suggestions for improvements. He said he would likely have many questions. He also was thinking about longer term capital planning in the adopted goals within the CAP, Transportation Plan (TP), et cetera. He spoke about budget decreases and increases.

Piedmont-Smith asked how parking was subsidized. She commented on the different pots of money and the flexibility of using the funding. It was worthwhile to look at funding sources to further the CAP and TP. She agreed that it was important to consider increases and decreases in the budget.

Hamilton said that the goal was not asking council to only share good ideas for spending with the requirement of decreasing in another area to offset that amount.

Underwood agreed that the goal was to get feedback from council and not require councilmembers to balance the request. He said that the city was required to have a balanced budget, annually.

Piedmont-Smith asked if surplus funds could be used towards balancing the budget.

Hamilton confirmed that they could.

Underwood said that it was recommended to have two months' worth of reserves.

Rollo said that one way to reduce costs was to reduce organics out of the city's waste through free composters to interested residents. He provided reasons in support of composting organics. He also spoke about the potential of reopening the landfill instead of shipping waste to Terre Haute in an effort to combat climate crisis.

Underwood said the administration was receptive to feedback.

Hamilton responded that there was a Waste Energy Review looking at best options. The Solid Waste Management District (SWMD) was key in analyzing information though there was room for additional research focused on the city, for example.

Rosenbarger thanked Hamilton and Underwood and stated she would submit questions in writing.

Volan spoke about the drafting of departmental budgets and asked Hamilton if he intended to invite councilmembers' assistance in drafting the budgets.

Hamilton explained that councilmembers' feedback was welcome.

Volan commented on the potential of moving money instead of simply cutting funding from one area.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Sims appreciated the discussion and said it was important to have a good, transparent, and thorough process for the budget. He intended to submit his questions in writing. Sims stated that there was an upcoming committee meeting and offered the opportunity to councilmembers to continue the discussion on the city budget.

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, stated that council could also opt to schedule a special session as opposed to a committee meeting. There was brief council discussion on the options.

Hamilton stated that staff was in the process of drafting budgets and asked council to be mindful of the current schedule which had an upcoming appropriation ordinance as well as detailed budget presentations by department heads in August. He was hesitant for council to expect details on the status of the budget between those already scheduled meetings. He reiterated that the administration always welcomed feedback from councilmembers.

Underwood agreed with Hamilton and said that staff was working extremely hard on the budget. He also agreed that feedback was welcome.

Sims understood that more details may not be available but that the intent was to ensure council engagement in the budget process.

Sandberg said that there may not be a reason to have a budget advance on July 28 based on the discussion. She also understood that the best way for council to engage was to submit questions directly to the administration prior to July 1.

Hamilton confirmed that was ideal.

Volan stated that a special session gave council more flexibility while the Committee of the Whole was limited. He provided additional details. He said that once the budget was presented in August, there was not much councilmembers could suggest at that point. He said that councilmembers intended to participate further in the budget process than in the past, and asked how the administration would respond to council questions.

Sims said that the response to questions would occur after the August budget hearing.

Hamilton said it seemed that council potentially wanted a preview of the budget prior to August which was not possible. He reiterated that council feedback was best given earlier rather than later. He explained that the budget discussion with council began in April and was ongoing.

Sgambelluri asked if councilmember feedback was best given to the administration sooner rather than later, and said they would not know the estimated property tax cap rates until after July 31.

Sims summarized the current schedule.

Rollo stated that he did not see the need to have a meeting on July 28 because there was ample time to submit questions.

Flaherty noted that it was also possible to include budget discussion at the next regular session. He commented on the value of having a public discussion on councilmembers' priorities regarding the budget, both for council and the public. He believed it was useful to have a meeting on July 28 especially if there were answers from the administration on councilmembers' questions.

Volan agreed that there was time to consider the schedule at the next regular session.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Bryony Gomez-Palacio, Chair of the Bloomington Arts Commission (BAC), presented the commission's Annual Report. She discussed the 2021-2026 Strategic Plan, core objectives, vision, mission, projects, Grants for the Arts program, art installation on the 4<sup>th</sup> Street parking garage and the Graduate Hotel, street murals, community partnerships, and other initiatives. She also spoke about the performing arts including the Buskirk-Chumley Theater, which was turning one hundred years old, and the Waldron Art Center. Gomez-Palacio also discussed goals and plans, and thanked the mayor, council, staff, and other arts partners.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Sgambelluri thanked Gomez-Palacio and highlighted the successes like BAC's emphasis on partnerships and art installations. She asked about the project on emerging artists and how they were identified.

Gomez-Palacio explained that the BAC was in the process of drafting guidelines. The grants would be smaller for individuals who may not already have a public portfolio of artwork. She provided additional details.

Jane Kupersmith, Assistant Director for Small Business Development in the Economic and Sustainable Development (ESD) department, presented the Annual Economic Development Commission Report on the 2020 Activity and Tax Abatement Summary. She discussed the general standards including the review criteria, the evaluative criteria, the phase-in of new property taxes, the authorization process, annual reporting requirements, economic impacts of proposed new investment and actual new investment, and new jobs and salary estimates. She concluded that there was a massive increase in employment relating to growth at Catalent, though salaries were lower than what was predicted. Kupersmith provided additional information and described other projects and abatements like the Southern Knoll/Milestone Ventures, Urban Station, Cook Pharmica d/b/a Catalent Biologics from Resolution 15-06, and Real America, LLC. She briefed council on other projects that were in the abatement period.

Rollo stated that the Urban Station project, which was considered to be in substantial compliance, but had only retained four jobs when it was estimated to have ten, in addition to adding jobs. He asked if the employer was the Chocolate Moose.

Council questions:

Alex Crowley, Director of ESD, responded that the employment was to be within the complex itself. He explained that this was one example of why the criteria was revisited. Crowley explained the metrics.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the actual new salaries of the Southern Knolls/Milestone Ventures project was \$14,731 for one full-time employee, which was not a living wage.

Kupersmith explained that there were two part-time jobs that were reported as one full-time job. While they were important jobs, they were not the high quality, full-time, and permanent jobs. She said the abatement was an affordable housing project, like the Urban Station project. She provided additional requirements from the state.

Piedmont-Smith was concerned that the employment did not meet the requirement of the city's living wage ordinance, which was required for the abatement.

Kupersmith stated she would double check but that it was most likely an issue with the required form.

Smith asked how the abatement rates were determined.

Kupersmith explained that the schedules were created by ESD and the Office of Legal Counsel and other entities, perhaps. It was a discussion on what the city was getting in exchange for the abatement.

Smith stated that it was a negotiation.

Kupersmith confirmed that was correct and that the city was strict and careful with its resources.

Crowley mentioned that the abatement was one part of local incentives which could offset operating costs. There were also other factors to consider that affected the schedule and he provided examples.

Piedmont-Smith asked staff to review how the city verified the affordable housing requirements like Union at Crescent requiring that at least 70% of the units be allocated to households that were at or below 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Crowley responded that was checked by the Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) department and he believed it was done annually.

There was brief council discussion pertaining to public comment.

Greg Alexander commented on the blocking of sidewalks and bicycle lane during construction of Urban Station for over one year.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to approve the Tax Abatement Report. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to approve Tax Abatement Report [9:00pm]

There were no council committee reports.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [9:01pm]

Greg Alexander spoke about sidewalks, connectivity, bike lanes, and scooters. He discussed safety and infrastructure.

- PUBLIC [9:02pm]

Tina Honeycutt discussed ways that council could use meetings to assist unhoused neighbors, including adding restrooms and handwashing facilities at Seminary Square.

Renee Miller echoed Honeycutt's comment and encouraged respect for the unhoused population.

There were no appointments to boards or commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [9:10pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [9:12pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Resolution 21-18 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Chief Deputy Clerk Sofia McDowell read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 21-18 – A Resolution Extending the Term of Ordinance 20-11 and Calling for the Continuation of Other Temporary Regulations

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Resolution 21-18 be adopted.

Kaisa Goodman, Special Projects Manager in ESD, described the proposed continuation of the pickup and drop off zone, parklets, and Kirkwood Conversion program. She discussed changes and said that staff believed it was ideal to continue the modifications through October 31, 2021.

Resolution 21-18 (cont'd)

Rollo asked if there were any problems with the policy.

Council questions:

Goodman explained that needs for outdoor dining and parking were issues. She said that staff's time was also used to set up the barriers, et cetera. Another concern was the accessibility of the closed blocks of Kirkwood. Goodman and other staff had conducted assessments and were working on modifications like temporary ramps for outdoor seating.

Rollo asked if the general response from restaurants was positive.

Goodman confirmed that was correct.

Rollo asked if any businesses claimed the modifications were hurting their revenue stream.

Goodman explained that the parklets were only in front of the businesses using them and staff had not received complaints from businesses. She said that Downtown Bloomington, Inc. had done a thorough survey regarding the closures and found overwhelming support. She clarified that there had been some concerns but businesses found it to be advantageous.

Sgambelluri asked about restaurants investing in outdoor dining, especially those that fronted on the street closures.

Goodman responded that staff's goal was to give as much predictability on the closures from the city.

Flaherty wondered about the longer term options for parklets, pickup/drop off sites, and street closures. He commented that many cities that had the programs in place prior to the pandemic, created a more vibrant streetscape because businesses invested in their own area. He supported the programs and asked about staff conversations regarding long term options.

Goodman explained that she had received feedback from businesses regarding their desire to continue the programs so staff was in a fact-finding stage.

Piedmont-Smith inquired about the trash receptacles on Kirkwood that sometimes were over-filled due to the increase in people on the street. She asked if Public Works was aware of the issue.

Goodman stated that they were and were also emptying the receptacles more often, and also were able to deal with large pizza boxes, for example, that clogged the receptacles.

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Sgambelluri commented on a recent experience she had where Director of Public Works, Adam Wason, had taken a photo of an over-filled trash receptacle which was promptly emptied. She also commented on her appointment to Downtown Bloomington, Inc. and was impressed with the organization's thoughtfulness with things like accessibility.

Council comments:

Volan spoke in favor of Resolution 21-18 and cautioned against moving too quickly to a permanent closure of the street and provided reasons. He appreciated that the closures were mainly driven by the constituents of Kirkwood.

Sandberg supported the extension through the summer. She reminded everyone that there were other businesses that were eager to open back up, like the Buskirk Chumley theater, and they needed to be accommodated as well, like the restaurants.

Rollo appreciated ESD having the policy and maintaining it to help restaurants be viable. He said it would be interesting to see how it played out in the long run. He supported Resolution 21-18.

The motion to adopt Resolution 21-18 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Resolution 21-20 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. McDowell read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to adopt Resolution 21-20.

Crowley presented Resolution 21-20 including the tax abatement process summary, the site summary and ownership activity, the developer's background, the site and redevelopment project overview, the city's local commitment, a comparable incentive analysis summary, and next steps.

There were no council questions.

There was no public comment.

Piedmont-Smith supported the tax abatement and designation and spoke in favor of affordable housing in a great location where people may not need to rely on a car. She was excited about the real low-income housing and about prospective rents being 30% of AMI.

Volan and Smith agreed with Piedmont-Smith.

The motion to adopt Resolution 21-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 21-30 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. McDowell read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to adopt Ordinance 21-30.

John Zody, Director of HAND, presented Ordinance 21-30 and summarized the updates including the rights and responsibilities of tenants and landlords, and the occupancy affidavit.

Rosenbarger reported the Housing Committee's analysis of Ordinance 21-30 including concerns and recommended do pass of Ayes: 4, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Rosenbarger moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 21-30. She presented Amendment 01.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cms. Rosenbarger, Piedmont-Smith, Sims, and Flaherty. While it is true that over-occupancy may present certain health and safety dangers, this Whereas clause raises the problematic comparison with owner-

Resolution 21-18 (cont'd)

Vote to adopt Resolution 21-18 [9:33pm]

Resolution 21-20 – To Designate an Economic Revitalization Area, Approve the Statement of Benefits, and Authorize an Abatement Period for Real Property Improvements - Re: Property at 1730 S. Walnut Street (Retreat at Switchyard) (Real America LLC/Retreat at Switchyard, LP, Petitioner)

Council questions:

Public comment:

Council comments:

Vote to adopt Resolution 21-20 [9:54pm]

Ordinance 21-30 – To Amend Title 16 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Residential Rental Unit and Lodging Establishment Inspection Program [9:55pm]

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 21-30



occupied units and pre-existing rental units with higher occupancy where unsafe conditions and negative impacts on neighbors due to a high number of occupants may also be an issue.

Amendment 01 to Resolution 21-30 (cont'd)

Piedmont-Smith added that one whereas clause implied that over-occupancy only took place in residential rental units.

Sims also added that there was a wrong perception when comparing rentals with other housing types, like single family units.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

Mark Fig said he was okay with Amendment 01.

Public comment:

Rollo asked for Zody's opinion on Amendment 01.

Council comments:

Zody stated that staff was not opposed to Amendment 01.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 21-30 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 21-30 [10:10pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 21-30. She presented Amendment 02.

Amendment 02 to Ordinance 21-30

Amendment 02 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith. If this amendment is adopted, the tenants affected by Ordinance 21-30 would have to sign a new affidavit of occupancy each year, regardless of whether they signed such an affidavit for the same unit in the previous year. The intent is to remind the tenants, as well as the property owner/agent, about the occupancy rules on an annual basis.

Sims added that the changes in state law hindered HAND's ability to perform its duties. He said education on occupancy rules and expectations on an annual basis was important.

Flaherty asked Zody for staff's opinion.

Council questions:

Zody stated that staff was not opposed to Amendment 02 and provided reasons and additional details.

Volan inquired about the nature of the clientele for a majority of housing in the city, which was typically students who may have to move every year. He asked how it was not an educational benefit to provide yearly education for that group.

Zody said that staff was thinking more about process. What was on the form was important. He said that with cycle inspections, having tenants understand and affirm that they read the affidavit, was ideal and would efficiently reduce one step.

Volan asked for clarification on the process.

Zody stated that it was not necessary to ask landlords to have tenants renew the affidavit on a yearly basis if the tenants had not changed.

Daniel Dixon, Assistant City Attorney, added that when a student moved to a new apartment, only then would they need to submit a new affidavit.

Volan asked if only one out of a few tenants moved, a new affidavit would be required.

Zody confirmed that it would be required and provided examples.

Sims asked about the signing of annual leases and wondered why it would not be important to also sign an affidavit.

Zody explained that there were also multi-year leases and more and that the goal was to make it reasonable for property owners.

Amendment 02 to Ordinance 21-30 (cont'd)

Sims stated that he did not see it as onerous to have tenants sign a lease, if annual, and the affidavit.

Piedmont-Smith asked Dixon if he saw anything legally problematic with Amendment 02.

Dixon stated he did not.

Greg Alexander commented on leases auto-renewing without signing an annual lease, and said he did not see the need for annual affidavits.

Public comment:

Lucas read a comment submitted via Zoom chat by Dave Askins asking about outreach to renters on the amendments or Ordinance 21-30.

Volan commented on the changes that would trigger a renewal of the affidavit. He also spoke about the benefits of educating renters and stated that he would support Amendment 02.

Council comments:

Flaherty thanked the sponsors and said that he would be voting against Amendment 02. He commented on the near equal amounts of undergraduate student, and graduate student, renters. He said Ordinance 21-30 was sufficient as drafted, without Amendment 02.

Rosenbarger appreciated the thoughtfulness in Amendment 02 and said that Ordinance 21-30 was sufficient in its original form, where the landlord was responsible for the verification of tenants in rental units. She would be voting against Amendment 02.

The motion to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 21-30 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 4 (Rollo, Rosenbarger, Flaherty, Sandberg), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 21-30 [10:29pm]

Flaherty asked Zody what outreach had been done to landlords and the apartment association and what feedback had been collected.

Council questions:

Zody stated that HAND staff had not reached out specifically to the apartment association, but that he had spoken with Mark Fig on the phone. Zody explained that the most important next step was to work with landlords and the apartment association on what would be on the affidavit form.

Mark Fig spoke as a landlord of Fig Properties, and as a representative of the Monroe County Apartment Association. He said that a recent poll of about one hundred landlords appreciated and used the rights and responsibilities form. He did not believe there was an over-occupancy problem in the city. He provided additional concerns.

Public comment:

Greg Alexander urged council to oppose Ordinance 21-30 and provided reasons. He disagreed with the three, unrelated adults in a home policy.

Flaherty asked Zody for additional details on the interaction with landlords in the city. He was hesitant about voting on Ordinance 21-30 that evening because reasonable concerns were raised in the discussion.

Council comments:

Zody addressed some of the concerns, including the fee ranges as well as email correspondence. He said that the administrative

details could be worked out with the apartment association, if Ordinance 21-30 was approved.

Ordinance 21-30 as amended  
(cont'd)

Dixon addressed the perjury language which was not required to be in the form, and may have been left over from a former form. He said that language could be removed or adjusted.

Sgambelluri asked about a fiscal impact, staffing, and administration costs.

Zody said he would have to follow up on those details with council at a later date but that it would be managed by the rental specialists in HAND. He said there would not be additional staff.

Sgambelluri asked for a future fiscal impact statement stating what Zody just said. She also questioned if there was a need to postpone the consideration of Ordinance 21-30 or if there were timing concerns.

Zody said that September was approaching and the goal was to get education and communication out as soon as possible.

Sgambelluri asked if HAND would be alright with prolonging the consideration of the legislation a little bit.

Zody responded that it was up to council but that he believed staff could collaborate with stakeholders

Volan shared concerns that other councilmembers expressed. He said that it was possible to offer fixes to Ordinance 21-30 before recess. He asked Zody why inspections could not be scheduled over email.

Zody understood that the inspections could be scheduled via email.

Brent Pierce, Assistant Director of HAND, said that he saw daily email correspondence about scheduling inspections.

Volan asked if staff heard about complaints of spam filters and community members not receiving correspondence.

Pierce said that he had seen only about three issues involving spam out of many hundreds of emails.

Smith asked if Ordinance 21-30 could be tabled.

Flaherty explained the many options council could choose from. There was brief council discussion concerning scheduling.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to postpone Ordinance 21-30 to the Regular Session on June 16, 2021. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to postpone Ordinance 21-30  
[10:57pm]

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST  
READING [10:59pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 21-25 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. McDowell read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 21-25 - To Establish the American Rescue Plan Act Fund ("ARPA Fund") Supporting the City of Bloomington's Recovery from the COVID-19 Pandemic

Sims referred Ordinance 21-25 to the Committee of the Whole on June 9, 2021 at 6:30pm.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 21-28 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. McDowell read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Sims referred Ordinance 21-28 to the Committee of the Whole on June 9, 2021 at 6:30pm.

Flaherty moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 21-29 be read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. McDowell read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Sims referred Ordinance 21-28 to the Committee of the Whole on June 9, 2021 at 6:30pm.

There was no public comment.

Lucas reviewed the upcoming schedule. Sims stated that the public health emergency so council would meet virtually until the recess, and move to a hybrid schedule on July 21, 2021.

Volan moved and it was seconded to adjourn. Sims adjourned the meeting.

Ordinance 21-28 - AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ORDINANCE 20-23 WHICH FIXED SALARIES FOR CERTAIN CITY OF BLOOMINGTON EMPLOYEES FOR THE YEAR 2021 - Re: To Change the Grade of Existing Positions in the Office of the Mayor, the Parks Department, and the Utilities Department and Revise Job Titles within the Police and Fire Departments and the Office of the Mayor to Better Reflect the Nature of Those Positions [11:01pm]

Ordinance 21-29 - Amending Ordinance 20-22 which Fixed the Salaries of Officers of the Police and Fire Departments for the City of Bloomington for 2021 Re: Title Change for Fire Inspector [11:04pm]

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [11:04pm]

ADJOURNMENT [11:09pm]

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2023.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sue Sgambelluri, PRESIDENT  
Bloomington Common Council

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