

<p>In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 13, 2023 at 6:30pm, Council President Sue Sgambelluri presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.</p>	<p>COMMON COUNCIL REGULAR SESSION December 13, 2023</p>
<p>Councilmembers present: Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger, Susan Sandberg, Sue Sgambelluri, Ron Smith, Stephen Volan Councilmembers present via Zoom: Jim Sims Councilmembers absent: none</p>	<p>ROLL CALL [6:30pm]</p>
<p>Council Vice President Isabel Piedmont-Smith gave a land acknowledgment and Council President Sue Sgambelluri summarized the agenda.</p>	<p>AGENDA SUMMATION [6:30pm]</p>
<p>Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to amend the agenda to add councilmember remarks for retiring members after council schedule, and before adjournment. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Sims' audio was not working, but indicated his yes vote via hand gesture.)</p>	<p>Vote to amend agenda [6:36pm]</p>
<p>Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to approve the minutes from March 1, 2023. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Sims' audio was not working, but indicated his yes vote via hand gesture)</p>	<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:40pm] March 01, 2023 (Regular Session)</p>
<p>Rollo noted the upcoming change in the administration and acknowledged Mayor John Hamilton for the willingness to work on difficult city projects, and with council.</p>	<p>REPORTS [6:41pm] Council Members</p>
<p>Sandberg mentioned her and Rollo's upcoming joint constituent meeting. She said it would be her last one as councilmember.</p>	
<p>Mayor John Hamilton noted it was the final council meeting of the year. He thanked Sandberg, Volan, Sims, Smith, and Sgambelluri for their time on council and congratulated Piedmont-Smith, Rollo, Flaherty, and Rosenbarger on their successful reelection. He appreciated the continued support for the down payment assistance program, the proposed sale of the current Bloomington Police Department (BPD) building, and funding for investing in police and fire facilities. He discussed the process of purchasing the Showers West building and the proposed projects to be funded. He said it was an honor to have worked with council over the previous eight years and noted significant accomplishments.</p>	<p>The Mayor and City Offices [6:43pm]</p>
<p>Flaherty reported on the Special Committee on Council Processes (SCCP) and its work on board and commission reforms. He noted the Novak report, council recommendations, priorities, and work the committee had done. He discussed the committee's recommendation for additional resources and funding for the Office of the City Clerk to oversee boards and commissions. He said that the incoming administration, along with other stakeholders, would best determine next steps. He provided additional information.</p>	<p>Council Committees [6:55pm]</p>
<p>Rollo asked about combining the Environmental Commission (EC) and the Commission on Sustainability (BCOS). He favored keeping them separate. Flaherty stated that the committee had discussed the options with the commissioners and chairs. The three pillars of sustainability were environmental, social, and economic. The EC was focused on environmental quality and BCOS was more holistic. Combining the commissions was not favored by most but the next steps were still being determined.</p>	<p>Council discussion:</p>

Volan moved and Rollo seconded to accept the report on Board and Commission Reform. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Sandberg).

Vote to accept report [7:02pm]

Daryl Ruble spoke against the land and labor acknowledgment, about traffic calming items and streets, the unhoused population, and BPD.

Public [7:02pm]

Jim Shelton discussed the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) program and explained how the children were supported in the courts.

Terry Amsle commented on the Novak report, the SCCP, the purpose of boards and commissions, and diversity, equity, and inclusion.

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:20pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:21pm]

Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Ordinance 23-31 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 23-31 - To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration And Personnel" - Re: Amending Chapter 2.23 (Community and Family Resources Department) by adding Section 2.23.240 - Closed Captioning in Places of Public Accommodation [7:21pm]

Rollo moved it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith to adopt Ordinance 23-31.

Volan presented Ordinance 23-31 and said it was important to have closed captioning in public accommodations in the city. He described when the closed captioning would be handled, how enforcement would occur, and a phase-in period. The legislation was endorsed by the Council for Community Accessibility (CCA) and the Bloomington and Monroe County Human Rights Commission (HRC). He introduced Holly Elkins.

Holly Elkins, Indiana Association of the Deaf (IAD), thanked council for the opportunity to comment on the importance of closed captioning. She shared personal experiences as a deaf person, and spoke about the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), closed captioning, and accessibility. She noted studies showing those aged fifteen to thirty nine years old preferred to have subtitles. She provided additional details and commented on subtitles on social media, and at the meeting that evening. She urged council to support the legislation and thanked Volan.

Volan concluded the presentation with his lived experience with subtitles.

Piedmont-Smith asked how places of public accommodation would be notified about the requirement.

Council questions

Volan stated that there was not a specific plan yet.

Michael Shermis, Special Projects Coordinator, Community and Family Resources (CFRD) department, and staff liaison for the CCA and HRC, stated there would be a press release, and more.

Volan spoke about his discussion on closed captioning with members of the city government in Seattle and their processes.

There was additional discussion on outreach and complaints.

Rollo asked if there were monetary penalties.

Shermis said no. It would be a human rights violation investigation.

Volan added the goal was to have closed captions turned on.

Rollo asked if CFRD was prepared to handle the complaints.

Shermis said yes, and that staff did not anticipate many complaints.

There was a brief discussion on accessibility with council’s meetings.

Ordinance 23-31 (cont’d)

Dan Domsic, AARP (formerly the American Association of Retired Persons), spoke in favor of Ordinance 23-31.

Public comment:

Volan wondered if closed captioning would be required when there was no sound on the television or for sporting events.

Council comments:

Elkins said that closed captioning was improving and some sports already included scores and more.

Volan said that places with multiple televisions only needed to have one of every five with closed captions.

Piedmont-Smith thanked Volan and Elkins. She favored the legislation and encouraged outreach to businesses and provided some examples.

Flaherty thanked Volan and noted Volan’s advocacy for accessibility during his tenure on council. He thanked everyone involved.

Volan thanked Elkins and Shermis and everyone that provided input in drafting the legislation.

Sims thanked Volan, Elkins, and Shermis. He expressed support for the legislation.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 23-31 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 23-31 [7:58pm]

Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 23-08 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Appropriation Ordinance 23-08 – To Specially Appropriate from the General Fund, Economic Development LIT Fund, Parks and Recreation General Fund, the Rental Inspection Program Fund, Local Road and Street Fund, Parking Facilities Fund, Cumulative Capital Development Fund, Vehicle Replacement Fund, Solid Waste Fund and Fleet Maintenance Fund Expenditures Not Otherwise Appropriated (Appropriating Various Transfers of Funds within the General Fund, Economic Development LIT Fund, Parks & Recreation General Fund, Local Road and Street Fund, Parking Facilities Fund, Cumulative Capital Development Fund, Solid Waste Fund, Fleet Maintenance Fund, and Appropriating Additional Funds from the Rental Inspection Program Fund and Vehicle Replacement Fund) [7:47pm]

Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 23-08 be adopted.

Cheryl Gilliland, Director of Auditing and Financial Systems in the Controller’s office, noted that the meeting that evening served as the public hearing and was noticed in the newspaper ten days prior. The legislation was the year-end appropriation. There was no impact on the General Fund or tax rates. She provided a summary on the transfers and the uses of funds.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on the fiscal impact of the vehicle replacement fund.

Gilliland clarified that the sale of the used vehicle, totaling \$180,000, had not been appropriated yet.

Rollo asked about the \$12,000 for the mayor’s office for employee turnover.

Gilliland stated that several employees had left that year and the payout cost needed additional funds.

Jeff Rodgers, Vice President of the Fraternal Order of Police, discussed staffing shortages.

Rollo commented on staff that had left and had received bonuses totaling about \$100,000. He referenced a Herald Times article where Mayor John Hamilton stated that was a normal process.

Larry Allen, Deputy Mayor, said that the policy in the employee manual dictated that employees be paid a certain amount for unused vacation time and comp time. He noted that two deputy mayors, a communications director, and a director of public engagement had left that year. It was an unusual year but followed normal city policy.

Rollo restated it was standard practice for when employees left the city. Allen confirmed that was correct.

Appropriation Ordinance 23-08 (cont'd)

Piedmont-Smith was pleased that additional money was not needed.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Appropriation Ordinance 23-08 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 1 (Sandberg).

Vote to adopt Appropriation Ordinance 23-08 [8:24pm]

Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 23-23 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 23-23 - A Resolution Authorizing the Sale of Real Property - Re: 220 E. Third Street [8:24pm]

Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded that Resolution 23-23 be adopted.

Allen presented Resolution 23-23 and provided details on the sale, statutory authority, and the best offer after the bidding process. The closing would occur in 2024 but Resolution 23-23 authorized the sale. He spoke about the background of the facility and its flooding. He commented on bonding, the purchase of the Showers West building, and repairs and improvements to fire station facilities, and presented funding sources and uses of public safety project funds. The sale of the current police station required the approval of the council. Allen said there was a deed restriction pertaining to the donation of the land to the city which would be addressed during the closing process. The sale of the police headquarters building would not change Waldron, Hill, and Buskirk Park. He briefly discussed the offers and stated that the administration recommended the approval of the sale to GMS-Pavilion Properties, LLC because the offer exceeded the minimum bid and was from a reputable developer, the holdover terms were flexible and favorable to BPD, and a range of uses would help activate the area economically by providing facilities that were currently lacking in the area, and allowed for additional community use of the adjacent public park. Allen explained the next steps.

Rollo asked why the deed restriction was no longer applicable.

Council questions:

Allen responded that staff was confident that the sale of the building was allowable and provided some details on staff's research into the matter.

Rollo asked if staff anticipated litigation.

Allen stated that the city hoped it did not come down to litigation, but that had been mentioned in the letter sent by Mr. Hill.

Piedmont-Smith expressed concern about the decrease in the cost for the renovation of Fire Station 3 and the training facility. She asked if the work to be done would be of high quality, with building longevity, given the decrease in funding.

Allen said that with a limited budget, the work would be prioritized and be up to code, and safe, et cetera.

Piedmont-Smith said there would be some savings from fire station #1.

Allen confirmed that was correct, as well as with Showers West. He gave additional examples of potential work and funding.

Volan asked why Tax Increment Financing (TIF), or rainy day funds were not being used.

Allen said those funding sources could be used, but it would be up to the next administration and council.

Smith asked what would prevent the city from selling the adjacent city park.

Allen explained that staff looked at the historic uses of the land, and there were clear boundaries for the park. It was not going to be changed in the foreseeable future.

Smith asked why the reversion clause was not disclosed earlier.

Allen responded that it was not disclosed earlier because it was not a barrier to the sale of the building.

Hamilton added that the question was if the city had a legal right to sell the building, and research confirmed that it could. The city had done its due diligence in researching the legal aspects. He reiterated that the bonds and the sale of the building paid for all four projects in the legislation, without using Community Revitalization Enhancement District (CRED) funds.

Rosenbarger asked for clarification on the lease of the building after the sale, if needed.

Allen stated that if needed, the city could lease the space until the police station moved. It had not been included in the projected costs, but could be paid for from multiple funding sources, including operations.

Rosenbarger asked if the realtor fees would come out of the proceeds to the city. She asked if that was negotiable.

Allen confirmed there would be associated closing costs with the sale of the building. There would be an opportunity to negotiate prior to closing.

Sgambelluri asked about possible cost overruns that would make the work impossible.

Allen said that the bids included contingency costs to allow for unforeseeable change orders. There were also conservative estimates, for items like the construction manager cost.

Volan referenced an email from Randy Lloyd who served on the Board of Public Works in 1997, when the building was being considered for the police headquarters. Lloyd noted in the email that the reversion clause in the deed was of legal significance. Volan asked why the administration now believed it was not valid.

Allen said that an Indiana statute declared void reversionary interests after thirty years. The deed was from the 1920s so the timeline far exceeded that. He noted that the building and parking lot had been used for a police headquarters, and not a public park. He highlighted that the city wanted to have good discussion on the issues with the families.

Volan stated that the building was built in the 1960 and had been used as a municipal building and later a police headquarters which were both for public purposes.

Rollo noted that the building was built to be a police station despite being used as a city hall. He asked what the \$12.5 million renovation cost of Showers West included and if it addressed the FOP concerns.

Allen said it addressed many issues but was not a full redesign of ingress or egress. It included a secure, gated area in the parking garage and the police radio tower would be relocated. There had been many discussions with city departments to arrive at the best outcome.

There was additional discussion on parking needs in the Showers building, for police, fire, city employees, and more.

Piedmont-Smith asked for further clarification on the closing costs which would decrease the city's proceeds.

Allen stated that there would be fees taken out of the total, but were negotiable during the closing process. He said that there were other funding sources that could make up the difference, such as the accumulated interest in the city's accounts.

Hamilton noted that the bids for Showers West had come in at the estimated amounts, which was helped with overall funding of projects. He clarified that what was before council that evening was the approval to move ahead with the sale of the current police headquarters, and proceed with negotiations. If council did not approve the legislation that evening, then the administration would move forward with the prioritized projects.

Resolution 23-23 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Nathaniel Hill, IV, urged council to not approve the sale of the building, as the grandson of the original signers of the deed, and provided reasons.

Resolution 23-23 (cont'd)

Public comment:

James Haverstock, representing the Waldron family and his deceased wife (a niece of Charlie and Cecil Waldron) spoke against the sale of the building.

Philip Hill, descendent of one of the families that donated the land, asked council to keep the building public and not sell it.

Dr. Norris Chumley, representing the Buskirk family, said he signed the original deed, and also spoke against the sale of the building.

Jeff Rodgers, FOP Vice President, commented on the costs, projects, and cautioned moving forward with many unknowns.

Jamie Sholl urged council to vote against the sale of the building.

Thomas Westgard gave reasons against Resolution 23-23.

Paul Post, FOP President, spoke against the sale of the building.

Kerry Thomson, mayor-elect, provided reasons to vote against the sale, and not rush into it at the end of the current administration.

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, read a comment submitted via Zoom chat from Owen Chumley who opposed the sale of the building.

Lucas read a comment submitted via Zoom chat from Jane [last name unknown] pertaining the parking needs and the lack of parking at Showers.

Volan asked about external improvements of Showers West and its costs.

Council comments:

Hamilton said there would be minimal changes to the exterior of Showers West because it was a historic building. There would be security improvements to parking, and secure doors, and moving the radio tower.

Volan asked for clarification on the secured parking.

Hamilton said it would be gated parking, only accessible by the police.

Volan asked why the sale would not be a violation of the deed, at least in spirit, and would possibly set a negative precedent for future donations.

Hamilton first thanked the families for the original, generous donation, and for their comments that evening. He stated that in the 1960s, a portion of the donated land was converted into a building for the city. Currently, it housed a dated police headquarters. The city had explored significant improvements and found it to not be feasible. He noted that it would be swapping one public building for another; the Showers West would become publicly owned, and the current police headquarters would become private. He provided reasons in support of moving forward with the negotiations and in order to begin the projects.

Volan asked if the building being built in the 1960s changed the reversion clause in the deed. He asked if there was a transfer of the property that allowed that.

Beth Cate, Corporation Counsel, said the issue was more complex than only referencing the original deed. There were additional documents, which had been researched by staff. She commented on the normal course of business, including extensive research and consulting, like was done in researching the legality of selling the current police headquarters.

Volan asked why it was not a violation of the spirit of the donation.

Hamilton explained that it was the sale of a building which had been used as a municipal building for over sixty years and not the public park. He stated that there was an inadequate police headquarters there and the goal was to have an outstanding headquarters elsewhere. Furthermore, if it was

against the spirit of the gift, it would have been better for the families to contest the building when it was built in the 1960s.

Resolution 23-23 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Rollo thanked the families for the donation and comments that evening. He was displeased that council had not been notified of the deed restriction especially since there was financing tied to the sale for other projects. He thought it could be legal to make the sale, but it was not ethical. He had opposed the purchase of the Showers West building for a new police headquarters, because it was opposed by the police union. He commented on the high costs, financing, and thought it best to vote against the sale.

Sandberg opposed the sale of the current police headquarters and move to Showers West. She noted the police preferred to stay in their current building. She commented on police officer retention and staffing shortages. She would vote against Resolution 23-23.

Piedmont-Smith reminded everyone that she voted in favor of the purchase of Showers West for the purpose of the new police station and fire administrative offices. She believed mayor-elect Kerry Thomson was also in favor of that move though she had expressed concerns about the financial details. Piedmont-Smith had requested specific details from staff about the sale and the original deed and her questions had not been answered. There was not a detailed breakdown of everything included in the bid, cost projections, and more. She also respected the feedback from the heirs of the original donors of the land. She could not vote yes that evening.

Rosenbarger concurred with Piedmont-Smith about Showers West, though more information was needed. She believed it ideal to have city staff in one building and to expand departments like the Community and Family Resources or creating a diversity, equity, and inclusion department. Many of the unknowns that evening would remain until the projects were started and finished. She commented on the legal and moral aspects of the proposal and the state statute limiting the deed restrictions. She believed the opposition should have occurred when the building was built. Rosenbarger spoke about a vacant block with part being a parking lot and the other a fenced in grassy area, owned by the church to the north of it. That property could be used for many other purposes. She commented on public transit, accessibility, and housing. She concluded by stating that all the city's land was stolen from Indigenous peoples.

Smith said the sale of the building violated the spirit of the donation and the decision did not have to occur that evening. He did not support Resolution 23-23. He spoke in favor of the original donation for the public good.

Volan commented on the potential litigation and noted that additional housing was needed in the city. He spoke about the original land donation and the intent of the donors. He said that council had fiscal oversight but did not appropriate funding. He commented on city funding, the rainy day fund, TIF, bonds, parking demands and usage, and parking garages. He asked about Rhino's which was supposed to be on the ground floor of Pavilion's Urban Station 2 building. Perhaps it was overlooked when the developers read the deed or the agreement.

Sims stated that he had supported the purchase of Showers West, the relocation of the police headquarters, renovations to the fire stations, and the bonds. He wished he had known about the reversion in the deed. He commented on knowing some of the original donor's family, like Dr. Chumley and expressed concern with the entire process. He was pleased that mayor-elect Thomson saw value in the Showers building.

Flaherty appreciated the discussion and thought it was important to have the police department and fire administration near other city staff, and also to continue to rethink policing with new paths forward. He looked forward to working with the new council and new administration on the Showers West building. He commented on his experience in teaching law and public affairs at Indiana University, and the discussion on the deed, which was a good case for property law analysis. There were differing perspectives on the spirit of the land donation, but law respected what was in the deed; that the land be a free public park. That was violated sixty years ago when the city chose to build a building. The clear, written intent of the deed required a free, public park. Adhering to that spirit would require leveling the building and parking lot to become part of the park. Flaherty commented on funding sources, reserves, and said that he was happy to continue the discussion but that it was not the right time to authorize the sale.

Resolution 23-23 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Sgambelluri noted the complexity of the proposed projects which bridged two councils and administrations. She did not believe that the finances or ethics were right. She acknowledged the additional information that was provided to council but stated she needed more time to digest it. She thought the new council might appreciate having more time too. There were too many questions at the time to vote in favor so she would vote against Resolution 23-23.

Volan commented on the administration's accomplishments like capital replacement into fleet and more. Mayor Hamilton also rehabilitated capital assets. He questioned recent funding sources for proposed projects and commented on options for funding. He noted that Mayor Hamilton had requested a higher Local Income Tax (LIT) and that council had rejected the full amount. He commented on his wish to use CRED funds in its district and did not like selling a public asset like the police headquarters.

The motion to adopt Resolution 23-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 0, Nays: 9, Abstain: 0. FAILED

Vote to adopt Resolution 23-23 [10:31pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [10:31pm]

Paul Post, FOP President, thanked council for their engagement with them.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [10:31pm]

Jennifer Crossley, Monroe County Council District IV, extended gratitude for outgoing councilmembers. She looked forward to working with the new councilmembers and administration.

Lucas reviewed the upcoming council schedule and organizational meeting. He said it was a privilege to have served council. He appreciated their dedication to public service, as well as Mayor Hamilton's.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:33pm]

Rollo read the encomium for Smith. Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to adopt an Encomium for Ron Smith.

Rosenbarger read the encomium for Volan. Rosenbarger moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to adopt an Encomium for Stephen Volan.

Flaherty read the encomium for Sims. Flaherty moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to adopt an Encomium for Jim Sims.

Rollo read the encomium for Sandberg. Rollo moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to adopt an Encomium for Susan Sandberg.

Piedmont-Smith read the encomium for Sgambelluri. She presented Sgambelluri with an engraved gavel. Piedmont-Smith and Rollo seconded to adopt an Encomium for Sue Sgambelluri.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE
(cont'd)

Volan thanked council staff that had left the city including Abbi Knipstine, Beck Boustani, Stacy Jane Rhodes, and Dan Sherman. He also thanked Chris Sturbaum, Dorothy Granger, Andy Ruff, Allison Chopra, Tim Mayer, Darryl Neher, Marty Spechler, Brad Wisler, Mark Satterfield, Jason Banach, David Sabbagh, Chris Gaal, and Mike Diekhoff. He commented on serving as president during the pandemic, and acknowledged Jim Sims, too. He thanked Dave Rollo who had served during Volan’s entire tenure. He looked forward to the next council and their work.

Rollo added his appreciation for his colleagues on council, as a deliberative body, and said he would miss those who would not be returning.

Sims appreciated his time on council and challenged the new council and new administration to minimize divisiveness. He commented on the collaboration on the resolution denouncing white supremacy and appreciated those who worked on that legislation, including Flaherty, Rosenbarger, and community activist Amy Ang. He spoke about being caucused in and thanked Tim Mayer who vacated the seat. He also thanked former council attorney Dan Sherman, and current council attorney Stephen Lucas. He noted that he and his wife, Doris Sims, cared deeply about the community in the city. He thanked Piedmont-Smith for all her work. He also acknowledged Rollo.

Sandberg said it was her privilege to serve the city. She thanked her constituents and those who strived to make the city a good, livable and strong place to live. She acknowledged the nonprofit, business, academic communities. She looked forward to retiring.

Sgambelluri said it was a pleasure and privilege to serve on council. She thanked Lucas and Deputy Attorney Ash Kulak for their work. She acknowledged her colleagues, Monroe County officials, and residents like Deb Hutton, Sharon Yarber, Tracy Bee, Corey Ruts, Cindy York, and many more who spent countless hours working for their neighborhoods.

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

Vote for encomia
[10:55pm]

Sgambelluri adjourned the meeting without objection.

ADJOURNMENT
[10:55pm]

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this ___ day of _____, 2024.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:

Isabel Piedmont-Smith, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington