



**City of Bloomington  
Office of the Common Council**

Minutes for Approval

---

18 May 2022

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, May 18, 2022 at 6:30pm, Council President Susan Sandberg presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL  
REGULAR SESSION  
May 18, 2022

Councilmembers present: Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger, Susan Sandberg, Sue Sgambelluri, Jim Sims, Ron Smith, Stephen Volan (arrived at 6:34pm)  
Councilmembers present via Zoom: none  
Councilmembers absent: none

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:31pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:34pm]

Volan reported on his signing on to a petition titled "Coalition Against Bigger Trucks" focused on preventing larger tractor-trailers on smaller roads not designed for them. He provided details.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:34pm]

Sandberg spoke on her attendance of the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Catholic Charities benefit luncheon and the group's work.

Ben Sharaf, Fellow in the Planning and Transportation Department, presented the Bloomington Habitat Connectivity Plan report. He discussed the Environmental Commission, five recommendations for habitat connectivity in the city, and reasons supporting the effort. He described deliverables including linking areas of greenspace, maps, pledge for landowners to voluntarily contribute to the connectivity efforts, next steps like community engagement, new funding channels, updating existing information, and to create binding goals and policies.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [6:41pm]

Sgambelluri asked about community feedback.

Sharaf replied that there had been positive feedback but that it had not been from all neighborhood association members.

Sgambelluri asked about other objectives with increased funding.

Sharaf said that it was early in the process so he was not sure how much funding would be needed. He explained how the city could purchase native species at a low cost.

Rollo asked what the criteria was for evaluating greenspace.

Sharaf said the criteria included slope, density of forest, waterways, how well the soil could absorb water. He said it was from the Coberry Report.

Rollo mentioned the tree survey and other criteria to include.

Sharaf agreed and said that since he was graduating from Indiana University, hopefully the next Fellow would be able to continue the efforts.

Smith summarized the Plan Commission's recent work on changes to fees related to the Planning and Transportation department, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) being considered, Trinitas Ventures project on Arlington Road, an apartment complex off of 17<sup>th</sup> Street, and the discussion regarding the avoidance of monolithic structures.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [6:56pm]

Flaherty asked Smith if the topic of maximum widths had been discussed.

Smith stated that it had not. But that the discussion was mainly focused on concerns with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and the allowance of monolithic structures.

Marc Haggerty said that the Flying Haggerty's were performing with Cirque du Soleil, and discussed basketball courts at Switchyard Park which had been unplayable for the previous four months. He highlighted the importance of the goals because it was a location available to poor kids and provided reasons. He also commented on the need for lights on the basketball courts, like were already present in the skate park and other areas. He also requested padding on the upright basketball goals for safety purposes.

• PUBLIC [7:02pm]

Michael Carmin spoke about high cost housing and concerns with the city's complicity. He discussed assessed value of properties, housing crises, and the city's role including sewer service expansion, and approving new housing developments along with the county.

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, read a comment submitted via Zoom chat from Sam Dove, commenting on the trash left in parks by the unhoused.

Phillip Emmy spoke against gas-powered leaf blowers. He commented on noise pollution, dangers, pollution and emissions, and the degradation of the quality of life.

Hugh Kramer also spoke against gas-powered leaf blowers. He discussed pollution, noise disturbance, usage, and toxic fumes. He commented on the leaf blowers used by his neighbors year round. There were no city regulations regarding leaf blowers.

There were no appointments to boards or commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:24pm]

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [7:24pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-15 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Clerk Nicole Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 22-15 - To Vacate a Public Parcel - Re: A 12-Foot Wide Alley Segment Running East/West between the B-Line Trail and the First Alley to the West, North of 7th Street and South of 8th Street (Peerless Development, Petitioner) [7:24pm]

Sandberg referred Ordinance 22-15 to the Committee of the Whole to meet on May 25, 2022 beginning at 6:30 pm.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-16 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 22-16 - To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" - Re: Amending BMC 2.12.130 (Citizens' Redistricting Advisory Commission) [7:25pm]

There was brief discussion on the consideration of Ordinance 22-16.

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:25pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-11 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 22-11 - To Approve and Authorize the Execution of a Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Bloomington and the Fraternal Order of Police, Don Owens Memorial Lodge 88

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-11 be adopted.

Michael Rouker, City Attorney in the Legal department, presented the legislation and summarized the process. He noted the key items in the Fraternal Order of Police’s (FOP) and City of Bloomington’s collective bargaining agreement including salary increases, increase in longevity pay, and impacts on salary beginning in 2023. He discussed the impact on pensions as a major benefit to retirees, overtime pay, and annual carryover of leave benefit.

Resolution 22-11 (cont’d)

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on the reduction of the clothing allowance by \$1100 to \$500.

Council questions:

Rouker said it was not a reflection on the reduced cost of items necessary for police officers, and the police department provided much of the necessary equipment. The clothing allowance was moved into the base pay as a benefit to police officers because it was included in the calculation of pensions. He said that \$500 was sufficient for covering expenses for various items not covered by the department.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the cleanup provisions like the allowance for parking passes for FOP employees. She asked what police officers paid for parking.

Rouker said that there was not a substantive difference. It was a difference of having employees pay up front and then be reimbursed. Police officers paid \$2.00 like other employees.

Piedmont-Smith asked if police officers would be impacted by the upcoming cash out programs.

Rouker stated that they would not be impacted since they parked at the police station or other police buildings.

Paul Post, FOP Lodge 88 president, said that the clothing allowance was adequate. He commented on the process, and thanked council for their support. He reminded council that the Bloomington Police Department (BPD) remained understaffed by twenty officers. He commented on the benefits and new contract that would assist in recruiting, et cetera. BPD would be more competitive with other departments.

Public comment:

Rollo was impressed with the agreement and stated that it helped BPD be competitive. He asked staff to report back with data on recruitment and retention under the new agreement and benefits.

Council comment:

Sandberg mentioned her observations during the agreement negotiation process. She said the FOP team did an excellent job in providing information during the process. The agreement was a good start in having BPD be competitive and having adequate staff.

The motion to adopt Resolution 22-11 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 22-11 [7:41pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-09 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 7, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Ordinance 22-09 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Technical Corrections Set Forth in BMC 20.03 [7:41pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-09 be adopted.

Scott Robinson, Director of Planning and Transportation, presented Ordinance 22-09. He commented on the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) amendments being considered that evening. He noted that council adopted the Comprehensive Plan in 2018 and planners used the implementation tool of zoning code. He

commented on the history of the UDO and provided examples that staff looked at regarding the new UDO. He also noted actions council could take going forward.

Ordinance 22-09 (cont'd)

Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager in Planning and Transportation, presented Ordinance 22-09 and summarized the key points including proposed changes, presented to the Plan Commission, and incentives.

Rollo asked what the typical floor plate size for a large development was, especially those with too much mass.

Council questions:

Scanlan clarified that the typical complaints were for buildings that were large, like the one formerly named Smallwood, which was over sixty thousand square feet. She said that size was even larger than what would be allowed with the proposed changes depending on the district zone. She provided an example.

Volan asked if floorplate was the same as footprint.

Scanlan confirmed that was correct.

Sims asked for clarification on the changes and if the goal was to recalibrate sustainability and affordability incentives.

Scanlan responded that since the update to the UDO, staff wanted to see if incentives generated more sustainable and affordable designs. She said there were very few uses of the incentives by developers. Staff wanted to make it more likely that the incentives were used while still having development be profitable.

Flaherty commented that many of the complaints and concerns about the large developments was based on the façade. He asked staff why floorplate was used instead of maximum building widths.

Scanlan said that staff had discussed widths, but floorplate was recommended by the consultant as a start. She said that widths were something that should be explored in the future.

Robinson added that prior to the new UDO, much of the downtown development had architectural constraints. He explained that the floor plate incentives were intended to have similar constrains.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-09. She said it corrected two typos.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-09

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment corrects grammatical errors in the ordinance.

Volan asked about the process regarding amendments.

Lucas explained that it was to go through the normal process.

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There was no council comment.

Council comment:

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-09 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-09 [8:00pm]

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Flaherty thanked staff for their work. He supported the iterative approach to incentives. He said that building width maximums could be used to help control the monotony of development especially since that was what a pedestrian or driver would see. He

Council comment:

said that some odd shaped lots would still allow for a long, but shallow structure. He provided examples.

Ordinance 22-09 (cont'd)

Rollo believed it was a step in the right direction and agreed that building widths needed to be capped. He said spacing between buildings also needed to be included, as well as architectural design.

Sandberg said that she too agreed that more needed to be done including maximizing affordability and sustainability incentives. She used Verve as an example of a development not having affordable and sustainable units. She commented on the community's concerns about what was being built and defined as increasing density. Sandberg wished that there were more types of incentives that could be offered to developers, other than more floor space.

Volan said that when the Verve was approved it was the largest in the city's history, and was processed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). With that, the developer agreed to fund a transit line in perpetuity. He commented on the PUD process and provided some history. He said that not everyone in the community was opposed to the large scale buildings. He discussed some of the taller buildings and urged the community to recognize that those buildings did provide more density.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-09 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-09 as amended [8:08pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-10 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee do-pass recommendation of Ayes: 5, Nays: 0, Abstain: 2. The committee do-pass recommendation for Amendment 01 was Ayes: 5, Nays: 0, Abstain: 2.

Ordinance 22-10 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Technical Corrections Set Forth in BMC 20.04 [8:08pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-10 be adopted.

Scanlan provided a synopsis of Ordinance 22-10 and summarized the amendments.

Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-10. Scanlan summarized Amendment 01.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-10

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment proposes changes to the existing Incentives section in Chapter 4 of Title 20, the Unified Development Ordinance. After working with the incentives since their adoption, the Department is proposing various changes in order to increase utilization of the incentives, as well as improve the outcomes of projects that utilize these incentives. These changes work in tandem with other changes proposed in Chapter 3. These changes were always intended to be included in the Ordinance update that went to Plan Commission, but were omitted through an error during the compilation of the Plan Commission packets. The amendment proposes the following:

- Increase the earnings threshold for 7.5 percent of affordable units in a Tier II affordable housing incentive bonus project from 80 percent to 90 percent
- Alter the requirements for Student Housing or Dormitory projects outside of the MD zoning district, removing the linkage study requirement
- Increase bulk reductions eligible in an affordable housing incentive bonus project

- Split the benefit for using both the affordable housing and sustainable incentives by Tier
- Add a proof of advertising requirement before occupancy for affordable housing incentive bonus projects
- Increase the allowable distance from the project site for associated affordable units to ¼ mile for affordable housing incentive bonus projects
- Alter the process for a Payment-in-Lieu agreement for affordable housing incentive bonus projects
- Reorganize the sustainable development incentive section
- Require compliance with more sustainable practices to receive the incentive bonuses
- Increases base Solar Reflectance Index readings for hardscape and roofing that is lightcolored and being used for incentive bonuses
- Increase the percentage of spaces that are required to be covered to receive incentive bonuses for covered parking

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-10 (cont'd)

Flaherty asked about the payment in lieu option, and referenced concerns with that option. He asked for clarification on the change.

Council questions:

Robinson explained that it was based on the assessment of the requests that were coming in to staff. Most developments were opting for sustainability incentives and not affordability ones. He said that the change was an effort to incentivize developers to have both affordable and sustainable components to their proposals.

Flaherty understood that there would not be a revenue source for the housing development fund, and the goal was to use the incentive to fund that program.

Robinson confirmed that was correct and was specific to student housing projects.

Flaherty asked if staff had heard from developers that this was something they wanted.

Robinson responded that staff had not heard that specifically, and said that developers had still been using the PUD process.

John Zody, Director of Housing and Neighborhood (HAND) Development department, noted that the Verve had used the payment in lieu option.

Sgambelluri asked for clarification on the payment in lieu changes and the removal of the Plan Commission from the process.

Robinson explained that the Plan Commission would still review the proposal, but not the linkage study and the payment in lieu.

Piedmont-Smith asked if it was correct that the incentives applied to all types of housing and not just student housing.

Robinson confirmed that was correct, but that based on the proposed projects, they were primarily for student housing.

Scanlan added that payment in lieu was in place for anyone wanting to use the incentives.

Piedmont-Smith said that developers were not considering affordable housing enough and that payment in lieu was going to be made easier in order to fund affordable housing elsewhere.

Robinson added that another issue was monitoring the units and ensuring that they were in compliance. He said that market-rate developers did not want to monitor affordable housing units in their business plan.

Jan Sorby asked how HAND was monitoring affordable housing units.

Public comment:

Smith thanked staff for their work.

Council comment:

Sandberg asked Zody to weigh in on how affordable housing units were monitored.

Zody explained that staff was in the process of setting up the program. There were about eleven hundred units, and about half were still under construction or had an approved design. Currently there were about five hundred units and HAND had reached out to those units, and found that most were in compliance. He provided additional details on the annual report to HAND on affordable housing unit compliance.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-10 ( *cont'd*)

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-10 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-10 [8:37pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-10.

Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-10

Amendment 02 Synopsis: This amendment corrects typographical errors in the ordinance.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-10 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-10 [8:38pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 03 to Ordinance 22-10. Flaherty summarized the proposed changes.

Amendment 03 to Ordinance 22-10

Amendment 03 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Flaherty. It removes three proposed Notes under Table 04- 3 that would affect mixed-use district dimensional standards in a specified geographical area. Such standards would be more appropriately proposed as part of an Overlay Zoning District for the area in question.

Scanlan explained the changes including the downtown overlay, which was split into different districts based on different requirements. The change only applied to a small portion of the area. She provided additional details.

Robinson added that the UDO update process had included many conversations about the overlay districts and commented on the consultant’s advice against multiple overlays and provided reasons. He clarified that it was focused on a specific area, Mixed Use Medium (MM) properties soon to be owned by the city, and allowed the city more leverage to work with developers. He asked council to not support Amendment 03 and instead support staff’s recommendation.

Volan asked Flaherty to elaborate on the suggestion of what would go into the overlay.

Council questions:

Flaherty asked staff if the Hopewell site would be developed by right or if there would be other anticipated changes over time to allow the site to develop in alignment with staff’s plans.

Volan concurred with the question and clarified his question. He asked if it was the city’s intent to make parcels in the Hopewell area to be developed by right.



Robinson stated that the area was in possession of the city who would negotiate with interested parties via Request for Information (RFIs). He further explained the process.

Volan asked if the changes were proposed as an exception and if staff considered parking minimums and maximums.

Robinson explained that there were conversations about use of the garage on the site. In reviewing the process for platting, staff attempted to balance sustainability and affordability goals with the amount of land. He explained that was why staff did not propose changes to parking.

Volan asked why a minimum parking standard would be required in a dense population area.

Robinson explained that there was not a consensus with all stakeholders. He preferred working with RFIs and negotiating to offset parking needs, and using car sharing services and more.

Volan suggested that reducing the supply of parking areas might also reduce the purchasing cost of a unit in that area.

Robinson clarified that staff recognized the differing needs of the community, including parking. He did not intend to hinder options for interested developers. He explained it was intended as a pilot and that Amendment 03 was more focused on impervious surfaces.

Volan thought parking needs were really parking demands.

Flaherty added that the district dimensional standards included a maximum of four stories not to exceed fifty feet. He said there were other considerations aside from parking.

Rollo asked what the capacity of the garage on the site was.

Robinson believed it was around three hundred spaces.

Piedmont-Smith stated that the hospital site's master plan noted the existing garage had four hundred and eighty spaces.

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

Flaherty noted that the process was a less cohesive way to address specific issues in that geographical area. The goal was to not build more parking since there was a parking garage close by as well as public transit. He commented on the formerly known as Bicycle Apartments as an example.

Council comments:

Piedmont-Smith supported Amendment 03. She said that an overlay district for the former hospital site was a good idea. There was a master plan that had been developed but had not been brought before council for consideration. She believed there was a good opportunity for council to consider the master plan and what was proposed, and how to implement development of the site given the current regulations. She provided examples such as impervious surfaces and alleys. She believed it was ideal to consider those concerns together. She commented on current overlays in the downtown area.

Sandberg thanked Flaherty for Amendment 03 and said that the development at Hopewell was a unique opportunity and needed thoughtful considerations.

Volan pointed out that there was about twenty seven acres of land to be owned by the city. He noted that the city did not develop structures and that there would be private developers involved. He provided reasons why the development of the Hopewell site enthused the community and highlighted its importance. Volan commented on the process including that the master plan had not been brought before council. He supported Amendment 03.

The motion to adopt Amendment 03 to Ordinance 22-10 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Smith), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 03 to Ordinance 22-10 [9:04pm]

Rollo asked about the Eurasian and Sycamore hybrid tree that was added to the tree list.

Council questions:

Scanlan stated that the trees were recommended by the Urban Forester.

Rollo said that it appeared to be an invasive species and questioned its inclusion. He also asked when the UDO would be revisited.

Scanlan said it would be next year, on an ongoing basis. She clarified that invasive plants/trees were excluded and code was changed to say native plants only. She said that a detailed package would be drafted to consider native street trees and provided some details.

Rollo asked if the city intended to plant that tree. He asked if staff would commit to not plant that tree.

Scanlan said the city did not intend to plant it, and that feedback had been obtained for options for trees installed by the city. She would discuss the tree with the Urban Forester and report to council.

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Rollo thanked Flaherty for Amendment 03. He said that there were many invasive trees in the city including the Callery Pear tree. His concern was that the tree was able to hybridize and could spread, including with other Sycamore species.

Council comments:

Volan said that he was hoping to reduce the ratio of parking and not eliminating it. There were better uses, and it was wasteful to require a parking minimum. He commented on some developers' thoughts on parking. He reiterated that parking was not a need, but rather a demand that the city needed to mitigate via supply.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-10 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-10 as amended [9:14pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-11 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 22-11 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Technical Corrections Set Forth in BMC 20.05, 20.06, & 20.07 [9:14pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-11 be adopted.

Scanlan presented Ordinance 22-11 and highlighted the proposed changes. She summarized the amendments in the legislation such as when the Engineering department would be involved, notices, tracking petitions, thresholds for subdivisions, incentives, student housing, exemptions, and more.

Volan asked for clarification on the student housing proposal.

Council questions:

Scanlan explained that currently, any multifamily dwelling with more than thirty-three percent of the units being three bedrooms, would automatically be defined as student housing. The scope was too large and captured dwellings that were not intended for student housing. The new threshold would be dwellings with eleven or more units, with more than thirty-three percent being three bedroom units, would be classified as student housing.

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comment:

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-11 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Rollo), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-11 [9:21pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-08 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 22-08 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Technical Corrections Set Forth in BMC 20 [9:21pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-08 be adopted.

Scanlan provided a summary of the proposed changes in the legislation including terminology, cross-referencing other changes, floorplates per building, buffering, and making code easier to use by the public. She summarized additional changes to definitions.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-08.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-08

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment corrects typographical errors in the ordinance.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-08 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0 (Sgambelluri out of the room).

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-08 [9:26pm]

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-08. He summarized Amendment 02.

Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-08

Amendment 02 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Flaherty. It removes three proposed Notes under Table 02- 11 that would affect mixed-use district dimensional standards in a specified geographical area. Such standards would be more appropriately proposed as part of an Overlay Zoning District for the area in question.

Scanlan stated that for clarity, that because council did not include the footnotes in Chapter 2 that they should not be included in Chapter 4 either.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-08 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 02 to Ordinance 22-08 [9:29pm]

Volan asked when the changes would be in effect.

Council comments:

Scanlan understood that it was in effect once the mayor signed.

Volan asked if it needed to go back to the Plan Commission.

Scanlan stated that was correct and that it would likely go to the Plan Commission in June.

Lucas explained that the legislation that was not amended, would go into effect once the mayor signed it. He explained the process for legislation that was amended.

Ordinance 22-08 as amended (cont'd)

Robinson added the process for legislation that would go back to the Plan Commission.

Bolden stated that ordinances were posted online immediately after they were adopted, and then were sent to the codifier on a monthly basis.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-08 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-08 as amended [9:32pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that the Council introduce and consider Ordinance 22-16 for adoption at the same meeting and on the same night it was introduced.

Ordinance 22-16 – To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" - Re: Amending BMC 2.12.130 (Citizens' Redistricting Advisory Commission) [9:32pm]

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

Vote to consider Ordinance 22-16 on the same night it was introduced [9:33pm]

Bolden read Ordinance 22-16 by title and synopsis only.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-16 be adopted.

Lucas summarized the legislation as well as the process in developing the Citizens' Redistricting Advisory Commission (CRAC), applications, difficulties, and proposed changes.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There were no public comments.

Public comment:

Volan thanked council for the changes and noted that he had intended that the commission model the League of Women Voters state level commission. He clarified that there had not been a commission like CRAC before and commented on the difficulty.

Council comments:

Lucas clarified that there had been significant interest in participating, but that it had been difficult for applicants to meet the requirements.

Flaherty commented on the difficulties on appointing applicants as well as the proposed changes. He noted the specific issues, such as COVID-19 and students having returned home due to the pandemic.

Sandberg thanked the At-Large councilmembers for their work with CRAC.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-16 [9:45pm]

There was no additional public comment.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [9:46]

Lucas reviewed the upcoming council schedule. There was brief council discussion.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [9:46pm]

Sandberg scheduled a Budget Advance meeting on May 31, 2022 at 6:30pm.

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

ADJOURNMENT [9:50pm]

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

For Approval