

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, October 04, 2023 at 6:30pm, Council President Sue Sgambelluri presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
October 04, 2023

Councilmembers present: Sue Sgambelluri, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Kate Rosenbarger, Ron Smith, Jim Sims, Dave Rollo, Susan Sandberg, Stephen Volan

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Councilmembers present via Zoom: Matt Flaherty

Councilmembers absent: none

Council Vice President Isabel Piedmont-Smith gave a land acknowledgment and Council President Sue Sgambelluri summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[6:31pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
[6:35pm]

Piedmont-Smith reported on the Justice Fiscal Advisory Committee. She noted county council, voting members Jennifer Crossley, Peter Iversen, and Kate Wiltz. Representing the city were Mayor John Hamilton, Beverly Calendar-Anderson, Director of Community and Family Resources department, and Piedmont-Smith. There were other non-voting members as well. There were seven meetings from June 30-September 18 on topics like reducing recidivism, and a final report with thirty four recommendations. She highlighted some of the recommendations including gathering data, prevention and reentry, and the location of a community justice system.

REPORTS [6:35pm]

Council Members

Volan noted the Bloomington Public Transportation Corporation's (BPTC) willingness to offer service outside of the city. He mentioned his upcoming talk titled, "Doppelganger Cities: A History of Campuses, How They Came to Compete with Municipalities, How They Hold Students Back from Adulthood, and How American Universities Must Rethink Their Physical Plans." The event was sponsored by Indiana University's Political and Civic Engagement program and the Collins Board of Educational Programming.

John Zody, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) department, introduced Mary Morgan, Director of Heading Home of South Central Indiana.

The Mayor and City
Offices [6:45pm]

Mary Morgan discussed Heading Home and its members. She highlighted the Built for Zero initiative to reduce homelessness with an initial focus on housing for veterans, outreach to landlords, including a Landlord Appreciation Breakfast to celebrate landlords and property managers who were working to strengthen housing security, and the Landlord Risk Mitigation Fund. She spoke about learning sessions, forums, training for case managers, shelter meetings, and communications.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded by Rollo to extend the report for an additional five minutes. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to extend time limit
[7:05pm]

Piedmont-Smith asked if one hundred and ninety three unhoused people in the seven county area had moved into permanent housing.

Council discussion:

Morgan confirmed that was correct and the majority were in Monroe County. She provided some details.

Sgambelluri asked what operating budget was.

Morgan said the city provided \$1.2 million and \$1.5 was appropriated but Heading Home had not yet received it. Another \$1.2 million was funded by the county and would offset costs so that the Community Foundation could do an endowment for operations. There was additional discussion. Smith asked how substance abuse was addressed.

Morgan stated foundationally, Heading Home focused on work and housing, and not on substance abuse disorder. Heading Home had asked to partner with the County Substance Use Disorder commission for their assistance. There were future plans like a Recovery Café in the city.

The Mayor and City Offices (*cont'd*)

There were no reports from council committees.

Council Committees [7:11pm]

There was no public comment.

Public [7:11pm]

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:11pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:11pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 23-17 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Deputy Clerk Jennifer Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Resolution 23-17 – To Initiate Amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan Re: Leading Pedestrian Intervals and Pedestrian Recall Phases [7:11pm]

Rollo moved it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith to adopt Resolution 23-17.

Flaherty said the resolution was intended to be high-level, policy guidance to increase safety on streets. He noted the plan's background and staff that were involved. Resolution 23-17 called for an amendment to the Transportation Plan (TP) enabling the city to be eligible for the Safe Streets For All federal grant, and coincided with safety updates to the TP. The Engineering department had an upcoming study on adjusting the timing and phasing of all traffic signals, and including leading pedestrian intervals at intersections. He spoke about the process and next steps.

Andrew Cibor, City Engineer, said staff was in support of Resolution 23-17.

Piedmont-Smith asked Flaherty to explain the pedestrian recall phases.

Council questions:

Flaherty said that intersections would automatically have a pedestrian signal as opposed to requiring that a pedestrian push a button for the signal. Having it automatic increased predictability and safety.

Rollo asked if there were automatic pedestrian actuated signals as the former Public Works Director had stated.

Cibor stated that mainly downtown intersections had automatic signals. Areas with less pedestrian activity were not automatic.

Volan asked when discussions with city staff were initiated.

Flaherty said a couple years ago but it was thought best to incorporate the proposed changes with the systemic updates to the TP. He gave additional details.

Volan asked to what extent the TP update coincided with 2024 funding for traffic signal modernization and on a separate pot of money in the budget that would trigger federal funding.

Cibor said the timing was close and both would happen independently. He clarified there were multiple, simultaneous projects. He briefly explained the projects and their funding sources.

Sims asked how many years it would take to complete the projects.

Cibor noted that there was minimal impact on the budget because it was already planned and funded.

Sims asked how many signals could be modernized in the next year.

Cibor explained the Engineering and Planning departments' plans but did not have the specific dollar amount or number of signals.

Flaherty said the legislation was a policy-informed decision plan on how to program each intersection; the study would inform the programming. It was timing and programming the signals, citywide.

There was additional discussion on plans to avoid duplication of effort and how the proposed guidance would be implemented.

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, explained the timeline for related Plan Commission amendments, per state code.

Volan asked what intersections would be improved.

Cibor stated that he did not know; the design phase would commence the following year.

Pauly Tarricone supported Resolution 23-17.

Olivia Young spoke in favor of Resolution 23-17.

Rosenbarger supported Resolution 23-17. She gave a brief history on council's discussion on the proposal.

Piedmont-Smith supported Resolution 23-17 and thanked Flaherty for his work. She noted the need for pedestrian-led signals on South Rogers. She looked forward to the implementation of the signals around the city.

Volan appreciated the prioritization of pedestrians and supported the legislation. He commented on project funding and the intersections in the former Community Revitalization Enhancement District (CRED) which should be prioritized, as the funding was generated there.

Sgambelluri was pleased to support the legislation and appreciated the efforts in drafting Resolution 23-17.

The motion to adopt Resolution 23-17 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 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. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Rollo moved and it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith that Ordinance 23-23 be adopted.

Cibor presented Ordinance 23-23 and said that adding a multi-stop intersection at 7th Street and Dunn was a result of data involving crashes. He discussed how the data was collected and details on trends. He provided a background of the Seventh Street Corridor and the 7-Line project. He explained some of the findings of traffic patterns for automobiles, pedestrians, and bicycles, and their speeds and crashes. He noted that the 7-Line improved east-west multimodal accessibility and mobility.

Flaherty asked if it was accurate that the crash reports, per quarter, were the same after construction of the 7-Line as before.

Cibor confirmed that was correct. The intersection at 7th Street and Dunn had increased crashes but the corridor had decreased crashes.

Rollo moved and it was seconded by Sandberg to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23. Rollo presented Amendment 01.

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment, sponsored by Cm. Rollo, converts three additional intersections along Seventh Street at Lincoln

Resolution 23-17 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Public comment:

Council comments:

Vote to adopt Resolution 23-17 [7:46pm]

Ordinance 23-23 – To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled “Vehicles and Traffic” – Re: Amending Section 15.12.010 (Stop Intersections) to remove a stop intersection from Schedule A and add a multi-stop intersection to Schedule B [7:47pm]

Council questions:

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23

Street, Morton Street, and Washington Street to all-way stop intersections within Bloomington Municipal Code Section 15.12.010.

Amendment 01 to
Ordinance 23-23 (cont'd)

Sandberg asked for staff's feedback on Amendment 01.

Council questions:

Cibor explained the data related to crashes, including as a result of stop sign removal, and what was expected if they were added back.

Sandberg asked about the slowing of traffic speeds on the corridor.

Cibor stated that stop signs were not an efficient tool to slow traffic. Though, stop signs at all intersections in the corridor would slow traffic.

Volan asked how many constituents had contacted Rollo on Amendment 01.

Rollo said it was less than ten.

Volan said that he, as the District VI representative, had not received any complaints regarding the corridor. He noted the distinction between the 7-Line and the Hawthorne greenway. He asked how many accidents were caused by cars versus bicycles and scooters and also pedestrians.

Cibor said that the majority were caused by drivers on the minor street that failed to yield to traffic on 7th Street.

Volan noted tools the city could use to reduce accidents and asked if warning lights could be used in the corridor, as opposed to stop signs.

Cibor stated that those types of tools were used in a transitional period, when traffic patterns changed. He noted that the 7-Line was not the cause for a continued trend of the number and types of crashes.

There was additional discussion on drivers' poor decision-making, and other causes for cars not yielding appropriately, as well as other tools available to the city.

Piedmont-Smith said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Commission (BPSC) and the Traffic Commission (TC) opposed the installation of stop signs at the intersections of 7th Street and Washington, Lincoln, Grant, Morton, and Dunn. The commissions compromised on the reinstallation of a stop sign on Dunn. She asked staff's opinion on reinstalling only at 7th and Dunn.

Cibor said it was complicated. Staff was addressing the most problematic intersection, 7th and Dunn, but more could be done in the future, if needed.

Piedmont-Smith asked if staff had received complaints from residents about difficulty crossing 7th Street, like Rollo had referenced.

Cibor stated that there had been complaints during the construction of the 7-Line. There were more concerns on 7th and Morton. The Council for Community Accessibility (CCA) had also requested easier crossing for people with disabilities.

Sims asked if there was data on pedestrian comfort level, or "near-misses," on 7th Street.

Cibor stated it would be difficult to qualitatively obtain that data.

Sims believed that Amendment 01 added safety for pedestrians. He asked if staff agreed.

Cibor said that the word safety was subjective. Adding stop signs would make the corridor feel safer for some pedestrians.

Volan commented on other intersections in the city where there was safe crossing for pedestrians and bicycles with an island in the middle. He asked why more stop signs were not placed in other areas of the city.

Cibor said that there were intersections where all-way stops were not warranted. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was the state-required guide for streets and gave examples of metrics.

Volan said adding stop signs everywhere made it safer for pedestrians. He asked what other options or tools the city could use.

Cibor said that ultimately, most tools would not change drivers' poor decision making.

There was discussion on the tools, expectations pertaining to crashes, and the data gathered in the last two quarters of the year.

Smith asked if adding stop signs would make the corridor generally safer.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23 (cont'd)

Cibor provided details on the crash data, and projected crashes that could be mitigated by having all-way stops.

Council questions:

Rosenbarger acknowledged that stop signs did not slow traffic speeds, and also that drivers felt comfortable driving in the ten foot lanes. She asked if it was ideal to make the lanes narrower and other ways to slow speeds.

Cibor did not recommend making the lanes narrower, especially because Bloomington Transit buses frequented 7th Street and barely fit.

Rosenbarger asked if bicycles in Indiana had to stop at stop signs.

Cibor said that was correct.

Rosenbarger asked who had the right of way when there were multiple cars and bicycles at an intersection.

Cibor stated that hopefully there would be eye contact and drivers and bicyclists could safely take turns. Fortunately, in that scenario, everyone would be stopped at the stop sign.

Sandberg understood the struggle with defining safety, and asked if it was more ideal to use the term predictability, especially with an all-way stop.

Cibor reiterated that with an all-way stop, there was an expectation that everyone would stop.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded by Rosenbarger to adopt Amendment A to Amendment 01. She proposed removing the reinstallation of a four-way stop at 7th and Morton. There was a stop sign a half block away at the B-Line. The data showed that only the intersections on 7th at Washington, Lincoln, and Dunn met the MUTCD guidelines.

Amendment A to Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23

Volan asked why a pedestrian crosswalk with lights could not be placed in those intersections.

Council questions:

Cibor noted limitations such as sufficient space and more.

Brianna Wright spoke in favor of Amendment 01 and provided reasons on behalf of the Indiana University Student Government.

Public comment:

Pauly Tarricone said that the original proposal, without the amendments, was ideal.

Volan asked about how decisions were made for things like adding stop signs.

Council comments:

Cibor stated that the MUTCD had guidelines and gave examples.

Rollo did not support Amendment A to Amendment 01. He said a stop sign was needed on Morton because the police station would be in Showers, the Farmer's Market, and the amount of pedestrian traffic there.

Sandberg agreed with Rollo and referenced her discussions with residents regarding the need for a stop sign at Morton.

Smith would not support Amendment A to Amendment 01.

Volan said those opposing Amendment A did not consider bicyclists and prioritized cars first. He discussed intersection safety. He would support Amendment A but did not support Amendment 01.

Piedmont-Smith said Amendment A was a compromise. She noted that the 7-Line's purpose was to prioritize bicycles and pedestrians, and not cars. The 7-Line had won awards for its design. She would vote for Amendment A and did not favor Amendment 01.

Sandberg said the intent was to increase safety for all users of 7th Street. She noted discussions with residents who were unhappy with the 7-Line.

Amendment A to Amendment 01(*cont'd*)

Rollo discussed his experience bicycling to council meetings and around town. He believed the older population and people with disabilities were disadvantaged by the lack of stop signs.

Council comments:

Volan said that many of the council comments referred to anecdotes and not data. The 7-Line was nationally recognized. He commented on other options such as bollards to prevent crossing 7th Street at all.

The motion to adopt Amendment A to Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 4, Nays: 5 (Sims, Sgambelluri, Rollo, Sandberg, Smith), Abstain: 0. FAILED.

Vote to adopt Amendment A to Amendment 01 [8:54pm]

Rosenbarger asked if staff recommended Amendment 01.

Council questions:

Cibor stated that staff supported the legislation as drafted.

Rosenbarger interpreted that staff supported Ordinance 23-23 without Amendment 01.

Flaherty said there was not a full year's data on the 7-Line, and asked if it was correct that crash levels were back to pre-corridor levels, with lower pedestrian and bicycle crashes than before.

Cibor confirmed that was correct.

Flaherty asked for clarification on the difference with other intersections, like 6th Street and Washington, where only 6th Street had to stop, and Dunn Street between 7th and 10th streets which had no stop signs.

Cibor responded that there were many factors like safety, mobility, and efficient flow of traffic.

Pauly Tarricone supported Ordinance 23-23 without Amendment 01. He said that the BPSC and TC had unanimously voted against the reinstallation of stop signs along 7th Street. He gave examples and details.

Public comment:

Hopi Stosberg noted the BPSC's robust discussion on bicyclists' concerns with reinstalling stop signs, and provided some details. She urged council consider not voting for Amendment 01.

Ben Fulton asked council to vote against Amendment 01.

Volan commented on councilmembers' and community members' stances on the reinstallation of stop signs. Those in favor of adding the stop signs were out of step with Bloomington, and pedestrians and bicyclists who benefitted by the 7-Line. He disagreed that adding the stop signs provided more safety to the intersections. Cars were being prioritized. He spoke about accidents caused by pedestrians or bicycles versus cars and the purpose of the 7-Line.

Council comments:

Flaherty said pedestrian crashes decreased after the 7-Line was installed. Car crashes returned to prior 7-Line levels. Staff supported gathering more data and allowing for more time before making significant changes. He noted the importance of the BPSC and TC voting unanimously against reinstalling stop signs and acknowledged the commissions were advisory. He noted the temporary order for a stop sign at 7th Street and Dunn, which was then drafted into Ordinance 23-23. He would not support Amendment 01 but would support the legislation.

Sandberg appreciated Flaherty's reminder of commissions being advisory. She spoke about her role as an at-large councilmember and stated that she did not rely only on anecdotes. She reached out to community members, and many supported Amendment 01. She agreed that data was also

important. She spoke about community members who did not attend council meetings out of fear of being diminished or ridiculed.

Amendment 01 to
Ordinance 23-23 (cont'd)

Rollo sponsored Amendment 01 for pedestrian safety. Transportation infrastructure needed to serve everyone and he believed that pedestrians had been the least prioritized. Older individuals and people with disabilities had the right to safely cross a street. He commented on where to place stop signs along 7th Street, crashes, car speeds, and for adding the stop signs to have more order in those intersections.

Council comments:

Rosenbarger said data indicated that unnecessary stop signs led to fewer drivers stopping, and failing to obey traffic rules. She feared a situation where a pedestrian or bicyclist assumed a car would stop at a stop sign and then did not, resulting in injury or death. There was not enough data to make major alterations to the 7-Line. She noted there were fewer crashes, and greater usage of the corridor. She represented the district containing Rogers and Madison Streets and many residents wanted more stop signs on those streets. She said when stop signs were placed in areas that did not warrant them, other intersections with needs for stop signs were excluded. City resources were limited. She said a councilmember who was not recently reelected had stated that the city had done enough for bicycles and pedestrians, but voters had disagreed. It was best to table the legislation. Amendment 01 had been discussed for months but was only released six hours prior to the meeting, resulting in many residents not knowing about it. She was disappointed that the current council did not respect members of city commissions and boards. She supported gathering more data and waiting to implement significant changes.

Sims noted that he had not sought reelection and had not said that enough had been done for bikes and pedestrians. He had mainly heard about the need for a stop sign on Morton and thought it best to start there. But with further discussions, he understood the purpose of Amendment 01. Having a difference of opinion did not make a councilmember out of step with the community. He referenced the Special Committee on Council Processes (SCCP) that would be reviewing council processes. It was not right to discount constituents' feedback simply because they did not attend council meetings. He supported Ordinance 23-23.

Volan said it was hard to document everyone's opinion, especially when an amendment was introduced the same day it was to be considered. He commented on feedback from the community on things council was considering. He found Amendment 01 to be inconsistent, arbitrary, and selective to personal biases. He was alarmed that those favoring stop signs on the 7-Line did not also seek to add stop signs at other risky intersections, too. He spoke about the history of east-west corridors in the city, and changes to streets over time. He urged council to postpone the amendment.

Rollo noted his advocacy for improving safety at intersections in the city, and listed several. He believed that pedestrians had not been prioritized throughout the city and he respected the principle of a protected bike lane. Adding stop signs was not an impediment. He appreciated the discussion.

Sgambelluri said councilmembers disagreed with what was best, though they were all attempting to do the right thing. She listened to commissions, constituents, and had experience on 7th Street for her work, and on Morton for council duties. She did not believe that having bicycles stop at stop signs was a punishment. She thought that stop signs could help calm traffic and reduce confusion. She supported Amendment 01.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 4 (Piedmont-Smith, Volan, Rosenbarger, Flaherty) Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 23-23 [9:41pm]

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Piedmont-Smith asked what happened if the legislation failed, specifically at 7th Street and Dunn.

Council comments:

Cibor stated that it was possible for him to extend the 180-day order with consultation from the Legal department.

Lucas said that city code did not preclude the 180-day order being reissued as well as other options.

Rosenbarger commented on other intersections that could also have stop signs added, based on the same rationale that supporters of Amendment 01 used. She highlighted 8th Street and Walnut, and 3rd Street and Grant Street, due to their width.

Volan noted other streets that also fell under similar rationale like 9th Street and Walnut. He was disappointed and believed that some of his colleagues did not understand the message the community was giving them.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 23-23 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 4 (Flaherty, Piedmont-Smith, Volan, Rosenbarger), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 23-23 as amended [9:48pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith that Ordinance 23-22 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 23-22 – To Vacate Public Parcels – Re: Two 12-Foot Wide Alley Segments Located Between West 1st Street, West 2nd Street, South Rogers Street, and South Walker Street (City of Bloomington Redevelopment Commission, Petitioner) [9:49pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith that Ordinance 23-22 be adopted.

Scott Robinson, Director of the Planning and Transportation department, presented the legislation including the approval of a preliminary plat from the Plan Commission. It was consistent with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and allowed for a low-income housing tax credit. He gave additional details.

Cibor added that the right of way vacation reflected feedback from council and others on previous iterations, including an overlay district. He spoke about Phase 1 East and Hopewell West. He said the TP was a factor in considering proposals and highlighted the alleys to be vacated, creating nearly five acres of new public space. He reminded council that if the vacation was rejected, the city could not reapply for funding for two years. The preliminary plat was key for the Kohr redevelopment application.

Volan asked why the two alleys needed to be vacated in order to have the new dedicated right of way area.

Council questions:

Cibor stated it was a condition of the preliminary plat. The existing right of ways were in conflict with the proposal of including twenty foot alleys.

Volan said that council's concern in the past was that there would be a monolithic building built there. He asked for additional details.

Cibor stated that the goal was to have individually developed lots. The overlay and the UDO had limitations to a building's footprint.

Volan asked if conditions could be written into the deed such as not combining lots to build large buildings.

Cibor said that the Redevelopment Commission would own the property but Indiana University Health still owned the deeds at present time.

Rollo asked if a monolithic building could be built in that area. He asked for additional details on the alleys.

Cibor reiterated that there were footprint limitations. He clarified that new alleys would be built, and would be larger. There would also be the new public space.

Robinson added that developers could buy multiple lots but the UDO limited the size of floor plates. It helped with the affordable and sustainable housing incentives.

Volan was not satisfied with the need to vacate two alleys in order to move forward with the proposal and the new public space.

Cibor clarified that any development would abide by the UDO and overlay restrictions. He gave details on alleys and the right of ways.

Volan asked why not move forward without vacating the two alleys.

Cibor gave details and said that there was not a need for the two alleys and that alleys were not meant to be used for managing the size of a new building. The UDO and overlay had the restrictions.

There was no public comment.

Volan commented on council's concerns in the past pertaining to alley right of way vacations and provided reasons.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 23-22 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Lucas explained options that council could take that evening given that the ordinance originated with the Plan Commission but was given a negative recommendation. He noted that if council did not introduce the legislation, after ninety days, the ordinance would be considered defeated. It was staff's preference that council not consider the legislation.

Smith, councilmember on the Plan Commission, stated that there was concern of there being many empty commercial spaces in residential buildings. Upon request, staff surveyed property owners and found that it was not a concern. The percentage of empty spaces was 15%.

Rollo moved and it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith to introduce Ordinance 23-27 by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 0, Nays: 9, Abstain: 0. (FAILED)

Rollo moved and it was seconded by Piedmont-Smith to introduce Ordinance 23-28 by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Crossley read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Sgambelluri referred the legislation to a Regular Session to be held on October 18, 2023.

Ordinance 23-22 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Public comment:

Council comments:

Vote to adopt Ordinance 23-22 [10:08pm]

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [10:13pm]

Ordinance 23-27 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Amendments Set Forth in BMC 20.03 [10:08pm]

Vote to introduce [10:13pm]

Ordinance 23-28 –To Amend Title 15 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled “Vehicles and Traffic” Re: Amending Section 15.08.040 to update how temporary, experimental, or emergency traffic regulations may be made and enforced; Section 15.12.010 to add three stop intersections; Section 15.16.010 to amend the included intersections of one-way travel on Henderson Street; Section 15.24.020 to modify the posted speed limit on

Seventeenth Street;
Section 15.32.030 to add
back in angle parking on
Pete Ellis Drive; Section
15.32.080 to add no
parking spaces on Eight
Street, Swain Avenue,
Wilson Street, Southern
Drive and Third Street
and to; Section 15.32.090
to remove limited
parking zones on Allen
Street, Eighth Street,
Swain Avenue and Third
Street and add limited
parking zone on Third
Street; Section 15.32.100
to add a loading zone on
East Longview Avenue;
and Section 15.32.110 to
add a bus zone on Third
Street [10:14pm]

There was no additional public comment.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC
COMMENT [10:16pm]

Lucas reviewed the upcoming council schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE
[10:16pm]

Sgambelluri adjourned the meeting without objection.

ADJOURNMENT
[10:17pm]

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