

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 14, 2022 at 6:30pm, Council President Susan Sandberg presided over a Special Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
SPECIAL SESSION
December 14, 2022

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

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION
[6:31pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-20 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.

LEGISLATION FOR
SECOND READING AND
RESOLUTIONS [6:35pm]

Resolution 22-20 - A
Resolution Responding to
Monroe County Board of
Commissioners
Ordinance 2022-46
[6:35pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-20 be adopted.

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, presented the legislation which would express the Common Council's support for the use of a Capital Improvement Board (CIB) to further a Monroe County Convention Center expansion project.

Mary Catherine Carmichael, Director of Public Engagement, discussed how the city administration planned the convention center expansion through the 501(c)(3) instead of the CIB.

Jeff Cockerill, Monroe County Legal Counsel, commented that he was there to listen to the discussion and answer questions related to the resolution.

Piedmont-Smith moved and it was seconded to introduce Amendment 01 to Resolution 22-20. She presented Amendment 01 which imposed conditions on the council's support for the CIB. She summarized the details.

Amendment 01 to
Resolution 22-20

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith and would add, through an attached exhibit to the resolution, a list of conditions for the Council's support of a Capital Improvement Board. The conditions would reflect certain components of a CIB that the Council and city administration consider essential to a prospective CIB.

Sandberg asked representatives of the county if they had reviewed the proposed amendment.

Council questions:

Cockerill expressed concern about the proposed amendment. He said some of the points in the amendment pertained to state code with respect to the Convention Visitors Commission (CVC). It allowed the CIB to hire the necessary contractors to do the work.

Piedmont-Smith asked Cockerill about his concern with the amendment.

Cockerill said that it would be better for both city and county to focus on creating a budget for the CIB instead of an interlocal agreement.

Beth Cate, Corporation Counsel, added that the legislation addressed the state code specifications through an interlocal agreement, and allowed the city to make recommendations.

Mike Campbell, CVC president, said there were limited number of hoteliers that could serve on the CIB and expressed concern with the budget approval process. He provided details.

Carmichael stated the memo that Piedmont-Smith referenced in the amendment listed items from 2019 from the administration. Those items were dropped from the county commissioner's resolution resulting in the city not preferring a CIB.

Amendment 01 to
Resolution 22-20
(cont'd)

Volan asked if the amendment, as presented, guaranteed that the funds from the Innkeeper's Tax would fund the convention center.

Council questions:

Campbell said a Monroe County statute required the collected funds go toward the convention center. The amendment was more restrictive.

Volan asked Campbell if he would like to add other related expenses for the CIB.

Campbell stated yes.

Volan asked if the Innkeeper's Tax funds would be withheld or be spent on the convention center without Amendment 01.

Campbell said a previous county ordinance required that 40% of Innkeeper's tax go toward the convention center.

Volan asked why Amendment 01 specified the use of funds if there was already a county ordinance in place.

Piedmont-Smith stated it was specific because the county could change the ordinance. It was also an attempt to improve the collaboration between the city and county.

Carmichael said the administration was focused on protecting the city.

Cate explained that there were items listed that were non-negotiable to the city. The administration did not prefer the CIB so there would be essential components if the CIB was to be in place.

Cockerill stated that the Innkeeper's Tax funds had to be approved by the CVC before being spent. The city and county were working towards the best possible outcome.

Sgambelluri asked if Campbell wanted to see if the funds for the CVC could be used for outreach and marketing efforts.

Campbell stated he wanted the funds to support staffing, destination marketing, and collateral material for the convention center rather than just operation and maintenance.

Sgambelluri asked if it was sufficient to add language that specified operations, maintenance and marketing, and convention sales.

Campbell said yes.

Rosenbarger asked Piedmont-Smith why she had chosen to leave some items out of the amendment from the administration's memo.

Piedmont-Smith stated she consolidated items for ease instead of listing all fifteen. Two items were excluded relating to the controller and auditor because the CIB would decide on both.

Flaherty asked if the language related to the conditional transfer of properties acquired by both governmental bodies was left out intentionally.

Piedmont-Smith said it was unintentional and proposed including it.

Flaherty asked the city and the county for their perspective.

Cockerill was concerned because the county still had debt on property. There would be barriers in the future with deeds and more.

Carmichael noted that the city had bought land to the north of the current convention center with the understanding that it would expand to the north. The administration preferred the expansion through the 501(c)(3) and did not support the CIB.

Smith asked if state code determined the members of the CIB and the CVC.

Cockerill explained state code and the Innkeeper's Tax funds and said the CIB members could choose their members.

Sims asked if operations included marketing.

Campbell said it included operations and maintenance but not marketing aimed at attracting organizations. Visit Bloomington had a convention center salesperson which could fall under the purview of supporting the convention center.

Resolution 22-20
(cont'd)

Council questions:

Volan asked if Amendment 01 intentionally excluded items 10 through 12 of the memo from the Office of the Mayor.

Piedmont-Smith said only items 11 and 12 were excluded intentionally and item 10 was not, but could be since the county found it problematic.

Volan asked the administration to weigh in on items left out and if they had a chance to see the amendment before the meeting.

Carmichael said the memo had originally been drafted as a response to the county's resolution and was not intended to be a roadmap for the CIB. The city was disadvantaged because the CIB's setup did not give the city long-term control.

Volan stated he was trying to understand which was better, the CIB or a 501(c)(3) entity for the convention center expansion, et cetera. He asked if it was correct that the city preferred a 501(c)(3) but if a CIB was decided on, then the city wanted some items in an agreement, as referenced in the memo and Amendment 01.

Carmichael said yes.

Sgambelluri asked what would happen if the mayor vetoed the resolution or if the council passed an amended version of the resolution.

Cockerill said that it would end current attempts to work with the city on the proposed CIB but the county would continue to work on the resolution to come back to the council for consideration.

Julie Thomas, Monroe County Commissioner, said the resolution was an effort to move the project forward, though a memorandum of understanding was likely needed.

Flaherty asked if the amendment passed, it would automatically void the resolution the county presented to council. Or since council was adding items, it could be argued that it was also accepting the county's terms.

Lucas stated that Amendment 01 was council's attempt to express a position.

Cockerill said the only thing that would void the resolution would be time lapsing. There were many discussions and approvals needed relating to budgets and more once the CIB was in place.

Flaherty asked why council should consider the legislation if many more discussions were needed instead of waiting.

Cockerill said the sooner that both bodies put together the CIB, the quicker the items could be addressed.

Thomas noted that the Covid-19 pandemic had delayed the process. She said a 501(c)(3) did not require public meetings, or appointments to it unlike the CIB which would have a more transparent process. The county preferred a CIB and the city preferred a nonprofit, so it was up to council to determine the negotiation path forward, either through a CIB or a nonprofit.

Smith asked what the CIB's role would be once the expansion was complete.

Cockerill said the CIB would control the current convention center and areas in the expansion in perpetuity. The CIB would come up with a plan and present it for approval to the county and the city.

Rosenbarger asked why council should act on the resolution that evening.

Carmichael clarified that a 501(c)(3) could have built-in, transparent processes. Both a CIB and a 501(c)(3) were being considered prior to the pandemic. The Commissioners passed their resolution, without city input, before their scheduled joint meeting which had a negative impact on the administration proceeding with a CIB.

Volan said the difference between the CIB as proposed by the county, and the 501(c)(3) as proposed by the city, was the composition of the board. He asked if other properties in the city would be managed by a 501(c)3.

Resolution 22-20
(cont'd)

Carmichael confirmed that was correct.

Council questions:

Volan noted the county's vested interest in the convention center. He asked if the membership of the proposed 501(c)3, with five being appointed by the administration, excluded the county.

Carmichael reiterated the flexibility with the 501(c)3 and said that city owned properties would be managed by the 501(c)3. It did not make sense to have those properties under the purview of the county.

Volan asked why there was not a 501(c)(3) already formed for the purpose of managing city owned properties.

Carmichael acknowledged that was ideal and it was being worked on.

Sgambelluri asked what needed to be addressed by an interlocal agreement.

Cockerill said that the CIB needed to be formed first, to address issues like parking garages, property, and other items.

Flaherty challenged the idea that the only next step was to form a 501(c)(3) or a CIB. There were steps that needed to be figured out before a CIB was formed, in case it was not the right fit. He asked for county's feedback if the resolution was not passed and which councilmembers had been involved.

Thomas responded that the county's resolution only asked for guidance on what the council wished to do, regarding the convention center expansion, whether it be through a CIB or a 501(c)3. She said that Sandberg and Sgambelluri had been involved in the discussions.

Cate added that the city was actively developing a nonprofit, but did not want to interfere with the process.

Volan asked when the county resolution was approved and when the legislation was drafted, and if the commissioners were aware that the legislation was being drafted.

Lucas said the county commissioners passed a resolution on November 09 and county councilors passed legislation in support on November 30. Resolution 22-20 was drafted the previous week.

Volan noted the timeline; the county drafted the resolution with an offer expiring at the end of the year. Now the council had less than two weeks process to consider the legislation.

Eric Spoonmore, President of the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, spoke in opposition to the amendment.

Public comment:

Geoff McKim, Monroe County Councilor, commented against having a 501(c)(3) and in favor of a CIB and gave several reasons why.

Kate Wiltz, Monroe County Councilor, said the amendment as written was problematic and hoped the council would support the CIB.

Trent Deckard, Monroe County Councilor, stated that the CIB was the most transparent and expressed opposition to Amendment 01.

Julie Thomas, Monroe County Commissioner, spoke in favor of the CIB and noted remarks made by Mayor John Hamilton, when requesting the Food and Beverage (FAB) tax, pledging to work collaboratively with the county.

Dave Askins, B-Square Bulletin, referenced a meeting in December 2019 where the city and county agreed on a CIB, and an interlocal agreement, to meet statutory requirements.

Piedmont-Smith moved and Sgambelluri seconded to adopt a sub-amendment A to Amendment 01. The proposed changes removed specific language pertaining to appointments to the CVC and to instead be within

Sub-amendment A to
Amendment 01 to
Resolution 22-20

the confines of state code. Also, marketing and related expenses were added to CIB funding expenditures.

Sub-amendment A to Amendment 01 to Resolution 22-20 (cont'd)

Volan said the city and county were interested in negotiating details later in the process. It seemed that Amendment 01 preempted that preference.

Council questions:

Piedmont-Smith said the CIB was preferred but she wanted assurance that the city had an equal role. She also wanted the mayor's buy in.

Volan noted that the FAB tax could be canceled by the state and asked how to ensure that the tax was no longer in jeopardy.

Spoonmore said that in regular conversations with state lawmakers, it was clear that they wanted meaningful progress. He believed that meant the formation of a CIB.

Volan asked what was necessary for the tax to not be repealed.

Cockerill clarified that the state could not interfere with contracts like a bond obligation. He noted that he was not council's attorney.

Cate agreed with Cockerill and also noted she was not providing legal guidance.

Carmichael was also in contact with state legislators and lobbyists and their priority was demonstrable progress. They did not have a preference on either the CIB or 501(c)3 option.

Rollo asked if Amendment 01 constituted progress.

Carmichael said it did but was not the administration's preference.

Julie Thomas, Monroe County Commissioner, spoke about the proposed changes to the amendment and the possible cancelation of the FAB tax.

Public comment:

Geoff McKim, Monroe County Councilor, commented on the appointments to the CVC which was separate from the management of the convention center and its expansion.

Sgambelluri asked if the county felt disadvantaged by Amendment 01.

Council comments:

Volan supported the amendment to Amendment 01 and gave reasons.

Sgambelluri agreed with Volan and provided reasons in support.

Rollo supported the amendment to Amendment 01 and expressed concern with the process.

Sandberg did not support Amendment 01 or the amendment to it.

The motion to adopt Sub-amendment A to Amendment 01 to Resolution 22-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Smith, Sims, Sandberg), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Sub-amendment A to Amendment 01 to Resolution 22-20 [8:32pm]

Sgambelluri asked if Amendment 01 as amended disadvantaged the county.

Council questions:

Cockerill asked for clarification on Amendment 01 as amended and if it was correct that a 501(c)3 would be formed if no agreement was reached.

Thomas discussed problematic issues with Amendment 01 as amended.

Sandberg called for a five-minute recess.

Recess [8:35pm]

Sgambelluri moved and Volan seconded to adopt Sub-amendment B to Amendment 01 as amended. The amendment would strike language from Exhibit A "if no agreement had been made, a 501c3 or an alternative governance structure that would maintain the balance."

Sub-amendment B to Amendment 01 to Resolution 22-20 as amended

Volan asked for feedback from the administration.

Council questions:

Carmichael commented on the process and the administration's efforts to advance the project. Putting pressure on those involved was necessary and having a 501c3 was the best option.

Eric Spoonmore supported Sub-amendment B.

Public comment:

Geoff McKim supported Sub-amendment B.

Steve Layman supported Sub-amendment B and the CIB.

Volan supported Sub-amendment B and provided reasons.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Sub-amendment B to Amendment 01 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Sub-amendment B to Amendment 01 [8:50pm]

John Rose supported the convention center expansion and the CIB.

Public comment:

Volan asked for feedback from the county on Amendment 01 as amended.

Council comments:

Thomas did not believe Amendment 01 as amended was needed because the details would be negotiated later. It would either be a CIB or a nonprofit.

Sgambelluri appreciated the conversation. She was satisfied with the answers and believed the negotiations to come would be beneficial to both the city and county.

Flaherty stated it was not simply choosing between a CIB or a nonprofit. There would be specifications that had legal requirements and more. He would support Amendment 01 as amended.

Rollo said he preferred the CIB and there were problems with Amendment 01 as amended. He appreciated Piedmont-Smith's effort and he supported Amendment 01 as amended.

Volan noted that Amendment 01 as amended pertained to a non-binding resolution and would not directly protect the tax. The progress forward was the discussion that evening though it was more complex than presented. He did not believe the administration had sufficiently provided reasons in favor of a 501(c)3. He would support Amendment 01 as amended.

Sandberg had been ready to support Resolution 22-20 as presented. She did not favor a 501(c)3. She was not satisfied with Amendment 01 as amended and would not support it.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 as amended to Resolution 22-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Sandberg), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 as amended [9:03pm]

Volan asked for clarification on transferring property to another entity.

Council questions:

Carmichael said the property had been amassed over a large period of time and most was purchased with Innkeeper's Tax funds.

Cate commented on the property and any pertaining debt obligations.

There was additional discussion on potential transfers of property.

Volan asked why the city believed the city controller should also be the CIB's controller.

Cate said the city controller was highly familiar with the funds, accounts, and record keeping. It made more sense to draw on someone with expertise instead of training and paying a new individual.

Cockerill said that the state statute explicitly stated that the CIB would determine who would be controller.

Carmichael clarified that the key points in the administration's memo had been compiled through extensive discussions in 2019.

Resolution 22-20 as amended (*cont'd*)

There was brief discussion on the options and statutes.

Eric Spoonmore thanked the council for their thoughtful deliberation. He supported the CIB.

Public comment:

Sims asked what the disadvantages were of either the CIB or a 501(c)3.

Council comments:

Carmichael said the city believed that with a CIB, the city would have no say in the decision of assets.

Cockerill commented on the potential lack of transparency with a 501(c)3, and the issues with the makeup of the board.

Volan asked about having a CIB for the convention center and a 501(c)3 to manage other city owned properties like the Buskirk-Chumley theater.

Carmichael spoke about the composition of the board for either.

Cate stated that a 501(c)3 was in the works and could easily transition to include the convention center.

Volan asked if the city could understand the county's hesitation with a board whose members were all appointed by the city.

Cate noted that even with a 501(c)3, the county retained all the state statutory authority as was discussed that evening. It was a matter of balance and the composition of the board members of a 501(c)3 could always be redressed.

Carmichael said that it was not ideal to include non-city board members to oversee city owned properties. There would also be an advisory board to the 501(c)3.

Cockerill explained the county's hesitation with putting the monumental task of the convention center under a 501(c)3 which would oversee many other city owned properties.

Piedmont-Smith said she was in favor of Resolution 22-20 as amended. The CIB was the best mechanism for the expansion of the convention center. She said that the city and county needed to work together in good faith. She was concerned about transparency with a 501(c)3 and that it had not been discussed in 2019. The FAB tax funds needed to be spent based on the purpose of the tax, passed by the county.

Volan commented on the tension between city and county. He did not see a compelling reason to move forward with a 501(c)3 for the convention center. The city had valid concerns about the CIB. He briefly described issues with deciding on the controller. He would support Resolution 22-20 as amended. He commented on the history of the city and county and noted that city residents were also residents of the county.

Smith would vote in favor of the CIB. A nonprofit, with all members being appointed by the city, was not fair to the county. He understood that there were differing opinions between the city and county. The taxpayers deserved a fair, neutral, and transparent process.

Sims recalled that in 2019, city and county stakeholders had discussed both the CIB and a nonprofit. He noted that negotiations were necessary. Sims commented on the state's interference. The best way to move forward was the CIB.

Rosenbarger stated that five days had not been enough time to properly consider a CIB or a 501(c)3. She commented on the process, before and after the pandemic. She still had many, larger questions about convention centers and data that showed decreased needs and usage. She would abstain or vote against the legislation that evening.

Flaherty would support Resolution 22-20 as amended. He questioned how to govern or manage assets like a convention center and its expansion. He commented on the resident survey from 2021 with data that showed that only 16% believed it was essential or very important to expand the convention center.

Resolution 22-20 as amended (cont'd)

Council comments:

Sandberg supported Resolution 22-20 as amended. She commented on the divide between city and county and their control over assets. It was time to use the FAB tax funds for the convention center expansion through a CIB, with members who had expertise, and move forward with the project.

Rollo echoed Flaherty's concerns about the scope and scale of the convention center expansion. Earlier discussions had included a civic center in the convention center and he wanted to restart those conversations. He would support Resolution 22-20 as amended.

The motion to adopt Resolution 22-20 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Rosenbarger), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 22-20 as amended [9:49pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-36 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.

Ordinance 22-36 – To Amend Title 20 (Unified Development Ordinance) of the Bloomington Municipal Code – Re: Proposal to Amend Chapter 20.02 “Zoning Districts” and Related Sections to Establish an Overlay District and Related Development Standards for the Hopewell Neighborhood [9:51pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-36 be adopted.

Ryan Robling, Planning Services Manager, Planning and Transportation department, presented the legislation including the overlay, restrictions, existing downtown character overlays, and guidance on the transform redevelopment overlay items. He provided details on the proposed changes and standards.

Smith moved and it was seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-36.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-36

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment makes the following technical corrections:

- fixes Table 02-29 so that all letters appear as they should;
- revises Table 02-29 to match corresponding footnotes;
- rewrites (6)(A)(i) to remove "shall", which would have forced structures to have ground floor dwelling units;
- changes "Maximum Vehicle Parking Requirements" to " Maximum Vehicle Parking Allowance" to match UDO;
- makes minor fixes to spacing throughout;
- replaces commas with semicolons in (5)(A)&(B);
- fixes indenting issues on (11) & (12); and
- corrects typographical errors in the ordinance

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 22-36 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 [10:08pm]

Volan asked for clarification on the parking maximum requirement.

Council questions:

Robling stated that parking, as addressed in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), would be cut in half in the overlay. He explained it was dependent on the use too.

Ordinance 22-36 as amended (*cont'd*)

Volan asked if there was no longer a minimum parking requirement in the overlay.

Council questions:

Robling confirmed that was correct.

Smith asked how the overlay affected existing buildings.

Robling said there was no affect. If the use changed, depending on the change, then there would be applicable conditions.

Rollo asked how the existing parking garage would be used.

Scott Robinson, Director of Planning and Transportation, said no decision had been made yet because the city did not own it. He noted the garage was in good condition.

Rollo asked about the square footage of buildings and how sustainability incentives and more could increase that size.

Robling said that if the incentives were achieved, then the façade of a building could expand.

Rollo asked about allowed materials, specifically stucco, and if it was related to Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS).

Robling confirmed that it was not related to EIFS which was prohibited.

Piedmont-Smith asked if fifteen thousand was the largest square footage for a façade or if it could increase to twenty thousand via the incentives.

Robling said that it could increase if both incentive tiers were achieved.

Piedmont-Smith asked about variations like depth in the façade.

Robling stated that had been replaced by the addition of the courtyard. He explained that developers told staff that due to the requirements, they were producing the same building around the city.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on the courtyard, and how the overlay would prevent a monolithic façade over an extended length.

Robling said that the goal was to break up the façade with the courtyard. The build-to encouraged usage of the courtyard, as well as agriculture requirements.

Volan said that there were parking usages with no upper limit in the UDO.

Robling said that staff was looking into that for the spring updates. At the time, there was not an upper limit for certain uses even in the overlay.

Rollo asked about the architectural design quality and possibly having a three dimensional model of the proposed building for the Plan Commission's consideration.

Robling said the Plan Commission could always request a three dimensional model, as was required in the downtown overlay. He explained the process of requesting additional information from the developer.

Piedmont-Smith asked about the rationale to setbacks for residential units.

Robling said it only applied to some streets that were well-traveled. It encouraged not having a dwelling unit be right on the street where pedestrians frequented.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there was anything to prevent there being an empty hallway or a public art installation in those spaces.

Robling stated there was not.

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Flaherty thanked staff for their work on the legislation and their forward-thinking with the overlay. He gave examples.

Council comments:

Volan echoed Flaherty's comments. There were many good things that could be applied to other spaces in the city. He said that it was ideal to have housing and businesses around parking garages.

Ordinance 22-36 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Rosenbarger looked forward to the changes in the district. She appreciated the lot size adjustment.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-36 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-36 as amended [10:31pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-37 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.

Ordinance 22-37 – To Amend the City of Bloomington Zoning Maps by Adding the Transform Redevelopment Overlay (TRO) to Certain Below-Described Property [10:32pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-37 be adopted.

Robling presented the Transform Redevelopment Overlay (TRO), and noted the map boundaries.

Council questions:

Piedmont-Smith asked about the Mixed Institutional (MI) zone in the TRO.

Robling confirmed that it would be Indiana University Health for a certain amount of time.

Volan asked if it would later revert to the TRO.

Robling said the TRO already applied to the MI zone.

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Ordinance 22-37 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 22-37 [10:36pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-38 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.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [10:37pm]

Sandberg referred the Ordinance 22-38 to a Regular Session to be held on December 21, 2022.

Ordinance 22-38 – To Amend the City of Bloomington Zoning Maps by Rezoning A 87.12 Acre Property from Mixed-Use Employment (ME) to Mixed-Use Institutional (MI) – Re: Northeast Corner of W. Fullerton Pike and S. State Road 37 (Monroe County Government, Petitioner) [10:37pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 22-06 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 22-06 – An Ordinance Appropriating the Proceeds of the City of Bloomington, Indiana, General Revenue Annual Appropriation Bonds of 2022, Together With All Investments Earnings

Sandberg referred the Appropriation Ordinance 22-06 to a Regular Session to be held on December 21, 2022.

Thereon, for the Purpose of Providing Funds to Be Applied to the Costs of Certain Capital Improvements for Public Safety Facilities, and Paying Miscellaneous Costs In Connection with the Foregoing and the Issuance of Said Bonds and Sale Thereof, and Approving and Agreement of the Bloomington Redevelopment Commission to Purchase Certain Property [10:38pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Ordinance 22-40 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.

Ordinance 22-40 - An Ordinance to Amend Ordinance 22-26, Which Fixed the Salaries of Appointed Officers, Non-Union, And A.F.S.C.M.E. Employees for All the Departments of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana for the Year 2023 – Re: To Reflect Changes Due to the Execution of a Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Bloomington and Local 2487 CBMC, A.F.S.C.M.E. and also a Change Affecting One Additional Job Title [10:41pm]

Sandberg referred the Ordinance 22-40 to a Regular Session to be held on December 21, 2022.

Lucas reviewed the upcoming council schedule. He noted that council had yet to approve an annual council schedule for 2023.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:43pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to approve Schedule B of the 2023 Annual Council Schedule with the annual budget hearings to start at 5:30pm. Volan presented reasons in support of starting the budget hearings at 5:30pm. There was brief council discussion on the annual legislative schedule.

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

Vote for legislative schedule [10:51pm]

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

ADJOURNMENT [10:51pm]

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

For Approval