

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, May 01, 2024 at 6:30pm, Council President Isabel Piedmont-Smith presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
May 01, 2024

Councilmembers present: Isak Nti Asare, Courtney Daily, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Kate Rosenbarger, Andy Ruff, Hopi Stosberg, Sydney Zulich
Councilmembers present via Zoom: Matt Flaherty
Councilmembers absent: none

ROLL CALL [6:30pm]

Council President Isabel Piedmont-Smith gave a land and labor acknowledgment and summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:31pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to suspend the rules to consider the minutes for approval. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:35pm]

November 05, 2003 (Regular Session)
December 17, 2003 (Regular Session)

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to approve the minutes of November 05, 2003 and December 17, 2003. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Piedmont-Smith noted that [Ordinance 2024-07](#) would have another reading and there would not be final action that evening. She read a letter from eight councilmembers to Indiana University (IU) President Pam Whitten and Provost and Executive Vice President Rahul Shrivastav:

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:38pm]

“Monday, April 29, 2024

*We, the undersigned Bloomington City Council Members, are writing to express our common opinion regarding recent actions of the Indiana University administration in regard to peaceful demonstrations in Dunn Meadow on the Indiana University Bloomington campus. Since 1969, IU policy has allowed peaceful demonstrations in Dunn Meadow, including those using tents and signs, on a broad range of issues. On April 24, 2024, one day prior to a planned rally, President Pamela Whitten convened an ad-hoc committee to review and rapidly change these long standing rules and norms regarding free speech in Dunn Meadow. According to President Whitten’s letter to faculty members the following day: “The committee affirmed the right of peaceful protest, with the additional recommendation that temporary or permanent installation of structures in Dunn Meadow (including, but not limited to posters, tents, etc.) at any time must be approved in advance by the university and, if approved, adhere to the guidelines provided by the university.” President Whitten followed through on these recommendations to change the policy. These changes were made without transparency or adequate process to involve affected stakeholders, including IU faculty, staff, and students, most of whom are residents of Bloomington. This change is a severe departure from over 50 years of IU policy, as well as IU and Bloomington community norms regarding free speech and nonviolent protest. The context under which the new policy was instituted indicates that the new rules were meant to directly target the April 25 rally and its subject matter, violating Bloomington residents’ First Amendment rights. **We denounce these actions and demand that the new policy be immediately rescinded.** We understand that President Whitten requested that Indiana State Police enforce the newly revised policies regarding daytime tents in Dunn Meadow on April 25 and on subsequent days. According to the many videos and photos taken during the protests, and the reports from people at the scene, the Indiana State Police*

response used force far in excess of what was necessary to enforce the new campus rules. The large number of police officers, the weapons displayed and used by the officers, and their forceful actions to arrest protesters only served to escalate the situation. Their violent response to peaceful protest is unacceptable. **We demand that no criminal charges be brought against peaceful protesters, that related bans from the IUB campus be immediately revoked, and that all disciplinary charges against peaceful protesters in the IU system be dropped.** We, as elected representatives of the residents of Bloomington (including IU students, faculty, and staff), decry the display of and use of force by the Indiana State Police during the rally as well as the IU administration's denial of free speech rights in Dunn Meadow. We want our residents to be safe, especially as they exercise their civil liberties. We swore an oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution, including the First Amendment. The actions of IU President Whitten's administration in recent days have been harmful to our community. We expect better. Bloomington deserves better.

Sincerely,

Isabel Piedmont-Smith, District 1, President; Andy Ruff, At Large, Vice President; Hopi Stosberg, District 3, Parliamentarian; Matt Flaherty, At Large; Kate Rosenbarger, District 2; Dave Rollo, District 4
Courtney Daily, District 5; Sydney Zulich, District 6"

Zulich noted her press release regarding the recent incidents at IU in Dunn Meadow. She said anyone who needed assistance with their arrest, housing, et cetera related to the incident could contact her.

Rollo believed he would never see such a militaristic suppression of free speech and assembly, as guaranteed by the United States (US) Constitution. He hoped IU's administration would apologize and drop charges, and if not, that the prosecutor would use her discretion to not charge the protestors.

Flaherty said the issue at hand was relevant for council's response, as it directly affected residents and put residents' safety at risk. Councilmembers swore to uphold the constitution and peoples' rights had been violated during the events at Dunn Meadow.

Daily thanked everyone who attended the grieving session the previous week. She was appalled at the violence that occurred at Dunn Meadow, and that a sharpshooter was posted on the roof of the Indiana Memorial Union with a rifle pointed at students. She expected an apology for the intentional threat towards a nonviolent protest. She urged the administration to revoke the ban on protests. She noted that May was the Jewish-American month and highlighted educational opportunities focused on anti-Semitism and more. She noted that it was Asian American and Pacific Islander month, too. Unfortunately, IU had celebrated it the previous month. She listed resources for learning more about cultures and becoming an ally. May was also mental health awareness and Daily explained the importance of destigmatizing mental illness.

Rosenbarger discussed the Community Crossing matching grant totaling \$745,000 received by the city from the Indiana Department of Transportation. It provided funding for preservation projects for local roads and bridges. She explained where projects had been done in the city. The new grant would repave West Third Street from South Patterson Drive to South Franklin Road. She discussed how the new grant could be applied towards the Transportation Plan's goals. She planned to reach out to city staff to consider other modes of transportation and things like a protected bike lane.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS
(cont'd)

Stosberg agreed with her colleagues regarding the recent incidents and said people could state the things that were important to them without demeaning what others believed. There were differing priorities and space to disagree without arguing and name calling.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS (cont'd)
- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [6:55pm]

Jane Kupersmith, Director of Economic and Sustainable (ESD) Development department, explained tax abatements and a reporting requirement with a forty five day timeline for reporting to council. Urban Station had filed early, triggering that timeline which was why she was presenting on that entity. The process consisted of entities applying for a tax abatement, and ESD staff reviewing and making a recommendation, or not, to the Economic Development Commission (EDC). The EDC would then make a recommendation in favor or against. Tax abatements were temporary, authorized by council, and administered by the county. She spoke about the phase-in of the tax abatement, duration, review process, annual reporting, ESD's responsibility of compiling and reporting on tax abatements, and a final report forwarded from the EDC. There was other evaluative criteria such as quality of life and environmental and sustainable efforts, as well as community character. Kupersmith gave a brief explanation of the Urban Station tax abatement provided by Resolution 16-11 and Resolution 16-12. The public benefit included that no less than fifteen bedrooms would be allocated to households with incomes at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI), with rent not to exceed 85% of market rate, and with a duration of ninety nine years. Staff found Urban Station to be compliant. She gave additional details on the rents.

Rollo asked if the salaries were based on the Consumer Price Index. Kupersmith stated they were not.

Council questions:

Stosberg asked how many affordable bedrooms there were. Kupersmith said there were six one-bedroom units, and four two-bedroom units totaling fourteen bedrooms, one less of fifteen. She stated that Urban Station was substantially compliant. Stosberg hoped there would be the required fifteen soon. Asare clarified that there was an empty room in one of the two-bedrooms.

Piedmont-Smith asked what options council had, given that Urban Station was below the required fifteen affordable bedrooms. Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, noted that the timeline was ending in the next few days. Council could hold a public hearing where Urban Station could provide an explanation. Kupersmith stated that Urban Station was willing to explain at a public hearing.

Rollo moved and Ruff seconded to hold a public hearing on June 05, 2024. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to schedule public hearing [7:15pm]

Deputy Mayor Gretchen Knapp gave an update on the Public Safety Officer Down Payment program; an effort to recruit and retain police officers in the city. She provided a brief history of the program. There were substantial issues that showed the program was not the proper path forward. The program would be very expensive and would not help many individuals. There was also not a proper way to measure its success.

Piedmont-Smith reported on the work session held the previous day. She highlighted some changes like immediately calling out hate speech, addressing the twenty minute time limit for items not on the agenda, and reviewing how to receive public input and comments.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [7:22pm]

Ryne Shadday, Chair of the Human Rights Commission (HRC), expressed dismay for the hateful speech and actions during the April 03, 2024 meeting. The HRC denounced hate speech.

- PUBLIC [7:24pm]

David Keppel, spokesperson for Bloomington Peace Action Coalition, thanked council for their role in democracy resulting in good quality of life in the city. He denounced the recent incident at Dunn Meadow at IU.

Thomas Westgard spoke against institutional violence and the way laws in the city were enforced.

Charles Cantx spoke about the protest at Dunn Meadow and against the actions taken towards protestors. He was reassured by council's discussion that evening and urged continued support.

Dave Thelan thanked council for their open letter to IU, and for listening when others deployed military force to silence others.

Jess Tang stated that she was happy to have voted for Asare but was concerned that he did not sign the open letter. Especially since residents' right to assemble was violated.

Kaitlyn Henderson thanked the councilmembers for using their voice to condemn the violence on protestors in Dunn Meadow at IU.

Beverly Stoelje, Citizens for a Just Peace in Palestine and Israel, spoke about the organization and thanked the eight councilmembers who signed the open letter to IU.

Nejla Routsong thanked those councilmembers who signed the open letter to IU. She was pleased that there were leaders who took community safety seriously.

Christopher Moore thanked council for their support and spoke against the military suppression of student protestors. He urged council to show up in person and be on the right side of history.

Hemayatullah Shahrani praised council for those councilmembers who signed the open letter and for protecting the First Amendment.

Rachid Manti spoke against the actions taken against protestors at Dunn Meadow and especially a rifle being pointed at residents.

There were no appointments to boards and commissions.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:45pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:46pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-08 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.

Resolution 2024-08 – A Resolution Calling for a Cessation of Hostilities and for Delivery of Humanitarian Aid to Civilians in Gaza [7:46pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Resolution 2024-08.

Resolution 2024-08 (cont'd)

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the legislation had passed on April 03, 2024 and was passively vetoed by Mayor Kerry Thomson on April 18, 2024, and was now back before council.

Rollo stated that people were still dying and starving in Gaza. He cited Bloomington's history of denouncing humanitarian crises and explained why the legislation was important.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2024-08 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Resolution 2024-08
[7:50pm]

Piedmont-Smith noted the audience had been holding signs asking council to override the veto, and now the signs said thank you.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-07 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 2024-07 – To Amend the City of Bloomington Zoning Maps by Rezoning a 138.51 Acre Property from Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Residential Medium Lot (R2) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and to Approve a District Ordinance and Preliminary Plan - Re: S. Weimer Road (Sudbury Partners LLC, Petitioner)
[7:51pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Ordinance 2024-07.

Jackie Scanlan, Development Services Manager in the Planning and Transportation department, provided a brief summary of the legislation.

Council questions:

Stosberg asked about the 90% occupancy requirement in the preceding units before Whitney Glen could be built.

Scanlan responded that it would be based on what was submitted by developers.

Stosberg asked what happened if easement requirements or other variables made the 90% occupancy not possible.

Scanlan clarified that the petitioners believed that the occupancy rate was possible and if not could address it with staff and council.

Travis Vencel, Sullivan Development, thanked everyone for their work on the proposal and briefly described the process thus far. He believed it was the best possible project to bring forward.

Rollo asked about the distinction between a flood plain and flood way, structures, and about other environmental concerns.

Scanlan said staff believed some environmental constraints were not properly mapped, and would have to be addressed by the petitioners during the platting process. Staff would verify, and nothing would be built where it was not environmentally sound. She reiterated that, presently, council was considering the rezoning in order to allow structures in the area, based on standards, and not the actual buildings. It would be later when the buildings would be proposed and planned. Before building, the flood plain would have to be properly mapped out.

Daily asked about building height maximums and what might be a reasonable base height, before incentives.

Vencel said that the reasonable base height was included in the proposal and was based on the community's housing needs and goals. It had been approved by the Plan Commission.

Asare asked about the balance of having homeowner occupied units, without it being a typical development. Ordinance 2024-07 (cont'd)

Vencel said that Bloomington was not a typical city. The proposal had multiple zones with different types of lots, design standards, and more. Developers needed to have flexibility in order to not build the typical “cookie cutter” type of housing. He gave examples. Council questions:

Asare asked about adjusting the affordable housing percentages or requirements.

Vencel explained that would disadvantage the project and gave examples. He explained how developers funded affordable units by transferring the value from more expensive units.

Rosenbarger said the proposal was a PUD and not rezoning. She asked why it was a PUD rather than rezone given that there would be updates to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Scanlan stated staff and council had to address the petition before them which was a PUD. With a PUD there were additional tools, like built in affordable housing and sustainable design requirements. She gave examples. With the proposal on the table, it allowed council and Plan Commission to work things in to the plan.

Flaherty agreed that as the UDO was updated, the PUD would not be adhering to the updates. He asked if there was a way to mirror the UDO on an ongoing basis and if staff had already considered that.

Scanlan said yes and clarified that when a PUD was silent on a standard, then it reverted back to the UDO standards. Reasonable Conditions could also be put in place which could be tied to UDO updates, too.

Stosberg asked if environmental constraints impacted buildable land, if it was possible to do so proportionately across the zones.

Scanlan said a large swath of land was not expected to be unbuildable. She gave potential examples.

Vencel said that the petitioners were following the standards of the UDO and would adapt accordingly. It made more sense to do that than spend a lot of money analyzing every environmental feature of the land.

Rollo said that the current census showed 11.3% of the city were under eighteen years old and asked if a new school would be needed in the area.

Scanlan said there had been discussion on the needs for a school.

Vencel said Monroe County Community School Corporation (MCCSC) advised a combination school might be needed in the area in the future and asked that the requested zone allow for a school.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Reasonable Condition 01 to Ordinance 2024-07. Stosberg presented the reasonable condition. Reasonable Condition 01

Reasonable Condition 01 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition (01) is sponsored by Cm. Stosberg. It requires parking areas for all multi-family residential, commercial, and mixed-use buildings to comply with the Electric Vehicle Charging standards in the UDO, as those standards may be amended in the future.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.	Vote to adopt Reasonable Condition 01 [8:33pm]
Piedmont-Smith moved and Stosberg seconded to adopt Reasonable Condition 03 to <u>Ordinance 2024-07</u> . Piedmont-Smith presented Reasonable Condition 03.	Reasonable Condition 03
Reasonable Condition 03 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition (03) is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith and was recommended by the Environmental Commission. It adds certain accessory uses to the allowed use table within the district ordinance to allow for these sustainable uses.	
Vencel said it was ideal to address all the reasonable conditions in case there were contradictions.	
There was brief council discussion on the process of adopting reasonable conditions to the legislation or only discussing them.	Council discussion:
Stosberg asked about allowed uses in the PO district, and possibly disallowing chicken flocks and greenhouses.	
Piedmont-Smith said they were allowed uses for the PO district according to the UDO.	
Scanlan clarified that the PO district areas would not have structures.	
Piedmont-Smith withdrew the motion.	Withdrawal of motion to adopt Reasonable Condition 03
Piedmont-Smith presented Reasonable Condition 04.	Reasonable Condition 04
Reasonable Condition 04 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition (04) is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith and was recommended by the Environmental Commission. It states that the UDO development standards applicable to steep slopes in effect on January 1, 2024 would apply to the PUD. These standards provide that areas of land where the pre-development slopes are greater than 18 percent should not be disturbed for any improvements with the exception of utility lines.	
Vencel stated that the developers could not agree to Reasonable Condition 04 at the time and without careful review.	
Stosberg believed it was important to keep steep slopes as written but to have a variance in place if needed.	
Piedmont-Smith moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Reasonable Condition 05 to <u>Ordinance 2024-07</u> . Piedmont-Smith presented it.	Reasonable Condition 05
Reasonable Condition 05 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition (05) is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith and renumbers a use specific standard applicable to surface parking lots.	
Asare moved to pause the meeting and have a Committee of the Whole to discuss the reasonable conditions. There was no second.	Motion to schedule Committee of the Whole
There was no public comment.	Public comment:
There were no council comments.	Council comments:

The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Zulich out of the room)

Vote to adopt Reasonable Condition 05 [8:50pm]

Piedmont-Smith presented Reasonable Condition 06.

Reasonable Condition 06

Reasonable Condition 06 Synopsis: This Reasonable Condition (06) is sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith. It changes the affordability threshold from 120% of the area median income (AMI) to 90% of the AMI for the 15% of units required to meet the permanent affordability standard in this PUD. It also states that any UDO amendment that requires PUDs to meet an affordability threshold below 90% AMI would apply to the affordability threshold applicable to this PUD.

Stosberg stated that a PUD was supposed to be something different and did not need to simply adhere to the UDO. She asked for more data on affordability, and rent versus mortgage.

Council discussion:

Flaherty was concerned about making adjustments only in the PUD and without further analysis. The developer had said that every other unit paid more, in order to fund the affordable housing requirements. He preferred to see specific examples.

Piedmont-Smith asked if the affordability rates in the UDO and the PUD were applicable whether they were owner occupied or rental. Scanlan confirmed they were.

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to adopt Reasonable Condition 07 to Ordinance 2024-07. Stosberg presented the condition.

Reasonable Condition 07

Reasonable Condition 07 synopsis: This Reasonable Condition (07) is sponsored by Cm. Stosberg and clarifies that a minimum of 10% of the units in each planned neighborhood would be required to meet the permanent affordability standard.

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

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

Vote to adopt Reasonable Condition 07 [9:03pm]

Rollo asked how to prioritize owner occupancy in the PUD.

Council discussion:

Scanlan said some zones already had restrictions through allowed uses. A minimum percentage could also be done.

Vencel said designing something that allowed for homeowner occupancy was ideal. He deferred to the petitioners' legal staff.

Lucas stated that council could not legally require homeowner occupancy but there were other ways to discuss the concern.

Asare asked if it was possible to limit company-owned units.

Lucas said there were many state limitations to that option.

Stosberg asked if a Homeowners Association (HOA) could address homeowner occupancy.

Lucas said likely no since HOA bylaws did not go before council.

Piedmont-Smith asked if council could ask the developer to commit to having a certain amount of units be in an HOA.

Scanlan said requirements could be done through a sales agreement, and gave examples of city owned property.

Vencel said that developers could not require an HOA to enforce homeownership through covenants.

Ordinance 2024-07 (cont'd)

Council discussion:

Flaherty concurred that council could not require homeownership, but could restrict homeownership to one or two units only. He gave examples in the city and options that could be structured.

Lucas said state code dictated that council could allow property owners provide a written commitment. He urged council to proceed with caution and have further discussions.

Public comment:

Lisa Abbott, Regional Opportunity Initiatives (ROI), spoke about housing needs and in favor of the proposed project. Approximately seven thousand different types of units were needed, especially to address the missing middle.

Kyle Davis, Yes in My Back Yard (YIMBY) Indiana, advocated for council to approve the proposed project in order to supply more housing and drive down housing costs.

Mary Beth Price said Summit Elementary was next to the PUD and asked where a new school could be built.

Thomas Landis spoke about responsible growth and vibrant communities, and in favor of the development.

Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, commented in favor of the proposed project.

Randy Rogers, United Way, spoke in favor of the project and provided reasons why.

Jessica Missy discussed the housing shortage in the city and in favor of the project.

Wendi Goodlet, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Habitat for Humanity of Monroe County, urged council to support the proposed project.

Jen Pearl, President of the Bloomington Economic Development Corporation, asked council to vote in favor of the legislation.

Council comments:

Rollo said reasonable conditions could be changed. He referenced Renwick where in 2003, developers had successfully appealed reasonable conditions to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).

Scanlan said that variances were no longer done in PUDs, and enforcement had also changed, including conditional approvals. The BZA could no longer make those adjustments.

Piedmont-Smith asked where a new school could be located.

Scanlan stated it could be built anywhere schools were allowed by zone. It would be allowable in all of the districts except R and PO.

Stosberg clarified that MCCSC would determine its own needs.

Stosberg asked if it was possible to build something for a household earning \$100,000.

Vencel said it was very difficult to build for that demographic. It was possible to have very small lots or modular homes.

Rollo agreed that more housing was needed. The number of rentals versus homes owned was disproportionate despite housing being the best way to build equity. A recent ROI study showed that many

more multifamily units were built through 2021, like Verve. He displayed multifamily buildings which primarily supplied rentals. He discussed home sales in Monroe County. He urged council to focus on the homeowner occupancy in the PUD.

Ordinance 2024-07 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Asare thanked everyone for their input and staff for their work. He believed it best to acknowledge and support staff's judgement. He noted that everything council put in the PUD was a cost to the developer which would be passed on to those living there. It was not ideal to have many more reasonable conditions, and there were other tools that could be used to facilitate homeownership.

Rosenbarger appreciated renters and said all types of housing was needed, especially more affordable units like condos in walkable areas which helped reduce the number of cars. More housing helped with the rise in housing costs. She praised everyone involved for their work and the valuable discussion.

Stosberg supported homeowner occupancy throughout the city. She commented on the city's demographics and gaps in housing types, and said it was possible to have valuable ownership in attached housing. She was working on having recycling in multifamily units.

Flaherty appreciated everyone's work. He said some cities with universities had a larger population than the student population. Bloomington's population was equivalent to the student population. Excluding students, the homeownership of Bloomington was similar to the national rate. Homeownership mandates were not ideal, and flexibility with different types of housing was best. Regulating how many units an individual or entity could own in the PUD was ideal.

Ruff took his time with the proposal because there had never been anything like it in his sixty years in Bloomington. He agreed there were housing needs but urged everyone not to oversimplify the issue. Some of the fastest growing cities did not have lower housing costs. He had heard rumors that there were many vacancies in the city's large, multifamily units. He discussed the purpose of public benefits like affordable housing and its context for developers.

Piedmont-Smith reminded everyone that the property had been undeveloped for decades and was not providing public benefits, aside from environmental ones. She noted several benefits that were specific to the PUD, and said there would also be an increase in property taxes which could be used to reinvest in the community. She would focus on affordability and environmental protections for steep slopes. She appreciated the discussion and staff's and the petitioners' work on the PUD.

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to postpone discussion of Ordinance 2024-07 until May 08, 2024.

Motion to postpone Ordinance 2024-07

There was brief council discussion on the date to postpone the legislation to and the process of adopting reasonable conditions.

Council discussion:

Stosberg withdrew the motion.

Withdrawal of motion to postpone

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to postpone discussion of Ordinance 2024-07 until May 15, 2024.

Motion to postpone Ordinance 2024-07

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

Vote to postpone [10:27pm]

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST
READING [10:28pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-08 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 2024-08 – To Enact Title 13 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled “Stormwater” [10:28pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-09 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0. (Rollo out of the room) Bolden read the legislation by title and synopsis.

Ordinance 2024-09 – To Amend Title 10 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled “Wastewater” to Remove Stormwater Language [10:30pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-10 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 2024-10 – Amending Ordinance 23-25, which Fixed the Salaries of Appointed Officers, NonUnion, and A.F.S.C.M.E. Employees for All the Departments of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana for the Year 2024 - Re: To Add a Position to the Department of Public Works and to Revise Job Titles and Job Grades within the Office of the Mayor and the Department of Public Works to Adjust or Better Reflect the Nature of Those Positions [10:32pm]

Lucas read a comment submitted by Sam Dove via Zoom chat commenting on the war between Hamas and Israel.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [10:33pm]

Lucas reviewed the upcoming council schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:35pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and Zulich seconded to hold a Council Work Session on May 09, 2024 at 12:00pm. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to schedule work session [10:37pm]

Piedmont-Smith adjourned the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT [10:38pm]

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