

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Tuesday, June 18, 2024 at 6:30pm, Council President Isabel Piedmont-Smith presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
June 18, 2024

Councilmembers present: Isak Nti Asare, Matt Flaherty, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Dave Rollo, Andy Ruff, Hopi Stosberg, Sydney Zulich

ROLL CALL [6:30pm]

Councilmembers present via Zoom: Courtney Daily, Kate Rosenbarger (arrived 6:32pm)
Councilmembers absent: none

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

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:30pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:34pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Council approve the letter to Mayor regarding councilmember priorities for the 2025 budget.

REPORTS

- COUNCIL MEMBERS [6:34pm]

Flaherty summarized the letter and council priorities. The goal was to have more collaboration between the city and county to best achieve the objectives.

Letter with Common Council budget priorities

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Piedmont-Smith said the discussions amongst council and with the mayor had been productive. She hoped the priorities would be reflected in Mayor Kerry Thomson's proposed budget.

Council comments:

The motion to approve the letter to the Mayor received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to approve letter [6:41pm]

Flaherty moved and Zulich seconded that the Council authorize distribution of the letter to the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor regarding a rate case proposed by Duke Energy Indiana.

Letter to Utility Consumer Counselor

Flaherty explained the purpose of the letter and noted that a signature line was added for the mayor. It also recognized the contributions Duke Energy had made in the community. The letter was with regard to a rate case proposed by Duke Energy which set new rates across all customer classes. The justification for the rate case was based on Duke Energy's investments. He provided details and described constituent concerns, primarily with affordability and environmental sustainability. Council was requesting that the Utility Consumer Counselor advocate on behalf of customers. There were broad concerns on rate increases and energy insecurity across the country, including racial and income disparities. He noted negative impacts on households. Flaherty discussed reliability projects in the city like larger transition poles. It was important to more rapidly decarbonize and to focus more on renewable energy. He described requests in the letter like consumer protections against inequities and shutoffs.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

Joe Davis supported the letter and the effort to protect consumers, especially those who were low income, and provided reasons.

Public comment:

Ruff thanked Flaherty for his work on the letter and was pleased that Mayor Thomson was in support. He acknowledged that entities like Duke Energy would attempt to recoup costs from rate payers. Grid reliability was part of the process of doing business.

Letter to Utility Consumer Counselor (*cont'd*)

Council comments:

Piedmont-Smith extended the time for councilmember comments until 7:10pm with no objections from the council.

Flaherty appreciated Mayor Thomson's support and recognized her understanding of decarbonizing the grid. There were factors that made the grid less reliable and increased costs. He thanked Liz Erwin and Stan Pinegar, from Duke Energy, for engaging in good discussions. He encouraged the public to attend the upcoming meeting of the regulatory commissioners. He noted that the previous year, the Indiana General Assembly (IGA), adopted a new framework for regulating rates that involved affordability and environmental sustainability. He highlighted the difference between equality and equity in regards to bearing energy costs.

Piedmont-Smith added that the Sierra Club was very active in the Indiana Beyond Coal campaign, as well as the Citizens Action Coalition. The public could participate that way as well.

The motion to approve the letter to Duke Energy received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to approve letter [7:00pm]

Stosberg noted her upcoming constituent meeting. She mentioned Stay Cool Bloomington would have free entry to city pools when the temperature rose to category 2 or above. There was a microtransit program that would begin in the summer.

Rollo mentioned his and Ruff's upcoming constituent meeting.

There were no reports from mayor and city offices.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES [7:03pm]

There were no reports from council committees.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [7:03pm]

Joe Davis asked council to investigate the abuses of discretion by the Housing and Neighborhood department, notices of violation, and the adjudicative processes of the Board of Public Works. He gave additional information.

- PUBLIC [7:03pm]

Chuck Livingston spoke about scooters blocking sidewalks.

Steve Volan commented on his time as a councilmember. He appreciated the many councilmembers that had constituent meetings, and suggested the meetings be posted online.

Flaherty moved and Zulich seconded to make to make the following appointments:

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:15pm]

- For the Commission on Sustainability - to reappoint Matt Austin to seat C-3 and Jon Eldon to seat C-5; and to appoint Tara Dunderdale to seat C-1 and Monte (Zero) Rose to seat C-4.

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

Vote to appoint [7:16pm]

Piedmont-Smith appointed Ruff, Stosberg, and Piedmont-Smith to the Common Council Hiring Committee. The purpose would be to lead the hiring process for any vacancy in the Council

Attorney/Administrator position that occur that year. The committee would then make a recommendation to the full council at a public meeting.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (*cont'd*)

There was no legislation for first reading.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST READING [7:17pm]

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:17pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Resolution 2024-15 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 2024-15 – Requesting the Food and Beverage Tax Advisory Commission to Make a Recommendation for Expenditure of Food and Beverage Tax Revenues [7:17pm]

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to adopt Resolution 2024-15.

Eric Spoonmore, Treasurer, Capital Improvement Board (CIB), said Resolution 2024-15 requested additional expenditures from the Food and Beverage Tax dollars held by the city, and would fund the CIB and its work for the remainder of 2024. Council would make a request to the Food and Beverage Tax Advisory Commission (FABTAC) for the use of city food and beverage tax revenues. He described the next steps in brief. The request totaled \$600,702, an increase of \$350,702 from the original \$200,000 budget. He gave details on the expenses including internal professional services for the CIB’s attorney and controller, external professional services, preconstruction services provided by the construction manager, and for the CIB website. Monroe County government had extended insurance coverage to the CIB.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there would be an appropriation ordinance in the near future.

Council questions:

Jessica McClellan, Controller, said yes. If council approved Resolution 2024-15, then a request would go before FABTAC, and then an appropriation ordinance would be brought before council.

Piedmont-Smith asked about outstanding purchase orders (POs).

McClellan stated there were three POs; one for the parking garage that would be closed since it was not needed. Another one for \$4.4 million for the full design of the expansion, and a third for the initial design. There would be two open POs with Schmidt Associates for design. Legal and CIB were working on transferring the contract to the CIB but the POs would be kept with the city. The CIB would review invoices and then McClellan would review them and expense against the open POs.

Piedmont-Smith asked for confirmation for when the parking garage PO was closed. She asked what the balance of the current FAB tax fund was.

McClellan said she would confirm. The FAB tax fund was around \$19 million.

Spoonmore appreciate John Whitehart, CIB’s President, and Jeff Underwood, CIB’s Controller.

Joe Davis requested delaying the proposed request until the fairness of the FAB tax was investigated, specifically for farmer’s market vendors who saw no benefit from the tax.

Public comment:

Geoff McKim clarified that Farmer’s Market vendors did not pay the tax, they collected the tax from customers. He supported Resolution

2024-15 and thanked council for their collaboration on the Convention Center expansion project.

Flaherty noted that some businesses opted to forgo charging their customers, primarily those who used cash. He discussed possible areas around the Convention Center that could be used for the expansion and economic vitality of the downtown. He noted that the hospital had moved, and the justice system might too, so the city needed to thoughtfully consider land use in the downtown areas.

Stosberg appreciated more detail in the revised budget.

The motion to adopt Resolution 2024-15 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-15 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.

Stosberg moved and Zulich seconded to adopt Ordinance 2024-15.

Sharr Pechac, Director, Human Resources, briefly presented the legislation including the new position in the Office of the City Clerk as well as the expanded 14-grade pay structure.

Flaherty expressed support for the new position in the Clerk's office and asked how it would fit into the overall duties of the clerk.

Bolden explained that she had reviewed the office, staff, and staff's duties as a whole and determined that upgrades were needed. After discussing with Pechac and other staff, it was ideal to create a new position and updated pay grades.

Stosberg asked how the new position's grade of seven compared with staff's current grades.

Bolden stated that it would be the highest pay grade in the office.

Pechac said the other positions were grade six.

Bolden clarified that the deputy clerks were grade five and the chief deputy clerk was grade six. The positions would need to be re-graded as discussed with human resources.

Stosberg asked if that was appropriate; that the new position would have a higher grade. And if not, why it was graded higher.

Bolden said it was not. She explained that the current positions used old job descriptions and were outdated. New job descriptions were drafted and Bolden thanked Erica De Santis for assisting with that effort. The job description for the new position landed at grade seven and while it was not ideal, that was the current situation. She understood that the other positions would be reviewed.

Pechac added that the new position was graded using the current pay grade structure. When the new pay grade structure was implemented, it would be re-graded.

Resolution 2024-15 (cont'd)

Council comments:

Vote to adopt Resolution 2024-15 [7:39pm]

Ordinance 2024-15 – 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 Requested by City Council to the Clerk's Office and to Replace the Existing 12-Grade Pay Grade Structure for Non-Union Employees with an Expanded 14-Grade Pay Grade Structure [7:40pm]

Council questions:

Asare asked for information regarding the public benefit of adding the new position in the Clerk's office.

Ordinance 2024-15 (cont'd)

Bolden said that the goal was to have a point person to spearhead appointments to boards and commissions. Currently, the process involved too many individuals. The new position would facilitate appointments, work with staff liaisons and departments, and onboard and train board members and commissioners.

Council questions:

Flaherty understood that the new position's grade was based on the current twelve grade structure, and that it would be included for review when the fourteen grade structure was implemented.

Pechac confirmed that was correct.

Rosenbarger asked if job titles across city departments would be streamlined, and if pay equity was considered, specifically gender and race.

Pechac said the expanded pay structure was the first step. There were other steps needed in order to revamp positions across the city; job families, classifications, and series. It would provide clearer career pathways and opportunities to reward staff for their skills, knowledge, and abilities. Analyzing equity was ongoing but establishing the new pay structure was key in that process.

Stosberg asked about the fiscal impact under the new pay grade structure.

Pechac said if the new pay grades were approved, then there would be a review. She gave examples of potential impacts. A very high estimate would be around \$10 million. An initial estimate for the budget would be the end of July.

Piedmont-Smith asked how the city would bear the cost of \$10 million and if it would be equitable, and if possible gradual.

Pechac said there would have to be prioritization focused on the most return on investment likely the middle grades. She gave examples of options.

Deputy Mayor Gretchen Knapp noted a tenure-based aspect with the evaluation of job descriptions, grades, and duties, and correction of discrepancies. Current and future funding would be analyzed and there were many options. She, McClellan, and consultants had regularly met to discuss long term financial planning for the city. There was easily \$10 million that could be used. The goal was to implement as much as possible and to retain and attract talent. She gave examples.

Rollo asked about the lowest paid employees and asked if they could afford to live in the city.

Knapp stated that the highest paid employees would be last.

Zulich asked if the clerk staff compensation had different legal issues.

Bolden stated that under state code, the clerk may fix the salaries of staff, with council approval. Historically, that had been done by the administration. Clerk staff served at the clerk's pleasure.

Stosberg asked if it was correct that the positions included benefits, and the numbers in the pay structure were specific to salary only.

Pechac said yes.

Dave Askins, B Square Bulletin, expressed confusion on the final document once the salary ordinance was amended because it used

Public comment:

the older, twelve grade pay structure. He wondered if there would end being a mix of old and new pay grades.

Ordinance 2024-15 (cont'd)

Christopher Emge, Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce, thanked staff for their work. He believed it was ideal to have a point person for boards and commissions and discussed staff retention.

Public comment:

Steve Volan expressed enthusiasm for the new position in the Clerk's office and gave reasons in support.

Asare asked why the new pay grade structure was not used.

Council comments:

Pechac responded that regrading was a larger process and went through the Workforce Evaluation Realignment Committee (WERC). The first step was approval of the pay grades and then salaries would go before council.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification on a list of positions in the salary ordinance referring to a pay grade table that would no longer exist.

Pechac stated that there were positions and classifications, by departments, listed in the salary ordinance.

Piedmont-Smith asked for clarification.

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney/Administrator for his opinion. He understood the confusion; that the salary ordinance referenced one pay grade scale, but if the legislation was approved, then that pay grade scale would no longer exist. The new fourteen pay grade structure would replace it.

Piedmont-Smith asked if there was a legal issue with that.

Lucas did not believe that it was a council issue, but was an issue for the administration and Human Resources (HR).

Stosberg asked why the proposal was not for year 2025.

Pechac said there was 2024 money reserved based on the 2023 Classification and Compensation Study conducted by Crowe, LLP.

Stosberg stated there could be a fiscal impact if pay grade changes were made.

Pechac confirmed that was correct and it would be brought before council.

Flaherty said it was useful to have both pay grade structures. He asked if there would be a point where some jobs were reclassified and others were not.

Pechac stated the goal was to review all the positions at once.

Flaherty asked if it was possible to regrade the jobs and not change the salaries.

Pechac explained the factors involved including the first phase of regrading, and the second phase of reviewing, salaries and budget implications.

Stosberg asked about adding language clarifying which pay grade table to refer to and how the ambiguity would affect the new position in the Clerk's office.

Lucas stated that would be helpful, but was not sure it could be done that evening.

Bolden explained that since board and commission outreach and recruitment began in the fall, and not just when council began making appointments, that it would potentially delay the process.

There was additional council discussion on clarifying language and the consideration of amendments.

Piedmont-Smith recessed the meeting for 15 minutes to reconvene at 8:48pm.

Recess [8:31pm]

Piedmont-Smith moved and Stosberg seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-15.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-15

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment, sponsored by Cm. Piedmont-Smith, would delay the effective date of Section 2 of the ordinance to January 1, 2025.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Stosberg thanked staff and Lucas for working on Amendment 01.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-15 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-15 [8:52pm]

There were no council comments.

Council comments:

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2024-15 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 2024-15 as amended [8:53pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded that Ordinance 2024-16 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 2024-16 – To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled “Administration and Personnel” Re: Amending BMC 2.04.120 (Limits On Debate) [8:54pm]

Stosberg moved and Ruff seconded to adopt Ordinance 2024-16.

Piedmont-Smith presented the legislation which was an effort to make Regular Sessions more efficient by limiting councilmember comments, after the legislation question and answer period, and public comment. Sometimes debates were too long, and time limits could encourage councilmembers to be better prepared.

Piedmont-Smith passed the gavel to Ruff.

Rollo asked about peer cities. It seemed to him that if the legislation passed, it would be the most restrictive.

Council questions:

Lucas referenced data from the top twenty most populated cities in Indiana, as well as other Big Ten states’ cities. Many had time limits in their city code like Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Evansville, South Bend, Gary, and more. Many did not. He provided examples.

Rollo said most had five minutes, plus five minutes for rebuttal.

Stosberg asked why three minutes was selected.

Piedmont-Smith said she selected three minutes based on her experience; three minutes had been sufficient in most cases.

Ruff asked how many councilmembers there were in Indianapolis.

Lucas said there were twenty five.

Rollo asked what supporting evidence validated the legislation.

Piedmont-Smith clarified the purpose of Ordinance 2024-16 was to have more efficient meetings. She was open to increasing time limits, but believed there needed to be time limits. She commented on the duration of meetings.

Asare asked if the time limit applied to question periods too and how much time would be saved.

Piedmont-Smith said it only applied to council comment period. She said it depended and was hard to estimate saved time.

Ordinance 2024-16 (cont'd)

Council questions:

Daily asked if the rules could be suspended to remove time limits for certain items.

Piedmont-Smith said yes and there would be a vote.

Flaherty asked for clarification on nuances in the data compiled by council staff, and what was codified.

Lucas said time limits varied by city, and referenced Indianapolis' rules.

There was additional discussion on exceptions to the proposed time limits.

Rollo asked if meetings were long because of scheduling issues.

Piedmont-Smith explained the variety of reasons that made meetings long. Limiting comment period was one option. There were other periods which could have time limits.

Rollo said it would be useful to have examples of council abusing comment periods. It was important to have lengthy debates on certain items of great magnitude.

Piedmont-Smith stated that if there was something of great magnitude, a councilmember could bring forth a debate structure. It was beneficial to default to a time limit, and if needed, vote to extend or remove the time limit.

Lucas confirmed that to restructure debate, a two-thirds vote was required.

Rollo asked if the majority could quash the minority.

Piedmont-Smith reiterated that each councilmember would have the same time limit.

Ruff asked if he recalled correctly that Piedmont-Smith stated that certain comments could be phrased as questions during that period.

Piedmont-Smith said the presiding councilmember should be stringent and only questions should be asked during that period.

Ruff said that lengthy comment periods only occurred with controversial legislation, and asked why it was necessary to impose a time limit for noncontroversial items.

Piedmont-Smith referred to Resolution 2024-14 which passed 9-0, but two councilmembers had made extensive comments despite voting in favor of the legislation.

Ruff considered council comment period as part of deliberations. He asked if Piedmont-Smith agreed or thought it was a statement on how someone planned to vote.

Stosberg moved and Piedmont-Smith seconded to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-16. Stosberg presented Amendment 01.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-16

Amendment 01 Synopsis: This amendment, sponsored by Cm. Stosberg, would increase the time limits applicable to council speeches or comments to five (5) minutes for the first speech and to two (2) minutes for the second speech.

There were no council questions.

Council questions:

Steve Volan spoke about the length of meetings.

Public comment:

Dave Askins, B Square Bulletin, discussed codifying time limits versus having a rules document.

Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-16 (cont'd)

Jami Sholl supported longer time limits.

Public comment:

Joe Davis spoke against limits on debates.

Rollo believed Amendment 01 improved the proposal but still made Bloomington the most restrictive in the state. He discussed the impact the legislation had on deliberation and debate. There was the occasional need for a slide presentation. It was concerning to rely on the majority to allow additional time. That had not happened for him during the discussion on the Summit proposal. He provided reasons in support of omitting time limits.

Council comments:

Piedmont-Smith appreciated Stosberg for proposing Amendment 01. She recognized other cities that may not have codified time limits, but many had time limits in rules documents.

Ruff noted his lengthy comments, like with the Summit project.

Stosberg did not believe that time limits negated checks and balances. Councilmembers could learn to be more efficient in their comments. She spoke about the importance of not repeating oneself, and supported time limits. She said posting opinions, or documents, on the council website was another mechanism that could be used.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 3 (Rollo, Ruff, Asare), Abstain: 0.

Vote to adopt Amendment 01 to Ordinance 2024-16 [9:44pm]

Steve Volan supported two rounds of comment with time limits. He referenced Robert's Rules of Order and listed different options that could occur including limiting time on other portions of the meeting.

Public comment:

Christopher Emge spoke about types of council meetings, including Committee of the Whole (COW), and the duration of meetings.

Joe Davis believed it was important for councilmembers to cross-examine other councilmembers. He urged council to not place restrictions on debate.

Dave Askins, B Square Bulletin, noted time allowances for speeches in Robert's Rules of Order. He appreciated front-loading questions prior to a meeting.

Rollo thanked Stosberg for Amendment 01. In most cases, time limits were not a problem. He expressed concern for time limits when deliberating contentious items, and the need to protect the minority's opinion. He would vote no.

Council comments:

Asare noted different parts of meetings that lengthened duration. It could be problematic to codify everything and be difficult to change. The goal should be better legislation and not grandstanding. He would not support Ordinance 2024-16. He mentioned the efficiency with considering Resolution 2024-15 that evening.

Piedmont-Smith brought the legislation forward in order to have a discussion on revisiting council meetings and acknowledged there were other parts to consider, as well as scheduling. She noted that Resolution 2024-15 was a simple request to the FABTAC and questions had been asked in advance. She questioned why Asare

Ordinance 2024-16 (cont'd)

would not support the legislation, given their conversations regarding the long duration of meetings. She agreed that the council minority opinion should be protected and noted she had been in the minority for most of her tenure. The legislation, if passed, would not curtail the duties of council as a balance to the executive branch.

Council comments:

Stosberg said formal meetings were necessary, by statute, in order to take final actions. Having other opportunities for less formal meetings was useful. It was possible for councilmembers to limit their comments in formal meetings to five minutes and not need subsequent rounds. Presentations were often too long and at times repetitive. She gave examples of timekeeping and other areas to use meeting time more effectively.

Rosenbarger believed it was fine to codify time limits and see how it worked, and to make changes if needed. She would support the legislation. It was important to attempt new ideas to make meetings more efficient. She noted that some councilmembers more regularly took up time, and that she as a woman tended to not take that space. Having designated time to speak, with limits, might give those councilmembers more space to speak. There were other opportunities for councilmembers to express their opinions.

Asare did not believe Ordinance 2024-16 achieved the goal of making meetings shorter, and delayed larger changes to council meetings. He believed the discussion that evening might have been more successful in a Consensus Building Activity. He stated that Rosenbarger's comments were quite persuasive.

Ruff believed legislation needed a lot of time and attention and did not believe council meetings were too long. He agreed that process could be reviewed. It was not wise to have already decided on items prior to a meeting, and before hearing from council colleagues. Deliberation was important for persuading councilmembers. He discussed his comments on legislation from previous meetings.

Daily had initially believed time limits would be efficient. She did not want councilmembers to feel unheard, especially if they were in the minority. She was in favor of shorter meetings but not at the expense of purposeful deliberation. She would vote no.

Flaherty thought it was ideal to look at time limits in various parts of council meetings, like presentations. He appreciated asking questions in advance of a meeting but not replacing the question and answer period. Ordinance 2024-16 was a step forward. It was important to attempt new things with council meetings. He noted that there was a status quo on the previous council and commented on the consideration of the Summit project. Time management was useful. He would support the legislation.

Zulich had initially supported the legislation but had been persuaded otherwise that evening. She agreed with Rosenbarger about some councilmembers speaking often and others not. She was the youngest councilmember and it was not always easy for her to take up space and speak. She believed it was useful to have council meet in different, more informal ways.

Piedmont-Smith discussed consensus building activities and expressed concern with the belief that type of meeting would be ideal for considering a topic. It took a long time to build consensus. There was a need for council to engage with each other, staff, and

the public in different ways. She encouraged councilmembers to bring other ideas for consideration.

Vote to adopt Ordinance 2024-16 as amended [10:34pm]

The motion to adopt Ordinance 2024-16 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 5, Nays: 4 (Rollo, Ruff, Zulich, Daily), Abstain: 0.

Ruff passed the gavel back to Piedmont-Smith.

Jami Sholl, Commission on Sustainability, spoke about the Summit project and the lack of things like a community garden in that area which was a food desert.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT [10:35pm]

There was brief discussion on where to have the consensus building activity.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:39pm]

Piedmont-Smith noted that the Public Safety Local Income Tax committee would meet on July 15, 2024 at 12:00pm.

Piedmont-Smith adjourned the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT [10:41pm]

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