

**CITY OF BLOOMINGTON
CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
MEETING AGENDA
109 E. OLIVE – COUNCIL CHAMBER
MONDAY, MAY 19, 2014, 5:30 P.M.**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Public Comment *(15 minutes)***
- 3. Committee of the Whole Minutes from January 21 and March 17, 2014. (Recommend that the reading of the minutes of the Committee of the Whole Proceedings of January 21 and March 17, 2014 be dispensed with and the minutes approved as printed.) *(5 minutes)***
- 4. Items to be Presented:**
 - A. Public Comment Ordinance Discussion *(15 minutes)***
 - B. West Jefferson Street Dead-end - Status Report on traffic engineering analysis, community outreach and future options *(20 minutes)***
 - C. FY 2015 Budget and \$1 million appropriation for street resurfacing - Staff option for multiple location small scale street repairs *(15 minutes)***
 - D. City Facility Needs Discussion *(20 minutes)***
 - E. FY 2015 City Manager Action Plan - Review and Discuss Final Draft *(10 minutes)***
- 5. Adjourn**

Item 3.

**Committee of the Whole Minutes
from January 21, 2014 and March 17, 2014
(5 minutes)**

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
City Hall Council Chambers
January 21, 2014

Council present: Aldermen Judy Stearns, Mboka Mwilambwe, Karen Schmidt, Jim Fruin, Rob Fazzini, Kevin Lower, Scott Black and David Sage, and Mayor Tari Renner.

Council absent: Alderman Jennifer McDade.

Staff present: David Hales, City Manager; Alex McElroy, Asst. to the City Manager; Jim Karch, Director of Public Works; and Tracey Covert, City Clerk.

Mayor Renner called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Renner opened the Public Comment section of the meeting. He added that there would not be a response from the Committee under the Public Comment portion of the meeting. No one came forward to address the Committee.

MINUTES

Motion by Alderman Fruin, seconded by Alderman Black to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2013 Committee of the Whole meeting as presented.

Motion carried, (viva voce).

ICMA CENTER OR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT RECAP

Mayor Renner introduced this topic.

David Hales, City Manager, addressed the Council. Alex McElroy, Asst. to the City Manager, has had performance management assigned to him as a key responsibility. Initially, City staff had to gather data. The International City/County Management Association, (ICMA), was involved in performance management. This action had been influenced by the accounting boards. These boards were requiring more information regarding service levels, what was being done, how much was spent, and what was neglected. Benchmarking provided the public with information regarding safeguarding of public funds and stewardship of infrastructure.

The City participated in a pilot program and joined the Center for Performance Management, (CPM). ICMA established consistency regarding gathering data regarding work load, productivity, efficiency, effectiveness and more. The program allows for realistic comparisons with other public entities and the opportunity to learn from same. He could not understate City staff's involvement in this program.

Good management dictated that progress be measured from year to year. This program provided information regarding service levels, comparison with other cities and how the City had been rated. The information/data would be shared with the public.

Alex McElroy, Asst. to the City Manager, addressed the Council. A PowerPoint presentation had been prepared. He presented a brief history of the ICMA's CPM. This program started in 1994. Its purpose was to develop common measures, encourage comparisons, identify effective management practices and learn from high performers.

The CPM program measures eighteen (18) service areas. The City provided responses for fourteen (14) areas. It was a significant undertaking. City staff took on this project knowing that the City's data would be shared. Data from FY 12/13 was provided. The ICMA trained City staff in August 2013; responses were compiled in September 2013 and provided to ICMA in October. Results were received from the ICMA in December 2013. The process was involved and labor intensive. He noted the short turnaround times. A key issue was the benefit gained by participation in the program.

Thirty-nine (39) entities participated in the program. These cities ranged from 5,000 to over a million in population. He noted the variety of size, services and service levels. Eleven (11) cities were identified as comparable and used as benchmarks.

The questions were outcome oriented and were used to identify successes and/or areas needing improvement. City staff saw the benefit of participation. He cautioned that this program was not intended to be used as a disciplinary tool.

The data was important for several reasons. Most federal grants require outcome evaluations as part of the application process. Bond sales require indicators of financial condition. Local government revenues were insufficient which made effective use of resources imperative. Both GASB, (Government Accounting Standards Board), and GFOA, (Government Finance Officers Association), have indicated that performance measurement will be a future requirement. It provided a manner to quantify to citizens "the bang for their buck".

Mr. McElroy mentioned several examples of the program in action. First, a city in Wyoming that participated in the program was experiencing more fleet accidents than their peers. They examined data detailing where the accidents occurred and types of accidents. It was found that most accidents were rear end collisions within one (1) mile of city hall. Further research showed that cars were backing into pillars in the parking area. The pillars were painted bright yellow and the number of accidents decreased.

A second example was from an Atlanta, GA suburb regarding potholes. The public works director reported to council the costs: materials and manpower required for repairs. Council questioned how much this work should cost. He did not know because he had not examined data from peers.

The final example was from a metro Seattle city. The fire chief saw a nearby community with an excellent ability to confine fires to the room of origin. He contacted the high performing

department chief and found that his community had a residential fire sprinkler ordinance that aided his crew.

Mr. McElroy provided data for the City and our peers for Code Enforcement; Parks, Recreation & Cultural Arts; and Police & Fire Departments. It showed areas that were successful and those needing research. He noted the steps involved: collect, compare and improve services.

The next steps involved further analyzing results, refining and selecting benchmarks, networking with high performing organizations, utilizing best practices, incorporating CPM measures into a monthly reporting system and sharing progress with Council and public. The purpose of these actions was basic quality municipal services.

Performance data was shared in the City Manager's Monthly Report and the City's Annual Budget. The City had received several awards: 2012 ICMA CPM Certificate of Distinction, 2013 ICMA CPM Certificate of Distinction, AMCP Hermes Gold Award Enhancing Communications Between Citizens and Government and the GFOA Distinguished Budget Award 2011, 2012 and 2013.

Mr. Hales stated that the ICMA's CPM went hand in hand with revitalizing City government and the Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. The City must look for efficiencies, direct outcomes and provide effective superior customer service. Mr. Hales noted City staff's involvement. These working managers would identify those cities which would help the City improve. The information gathered should be shared with the employees. He thanked Mr. McElroy for his efforts and the efforts of the department directors.

Mayor Renner noted that this program was important for the Council, City Manager, department heads, staff and citizens. The data would impact budget decisions.

Alderman Black was curious about metrics. He questioned if the City was considered a leader. Mr. McElroy said that the data needed further analysis. He cited Parks, Recreation & Cultural Arts' revenues as highlight.

Alderman Schmidt thanked Mr. McElroy for his efforts. She asked if the data would compare the City with other communities of similar financial structure and unions. She noted benchmarks and cost for services. Mr. McElroy answered that ICMA recommended demographics as a basis for determining peers. He restated eleven (11) communities were identified and noted the challenge of finding a Fire Department that also served an airport.

Alderman Fazzini had attended two (2) IML, (Illinois Municipal League), Conferences and visited six (6) other Central IL council meetings. In some communities, council members with expertise were assigned to specific departments where they lend expertise and experience. It was critical for a policy making board to have sufficient data that was consistent over the years. This data would be used as a policy making tool.

Alderman Sage thanked Mr. McElroy for his efforts. He understood the scope of this plan and that it supported a decision making system. The City responded to fourteen (14) areas and the

report addressed only four (4). Mr. McElroy noted that the City did not offer all of the services/departments included in the CPM.

Alderman Sage questioned MUNIS' role in data gathering. Mr. McElroy stated that MUNIS has the ability to track data and could be a future resource. Alderman Sage cited the benefits of enterprise software. He noted outcome based information which positively impacted federal grants, bond rating agencies, etc.

Alderman Stearns questioned the data's statistical significance. She noted scientific research. She was concerned about the concept of performance management and benchmarking. Comparable cities were based upon size. She cited other important factors such as location, culture, economy, government structure, etc. She wanted to see meaningful comparisons. The City was unique. She noted that this data would be presented to the citizens. She questioned the validity of the data and total cost of program participation, (ICMA membership, staff time and program software).

Mr. McElroy noted that the ICMA addressed standard deviation.

Mayor Renner added that eleven (11) participants were not sufficient.

Mr. Hales cited ICMA's membership cost. He believed that there was a cost to not participating. The program provided good value. The City would determine the cost of services. The City must provide results. The goal was service improvements. The City must collect data and look inward. The data addressed basic workload information. The City would have the ability to measure progress and efficiency in order to provide effective services.

Mayor Renner recognized good points made by Alderman Stearns. The information provided a good reference point. Comparisons with other cities may vary due to unique differences, (departments/services). The meaning of the numbers should not be overstated.

Alderman Stearns stated that the City has no idea of the program's cost. She cited the staff time involved. The cost of not doing was not understood. In financial reporting, the benchmarks were known. She questioned the validity of comparisons with other cities.

Alderman Fruin believed that population was key to metrics. He was interested in demographics of peer cities. Data was becoming a compliance issue. The City needed to start somewhere. He appreciated the work done to date. He was glad that the City had started in a process of continuous improvement.

Alderman Mwilambwe thanked Mr. McElroy for his efforts. This was a large undertaking. He expressed concern about the meaning of the data. However, it provided a foundation and a guide for improvement. He questioned program implementation, (staff's ability to complete the near-term work, use of committees, etc.).

Alderman Lower stated that the ICMA was a great organization but it offered a narrow view point. The City should consider other groups, (CATO Institute or the IL Policy Institute, etc.). The City must look within and accept feedback from staff working in the trenches.

\$10 MILLION STREET RESURFACING PROJECT UPDATE

Mayor Renner introduced this item.

Mr. Hales addressed the Committee. There has been a large investment in this project. City staff had been reassigned. The Council would have to approve the related contracts. The Committee would be informed what to expect in the near term.

Jim Karch, Public Works Director, addressed the Committee. He planned to present a resurfacing update. He noted that \$10 million was significant. Looking at City sewers was complex. The project was on schedule.

Work started with street ratings followed by a master list and then field inspections. The list was subject to change as work continued. The focus was on major streets but City staff was also examining residential streets.

Sewers must also be evaluated prior to resurfacing as they were located under the payment. Televising the sewers helped the City to know what was there. This provided structural information and needed repairs were identified. Sewer repairs must be coordinated with underground utility work and completed before resurfacing. Many main line sewers were clay and could be lined to extend their useful life. There were a number of sewers which were good candidates for lining. He described this work as a best practice.

City staff was in the final stages of prioritizing work within budget restraints. This evaluation must be completed by February 20, 2014. City staff held weekly project meetings. Issues with sewer laterals have been seen.

Mr. Hales questioned past sewer televising. Mr. Karch offered to provide the information. The practice had changed. Televising had been used only in specific instances. It had not been used to gather citywide data.

Mr. Karch compared brick versus pipe sewers. He pointed out that there were many problems with brick sewers. Other issues could be discovered once streets were milled. Quantities would be determined after the final assessment. The project was on schedule. Staff intended to present a contract to Council for approval at their March 24, 2014 meeting.

Alderman Fruin questioned if the bond issue would be broken down into components and would different contractors be used on separate phases. Mr. Karch stated that it would be difficult based upon the contract's size. He noted the large scale of the bid. He hoped that multiple contractors would submit bids.

Alderman Black noted the winter weather. He cited the impact upon City streets. He questioned if the bond dollars would be directed towards same. Mr. Karch stated that the bond issue was for arterial and some residential streets. Pothole repairs were different. He noted that this year there appeared to be fewer potholes but they were deeper. The City had hot asphalt boxes and the proper equipment which resulted in better repairs. The bond issue would help but permanent pothole patching and preservation treatment were key.

CURB & GUTTER POLICY

Mayor Renner introduced this item.

Mr. Hales addressed the Council. He noted that the Public Works Department's Engineering Division had a program for repair and replacement of curbs & gutters. Citizens had voiced concerns and he anticipated additional feedback from same once repairs begin. Residents did not want new streets with old existing curbs & gutters. Due to costs, Council guidance was needed.

Mr. Karch stated that a preliminary plan was brought before the Infrastructure Committee. Cost figures were analyzed. Cost was the driving force. He noted the cost to add curb & gutter to a street project. The cost of resurfacing plus full curb & gutter replacement was over twice the cost for resurfacing plus spot curb & gutter repair. The tipping point was when forty percent, (40%), of the curb & gutter needed to be replaced. The function of curbs & gutters were to serve as a barrier and to carry storm water.

Past overlay practices have filled the curb & gutter. This practice had saved the City money. Streets were overlaid not milled as part of the street resurfacing program. Standard curb height was six inches (6"). Serviceable curb height was two inches (2").

City staff considered the neighborhood character. Curb & gutter replacement required that a portion of the parkway be removed. This work impacted trees. Sandstone curbs were major issues. These curbs held the street bricks in place. City staff did not want to remove these curbs.

Mr. Hales referred to Alderman Stearns comments regarding the Locust/Colton Combined Sewer Overflow project. The City resurfaced streets and citizens expected new curbs & gutters. Some solutions were provided. New curbs also addressed drainage issues. The City needed to consider citizens' expectations.

Alderman Fazzini stated that the cost of repair versus replacement needed to be shared with the public. The cost estimated would double resurfacing costs. Mr. Karch informed the Council that the City had 800 lane miles of streets. Alderman Fazzini added that there were forty-three (43) miles of private streets. He believed that citizens wanted perfect curbs. He did believe that the City could afford same.

Mr. Karch stated that information would be placed on the City's web site in an effort to educate and communicate with citizens.

Alderman Fazzini requested a map indicating which streets need new curbs & gutters. Mr. Hales noted that there were a couple of streets which will have new curbs & gutters.

Mr. Karch noted McArthur and Linden St. as there were no curbs remaining. These were collector streets which would also be widened. He added that there were also sewer concerns on Linden St.

Alderman Stearns believed that there was a curb issue. She understood that curbs could not be replaced for appearance only. Curbs served an important function: a drainage tool.

Alderman Mwilambwe questioned the science behind planting trees in the parkway. Their roots damaged curbs. Mr. Karch added that although beautiful, tree roots also destroy sewers and sidewalks. It was an issue of balance.

FY 2014 ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Mayor Renner introduced this item.

Mr. Hales addressed the Committee. He stated there were twenty-four (24) projects. This was the City Manager's Action Plan. Priorities came from Council. The City faced funding and resource issues. The list was provided as background to the FY 2015 Plan. He welcomed the Council's questions.

Alderman Fazzini requested that the Visitor's Center being added to the plan. Mr. Hales agreed that this was a high priority. It would be placed in the five (5) year Capital Improvement Plan. It would require a contribution from the City but be located in a County facility.

Mayor Renner expressed his concern that too many items were placed on the Action Plan. He believed that only large items should be listed. He cited a top ten (10) priorities list. The Visitor's Center was important. The City was waiting to hear about state funding.

Alderman Black agreed that it should be a high level list. He expressed concern with the format, percentage completed and subtasks. He wanted to see more detail: percentages included on FY 14 and clearer guidelines for FY 15.

DRAFT FY15 ACTION PLAN

Mayor Renner introduced this item.

Mr. Hales addressed the Committee. FY 15 was heavy on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). He addressed a twenty (20) year master plan which would include financial feasibility. Items would be prioritized. He noted the Sewer and Storm Water Master Plan which had not been presented to the Council. City staff was reviewing the 900 pages of material in this plan. The goal was to start with a five (5) year Capital Improvement Plan approved by the Council that outlined prioritized projects with revenue sources identified. This five (5) year plan would include political and financial challenges. The estimated cost of the twenty (20) year plan was

over \$400 million. The City needed to address key elements. The City has struggled with General Fund projects such as streets, sidewalks and facilities. He restated that the FY 15 Plan had a heavy emphasis on infrastructure. A realistic five (5) year CIP required the assessment of condition/inventory, setting priorities and determining funding sources. The City's purchasing/procurement policies need to be updated. General Fund revenue audits would indicate if the City was collecting all that was owed. He believed that this plan was doable. This plan would pull together separate studies. The focus was on infrastructure. Only a small number of items were listed. He welcomed the Council's input.

Mayor Renner stated that Mr. Hales would continue to work on revitalizing City government. The Council needed to establish action sets, i.e. the top priorities for FY 2015.

Alderman Fazzini noted that there are forty-three (43) miles of private streets. The issue was citizens wanting to turn them over to the City. He suggested that a Private Street Master Plan was needed or it could be incorporated into another one. Mayor Renner suggested this be included in smart future growth. Alderman Fazzini restated that a Master Plan was needed.

Alderman Sage expressed his support for Alderman Fazzini's comments. This was a legacy issue which needed a policy statement. Alderman Fazzini agreed that it did not have to be a Master Plan but guidance was needed.

Alderman Black addressed execution for FY 14 and FY 15. Items needed to be measurable and definable. As an example he cited City culture change/revitalizing City government.

Mayor Renner questioned Council sentiment regarding private streets.

Alderman Fruin expressed his concern regarding simply reacting to something. The Council was recommending adding items to the list. He thought the goal was to reduce the list. He believed that each Council member wanted to add something.

Mayor Renner suggested that the Council schedule a follow up Work Session as this was not a good time to address this item. The Committee's thoughts about same should be emailed to Mr. Hales. A Work Session would be scheduled before this list was finalized.

Mr. Hales welcomed the Council's input. Revitalizing City government would be added. The focus must be on items with majority support. He was working with City staff. He had the list from the Council's retreat. The Council needed to define open and transparent government. New things would come up. The Council must be willing to allow for updates and changes. He believed that the City had the ability to accomplish priorities. Everything was contingent upon financial resources being available and budget approval. The list may need to be modified.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: None.

The meeting adjourned. Time: 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey Covert
City Clerk

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
City Hall Council Chambers
March 17, 2014

Council present: Aldermen Judy Stearns, Mboka Mwilambwe, Karen Schmidt, Joni Painter, Jim Fruin, Ron Fazzini, Kevin Lower, Scott Black and David Sage, and Mayor Tari Renner.

Staff present: David Hales, City Manager and Tracey Covert, City Clerk.

Mayor Renner called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Renner opened the Public Comment section of the meeting. He added that there would not be a response from the Committee under the Public Comment portion of the meeting.

Bruce Meeks, 1402 Wright St., addressed the Council. He requested to make a parliamentary point of order to obtain and offer information regarding parliamentary procedure and the City Code. He noted agendas had listed five to six (5 – 6) minutes be allowed for public comment. He claimed that Chapter 2. Administration, Section 17. Regular Meetings; Seating; Order of Business, was violated by offering these time limits.

Mayor Renner stated that public comment is not an engagement with the Council and there would be no Council response.

George Boyle, Asst. Corporation Council, addressed the Council. He cited Chapter 2. Section 15. Meetings – Regular and Adjourned and Section 17 that allowed up to five (5) speakers with a three (3) minute time limit.

Mr. Meeks stated that Council was not following parliamentary procedure. He was opposed to the proposed change to the Home Rule Sales Tax, and the proposed Amusement Tax, Utility Tax and Local Motor Fuel Tax.

He believed that the Mayor and City Manager had too much control over meeting agendas. This issue should be addressed at a Committee of the Whole meeting due to the impact upon minority members of the Council.

PROPOSED SOCCER COMPLEX AND COMMUNITY CENTER PROJECT AND
REQUEST FOR PUBLIC FUNDING (0.25% HOME RULE SALES TAX INCREASE)

Mayor Renner introduced this topic.

Dave Magers addressed the Council. Mr. Magers stated that he and Jeff Tinervin represented Citizens Advocating For Area Youth (CAFAY). Mr. Magers stated that this project was very important to the community. Handout material had been provided to Council. He acknowledged

the City's budget constraints and hoped that this project would be considered a priority. It would provide structured activities. Mr. Magers added that neither himself or Mr. Tinervin or anyone associated with CAFAY have any personal financial involvement in this project. He wanted to see this project come to fruition. These projects had started separately. Mr. Magers had been involved in the soccer project for over six (6) years. Mr. Tinervin had been involved in the community center project almost as long. Both projects had endured many starts and stops and have been fully vetted.

Mr. Magers referred to an aerial rendering of the soccer complex. It would include twenty-six (26) pitches of various sizes, (nine/9 were lighted and irrigated), parking, concessions, seating, restrooms, and locker rooms. The proposed location would be west of I-74/I-55 and south of College Ave., (i.e. near the former outlet mall). Other locations had been considered. The selected location was in the Enterprise Zone, and on the west side. It could be accessed easily from the interstates and was in close proximity to shopping, hotels and restaurants. This would be a joint opportunity for the City and the Town of Normal.

Julia Turner, former soccer mom, addressed Council. Over 2,600 individuals in the area participated in soccer, (PCSL/Prairie City Soccer League, club and adult players). Currently, there was only one (1) local volunteer operated tournament. It attracted 170 teams and 6,000 - 7,000 people. This year, there would be a 140 team limit. She expected that the area would host four to six (4 - 6) tournaments per year due to the new facility. The proposed facility could attract an Olympic Development Program (ODP) as the City's central location in the state was key.

Jeff Tinervin addressed Council. He began investigating a new YMCA facility and found a larger need existed for programming that served other local organizations as well. The proposed community center would serve a number of groups, address programming needs and combine programs. The center would also serve senior citizens. The former Great Escape located at 1710 RT Dunn Dr., had been selected due to its proximity to RT Dunn fields which would allow access to outdoor activities. He noted the groups involved in this project. Details were provided in a handout provided to Council. There had been too much talk regarding funding. The focus needed to be on addressing youth needs and investing in their future.

Rev. John Rayford addressed Council. He urged the Council to move forward. The project should be viewed as an investment, not an expense. He was concerned about at risk youth. The center would create a safe place. He believed that there would be a huge return on investment. Local tournaments would provide a financial return. It was a comprehensive project that bridged various groups. He encouraged the Council to work with the Town of Normal. It was better to invest in properly growing youth than to correct them later.

Mr. Magers thanked Council for the time and consideration of this important project for area youth and the entire community. He added that the Council must consider the fact that the current fields were going away. He requested that the Council review the material provided and give consideration to the letters of support.

Alderman Schmidt was struggling with funding this proposal. The proposal identified important needs in the community and would be an investment in the future. She cited the collaboration that had developed. The key question was how to fund this project. She noted the community good and hope that all of the parties involved would come together in order to move this project forward.

Mayor Renner stated that the YMCA was not sustainable at its current location. He acknowledged that the soccer fields were going away and this fact needed to be considered.

Alderman Fruin commented that it was a good project but financing was in question. He cited intergovernmental cooperation and west side development. He noted the tax burden that would be placed on the next generation. The project had the potential to attract outside investment to the area. There were a number of smart individuals in the community that needed to come together and determine how to fund this project. The current soccer fields would be vacated.

Alderman Black noted citizen presence for this item. He had received emails related to this item. He had also received negative feedback from his ward. Public buy in was lacking. He cited a public referendum as a means of gaining support. He noted the City's infrastructure needs. The community's youth were important. The community needed to get behind this project. He would not feel confident informing his ward that the City would fund this project instead of repairing infrastructure.

Alderman Mwilambwe acknowledged that this was a difficult item as his children played soccer. He needed to separate his passion for the sport and the best interests of the City. He expressed his interest in finding a creative way to fund the project. He noted the City's sewer and street issues. He compared this project to the Miller Park Zoo. He recommended fundraising and establishing seed money. He restated his interest in community youth as he had four (4) children.

Mayor Renner informed those present that a Budget Work Session was scheduled for March 22, 2014. The City must resolve an \$8 million budget shortfall.

Alderman Lower stated that developers have offered green space that would provide space for soccer fields. They would mow the grounds but the green spaces must be maintained/secured by a soccer organization. He believed that there was goodwill in the community. There would not be a central location. There were other avenues available to meet the need.

Alderman Stearns noted the effort made regarding this project. It was a well executed plan. She cited the City's budget pressures. She addressed the sales tax referendum and proposed sales tax increases. She also addressed the City's pension funds shortfall and her belief that the obligation would double in coming years. She invited all present to the Budget Work Session. She encouraged a referendum as a means to move this project forward.

Mayor Renner stated that a referendum could be placed on the November 2014 election ballot.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - DISCUSSION OF THE SCOPE OF WORK, COUNCIL EXPECTATIONS AND PROJECT TIMELINE

Mayor Renner introduced this item.

Vasudha Pinnamaraju, McLean County Regional Planning Commission's (MCRPC) Executive Director addressed Council. The Comprehensive Plan was proposed to be addressed in four (4) phases. The phases would address issues/analysis.

Phase 1 would be Existing Conditions Analysis which was ongoing and would take four to five (4 – 5) months. Phase 2 would be Community Visioning which would begin in July 2014 and would take four to five (4 - 5) months. Phase 3 would be Strategic Planning and Phase 4 would be Plan Making and Adoption. Together the last two (2) phases will take six to eight (6 - 8) months.

Phase 1 Existing Conditions Analysis was a snapshot of what existed today. All current City plans and studies would be evaluated, as well as state and federal plans and policies that would affect the City.

The second part of this phase would be data collection and analysis. She cited census data as an example: the City has sixty-eight percent (68%) home ownership and thirty-two percent (32%) rental. Local data told a different story: sixty-three percent (63%) home ownership and thirty-seven percent (37%) rental, a difference of five percent (5%). The existing conditions report would be evidence based. This phase should be completed in June 2014 for presentation to Council and the Planning Commission.

She requested the City form two (2) committees: Steering Committee and an Advisory Committee. Both will be important to the overall process.

Comprehensive Plans were changing. They were being redefined to accommodate a range of needs. The City needed to be committed to this work, (i.e. buy in). There would be frequent presentations and committees needed to provide direction.

Phase 2 Community Visioning. Outreach would be key. The goal was to reach at least thirty percent (30%) of all City residents for education, to encourage participation, and to evaluate who was participating. She cited the recent Bike Plan which generated 700 responses. This figure represented good results. An organized effort could reach out to all interested residents. There would be outreach to community groups/organizations as opposed to making individuals come to the City.

Educational tools would include outreach, a project web site, a promotional video, various types of promotional information, and targeted speaking engagements. These tools would be creative and there would be outreach to school districts in addition to wards and organizations.

Participation generally lacked in the fourteen to twenty-four (14 – 24) age group. She cited the recent Bike Plan. The timeline for this process was four to five (4 - 5) months. It would not take

too long. At the conclusion of this phase, a Community Vision Plan would be presented to Council.

Phase 3 Strategic Planning. This phase involved putting the vision into action. The City would be compared to peer communities. Kalamazoo Promise was cited as an example. This project used lottery revenue to fund college education for students who attended Kalamazoo's public high schools. This led to a twenty-five percent (25%) population increase. One goal would be to review best practices and be inspired by the success of others. Working Groups would be created. Initially, there would be seven (7) Working Groups, (Neighborhoods, Natural Environment, Healthy Community, Regional Cooperation, Arts & Culture, Economic Vitality and Infrastructure) with focused subgroups under each area.

Phase 4 Plan Making and Adoption. This phase would overlap with Phase 3. The time frame for these two (2) phases was six to eight (6 - 8) months. Working Groups would meet once per month plus there might be other virtual meetings.

Alderman Sage thanked Ms. Pinnamaraju for her presentation which he found enjoyable. He noted the use of technology. He questioned philosophy and/or process. He noted past conversations with the MCRPC. MCRPC would prepare the plan which would belong to the City.

Ms. Pinnamaraju responded affirmatively. The City needed to be involved with MCRPC providing technical support.

Alderman Sage believed that there would be citizen interest. He questioned how someone could become involved.

Ms. Pinnamaraju cited the Working Groups. The Steering and Advisory Committees needed to be established first. Interested individuals should submit an email to MCRPC and their names would be placed on a waiting list until the two (2) committees were formed. Working Groups would begin their efforts at the start of Phase 2. The initial input would be comprehensive.

Alderman Sage requested that David Hales, City Manager, provide the Council with the appropriate email address. Ms. Pinnamaraju added that there was a general email address for the MCRPC.

Alderman Lower also thanked Ms. Pinnamaraju for her presentation and for attending a ward meeting. He encouraged citizen involvement. He was in favor of keeping the City the City and retaining its culture. He was troubled that this plan was driven by a federal government requirement. This project would be limited due to the expense. The plan needed to be effective and cost efficient. The Council needed to keep things in perspective and keep the cost for this plan to a minimum.

Ms. Pinnamaraju noted that the plan would be provided to the City at no additional cost. She was sensitive to concerns that this plan would sit on a shelf. There would be community input.

Alderman Lower expressed his concern regarding implementation costs. He noted that the plan proposal cited 'rapid population growth', (see page 2 of the proposal). He believed that there would be a population decline. He also questioned best practices. He specifically cited the definition of 'Accessory Dwelling Units', (see page 9 of the proposal).

Ms. Pinnamaraju noted that the plan proposal referenced other communities. An example of an accessory dwelling unit was a housing accommodation for 'mother in law' apartments. This was an example of thinking outside of the box.

Mayor Renner stated that the City had continued to gain approximately 1,000 people per year.

Ms. Pinnamaraju clarified that plans normally encompass thirty-five (35) years. Population was difficult to predict (growth/decline) and the plan should reflect 'what if' scenarios. The City had experienced rapid growth in the recent past.

Mayor Renner stated that this process would be different than what had been done in the past.

Ms. Pinnamaraju agreed and added that planning must adapt as there were new ways of doing business.

Alderman Fruin was encouraged by the efforts and energy shown by the MCRPC. This project would be regional in scope.

Ms. Pinnamaraju hoped to engage the Bloomington Normal community. She was noted that the recent Bicycle Plan received over 700 responses. She planned to build upon existing plans.

Alderman Black noted Ms. Pinnamaraju's presentation at a joint meeting. The City needed a plan and he supported reaching out to the community to solicit information. He questioned the time line for Phase 1 and hoped to solicit Council feedback. He noted the importance of Steering and Advisory Committees. He encouraged Ms. Pinnamaraju to keep the Council informed.

Alderman Stearns questioned the cost to the taxpayers. Time was money. She noted the plan's scope. She also requested an update on the current plan.

Alderman Fazzini suggested that Ms. Pinnamaraju's contact information be included on the presentation materials along with instructions for potential volunteers.

David Hales, City Manager, informed the Council that information regarding this project would be made available through water billing inserts and the City's web site. The MCRPC had recommended that the Mayor and two (2) Aldermen serve as on the Steering Committee. He and City department heads would also be involved. The plan should be owned by the citizens. There was great potential to define what citizens wanted. Sub area plans would be addressed in the future. Council needed to be involved throughout the process. He complimented Ms. Pinnamaraju and her staff for a creative, innovative process.

DISCUSSION - TERM LIMITS FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

Alderman Fruin introduced this item. The initiative was generated by the public. He thanked the Council for their willingness to discuss this matter. This issue appeared to be important to the citizens. The public had raised questions after term limits were placed upon board and commission members. The question addressed if the same philosophy, practices and standards should be applied to Council. The rules should be consistent, (i.e. walk the talk). The topic should be discussed in order to be responsive to the citizens.

Mayor Renner clarified that a limit of nine (9) years was approved by Council for board and commission appointments. After reaching this limit, members must take one (1) year off and then may be eligible for appointment again. This text amendment originated from working with Aldermen Schmidt and Sage regarding an evaluation of the appointment process. He believed that many board and commission members held a sense of entitlement and were isolated from the Council. Members were appointed not elected. The Council was accountable to the citizens, (i.e. electoral process).

Alderman Black acknowledged that this was an important topic. He also had been questioned regarding the double standard. Boards and commissions were under the radar. There was an accountability gap. The term limit for the Council was an election. This was the difference. The Council was held accountable by the public.

Mayor Renner restated that after one (1) year, individuals may reapply to serve on a board and/or commission.

Alderman Stearns believed that this issue should be subject to referendum in order to gain the public's opinion. There were no career aldermen. She expressed her disappointment at the limited public input. The public did not understand and was not informed. Residents needed a better understanding of what the Council did.

Mayor Renner noted that a referendum would be advisory only.

Alderman Lower stated that at first glance, the common perception was that Council was similar to state and federal elected officials. At the state and federal level of government it was common for elected officials to serve for long periods. He added that a number of Chicago collar communities have imposed term limits. The City was different form of government. The City operated under the City Manager form of government. Council members give of their time. He noted the effort to serve. He did not see the point of a referendum. He cited Alderman Fruin tenure and questioned the number of challenged elections for Alderman. Citizens were apathetic.

Alderman Mwilambwe had read the materials provided. He had several questions. First, he wanted to know what the problem that needed to be solved was. There had been a history of turnover and therefore there was opportunity to serve. There had been several uncontested elections in recent history. He questioned what was applicable to the City. He cautioned against unintended consequences. There was limited research on the subject of term limits for local government. He recommended a wait and see approach. If the City made this change, might it

be trading problems and was the City willing to live with same. Education was the key for an informed public.

Mayor Renner noted that based upon the current makeup of the Council eight (8) of ten (10) were elected after 2007.

Alderman Schmidt believed that the distinction between the Council and boards/commissions was accountability. Accountability came through elections. The decision belonged to the people. She recommended that the League of Women Voters distill the information presented.

Alderman Fazzini noted that shorter terms would lead to fresh ideas and more participation in local elections. He had visited other city council meetings and saw things differently. He supported a referendum on this topic.

Alderman Fruin restated that the purpose was to initiate discussion. The differences between Council and boards/commissions were clear. Any future action should come from others outside of the Council.

Mayor Renner supported Alderman's Schmidt's recommendation to involve the League of Women Voters.

CITY MANAGER'S COMMENTS: David Hales, City Manager, addressed the Council. He reminded them that the Budget Work Session would be held on Saturday, March 22, 2014 starting at 8:00 a.m. in the Osborn Room.

Alderman Stearns questioned if the Budget Work Session would be streamed live to the web.

Mr. Hales stated that the Osborn Room was not optimal for this option. The Work Session agenda had not been officially posted.

Mayor Renner stated that the meeting would be moved to the Council Chambers and streamed to the web.

The meeting adjourned. Time: 6:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey Covert
City Clerk

Item 4A.

**Public Comment Ordinance Discussion
(15 minutes)**



FOR COUNCIL: May 19, 2014

SUBJECT: Proposed Text Amendment to Chapter 2. Administration regarding Public Comment at Council Meetings

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend that the proposed Text Amendment be placed on a future City Council Regular Meeting Agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN LINK: Goal 1. Financially sound City providing quality basic services.

STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE: Objective 1c. Engaged residents that are well informed and involved in an open governance process.

BACKGROUND: The Illinois Open Meetings Act provides “any person shall be permitted an opportunity to address public officials under the rules established and recorded by the public body.” 5 ILCS 1/2.06(g). In a request for review letter on public comment at the City’s previous Administration and Finance Committee, the Public Access Counselor’s office concluded the Committee was required to provide an opportunity for public comment at all future committee meetings subject to any reasonable rules that are consistent with Section 2.06(g). Although the City now allows public comment at all committee meetings, the City Code provides for public comment only at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the month. The proposed ordinance provides there will be a fifteen (15) minute public comment period at every regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council, including special City Council meetings where there is an action item on the agenda. It also provides public comment is limited to three (3) minutes per person, comments may not be threatening and disorderly conduct is prohibited. Finally, it provides that individuals may submit written comments to the City Clerk at least twenty-four (24) hours before a meeting and said comments will be copied and provided to Aldermen or alternatively that comments may be emailed to the City Council.

This matter was tabled for further discussion at the meeting on April 28, 2014. In addition, some questions were raised about discrepancies between the public comment set forth in this ordinance as compared to public comment during commission meetings in Section 85. This ordinance applies solely to City Council meetings and has a slightly different set of rules, including that public comment is toward the beginning of the meeting as opposed to the end. This allows citizens to comment on an issue prior to a vote being taken on the item. There is no requirement that the rules be identical as they are for different types of meetings and serve different types of needs.

The Council will need to make a Motion to Revive Consideration at the time that this item is placed on a Regular City Council Meeting Agenda. This motion is in order at any time within 100 days after the day of the vote to defer consideration, i.e. table. The last Regular Council Meeting Agenda for this item to appear would be July 28, 2014.

COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED: Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Jeffrey R. Jurgens, Interim Corporation Counsel

Recommended by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Hales".

David A. Hales
City Manager

Attachments: Attachment 1. Ordinance Amending the Public Comment Rules for the City of Bloomington

ORDINANCE 2014 - _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PUBLIC COMMENT RULES
FOR THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 2, Article II, Section 17(5) of Bloomington City Code, 1960, as amended, shall be further amended as follows (unless otherwise noted, additions are indicated by underlines; deletions indicated by strikeouts):

(5) Public Comment.

- (a) A public comment period not to exceed fifteen (15) minutes will be held during ~~the first~~ every regularly-scheduled City Council meeting of each month, as well as all special City Council meetings. Written comments may also be submitted to the City Council by filing same with the City Clerk at least 24 hours prior to the start time of the meeting. Said written comments shall be copied and distributed to each member of the City Council by the City Clerk prior to the start of the meeting. The City Council also accepts comments via e-mail to citycouncil@cityblm.org.
- (b) Anyone desiring to address the City Council must complete and submit a public comment card available in the City Council Chamber up to fifteen (15) minutes prior to the start of the meeting. The person must include his or her name and contact information.
- (c) ~~There shall be a maximum of five (5) speakers in any public comment period. In the event more than five (5) public comment cards are submitted, the Mayor shall randomly select the five (5) speakers.~~ Comments are limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The comment cards shall be randomly drawn by the City Clerk, in front of at least one member of the City Council, to determine the speaking order and the City Clerk shall announce the order of the names drawn. After 15 minutes of public comment, the public comment period shall be closed. A speaker cannot give his or her allotted minutes to another speaker to increase that person's allotted time.
- (d) Speakers will be acknowledged by the Mayor and shall address the City Council from the podium and not approach the City Council or City staff. Speakers will begin their statement by first stating their name and address for the record.
- (e) Statements are to be directed to the City Council as a whole and not to individual Council members. Public comment is not intended to require

Council members or staff to provide any answer to the speaker. Discussions between speakers and members of the audience will not be allowed.

- (f) After the speaker has made his or her statement, he or she shall be seated with no further debate, dialogue or comment.
- (g) Any person who engages in threatening or disorderly behavior when addressing the City Council shall be deemed out-of-order by the presiding officer and their time ceased to address the City Council at said meeting.

SECTION 4. Except as provided herein, the Bloomington City Code, 1960, as amended shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 5. In the event that any section, clause, provision, or part of this Ordinance shall be found and determined to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid parts shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 6. The City Clerk is hereby authorized to publish this ordinance in pamphlet form as provided by law.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall be effective immediately after the date of its publication as required by law.

SECTION 8. This ordinance is passed and approved pursuant to the home rule authority granted Article VII, Section 6 of the 1970 Illinois Constitution.

PASSED this _____ day of May, 2014.

APPROVED this _____ day of May, 2014.

APPROVED:

Tari Renner
Mayor

ATTEST:

Tracey Covert
City Clerk



ADDENDUM I

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AGENDA

MAY 19, 2014

ADDITION TO AGENDA

Item 4A. Public Comment Ordinance Discussion. (*Revised memo and Ordinance*)



FOR COUNCIL: May 19, 2014

SUBJECT: Proposed Text Amendment to Chapter 2. Administration regarding Public Comment at Council Meetings

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend that the proposed Text Amendment be placed on a future City Council Regular Meeting Agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN LINK: Goal 1. Financially sound City providing quality basic services.

STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE: Objective 1c. Engaged residents that are well informed and involved in an open governance process.

BACKGROUND: The Illinois Open Meetings Act provides “any person shall be permitted an opportunity to address public officials under the rules established and recorded by the public body.” 5 ILCS 1/2.06(g). In a request for review letter on public comment at the City’s previous Administration and Finance Committee, the Public Access Counselor’s office concluded the Committee was required to provide an opportunity for public comment at all future committee meetings subject to any reasonable rules that are consistent with Section 2.06(g). Although the City now allows public comment at all committee meetings, the City Code provides for public comment only at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the month. The proposed ordinance provides there will be a fifteen (15) minute public comment period at every regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council, including special City Council meetings where there is an action item on the agenda. It also provides public comment is limited to three (3) minutes per person, comments may not be threatening and disorderly conduct is prohibited. Finally, it provides that individuals may submit written comments to the City Clerk at least twenty-four (24) hours before a meeting and said comments will be copied and provided to Aldermen or alternatively that comments may be emailed to the City Council.

This matter was tabled for further discussion at the meeting on April 28, 2014. In addition, some questions were raised about discrepancies between the public comment set forth in this ordinance as compared to public comment during commission meetings in Section 85. This ordinance applies solely to City Council meetings and has a slightly different set of rules, including that public comment is toward the beginning of the meeting as opposed to the end. This allows citizens to comment on an issue prior to a vote being taken on the item. There is no requirement that the rules be identical as they are for different types of meetings and serve different types of needs.

The Council will need to make a Motion to Revive Consideration at the time that this item is placed on a Regular City Council Meeting Agenda. This motion is in order at any time within 100 days after the day of the vote to defer consideration, i.e. table. The last Regular Council Meeting Agenda for this item to appear would be July 28, 2014.

COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED: Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Jeffrey R. Jurgens, Interim Corporation Counsel

Recommended by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Hales", written in a cursive style.

David A. Hales
City Manager

Attachments: Attachment 1. Ordinance Amending the Public Comment Rules for the City of Bloomington

ORDINANCE 2014 - __

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PUBLIC COMMENT RULES
FOR THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 2, Article II, Section 17(5) of Bloomington City Code, 1960, as amended, shall be further amended as follows (unless otherwise noted, additions are indicated by underlines; deletions indicated by strikeouts):

(5) Public Comment.

- (a) A public comment period not to exceed fifteen (15) minutes will be held during ~~the first~~ every regularly-scheduled City Council meeting of each month, as well as all special City Council meetings where there is an action item on the agenda, not including closed session. Written comments may also be submitted to the City Council by filing same with the City Clerk at least 24 hours prior to the start time of the meeting. Said written comments shall be copied and distributed to each member of the City Council by the City Clerk prior to the start of the meeting. The City Council also accepts comments via e-mail to citycouncil@cityblm.org.
- (b) Anyone desiring to address the City Council must complete and submit a public comment card available in the City Council Chamber up to fifteen (15) minutes prior to the start of the meeting. The person must include his or her name and contact information.
- (c) ~~There shall be a maximum of five (5) speakers in any public comment period. In the event more than five (5) public comment cards are submitted, the Mayor shall randomly select the five (5) speakers.~~ Comments are limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The comment cards shall be randomly drawn by the City Clerk, in front of at least one member of the City Council, to determine the speaking order and the City Clerk shall announce the order of the names drawn. After 15 minutes of public comment, the public comment period shall be closed. A speaker cannot give his or her allotted minutes to another speaker to increase that person's allotted time.
- (d) Speakers will be acknowledged by the Mayor and shall address the City Council from the podium and not approach the City Council or City staff. Speakers will begin their statement by first stating their name and address for the record.

- (e) Statements are to be directed to the City Council as a whole and not to individual Council members. Public comment is not intended to require Council members or staff to provide any answer to the speaker. Discussions between speakers and members of the audience will not be allowed.
- (f) After the speaker has made his or her statement, he or she shall be seated with no further debate, dialogue or comment.
- (g) Any person who engages in threatening or disorderly behavior when addressing the City Council shall be deemed out-of-order by the presiding officer and their time ceased to address the City Council at said meeting.

SECTION 4. Except as provided herein, the Bloomington City Code, 1960, as amended shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 5. In the event that any section, clause, provision, or part of this Ordinance shall be found and determined to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid parts shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 6. The City Clerk is hereby authorized to publish this ordinance in pamphlet form as provided by law.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall be effective immediately after the date of its publication as required by law.

SECTION 8. This ordinance is passed and approved pursuant to the home rule authority granted Article VII, Section 6 of the 1970 Illinois Constitution.

PASSED this _____ day of May, 2014.

APPROVED this _____ day of May, 2014.

APPROVED:

Tari Renner
Mayor

ATTEST:

Tracey Covert
City Clerk