

July 22, 2015

Today there is a public meeting regarding the Comprehensive Plan of which I am unable to attend due to a previous out of town commitment. So therefore I will submit this review of my participation in the Down Town Working Group which was one of the many working groups leading to finalizing this current proposed draft of the Comprehensive Plan.

At the onset we were given the basic introductory program which included protocol that sounded good but was not fully implemented. In an effort to keep this short and sweet, here are my observations of fact with a short summary to follow.

First it was noted that a chairman, vice chairman would be chosen to chair the meetings. As this process was completed at the 2nd meeting, I can vouch for following four meetings that I attended that neither the chair or vice chair ever chaired any of those meetings. Instead all of these meetings were lead by (facilitated by) the MCRPC, Executive Director Vasudha Pinnamaraju. I find this quite unfortunate as set protocol was not adhered to. Should all meetings that did not follow protocol be considered out of order and therefore be invalidated?

Second I would like to note that at least half of the citizens in our group were either directly employed by local government, were in positions of government appointment and/or were members of the Down Town Bloomington Association. Although this statement of fact in itself does not necessarily qualify in the pc world of a legal conflict of interest, it does raise some suspicion that a truly objective look at the details might prove to be challenged.

The introductory program noted that if help was needed, ask and help would be provided. As the particular application of Zoho email was new to me and escaped my limits I mentioned in a email to the webmaster and to Vasu a request for help in posting but never got a reply.

For our January meeting it was proposed and decided that Tricia Stiller, Executive Director of the Downtown Bloomington Association be allowed time for a presentation to be given at our meeting. Therefore I asked for and was granted presentation time as myself being the President of the Main Street Association of B-N.

As I gave my presentation at the February 2015 meeting, committee member Austin Grammar was replaced by Tom Dabareiner, Director of Building and Code Enforcement, Bloomington. Maybe I missed it but I was not aware that substitution of committee members was in the script. What other committees do this when a member is not present? Anyway my presentation centered on the Form Based Code which (I stress) merely touched on property rights. Interestingly during this presentation of which Mr. Dabareiner, a self pro-claimed expert of FBC, turned a bit of my presentation into a discussion between the two of us.

Although it seemed as though the fix was in relative to my presentation what was worse was the fact that in the previous meeting I had been successful in bringing property rights to be considered by the group as a goal and objective to be discussed. Noting after this February meeting that the March meeting did not include any decision or further discussion regarding this group agreed goal/objective, Vasu informed me that property rights had already been discussed during my presentation and that no more time was needed. I disagree.

Fact of the matter is that (although it was barely mentioned) even if the property rights issued was discussed during a presentation, it should still be open for discussion afterwards by the

group as was agreed by the group.

What I do understand is that any real discussion of property rights will pull the teeth of the the Comprehensive Plan as this plan follows an agenda irrespective of the rights of the people to be secure in their property.

Phil Boulds