

In Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, March 02, 2022 at 6:30pm, Council President Susan Sandberg presided over a Regular Session of the Common Council. This meeting was conducted electronically via Zoom.

COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
March 02, 2022

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

ROLL CALL [6:31pm]

Council President Susan Sandberg summarized the agenda.

AGENDA SUMMATION [6:31pm]

There were no minutes for approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [6:31pm]

Sgambelluri mentioned her upcoming constituent meeting.

REPORTS

Rollo spoke in support of the Ukrainian people and said it was imperative for the public to contact their representatives to compel diplomacy.

- COUNCIL MEMBERS
[6:33pm]

Smith expressed support for Ukraine and echoed Rollo's comment.

Volan acknowledged a constituent's complaint of a construction site's noise very early in the morning.

Rosenbarger mentioned her upcoming constituent meeting.

Sandberg spoke about the upcoming reopening of the Waldron Arts Center.

Devta Kidd, Director of Innovation in the Office of the Mayor, gave a report on end of pilot recommendations on the 1,000 Households Who Mulch program. She discussed successes, metrics, environmental impacts, recommendations, and community partners. She introduced Michael Large, Joe Wynia, and Lauren Clemens.

- The MAYOR AND CITY
OFFICES [6:41pm]

Michael Large, Special Projects/Operations Manager in Public Works, discussed the history of the project, conversations with residents, education, guides, incentives, successes, concerns, incentives, and negative consequences.

Joe Wynia, member of the Steering Team, commissioner for the Commission on Sustainability, and a member of the Citizens' Advisory Committee for the Monroe County Solid Waste Management District, discussed environmental co-benefits, positive consequences, community building, and participant feedback.

Rollo thanked staff and Piedmont-Smith for continuously reminding the administration about the program during council discussions. He commented on the ability to use leaves for mulching, suppress weeds, and on cardboard over invasive plants. He asked if it was possible to further reduce carbon and energy use by not shredding leaves.

Council questions:

Kidd said the response varied and there were participants that kept the leaves whole, but others believed that entire yards should be raked clean.

Rollo also commented that the leaves also would remain out of the storm drains.

Sims also thanked staff and participants. He asked if community members would be able to get leaf pick-up bags as had been done in the past.

Kidd responded that the expanded pilot program showed that not many community members used the free yard waste bags, but those that did saw it as an incentive. She described how the program worked as well as tracking households that used, or did not use, the leaf vacuum.

Smith thanked staff as well, and asked about fees.

Kidd said that the fee recommendation would be \$20 per pickup, starting after year three. She described incentivizing, on-demand pick up, and more in years one, two, and three.

Smith asked how households would learn about the program.

Kidd stated there would be promotional materials, word of mouth information, and neighborhood listservs.

Piedmont-Smith thanked staff, Wynia, and Large. She asked how residents could pickup free yard waste bags worked well for the community and if there was currently a fee.

Kidd thanked Piedmont-Smith for participating in the pilot program. She explained that the yard waste bags would be free only during the leafing season.

Piedmont-Smith asked if that was only in the transition phase.

Kidd said it would be free in the leaf collection season, but during the rest of the year, it would remain at \$1 per bag.

Piedmont-Smith said it was something to consider in the future since the goal was to mulch and compost on site, and not have greenhouse gas emissions in collecting the yard waste.

Kidd agreed and noted the importance of there not being an increase in yard waste collection.

Sgambelluri asked for clarification on the reduction in operating costs.

Kidd explained that it was a separate sub-pilot program focused on making the vacuum collection more efficient. She said Large worked with the Streets division in Public Works who worked with Centerstone staff to rake ahead of the vacuum trucks to improve efficiency. That led to reduction in labor and overtime pay.

Sgambelluri asked if the vacuum trucks ran only on demand and presupposed fees to property owners for the service.

Kidd confirmed that was correct and explained details about the costs.

Sgambelluri asked what incentives would be successful in getting more participants.

Kidd said that it would be great to engage councilmembers in outreach about the program. She said that many had seen yard signs about the program.

Rollo asked if the collected leaves were still sent to Good Earth and if the city paid for that.

Kidd confirmed that was correct and the noted a reduction in operating costs when households processed leaves in their yard.

Rollo recommended that the city, and/or households, give leaves to local growers free of charge and provided benefits of doing so.

Kidd said that was explored during the pilot program and described the participant's mutual aid that occurred.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Gloria Colom Braña, Program Manager, Historic Preservation, in the Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Department, reviewed the Historic and Conservation District Guidelines including an overview on current districts, design guidelines, Certificate of Appropriateness, current guidelines, multi-property districts, and the role of communities.

- The MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES (*cont'd*)

Sims thanked Braña and asked about revising historic preservation guidelines by working with the community.

Council questions:

Braña explained that each community worked differently. She referenced the Prospect Hill Local Historic District Guidelines and its processes as an example.

Sims asked if roofing and exteriors of a historic house were examples of what would be updated.

Braña said it would not be complete revisions, but things like accessibility could require updating the guidelines.

Flaherty asked about technology improvements like access to solar energy, affordable housing types, and more. He said that sometimes historic preservation was a barrier to such improvements.

Braña responded that evolving technology was incorporated and some historic districts were more explicit about it. She explained that sometimes an exception was made if the change did not cause permanent or extreme changes and she provided examples. She said it was ultimately up to the communities.

Flaherty asked if the decisions were up to the individuals making the standards for their neighborhoods and not a uniform approach in the city.

Braña confirmed that was correct.

Sandberg referenced a discussion she had with Braña about challenges regarding communication with various historic preservation units within the city, as well as notices.

There were no council committee reports.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES [7:35pm]

Connor Bickel spoke about construction noise concerns near his home on 14th Street. He provided details of the neighborhood and the construction site.

- PUBLIC [7:36pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded to make the following appointments:

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS [7:40pm]

- For the Bloomington Arts Commission – to appoint Nia Carlsgaard to seat C-5 and to appoint Suzanne Ryan Melamed to seat C-3.

- For the Historic Preservation Commission – to appoint Ernesto Castaneda to seat C-3.

- For the Redevelopment Commission – to reappoint Deborah Myerson to seat C-2 and to appoint Randy Cassady to seat C-1.

- For the Tree Commission – to appoint Mary Welz to seat C-1 and Stephanie Freeman Day to seat C-2.

Piedmont-Smith also moved and it was seconded to appoint Jack Wanninger to seat C-5 of the Parking Commission.

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

Volan moved and it was seconded to make the following appointments:

- For the Community Advisory on Public Safety Commission – to appoint Satish Vuyyuri to seat C-1 and Jason Michalek to seat C-2.

- For the Traffic Commission – to appoint Steven Reynolds to seat C-4 and David Sabbagh to seat C-1.

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

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

Flaherty moved and it was seconded to make the following appointments:

- For the Bloomington Digital Underground Advisory Committee – to appoint Mike Satterfield to seat C-2.
- For the Commission on the Status of Women – to appoint Shefali Prabhakar to seat C-2 and to reappoint A'ame Joslin to seat C-3.
- For the Community Advisory on Public Safety Commission – to reappoint Nejla Routsong to seat C-5.
- For the Environmental Commission – to appoint Luke Swain to seat C-3.

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

Sims moved and it was seconded to make the following appointments:

- For the Animal Control Commission – to reappoint Sita Cohen to seat C-1.
- For the Board of Zoning Appeals – to reappoint Jo Throckmorton to seat C-1.
- For the Commission on Aging – to reappoint Jennifer Donegan to seat C-1 and to reappoint Robert Deppert to seat C-2.
- For the Housing Quality Appeals Board – to reappoint Nicholas Carder to seat C-2.
- For the Human Rights Commission – to reappoint Valeri Haughton to seat C-2 and to reappoint Byron Bangert to seat C-3.
- For the Bloomington Urban Enterprise Association – to reappoint Mary Morgan for reappointment to seat C-3.

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

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS [7:54pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-07 be 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 22-07 - To Approve Recommendations of the Mayor for Distribution of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds for 2022 [7:54pm]

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-07 be adopted.

John Zody, Director of the Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Department, presented the legislation. He thanked staff and the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) for their work on reviewing the applications and making recommendations. Zody provided details on the recommended allocation of dollars totaling \$1.1 million to seventeen local organizations.

Piedmont-Smith asked for the proposed allocations to be shared during the meeting for the benefit of the public. Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, shared the information from the packet.

Council questions:

There was no public comment.

Public comment:

Piedmont-Smith referenced the Transportation Committee's (TC) report with sidewalk allocations including the Adams Street sidewalk. She asked if the funding for physical improvements for the City of Bloomington Engineering meshed with the TC's decision on the project.

Smith said he did not have knowledge of it meshing.

Zody asked for clarification on the question.

Piedmont-Smith responded that it was her understanding that the project would be funded by both the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and the council sidewalk funds.

Lucas clarified that for the Adams Street project, council's sidewalk funds would total \$120,000 and the CDBG would fund \$140,000 and would mesh.

Sims asked for clarification on the projected funding and what happened if not enough funding was received.

Zody explained that the Housing and Urban Department (HUD) allocated funding directly to Bloomington, as a city of 50,000 or more, as opposed to going through the state of Indiana. He explained the timeline, annual action plan, and goals for the next program year. He said that Resolution 22-07 was considering projects for the next program year. Zody clarified that the actual dollar amount would not be known until the following spring or summer and provided additional details.

Sandberg thanked Smith and Rosenbarger for their participation with the CAC.

The motion to adopt Resolution 22-07 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-06 be 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.

Rollo moved and it was seconded that Resolution 22-06 be adopted.

Lucas noted that the opportunity for public comment on the legislation served as the statutorily required public hearing where any objections and remonstrance would be heard by council.

Alex Crowley, Director of the Economic and Sustainable Development (ESD) Department, presented the legislation. He said that council would be considering the confirmatory resolution of the tax abatement to help attract a significant potential capital investment and proposed job growth commitment by Catalent. Crowley explained that the job and capital commitment was significant and reiterated that Bloomington was competing for the investment. He also explained that the proposal was designed to minimize Bloomington's risks. He summarized Catalent Investments & proposal, wage growth, housing demand, Catalent-related taxes, analysis by Press, Catalent engagement, and recommendations.

Sims asked if it was correct that passing Resolution 22-06 would indicate to other businesses the attractiveness of investing in Bloomington. He wondered how much abatements figured into potential investments.

Crowley said that it depended on the need of the organization. Catalent's investment was heavily skewed to personal property. He provided examples of other organizations' needs.

Resolution 22-07 (cont'd)

Council comment:

Vote to adopt Resolution 22-07 [8:07pm]

Resolution 22-06 - To Confirm Resolution 22-05 Designating an Economic Revitalization Area, Approving the Statement of Benefits, and Authorizing an Abatement Period for Real Property Improvements and Personal Property Re: Properties at 1300 S Patterson Drive (Catalent Indiana, LLC, Petitioner) [8:08pm]

Council questions:

Sims clarified that he was interested in learning about businesses outside of Bloomington that were looking at investing in the city. He did not want to needlessly encourage abatements.

Resolution 22-06 (cont'd)

Crowley agreed and provided information on abatements. There were other strengths within Bloomington and tax abatements were not always necessary.

Rollo commented that the biggest shock when Thompson and Consumer Electronics left the city had been the size of the organization. He also commented on communities relying heavily on one organization and on the aftermath when that company leaves. He asked about diversification of public investment within various economic sectors. He also asked how biotechnology would be expected to perform in a recession.

Crowley responded that diversification was important. He also commented on lack of large- and medium-scale businesses for job applicants. There had been some increasingly strong businesses in the community, including mid-range businesses. He commented further on attracting talent to Bloomington.

Andrew Espejo, General Manager at Catalent, commented on Catalent's diversified offerings, demands, biologic markets, non-Covid programs, manufacturing, and increase in demand.

Rollo said that biologics seemed to have a steady market.

Espejo agreed.

Volan asked for further clarification on the diversification of public investments and why Bloomington was not investing millions into multiple businesses.

Crowley responded that the city was investing into multiple businesses and referenced The Mill which encouraged startup companies. He said that the city applied for, and received, federal money for the Trades District technology center. He provided additional details.

Volan asked if all those investments totaled \$30 million.

Crowley did not have the total amount, and reiterated the significant opportunity in the proposal.

Volan asked if granting a tax abatement made Bloomington more attractive to companies seeking tax abatements. He referenced Catalent's and Cook Pharmica's growth over the past two decades. He wondered why staff thought that growth would not have happened without an abatement.

Crowley explained that while those companies were already in Bloomington, they were also in other communities. The proposal was attempting to encourage job growth by tipping the scale in favor of Bloomington. He explained the interconnectedness of investments.

Volan said that homeowners were paying a disproportionate price because in Indiana (IN) the only tax on businesses was principal property tax. He said that passing the proposal would make homeowners pay. He also commented on circuit breakers.

Crowley explained that real estate property was also taxable for businesses.

Volan responded that the proposal was an investment in personal property and that the real estate investment was minimal in comparison.

Crowley said that the overall assessed value for the community was about 94% real property and 6% personal property. The overall contribution for taxes paid far outweighed personal property. He encouraged people not to assume that the taxpayer would bear the burden of the cumulative amount of the tax abatement. He said that was oversimplifying the proposal.

Volan asked if Crowley was saying that it was a cost-free proposal and there was no downfall for the community. Resolution 22-06 (cont'd)

Crowley explained that it was a positive effect on the community that went beyond tax calculations.

Flaherty was struggling with the proposal because of Indiana's statutory guidance regarding tax abatements. He referenced Indiana code and the requirements for an Economic Revitalization Area (ERA). He did not disagree with the benefits that Resolution 22-06 would bring to the community, however, did not see how it reconciled with certain requirements of state code like being an undesirable property for normal development.

Crowley explained the parcels that would be incorporated were stagnant since the departure of Thompson. He said there was still a lot of development that could be done and provided additional details regarding the land area in the proposal.

Flaherty asked for further clarification on why an area could be undesirable for growth could be provided. He said that the proposal did not meet that specific requirement. He asked for financial justification from Catalent as to why the expansion was necessary, and could not occur without an abatement. He asked for other justification aside from it making Bloomington more competitive.

Crowley said that the competitive disadvantage relative to the personal property liabilities was significant. He explained that staff had been working with Catalent over the previous six months to learn what would make Bloomington a desirable location to invest.

Espejo explained that Catalent was in the planning period and all the sites were competing for volume. Catalent had financial packages showing viability within a particular location. He said that the abatement would help with attracting the investment to Bloomington.

Flaherty asked if the financial package was modeled on various scenarios including with and without an abatement. He asked if there was information on the expected return on investment in the two scenarios.

Espejo said he did not have the numbers at the time. He explained that if Catalent did not receive the abatement, then the company would need to reevaluate its plans.

Volan asked how it could be assumed that there was a lack of development given the data on job growth. He referenced the investment made with Cook Pharmica in 2003-2004 said it was justified. He asked for further clarification on the proposal.

Crowley responded that Bloomington was not competing with other IN counties but rather with out of state locations. He explained that Catalent's decision was based on how Bloomington stacked up against other locations.

Volan clarified that he asked about the statute which called for renewal of underdeveloped locations. He understood that there were some areas that needed to be built on but the area in the proposal was not a decrepit or neglected area.

Crowley said it was important to look at the entire area which had different histories. He said that the area had a lot of potential to help with the employment base but it needed to be optimized.

Volan said that the undeveloped land had been owned for a long time by Monroe County government. He did not believe it could be said that land was undeveloped because it was owned by the county.

Crowley responded that he did not know the whole history of the area but understood that the county was eager to develop the land under the right circumstances.

Volan clarified that the land being held by county government did not meet the standard that Flaherty referenced in Indiana code. Resolution 22-06 (cont'd)

Crowley said he could not speak to the history of offers for the land to the county.

Rollo commented on the number of jobs that had left the community as well as job growth. He commented that the proposal would allow for one thousand jobs, with half living with Bloomington, and others commuting. He asked for clarification on those numbers.

Espejo said that it was hard to predict exact numbers, but that the goal was to attract local talent.

Rollo asked about the numbers, historically.

Espejo said 52% were from Monroe County and 48% were from outside the county.

Rollo stated that was where employees were currently living and asked about future job applicants. He provided examples of training in the biotechnology fields available in the city. He commented that there would be less technical positions that would need to be filled.

Espejo said he did not have that data and it was difficult to say.

Crowley added that he did not have that demographic information either and said that the goal was to provide opportunities to the local population. He commented on wage growth and avenues for higher wage opportunities.

Sandberg established three minutes per public speaker.

Public comment:

Jennifer Pearl, President of the Bloomington Economic and Development Corporation (BEDC), commented in favor of Resolution 22-06 and provided reasons.

Joseph Wynia spoke about climate crisis and the effects of sectors like biotechnology on the environment and living beings.

Cindy Canarnee discussed reasons in favor of Resolution 22-06.

Eric Spoonmore, President of the Bloomington Greater Chamber of Commerce, spoke in favor of Resolution 22-06.

Ariana Gunderson spoke against Resolution 22-06 and urged council to vote against it.

Geoff McKim, County Council, spoke in support of Resolution 22-06 and provided reasons.

John Fernandez commented on the benefits of Resolution 22-06.

Jeff Wuslich supported Resolution 22-06 as a small business owner.

Volan asked about Catalent's work with ESD on the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

Council comments:

Crowley referenced the TDM plan from 2015. He said they were working to build a platform and a software program that allowed people to connect on non-single occupancy travel. He provided additional details on the plans, partnerships, and marketing of the program.

Volan inquired about the metrics of the program.

Crowley mentioned end-user engagement levels, and how people used the program, as well as behavior changes.

Volan asked how staff would know that opportunities were accessed by local community members. He asked if the number of

employees hired from Monroe County versus outside of the county could be reported.

Crowley said that could be worked out with Catalent.

Espejo stated that he would follow up with Catalent's Human Resources (HR) department for that information.

Volan asked if Catalent would be willing to collect the information if they did not already have it.

Espejo reiterated that he would follow up with HR.

Resolution 22-06 (cont'd)

Rollo thanked the public for their input and said that Resolution 22-06 needed careful consideration. He explained that it was important to balance economic development with the impact of the human footprint on ecological resources. He commented on human well-being, circular economy, and local agriculture. Rollo noted that Catalent, as an economic sector, had minimal pollution and provided examples. He highlighted some ongoing successes. He spoke against growth without purpose and about the site's development. He also commented on the jobs that would result from the proposal, and about Ivy Tech's commitment to education and training in the sector. He said that the range of jobs' skill sets and higher wages were significant as a public investment. He further commented on jobs in the region and spoke in favor of the proposal.

Flaherty thanked everyone for the discussion. He said that Catalent paid its employees good wages and commented on tax abatements and the statutory authority for doing them. He referenced the proposal and its reasoning and explained his hesitation with the tax abatement at the proposed level. He said that there had not been a justification for an abatement as a necessary condition for Catalent's proposed investment. Flaherty stated that it was possible that Catalent would still invest in Bloomington, without the abatement, since the city was the most attractive prospect amongst the alternatives. He further commented on the proposal and decision-making by councilmembers. He referenced the criteria for tax abatements in the IN code and said that Catalent would need to demonstrate that the development could not occur without the abatement. He provided examples. Flaherty reiterated that there were many unknowns, including if the abatement was necessary and if so, at what level, and whether or not Catalent would invest in Bloomington without the abatement. He would be voting against Resolution 22-06.

Smith also thanked everyone for their input. He believed Resolution 22-06 was a great opportunity. He explained that the tax abatement landscape had changed and there was more competition. He believed the proposal was a win for everyone in the long term and for the future of Bloomington. He pointed out that over the course of twenty years, the salary would total about \$134 million and the tax the city would collect in one year would be about \$455,000 and that over twenty years it would be \$9 million. He praised Catalent for being a good community partner, being environmentally sound, and for its wages and education. He said that voting against the proposal was a vote against bringing jobs to Bloomington, and tens of millions of dollars to the local economy.

Piedmont-Smith thanked everyone and stated that Resolution 22-06 was a very difficult decision and that tax abatements were not the ideal way to run a local government. She explained that there were rules as a society so that everyone paid taxes in order to do things as a community that could not be done individually. She was concerned with allowing a multi-billion dollar corporation to not

Resolution 22-06 (cont'd)

adhere to the rules. It appeared as bribery to have Catalent expand in Bloomington. Piedmont-Smith said that Catalent had \$3 billion in revenue in 2020, and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) made \$12.6 million. She said the pay ratio was 189:1 for average pay and 318:1 for lowest pay. She commented on climate change, threats to the biosphere, and the rapid decreasing of species. She explained that Resolution 22-06 was business as usual, and said that voting against it would not change things immediately. She said it was important to use the economic development tools for re-localization efforts in order to become more self-reliant as a community and provided reasoning. She said that in the current paradigm, the proposal would provide many good paying jobs. She explained other efforts Catalent had made including sustainability efforts and diversity efforts. She would vote for Resolution 22-06.

Rosenbarger also thanked those who worked on the proposal and provided feedback. She said that the proposal was a difficult decision to make and found the discussion helpful. She mostly agreed with the consensus regarding the proposal. She explained that she would abstain because she did not support the tax abatement process. Rosenbarger stated that it was not ideal to provide tax abatements for multi-billion dollar companies instead of the many local small businesses in the city. She also said it was fair that Catalent and the city were using the processes that were available. It was odd to her that the city was having to convince a company to invest in the city when there were so many people wanting to live in the city that there was not enough housing. She appreciated that Catalent paid living wages. Rosenbarger was concerned that the proposal would bring in employees, mostly from outside the city, who would then not pay their fair share in using the city's roads, amenities, and spaces. She felt it was not equitable. She also commented on the missed opportunity for a robust discussion about supporting sustainability as well as business. She provided examples like a Planned Unit Development (PUD) paying for a bus route, et cetera. She appreciated the discussion regarding Resolution 22-06.

Volan said that the reasons in favor of the largest tax abatement proposed in city history were devoid of details. He said that the labor market was already attractive because of past government actions and provided reasons for the desirability of the city. He explained that even during downturns, Bloomington had been a good steward of its budget. He commented on problems with the proposal including its vagueness, lack of hard numbers, and lack of data regarding the incoming employees. The city could have required more information as a condition of the abatement. Volan said that he would have been willing to vote in favor of the proposal if Catalent had proposed something more than just buying a lot of equipment to further their business. Catalent could have committed to doing something that furthered the Comprehensive Plan like building housing, reducing commute times and the use of cars, increasing density, and increasing public transportation. Volan said that Catalent still could do so. He also said that council was being asked to bid blindly on Catalent. Volan then commented on the city's and county's housing, density, transit, and the local economy. He further discussed the possible count of Catalent employees living in the city. Volan echoed Flaherty's concerns on the lack of information and data with the proposal. He expected that Catalent would provide the data as requested and thus, Volan would abstain on Resolution 22-06.

Resolution 22-06 (cont'd)

Sgambelluri thanked everyone for the discussion and spoke about council's responsibilities including ensuring Bloomington's long term economic resilience. She said that an economically healthy city was able to do all that Bloomington aspired to do. She explained that Bloomington was not the only desirable community to locate and grow a business. Sgambelluri said that it was unclear if the land would be developed without the abatement, but that it was possible. Council was being asked to vote based on incomplete information, but iterated that Catalent's proposed project was an enviable opportunity for the city. She said that Catalent had a history of under-promising and over-delivering and had invested significant dollars in the community. Sgambelluri provided examples and named some benefits of the proposal. She would enthusiastically support Resolution 22-06.

Sims thanked everyone for their work and input on the proposal stated that he would support Resolution 22-06. He appreciated and agreed with many of the points made in the discussion. He discussed the advancement with tourism to the city and provided examples. He spoke about enrollment at Indiana University (IU) which had increased, while had decreased at other universities. He spoke about diversification in the city and IU's and IU Health's contribution. Sims commented on vulnerable populations within the city and his experience. He appreciated Catalent's diversity initiatives. He commented on the labor pool and the affordability of living in the city in conjunction with the percentage of Catalent employees that lived in and out of the city. He disagreed that it was necessary for council to ask Catalent for employee addresses and did not understand what the purpose of the request was. He iterated that what was important was the regional aspect of the proposal.

Sandberg also thanked everyone for the discussion. She repeated that wages were a part of affordability and of one's ability to live in the city. She said it was important to raise the wage floor. She commented on the resilience of the community when industry had left the city. She stated that she supported the opportunity to raise the wage floor with Resolution 22-06 and supported it.

Volan addressed Sims point regarding the privacy of employees. He said he did not request addresses of Catalent employees but rather requested data on the counties in which the employees resided. He noted that other employers were not asking the city for a \$30 million abatement. Volan stated that, if the proportions remained the same, that only 30% of new Catalent jobs would be made available to Bloomington residents, and taxpayers, and that 48% would be from outside the county. He clarified that the other 22% of new jobs would be going to people who were currently remonstrating against becoming part of the city via annexation.

Flaherty commented that his colleague from District III [Smith] stated that voting against Resolution 22-06 was akin to voting against bringing one thousand good jobs to Bloomington. He clarified that was patently false and that council was voting on a \$30 million tax abatement to a highly profitable corporation as an incentive to bring jobs though it was unclear whether or not the incentive was needed. He said it was also unclear if the jobs would arise without the abatement.

The motion to adopt Resolution 22-06 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 6, Nays: 1 (Flaherty), Abstain: 2 (Rosenbarger, Volan).

Vote to adopt Resolution 22-06 as amended [10:25pm]

There was no legislation for first reading.

LEGISLATION FOR FIRST
READING [10:25pm]

There was no additional public comment.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT
[10:25pm]

Stephen Lucas, Council Attorney, reviewed the upcoming schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE [10:26pm]

Volan moved and it was seconded to cancel the Committee of the Whole scheduled for March 09, 2022. The motion received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0, Abstain: 0.

Vote to cancel Committee of the Whole [10:27pm]

There was brief council discussion.

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


ADJOURNMENT [10:30pm]

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 25th day of January, 2023.

APPROVE:

ATTEST:


Sue Sgambelluri, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council


Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington