COMMON COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
December 7, 2016

In the Council Chambers of the Showers City Hall, Bloomington, Indiana on Wednesday, December 7, 2016 at 7:32pm with Council President Andy Ruff presiding over a Regular Session of the Common Council.

ROLL CALL
[7:32pm]

Roll Call: Granger, Sturbaum, Mayer, Sandberg, Ruff, Volan, Piedmont-Smith, Chopra, Rollo
Absent: None

AGENDA SUMMATION
[7:33pm]

Council President Ruff gave a summary of the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
[7:35pm]

November 9, 2016 (Special Session)
November 30, 2016 (Special Session)

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of November 9, 2016, and November 30, 2016, as corrected by an amended draft of said minutes presented to the Council.

The motion to approve the minutes of November 9, 2016 and November 30, 2016 as corrected was approved by voice vote.

REPORTS

- COUNCILMEMBERS [7:37pm]

Councilmember Dorothy Granger reminded the public that December was the last month of the Georgetown Energy Challenge, and noted that conserving water would be beneficial that month.

Councilmember Chris Sturbaum welcomed members of the public to the meeting, and said, while sometimes boring, the business of the Council was important.

Councilmember Tim Mayer echoed Sturbaum's welcome, and also acknowledged the Indiana Pacers, who had visited Bloomington earlier that day to deliver toys to children in need. He reminded the public to keep the less fortunate in mind during the holiday season.

Councilmember Allison Chopra said she had recently attended a public meeting regarding the sidewalk project near 10th Street and Smith Road. She reported that over 60 people had attended the meeting, and that she was pleased to see so many neighbors and families. She noted there had been an appropriation from the Common Council Sidewalk Committee in the previous year to pay for the planning of that stretch of sidewalk, which would allow kids to safely walk to and from school. She said there was still money that needed to be allocated to the project. She added that the neighbors were excited about it, and she would continue to talk about the project in the upcoming months, especially as the Sidewalk Committee began meeting in January, 2017.

Ruff asked Chopra to clarify the exact location of the project.

Chopra explained the location of the project, and gave a summary of the intended scope of the project and intersection in question.

Councilmember Steve Volan observed that the day was the 75th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, and noted an article in the Herald Times about a living veteran of World War II. Volan suggested that people look back and read about that day, while also giving thanks to all veterans.

- THE MAYOR AND CITY OFFICES

There were no reports from the Mayor's office.

- COUNCIL COMMITTEES

There were no council committee reports.

- PUBLIC

Katie Lind spoke about UndocuHoosiers and the efforts of that group to establish a sanctuary city in Indiana.

REPORTS (*cont'd*)

Dan Johnston echoed Ms. Lind's comments, complimented Bloomington for standing out as a symbol of progressive thought and action, and said he looked forward to discussion in the following weeks and months regarding establishing a sanctuary city in Indiana.

Steven Tait suggested that the Council consider legislation to address parking meters rendered inoperative by inclement weather.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS ANI COMMISSIONS

There were no appointments to Boards or Commissions.

LEGISLATION FOR SECOND READING AND RESOLUTIONS

Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 – To Specially Appropriate from the General Fund, LOIT Special Distribution Fund, Police Education Fund, Non-Reverting Improvement 1 (Westside) Fund, and Rental Inspection Program Fund Expenditures Not Otherwise Appropriated (Appropriating Various Transfers of Funds within the General Fund, Parks General Fund, Parking Facilities Fund, Solid Waste Fund, and Fleet Maintenance Fund; and, Appropriating Additional Funds from the General Fund, LOIT Special Distribution Fund, Police Education Fund, Non-Reverting Improvement 1 (Westside Fund, Rental Inspection Program Fund)

It was moved and seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Martha Hilderbrand read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 8-0 for both Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 and Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 16-07).

It was moved and seconded that Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 be adopted.

Jeffrey Underwood, Controller, provided a brief overview of the appropriation ordinance, noting the various appropriations and transfers requested. He explained that the appropriation ordinance affected nine funds, noting that about half of the requests were to appropriate money, while the other half would have zero fiscal impact. He explained that the total request was for $525,600 and the general fund request had a net of $40,600. He said the transfers were at zero, while the $40,600 appropriated a rebate check the City had received from Duke Energy for installation of LED lights in Showers City Hall. He said the biggest appropriation was from the rental inspection funds. He said he was available to answer any questions.

Council Administrator/Attorney Daniel Sherman noted that there was an amendment included in the materials provided to councilmembers.

Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 16-07

It was moved and seconded that Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 be adopted.

Councilmember Isabel Piedmont-Smith explained that the proposed amendment corrected typographical errors contained in the proposed legislation.

Council Comment:

Sturbaum provided additional explanation of the purpose of the appropriation ordinance to the members of the public present at the meeting.

Ruff added further explanation of the legislative process.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 [7:52]

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Council Comment:

Mayer thanked Underwood for all of the work City staff put into balancing the books.

Vote on Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 [7:55pm]

The motion to adopt Appropriation Ordinance 16-07 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Ordinance 16-43 – To Amend Title 2 of the Bloomington Municipal Code Entitled "Administration and Personnel" (Amending Chapter 2.26 (Controller's Department) to Add Section 2.26.110 Authorizing a Fee Schedule for the Private Rental of City Facilities)

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-43 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 5-0-3.

It was moved and seconded that Ordinance 16-43 be adopted.

Ruff noted that Corporation Counsel Philippa Guthrie had provided councilmembers with responses to questions that been posed at the previous meeting, and asked if she had anything to add.

Guthrie said she did not, but that she was available for any additional questions from councilmembers.

Council Questions:

Volan asked whether the administration had an opinion about whether private, for-profit groups should be allowed to use City Hall facilities.

Guthrie said that was not the primary focus of the proposed policy. Rather, the issue of for-profit groups using the same had come up during the discussion about how to approach increasing transparency and how to bring the public into the public space. She said the administration had gotten a few requests from private groups to use City Hall space and did not object to such use if the space was available. However, the administration thought a fee would be appropriate.

Volan suggested that one drawback of the idea might be that a group renting the space might espouse objectionable views. He asked whether there was any recourse if, during the course of an event, someone was espousing objectionable views that would have caused the City to reject the application in the first place.

Guthrie said it would not matter whether a group was a private, for-profit entity, or a not-for-profit public group, the space would all be open to the public, which was a requirement of the policy. She said the City could not regulate viewpoints, which meant groups could say objectionable things, but would not be allowed to incite imminent violence. She reiterated that the City could not regulate things based on disliking what groups were saying.

Volan said the same was true for the Council meetings as well, except the Council could regulate certain blatant violations of protocol. He explained that one alternative the Council had was either to not allow public comment at all, or to allow public comment as long as everyone had the right to speak. He asked whether that was an argument for not allowing anyone to use City Hall space outside of a duly-appointed board or commission.

Guthrie said one could argue that, but that the administration did not agree with that argument. She said the administration preferred to have the public see City Hall, see how it operates, and be allowed to use the space.

Volan asked whether there were any parallels between the proposed policy and the right-of-way policy the City had to adopt, where the City could either allow no signs in public rights-of-way or had to allow any sign in the rights-of-way.

Guthrie said those policies could be compared in that one could not pick groups based on viewpoints.

Ordinance 16-43 (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith asked for additional information regarding when groups using City facilities would be required or encouraged to have insurance, and whether that would change based on how much money a given group had.

Guthrie provided an example of a time when the City had asked a group to provide its own insurance, recalling a time when a department from the State used a conference room in the City. She said the City had asked if the State department had its own insurance, and the State then provided a certificate. Guthrie said asking for insurance was something that would need to be done on a case-by-case basis, unless the City wanted to require neighborhood group coming in to have insurance. She explained that when a group was likely to have access to its own insurance, the City would ask that group for it.

Piedmont-Smith said she read the policy as stating that staff would consistently recommend having insurance, so there was some flexibility in the policy. She asked what would happen if a group said it could not provide its own insurance.

Guthrie said then the City would decide whether to allow that group to use the space based on the risk.

Piedmont-Smith asked if that was something the City would do for any kind of group anyway.

Guthrie said yes, unless the City knew, for example, it was a group of 10 citizens that simply wanted to have a meeting in some meeting room.

Piedmont-Smith clarified that the City would evaluate risk in any case.

Guthrie confirmed that the risk, above all, would determine whether the City would require insurance.

Sturbaum asked whether the City would provide a police presence, as a matter of course, in the event a controversial group was expected to draw a protest. And if so, he asked, would the City consider that as part of the cost of the policy.

Guthrie said the City would probably request officers if it expected anything like that.

Sturbaum asked whether that would be an extra cost or whether that was just part of the job of an officer, to go where the City requested or to go where there might be issues.

Guthrie said she thought so. She explained that generally, if there was the potential for confrontation, the City could ask for a police presence there, like at the Council meetings.

Sturbaum asked whether the administration had heard from any provider of space mentioning that the City's new policy might create competition.

Guthrie said that she had not heard from anyone, that she did not know of anyone that had heard from anyone, and she thought she would have heard about such comments had there been any.

Chopra asked whether the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce had been involved in the discussion.

Guthrie said not to her knowledge.

Chopra asked whether part of the motivation for putting the new policy in place was in response to a need for such space.

Guthrie said yes, especially space at a reasonable cost, or free.

Council Comment:

Piedmont-Smith reminded the public that the City had had community groups using space at City Hall for a long time, without any regulation of speech and without any incidents. She explained that that part of the policy was not new; the new part was to allow for-profit entities to use the space for a fee, while also formalizing

Ordinance 16-43 (*cont'd*)

the process for non-profits wanting to use the space. She did share some of the concerns Volan had brought up, but also noted that the City had already had the same openness for the space for quite some time. However, she remembered that, in the previous administration, the process was less formalized and a person wanting to use the space needed a sponsor for the meeting, which might have given the City more control. But overall, she thought the City should not restrict speech, and she hoped that Bloomington was a community in which groups that espoused hate would not be using City space.

Chopra said she would vote no because she thought the City did not need to get in the business of renting spaces to for-profit entities. She realized the City was not making a profit, but did not think the City should get in the way of the free market. She said many current spaces bore a high cost to groups wanting to rent space, and many spaces required a person to order a certain amount of food. She said it felt like the City was undercutting the business community, and she would rather see a business need met by a business, which would create jobs and generate tax revenue.

Granger said she was concerned about City liability, and recommended that the City ask for insurance whenever possible. She realized that some small groups might not have the capability to provide their own insurance, but reiterated that she was concerned about liability, despite the fact that the City had been sharing its space for years. However, she applauded the efforts to create a fee structure.

Sturbaum said he would support the ordinance, but wanted to check back after a year to see how it worked out and whether there were any issues.

Sandberg said she would support the ordinance as well, as a trial run. She said the policy had been explained well, and the adiministration had talked through some of the possible issues. She said she expected the non-profit activity that had already been occurring to continue, but said the City might not get as much interest from for-profit groups as everyone was expecting. She noted City business would always take precedence, which might discourage event planning, as there was a likelihood that the private for-profit events could be cancelled because City business would take priority. She did not anticipate as much usage as was expected, but acknowledged she could be wrong, and if it did cause problems, she said she would take a second look at the policy.

Volan said he was concerned about some rooms in City Hall being wired for television. He wondered if some groups would ask that events be televised, and did not know if there would be consequences for that possibility. Second, he was concerned about the possibility of a first-amendment-related infraction that might happen in City space. He raised concerns about how such an infraction would be policed or monitored. He noted he was not overly worried about the issue, but the thought had come up in the course of the debate. He said it was not just hate that the City might be worried about, but also any publicly inappropriate behavior. In his time on the Council, he had seen the changes to the use of police presence. He said he could see the need for more public meeting space, and Chopra made some good points. But he was encouraged by the County policy provided to councilmembers, and encouraged the City to adopt a similar policy. He said he favored the policy, and

said City could look at it in a year and see if there were any problems.

Ordinance 16-43 (*cont'd*)

Ruff said he shared many of the concerns that had already been brought up, and was also little uncomfortable with the arbitrariness regarding who would need insurance or security, but agreed that the City should see how it went.

The motion to adopt Ordinance 16-43 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 8, Nays: 1 (Chopra).

Vote on Ordinance 16-43 [8:19pm]

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-20 be introduced and read by title and synopsis only. The motion was approved by voice vote. Deputy Clerk Hilderbrand read the legislation by title and synopsis, giving the committee Do Pass recommendation of 8-0-0.

Resolution 16-20 – The Adoption of Minimum Internal Control Standards and Procedures and Determining Materiality Threshold for the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana

It was moved and seconded that Resolution 16-20 be adopted.

It was moved and seconded that Amendment 01 to Resolution Ordinance 16-20 be adopted.

Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20

Piedmont-Smith thanked Council staff for drafting the amendment. She explained that the amendment contained a reporting requirement, which meant the Council would get a report once per year from the Controller's Office. The report would include whether there were any breaches in the City's internal control policies and whether there were any fiscal lapses throughout the year. The Council could then implement any changes needed. She thought it was an important element to the policy as the Council was ultimately responsible for the use of public funds.

Controller Jeffrey Underwood noted that he and Corporation Counsel Philippa Guthrie had a chance to review the proposed amendment and were in favor of it. He said he would be happy to come once per year and make that report, and also noted the administration would be working on such issues throughout the year, and would bring forward proposals for any needed changes to the Council.

Council Questions:

Volan asked Piedmont Smith whether there was any specific time of the year that the report would be given to the Council.

Piedmont-Smith thought it would be appropriate to hear the report at the same time the Council considered the end-of-year appropriation ordinance.

Volan noted that time had already passed for 2016.

Piedmont-Smith suggested the Council could hear an initial report in January.

Volan asked Underwood whether Underwood had a particular preference as to when the report would be given to the Council.

Underwood said he preferred December so the administration could come to the Council and review what had happened over the past year.

Volan asked whether there would ever be a year where an end-of-year appropriation ordinance was not necessary.

Underwood said that had not been his experience. He said it would be fine with him if Council wanted him to come report in December.

Resolution 16-20 (*cont'd*)

Volan said he was going to propose hearing the report during the annual budget process, since the Controller would be in front of Council anyway. He explained that that process would be guaranteed to happen, whereas an end-of-year appropriation ordinance was not required by state law.

Underwood said December seemed like the appropriate time to give such a report so that he and the administration could provide a review of the previous year.

Volan suggested that the report could be made in either November or December.

Underwood clarified that everything required by the resolution was already being done and had been put in place by the City. The City was not changing policy. He explained that the resolution merely addressed some requirements by state statute. It would go into effect with his certification after the Council approved it and after City employees completed the training. He added that the fiscal task force had recently made a recommendation that, every other year, an outside firm be brought in to review the City's internal controls and segregation of duties. He reminded the Council that it had approved funds in the 2017 budget for that, so that report would also be part of the administrations report to the Council in the next year.

Volan confirmed that the best time for the report to Council would be toward the end of the year.

Underwood said yes.

Volan suggested that the phrase "in November or December" be added to Amendment 01.

Ruff suggested that the change could be made during the ongoing discussion.

Volan said the change could be a friendly amendment simply written in by each councilmember, as Amendment 01 was already in writing. He specified that the secondary amendment to Amendment 01 would add ", in November or December" at the end of the second to last sentence.

It was moved and seconded to so amend Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20.

Vote on Secondary Amendment 01 to Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20.
[8:28pm]

The motion to amend Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Chopra asked when the Council would be notified if the City made a report to the State Board of Accounts.

Underwood said the City issues a press release in every instance of a report made to the State Board of Accounts.

Chopra said she was asking about any requirement to notify the Council of such a report.

Underwood said there would be no reason to not notify the Council, so if the Council wanted to include an amendment that required such a notification, it could.

Chopra clarified that there was no requirement in the language of the resolution that would require that Council be notified.

Underwood said no. He explained that state statute included two requirements. The first requirement was that a report must be sent to the State Board of Accounts if the City believed there was an intentional act to misappropriate City resources, which had a $0 threshold. The second requirement was that a report must be sent to the State Board of Accounts if it was an inadvertent error, which had a threshold is $500.

Resolution 16-20 (*cont'd*)

Chopra stated she understood the City's reporting requirements, but asked whether those requirements included any requirement to notify the Council that a report had in fact been sent to the State Board of Accounts.

Underwood said that would not be required.

Chopra again asked whether the Council would have to be notified if a report was made to the State Board of Accounts, and, if not, said she would like to see something in the resolution that would require the Council to be notified.

Ruff said he and Sandberg had been working to put Amendment 01 together only very recently, but thought the language "shall identify any areas of concern for review by Council" would cover Chopra's concern.

Chopra said that language was too vague and additional language was needed to address her concern.

Ruff said he disagreed.

Chopra asked when work on Amendment 01 had taken place, and who had suggested that an amendment was needed.

Council Attorney/Administrator Daniel Sherman said that during the previous week there had been discussion about whether the Council was approving the policies provided with the resolution. The Controller had indicated that what Council was approving was the standards provided by the State Board of Accounts pursuant to statute, and Sherman confirmed that was what the resolution did. Sherman had then raised the question with Council leadership whether that action was sufficient or whether Council wanted more. He said that conversation had happened that day, which led to the amendment. He noted that Council did not need to act that night, and if additional conversations needed to happen, or if the Council needed additional answers, the Council could act at the next meeting.

Chopra said she was happy to work through the discussion that evening, if she could propose an amendment.

Sherman said he would need the proposed amendment in writing.

Sandberg said that, in the past, the president of the Council had been invited to any discussions between the City and the State Board of Accounts, in the event there had been a material finding.

Underwood added that the State Board of Accounts conducted two types of audits, and provided additional detail on each kind. He explained there were regular audits, which occurred annually, and special investigations, which were prompted by reports of irregularities by the City. The State Board of Accounts would then make a determination as to whether there was a need for a special investigation. He said the City had had two special investigations in the last few years. In all cases where a report was generated by the State Board of Accounts, the Council president was invited to those discussions and the exit conference. Underwood said the reports were then available to public.

Piedmont-Smith asked whether the Council was precluded from asking for a report from the Controller in January of 2017. She thought it would be ill-advised to wait until the end of 2017 to get the first report.

Volan noted that the resolution as amended required a report to the Council at least once per year, but it did not prevent more frequent reports.

Underwood said the administration was committed to transparency, and if there was any additional information he could provide January, he would be able to do so.

Resolution 16-20 (*cont'd*)

Piedmont-Smith asked whether there was nothing to report in the first 11 months of 2016.

Underwood said there was nothing to report that had not already been reported.

Piedmont Smith responded that she would still like to see a report in January.

Chopra asked whether a second amendment to Amendment 01 would be proper.

Sherman said that the Council could amend a primary Amendment, but a secondary amendment (an amendment to an amendment) could not be amended. He said what Chopra was proposing was an amendment to the primary Amendment, so the Council could take that action, if it wished.

Council had some discussion about providing all councilmembers with copies of the proposed secondary amendment and how best to proceed with the discussion.

Chopra noted the proposed secondary amendment would add a requirement to notify the Council of any report made by the City to the State Board of Accounts.

Volan asked when Chopra intended for the Council to be notified of a report made to the State Board of Accounts.

Chopra said at least within a year, though she had faith that the administration would notify the Council right away.

Volan asked what made Chopra think that the Controller would not notify the Council of any reports made to the State Board of Accounts.

Chopra said it would be a safe guard, and although Mr. Underwood was a fantastic controller, he might not always be the City's controller. She said the Council had many other similar requirements to ensure the Council was notified of various things.

Volan asked why Chopra would not want to be notified immediately of any report filed with the State Board of Accounts.

Chopra said perhaps some administrations would like to hide it, but regardless, she would like to see a regular report to the Council.

Ruff asked Sherman if there were any procedural or legal reasons why one might not want a formal announcement to the Council during an investigation of an incident.

Sherman said he would defer to the Controller. He reminded the Council that the report made to the State Board of Accounts was a report of an incident, not the report issued after an investigation.

Underwood said it was his understanding that he would notify the Council of any incident after the State Board of Accounts had acted on a report. He said the Controller would report to State Board of Accounts, then the State Board of Accounts would take action, and then anything the State Board of Accounts took action on would be public record and would be included in the annual report made to the Council. He could foresee an incident where it might take years to complete an investigation for that incident. He said he would not feel comfortable reporting to the Council on that incident before the investigation was complete, because all parties involved must have their rights protected.

Resolution 16-20 (*cont'd*)

Chopra said her proposed secondary amendment to Amendment 01 may need to be rewritten, and she understood and agreed with Underwood's concerns. She said she would withdraw the proposed secondary amendment.

It was moved and seconded to withdraw the proposed secondary amendment to Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20.

Vote to withdraw Secondary Amendment 02 to Amendment 0 to Resolution 16-20 [8:45pm]

The motion to withdraw the secondary amendment to Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Ruff directed Council back to discussion of Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20.

Council Comment:

Volan said his understanding of the amendment was to provide a failsafe to make sure, at least once per year, the Council got a report on internal controls. He thought it was a good idea. He also thought Chopra's secondary amendment was a good idea, but it might need some changes, and noted she could continue to look at it in the future.

Piedmont-Smith apologized to Ruff and Sandberg for pouncing on the amendment they had come up with. She explained she saw the amendment did not have a sponsor, and so she jumped on it. She said she appreciated the work done on the issue.

Sandberg appreciated the simplicity of the amendment, noting it was not meant to be a micromanaging tool, but was meant to ensure the Council received some reports. She noted that the Council had historically been included in talks with the State Board of Accounts. She thought it was a good thing to have in place, just as a safeguard, and expected to not hear anything negative reported.

Mayer said the policies were required by the State Board of Accounts, and he appreciated the way the Council and the City had addressed meeting those requirements. He also noted Mayor Hamilton ran on a platform of being open and transparent in government, and thought the policies satisfied that commitment.

Chopra clarified that the comments being made related only to the amendment. She noted she would be seeking to insert additional language to amend the legislation. She thought it was important to require that the Council be notified of any reports made to the State Board of Accounts, but was open to further discussions regarding when that notification could happen.

Volan said Chopra's secondary amendment would require notifying the Council of a report, which was not the same thing as demanding that the report be given to the Council. He added that just because a councilmember was in Council leadership did not mean that councilmember could not sponsor amendments.

Chopra clarified whether the resolution could be later amended through an additional resolution.

Ruff explained that the amendment had only been brought up earlier that day, which was why the amendment came from the Council office offer rather than from a sponsoring councilmember. He also stated that he would have voted against Chopra's secondary amendment, and would do so in the future if it came up, because he saw it as unnecessary.

The motion to adopt Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20 received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Vote on Amendment 01 to Resolution 16-20 [8:54pm]

Sturbaum provided explanation of the Council's discussion, actions, and the purpose of Resolution 16-20 to the members of the public present in the audience.

Volan said he appreciated Sturbaum's explanation to the members of the audience, and it was a shame more people did not attend the Council meetings as more frequent explanations might be helpful.

The motion to adopt Resolution 16-20 as amended received a roll call vote of Ayes: 9, Nays: 0.

Vote on Resolution 16-20 [8:57pm]

Underwood reminded Councilmembers that they had to complete the required training as well.

Sherman noted there were a few items related to the Council's schedule that needed to be addressed. Sherman asked the Council to approve non-substantive amendments to the Council's annual schedule.

COUNCIL SCHEDULE

It was moved and seconded to adopt the amendments to the schedule. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Sherman suggested that the Council cancel the Committee of the Whole meeting scheduled for December 14, 2016 and schedule a Special Session for that evening.

Volan asked what legislation was pending that would necessitate a Special Session.

Sherman explained that the salary ordinance needed to be ratified.

Sturbaum clarified that that could be handled in one meeting instead of two.

Sherman concurred.

Sturbaum asked whether the meeting on December 21, 2016 could be cancelled.

Sherman said that was up in the air, as there might have been additional action needed by the Council to open proposals for a guaranteed savings contract.

Volan and Sherman provided additional clarification on the business that could be resolved on December 14, 2016 and what business might still be pending on December 21, 2016.

Piedmont Smith said she would be unavailable on December 21, 2016, as would Councilmember Mayer, and thought it would be prudent to get as much done on December 14, 2016 as possible.

It was moved and seconded to cancel the Committee of the Whole meeting scheduled for December 14, 2016 and schedule a Special Session for that same evening. The motion was approved by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 pm.

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED by the Common Council of the City of Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana upon this 11th day of January 2017.

APPROVE:

Susan Sandberg
, PRESIDENT
Bloomington Common Council

ATTEST:

N Bolden
Nicole Bolden, CLERK
City of Bloomington