In the Council Chambers, Municipal Building on September 18, 1969, at 7:30 p.m., E.D.T. Councilman Charles J. Faris presiding.

Council President Charles J. Faris

Acting Clerk Naomi Stapleton Members Present: Robert Clegg, Clyde Day, Harry Day, Charles Faris, Richard Fee, Robert Gray, Ralph Johnson and Jack Morrison.

Members Absent: James Clendening

Mayor John H. Hooker, Jr.; City Engineer R. E. Long; City Clerk Marian Tardy, Police Chief James East; Director of Planning Clifford Curry; Assistant City Engineer Marvard Clark; Director of Parks & Recreation Jerry Femal.

Eleven including James R. Root, Reporter for the Daily Herald-Telephone and Fred Hill, Reporter for the Courier Tribune.

Councilman Ralph Johnson

Councilman Johnson moved that the minutes for the September 4th meeting be approved as prepared and distributed. Motion seconded by Councilman Clegg.

None

None

Councilman Clegg moved that proposed Ordinance No. 69-41 be introduced and be read by the Clerk. Motion seconded by Councilman Morrison. Motion carried unanimously.

The Acting Clerk read proposed Ordinance No. 69-41.

Councilman Clegg moved that proposed Ordinance No. 69-42 be introduced and be read by the Clerk. Motion seconded by Councilman Clyde Day. Motion carried unanimously.

The Acting Clerk read proposed Ordinance No. 69-42.

Councilman Clegg asked the Clerk to read proposed Resolution No. 69-21.

The Acting Clerk read proposed Resolution No. 69-21 as follows: (H.I.)

Councilman Clegg moved for the adoption of proposed Resolution No. 69-21. Motion seconded by Councilman Harry Day.

Roll call vote: ayes - 6; nays - 1

Councilman Harry Day asked Jerry Femal, Director of Parks & Recreation, to comment on what the departREGULAR MEETING COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

OFFICIALS IN ATTENDANCE

NUMBER OF CITIZENS IN ATTENDANCE

INVOCATION

MINUTES OF FORMER MEETING

REMONSTRANCES & OBJECTIONS

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING

GENERAL AND SPECIAL ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 69-41

Ordinance No. 69-42

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 69-21

on what the department would do if the money were not restored to their 1970 budget. Mr. Femal stated that the main service performed by his department was leadership rather than maintenance. In order to keep pace with the demands for more services, the department would have to have additional personnel and facilities, as well as maintain the equipment it has. There are many school facili-ties which should be utilized, but they can not be without supervision and without the funds there can be no supervision. The department should have an annual ex-It will be impossible panding program. to carry out the planned program for 1970 if the funds are not restored to the budget.

Councilman Johnson asked the Clerk to read proposed Resolution No. 69-22.

The Acting Clerk read proposed Resolution No. 69-22 as follows: (H.I.)

Councilman Johnson moved for adoption of proposed Resolution No. 69-22. Motion seconded by Councilman Clyde Day.

Councilman Harry Day stated that he could understand the practicalities of the proposed Resolution, but that he would have to vote against it because he feels it is very fundamental to the welfare of the citizens of Bloomington and necessary that animals be made available to medical science for research. "This just puts us on record as not putting us on record!"

Roll call vote: ayes - 6; nays - 1; abstained - 1.

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

Mayor Hooker reported as follows on a point which he covered in the final moments of the last session of the Monroe County Tax Adjustment Board...a matter which he feels should constantly be brought to the attention of the public:

When we consider property tax, there are many things which are unfair. The property tax only can no longer support, in an adequate fashion, the needs for services that are supplied by local governments in Indiana. We must encourage the General Assembly to

move with dispatch in this next

Resolution No. 69-22

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

REPORTS FROM OFFICIAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

REPORTS FROM SPECIAL COMMITTEES

REPORTS FROM CITY OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS

MESSAGES FROM COUNCILMEN

OTHER NEW BUSINESS

MESSAGE FROM MAYOR

move with dispatch in this next session and bring forth a revised, reformed piece of legislature which would change the means by which local government would bring about the monies necessary to support it. We must have other sources - whether it be a sales tax, a utility tax, or some other means - for we have reached the saturation point as far as property tax is concerned.

I do not feel it is right for the people of the cities of Indiana to pay for services for which they are not direct benefactors. The taxpayers of the City of Bloomington pay over one-third of a million dollars for county services for which they do not have any direct benefit. These services are:

- 1. County Plan Commission - \$14,000 The people of Monroe County are not providing one cent to our City Plan Commission program. County Sheriff's Budget - \$195,000
- 2. It is right, I feel, that the city residents should help pay for the operation of the jail. However, only approximately one-half of the Sheriff's activities are directed at the City of Bloomington residents.
- з. Cumulative Bridge Fund - \$114,000 This amount equals almost one-third of the entire City Street Department budget. In my opinion, city resi-dents are not direct benefactors of county bridges.
- 4. Animal Control Services - The County Commissioners have a \$10,000 item representing its cost in a contract it has with the City of Bloomington for these services. City residents pay one-half of this; the county people are getting by, then, with \$5,000.
- Ambulance Service \$40,000 5.
- County Retirement Fund \$40,000 6. City residents should not be participants in the whole \$40,000.
- Landfill The city pays \$35,000 for the privilege of using the county's 7. sanitary landfill. Included in the county's budget is \$26,000 for a bulldozer to be used for the operation of the landfill. City taxpayers are paying their part of this. Township assessors outside of Bloom-
- 8. ington and Perry - \$4,000

The County Park Department should be funded and supported entirely by the county people because the city has its own park department.

We, the City of Bloomington, are paying a substantial amount of money for these county services, over \$150,000, which could well be used in any one of our several city departments.

If the law can provide that the residents of a township within a city which has a contract with the city do not have to pay, why can there not be a similar law that would apply to a city within a county?

MESSAGE FROM MAYOR, CONTINUED

Councilman Fee stated that he would be inclined to question some of the Mayor's figures. However, in regard to the Mayor's reference to independent cities, Councilman Fee cited the State of Virginia as having independent cities which do not belong to any county in any way, shape, nor form.

Council President Faris moved for adjournment at 8:10 P.M., E.D.T. ADJOURNMENT

Chailes Dwis Pris e R