

1. Can anyone remember any other resolutions since 2016 when Mayor Hamilton took office that include such a signing statement? (I think I looked at all of them, but I was working pretty fast, not exactly studying them, and figured if there's more than just those two, it might have stuck in someone's memory, and be easy enough to track down.) **According to Mike Rouker, no, there have not been.**

2. The note mentions the third "whereas" clause, and I gather, based on Mike Rouker's remarks at the council's meeting when it was passed, that the disputed wording on that one relates to the use of the "salary" in that clause. Can I get confirmation that that's the basis of the disagreement? **Yes**

3. The note mentions "several" inaccurate factual statements, so I could guess that maybe another one is whether the consultants report actually "prescribes" the number 121. Can I get confirmation of that? **Yes**

4. Besides those two "whereas" clauses, are there other "whereas" clauses that the mayor believes contain factually inaccurate statements? **The clauses you mention are those with which the mayor principally takes issue.**

5. Why not just veto the resolution, given that the veto procedure provides a method (through the required statement of reason for the veto) to create a separate document that makes clear the mayor's disagreement with the factual claims in the "whereas" clauses?

<http://iga.in.gov/legislative/laws/2021/ic/titles/036#36-3-4-16> **Since the resolution is an "expression of support" by the council and not a binding action, it is not appropriate for the mayor to reject it--the council may of course express support as it sees fit.**

6. Could I get a copy of the required "message announcing the executive's approval" that was sent to the city council in connection with Res 21-27? **Yes, please see the "Chain of custody form" in question, which signals the executive's approval of Res 21-27 to city council.**