

# Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

## Monday June 8, 1998 Meeting, 1:30 PM

*Training Room 6*

*Indiana State Government Center South*

### MINUTES

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chair William W. Bailey announced that there was a quorum present (see attendance sheet attached) and called the meeting to order at approximately 1:40 P.M.

---

#### AGENDA

- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| - Call to Order                                 | Chair Bailey                   |
| - Approval of Minutes of March 31, 1998 Meeting | Commission Members             |
| - Discussion of Annexation Public Forums        | Chair Bailey<br>John L. Krauss |
| -   | Commission Members             |
| - Other Business                                |                                |
| - Next Meeting                                  |                                |
| ?? Adjournment                                  |                                |
- 

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Representative Bailey asked for questions or comments in regard to the minutes of the March 1998 meeting. A motion was made and seconded for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

#### DISCUSSION OF ANNEXATION PUBLIC MEETINGS

Chair Bailey began the discussion by suggesting that each of the commission members obtain a copy of *Annexation Issues: Progress Report 2 to the Legislative Council*. He suggested that the report contains useful information that each member should read prior to attendance at the summer meetings. Several members indicated that they had not received the report. Commission staff indicated that they would mail reports to each commission member.

John Krauss discussed the objectives and proposed format for the annexation meetings as outlined in a memorandum prepared by staff (text attached). Krauss proposed that the objectives of the meetings be to identify the strengths and weaknesses of current annexation procedures, potential changes in annexation law and policy, and issues related to balancing public responsibilities and private rights.

He further explained that staff was proposing a community forum process as the format for the series of meetings. Traditional public meetings/hearings do not allow for thoughtful discussion among participants. The community forum format would involve splitting participants into groups of 10-12 and seating them around a table. Each table would have a facilitator and a recorder. Mr. Krauss cited several instances in which the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment has used this technique with much success.

Senator Gard asked Mr. Krauss to clarify a comment about voting on proposals at the meetings. Mr. Krauss corrected himself, indicating that there would be no formal proposals or voting at the forums.

Senator Gard went on to say that it is important to give citizens an opportunity to speak. The Commission needs to provide public education through the media to let citizens know what they can expect from the meetings. It is possible to maintain order at meetings by setting ground rules for participants.

Joyce Poling asked for clarification about the purpose of the meetings. Specifically, if the meeting served as a vehicle for public education or for fact finding.

Senator Gard clarified that the IACIR has not taken a position on annexation.

Representative Bailey indicated that the purpose of the IACIR is to study issues that affect multiple levels of government and not necessarily to propose legislation.

Representative Goeglein said that education is an important component.

Gerald Gilles said there will have to be change in the annexation process as a result of the commission's discussions.

Representative Bailey conveyed that the purpose of the annexation meetings was to define the real issues. Actual problems may not be those that commission members currently perceive. Listening to citizens will allow commission members to expand their understanding of the issues.

Senator Zakas asked for clarification of the format as a series of group discussion. He asked for information on the types of facilities/rooms that would be used and whether facilitators would lead round-table discussions. He also expressed concern about balancing points of view and what method the commission would use to ensure a mix.

Gardest Gillespie said that the discussions at each table should center around education provided to participants at the beginning of the meeting.

Sonya Margerum suggested choosing at least one location where annexation has not been a problem.

Susan Williams asked if there would be a way to identify commission members at the meetings. She liked the round-table format for discussions. She also suggested that one or more of the locations should provide opportunities for smaller community to participate.

John Ryan asked about rules of facilitation.

Representative Bailey suggested that the discussions be preceded by a summary of current annexation law and be based on a framed set of specific questions.

Mr. Krauss indicated that the staff would prepare guides for facilitators and participants.

Rick Cockrum asked about the intended outcome of the series of meetings.

Mr. Krauss indicated that over the course of the annexation project citizens have asked for a chance to speak. At the previous commission meeting there had been consensus about going to "hot spots."

Dave Bohmer asked again about the intended outcome of the meetings.

Representative Bailey said that the purpose was to inform legislators. He summarized the discussion about meeting format. The meetings will involve a series of round-table discussions of questions framed in an orderly manner. He suggested some minor adjustments to the timing of activities at the meetings. The closing activity will be a reporting of discussions to all of the participants in attendance.

Senator Zakas cautioned about the need for flexibility in the meeting format in case of an emergency. He suggested using a traditional public hearing format if any of the meetings draws more participants than expected.

Chairperson Bailey opened a discussion of meeting locations.

Joyce Poling indicated that Monroe County residents do not like to attend meetings at the Bloomington campus of Indiana University.

Senator Zakas suggested Elkhart, Lafayette, or a city in northwest Indiana as an alternative to South Bend.

Susan Williams suggested that dates should be chosen so as not to conflict with summer conferences. She indicated that Noblesville would be a good location to gain input from varying perspectives and include smaller communities.

Sonya Margerum suggested Lafayette as a site.

Jim Berry suggested Terre Haute as a site.

Senator Gard indicated that there is a need to provide geographic dispersion in choosing meeting sites.

Bailey asked the commission to choose a site for each of the four quadrants of the state (NW, NE, SW, SE) as well as a site for the central region.

The group suggested Merrillville, Crowne Point, Purdue Northwest, and Lafayette as possibilities for the northwest quadrant, Fort Wayne for the northeast quadrant, New Albany for the southeast quadrant, Terre Haute for the southwest quadrant, and Noblesville for the central region. The commission voted to hold the northwest meeting in Lafayette. Noblesville High School and the new Hamilton County 4-H meeting facility were identified as specific locations for the Noblesville meeting.

In summary, the commission chose: New Albany, Terre Haute, Noblesville, Ft. Wayne, and Lafayette as sites for the annexation meetings.

Senator Gard stressed the importance of getting the information to the media for distribution.

Representative Bailey took comments from citizens in attendance.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

None.

#### NEXT MEETING

Representative Bailey indicated that a set of proposed meeting dates would be circulated to commission members within ten days.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:50 P.M.