

Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Wednesday August 12, 1998 Meeting, 7:00 PM

Hulman Memorial Student Union

Indiana State University

Terre Haute

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

Chair William W. Bailey called the meeting to order at approximately 7:15 p.m. He welcomed commission members and attendees and asked that commission members introduce themselves. Ten members were in attendance, including: Representative William W. Bailey, Representative Sue W. Scholer, Representative Gloria J. Goeglein, John X. Ryan, James Beery, John Fernandez, Gerald Gilles, Sue Paris, Joyce Poling, and Linda Williams. A quorum was not present. IACIR staff members, John L. Krauss, Dr. Greg Lindsey, and Jamie L. Palmer also were in attendance.

At least 15 non-commission members were in attendance, including: Esther Atherson (Terre Haute), Gary Garrahan (Terre Haute), Kim Tanner (Terre Haute), Dorothy Scott (Terre Haute), Bill Turner (Terre Haute), Barbara Baker (Terre Haute), Carl Baker (Terre Haute), Kenneth C. Nordmeyer (Terre Haute), Marcia Nordmeyer (Terre Haute), Ron Kiger (Terre Haute), Trudy Selvia (Greencastle), Bill Foraken (Terre Haute), Taihung Duong (Terre Haute), Ellen Richter (Terre Haute), and Paul Marietta (Terre Haute).

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| - Welcome and Call to Order | Chair Bailey |
| - Explanation of Discussion Format | John L. Krauss |
| - Presentation of Annexation Research Results | Dr. Greg H. Lindsey |
| - | |
| - Public Discussion Period | Commission Members
Meeting Attendees |
| - Next Meeting is set for August 13, 1998, at 7 p.m. at the Exhibition Center of the Hamilton County Fairgrounds in Noblesville. | |
| - Adjournment | |
-

Following introductions, Bailey asked John Krauss to explain the ground rules for discussion at the meeting. Krauss explained that following a brief presentation of results, the non-commission members in attendance would be given a chance to offer comments on annexation issues in Indiana. The attendees at each of the tables in the room would discuss the issue amongst themselves. Following the discussion, each table would appoint a spokesperson to report the table's discussion. Krauss asked that each succeeding table report only the issues and concerns that had not yet been presented.

PRESENTATION OF ANNEXATION RESEARCH RESULTS

Dr. Greg Lindsey presented selected results from the ongoing annexation study. Copies of the presentation materials and the issue guide prepared for the meeting are attached.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Each table of participants and IACIR members discussed the issues surrounding annexation. Following the discussion, each table chose a spokesperson to report the issues raised in each discussion. The issues raised by each table are listed below.

Table 1

- ?? State law should require real notice. There is not enough time allowed to gear up for a remonstrance.
- ?? Provide a voice.
- ?? Often there is not a good reason for annexation or plan for providing services.
- ?? Annexation perpetuates urban sprawl.
- ?? Cities and towns annex for financial reasons.

Table 2

- ?? Municipalities annex for revenue.
- ?? Current system is taxation without representation.
- ?? People have been threatened if they remonstrate.
- ?? Law is biased toward municipalities.
- ?? Some municipalities are annexing to increase population for the upcoming census.
- ?? The best solution is referenda.
- ?? There is currently a lack of notification.
- ?? Some disagree with allowing more public comment. It is not an effective way to get people out because people do not participate in the affairs of government generally.
- ?? No checks and balances; municipalities do not have any impetus to do a "good" thing.

Table 3

- ?? Process is un-democratic.
- ?? Burden of persuasion is on opponents.
- ?? There is no recourse short of legal action.

- ?? Annexation imposes municipal laws on rural territory.
- ?? Annexation creates duplicative services.
- ?? The current property tax system prompts communities to annex.
- ?? Some communities use intimidation to squelch remonstrance efforts.

Table 4

- ?? Why should we be forced to remonstrate? Put the burden on the municipality.
- ?? The remonstrance process is coercive; there have been threats of counter-suits. Some folks are afraid to oppose annexation for fear of losing business.
- ?? Annexation occurs for financial reasons.

Table 5

- ?? What is the process for de-annexing?
- ?? Cities annex for additional assessed value.
- ?? Need better communication between owners and municipalities including, better notification and longer than 60 days for remonstrance.
- ?? Why should the burden be on individuals rather than the municipality?
- ?? There should be independent review of fiscal plans.
- ?? Participants like “popular determination.”

Table 6

- ?? Municipalities have the benefit of staff attorneys. Citizens do not.
- ?? It should be ok to annex properties that already receive city services.
- ?? Indiana law discourages large annexations.
- ?? There is no oversight to make sure that municipalities carry out their promises.
- ?? Some remonstrators receive threatening letters.
- ?? Local economic development happens mostly in cities and towns.

Miscellaneous

- ?? Cities pick and choose areas. They often skip poor areas.
- ?? Cities don't provide a “public” meeting.

Following reports from all tables, Krauss asked the group if the discussion format used during the meeting was effective. Most participants agreed that it was preferable to a traditional public hearing format.

Bailey thanked the group for their attendance and participation. He concluded the meeting with a few comments. Several participants produced written comments for the meeting. Bailey indicated that they would be entered into the minutes of the meeting.

NEXT MEETING

Representative Bailey indicated that the next meeting was set for August 13, 1998, at 7 p.m. at the Exhibition Center at the Hamilton County Fairgrounds in Noblesville.

ADJOURNMENT

The chair adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:15 p.m.