

# **Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations**

**Tuesday August 18, 1998 Meeting, 7:00 PM**

*Walb Memorial Union  
Indiana Purdue Fort Wayne  
Ft. Wayne*

## **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. He introduced Linda Bloom, Allen County Commissioner, who also welcomed the group.

Following the welcome, Bailey asked that commission members introduce themselves. Six members were in attendance, including: Representative William W. Bailey, Representative Gloria Goeglein, Senator Joe Zakas, John X. Ryan, Gerald Gilles, and Leslie Goss. A quorum was not present. IACIR staff members, John L. Krauss, Dr. Greg Lindsey, and Jamie L. Palmer also were in attendance.

At least 60 non-commission members were in attendance, including: Marilyn Morrison, Ron Bonan (Ft. Wayne), Roland Waters (Ft. Wayne), Bud Baker (Ft. Wayne), Pamela Holochen (Ft. Wayne), Jim Berger (Ft. Wayne), Max Eggman (Ft. Wayne), Dick Uhen (Ft. Wayne), Colleen S. Hake (Ft. Wayne), Leonard Goeglein (Ft. Wayne), Linda Bloom, Bruce Westrick, Ron Hakes, Evan Davis (Ft. Wayne), Dave Butterfield (Valparaiso), Tonya Galbraith (Indianapolis), Richard Graham, John Larsen, Cathy Voors, Philip Davich (Woodburn), David Long, Bob Howard, Ken & Mary Jurse (Ft. Wayne), Dan & Paula Smith (Ft. Wayne), Namita Kamath (Ft. Wayne), Dede Hall (Ft. Wayne), Don Morris, Larry Magliozzi (South Bend), Paul Eash, Win & Tamara Moses (Ft. Wayne), Paul Spoelhof, Tom Bangler (Ft. Wayne), John Harrington (Ft. Wayne), Bob Alderman (Ft. Wayne), Tom Hayhurst (Ft. Wayne), and Paul Helmke (Ft. Wayne).

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.

---

**AGENDA**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| - | Welcome and Call to Order  | Chair Bailey<br>Commissioner Linda Bloom |
| - | Explanation of Discussion Format   | John L. Krauss                           |
| - | Presentation of Annexation Research Results  | Dr. Greg H. Lindsey                      |
| - | Public Discussion Period   | Commission Members<br>Meeting Attendees  |
| - | Next Meeting is set for August 27, 1998, at 7 p.m. at the Tippecanoe County Extension Office in Lafayette. |  |
| - | Adjournment  |  |
- 

**PRESENTATION OF ANNEXATION RESEARCH RESULTS**

Dr. Greg Lindsey presented selected results from the ongoing annexation study. Copies of the overheads 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***

- There was consensus that there are environmental problems that require services. Once services are supplied then municipalities should annex.
- Citizens have no voice.
- Some cities need revenue.
- Annexation is taxation without representation.
- Reduce county taxes for city taxpayers.
- Annexation can provide efficiencies in service delivery.
- Small towns have limited funds to deal with issues.
- Re-establish procedures for state notification, better record keeping.
- ?? No forced annexation.

***Table 2***

- Outside municipalities, there should no forced annexation.

- Voting is the answer.
- New services are not worth the additional taxes.
- If a city's in trouble, the suburbs provide a windfall.
- Establish enhanced home rule: vote on a county by county basis how local government will be arranged, like in Lexington.

### ***Table 3***

- Lessen the reliance on property taxes as revenue source for local government.
- Communicate what citizens will get.
- More joint services and shared planning.
- Give property owners a voice in the process.

### ***Table 4***

- Fundamentally, this is a property rights issue.
- How should we provide a vote? Petition? General election?
- Process is stacked against citizens. Sixty days is too short.
- Current law has no teeth. There should be automatic fines or penalties.
- Municipal fire service is more expensive and less responsive.
- Diminished township fire departments have fewer resources.
- ?? City residents pay for county services.

### ***Table 5***

- Need a voice in the decision but no consensus from the group on how to achieve that.
- Should be a separate review of the fiscal plan.
- Give judges more latitude in ruling on remonstrance.
- The county commission should vote.
- Annexation brings tax increases for those annexed.
- Tax abatements are available but rarely used.

### ***Table 6***

- Reasons for annexation: expand tax base.
- Need to function as a region. Not to do so spells doom. Think regionally.
- Process can be improved by voting. Should consider multiple options.

### ***Table 7***

- Reasons for annexation: finances, migration out of municipalities to suburbs.
- Services.
- Taxes.

- We have a complex system of layered government: often there are higher water and sewer rates outside municipalities.
- Differences in development regulations between incorporated and unincorporated.
- Voting issues.
- Annexation is taxation without representation.
- City should be up front about what they are going to do.
- Annexation is unconstitutional.
- We should require a three-tier majority.
- Return annexation law to the way it was prior to 1980, when the existing law was passed.

### ***Table 7***

- Annexation is needed to grow the tax base and to allow redevelopment of inner cities.
- Cities have monopoly power; there is a need for more state oversight.
- Municipalities should forego taxes until services are available.

### ***Table 8***

- Split city and county government.
- Change the remonstrance process.
- Strong support for voting.
- Annexation is one way to grow.
- Combine services for more efficiency.
- One vote per household.
- Municipalities don't have to compete. Annexation allows them to perpetuate poor management.
- Star community in Mishawaka.
- Indianapolis is successful without annexation.

### ***Miscellaneous***

- One possible solution is immediate annexation upon development approval.

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 27, 1998, at 7 p.m. at the Tippecanoe County Extension Office in Lafayette.

ADJOURNMENT

The chair adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.