

Committee Chairman Pat Sherman called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

PRESENT:	Committee Members:	Paul Reed, Pat Sherman, Dr. Eric Kapke, Don Hanlin, David Payne, Dale Tumey Forrest Chambers was absent.
	Non-Voting Advisors:	Forrest Mellott, John Griffith
	White River Board President:	Mark Messick

Following the Roll Call (Mr. Forrest Chambers was absent), and the Pledge of Allegiance, Mr. Don Hanlin made a motion to approve the Minutes from the meeting held on 3/2/09 in the conference room at the Greenwood City Building. Mr. Paul Reed seconded the motion, and it passed with a vote of 6-0. The Minutes from the meeting held on 3/2/09 in the Council Chambers (Presentation to Council and Board) were postponed until the next Committee meeting.

### Sub-committee Reports

**Finance** Chair Mr. Paul Reed reported that his sub-committee met 3/4/09, and reviewed the individual tasks related to tax issues. He added that he is very pleased with his committee members, and believe they will do a good job.

**Parks and Recreation** Chair Dr. Eric Kapke advised that his committee had met on 3/3/09, and worked on the assignment of tasks, with the next scheduled meeting to be held on 3/18/09.

**Infrastructure** Chair Mr. David Payne advised that his sub-committee will be meeting tonight, after the Committee meeting.

**Planning and Land Use** Chair Mr. Dale Tumey advised that his sub-committee had not met yet, but would be meeting before the end of the month.

**Governance** Chair Mr. Don Hanlin advised that his sub-committee would be meeting tonight after the Committee meeting.

Dr. Kapke (Co-Chair) advised that the **Health and Safety** Sub-committee met in February, concentrating on Fire Department issues, with plans to address Police issues in their next meeting.

### New Business

Mr. Sherman advised that it is important for the Committee to discuss the name for the new community, and make a determination, if possible. He had requested Mr. Paul Reed to research the issue, with regards to cost factors. Mr. Reed reported that he had conducted an in depth study of this, including discussions with White River Township

WHITE RIVER TOWNSHIP – GREENWOOD REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Greenwood Council Chambers, 2 N. Madison Ave., Greenwood, IN

March 5, 2009

Page 2 of 6

and Greenwood business owners, the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce, the Franklin IT Dept. A survey of small business owners was conducted in 2002, and Mr. Reed read the definition of what constitutes a “business”, and what constitutes an “establishment”. The number of small businesses was 3,399 and the number of establishments was 989. These are 2002 figures.

Concerning a name change of the community, Mr. Reed felt that there would be a major problem with businesses, as they would be required to cover costs, including building signage (if the word “Greenwood” is in their business name), web page changes, advertising material changes, invoices, letterheads, shipping documents, business cards, and all day-to-day operation forms used. He noted that he has a Greenwood residential address, although he lives in White River Township, and insofar as the mail is concerned regarding other mailings from another country or state, a change in address would cause problems. He added that a White River or Center Grove resident could still say that they live in that area, regardless of their mailing address. Mr. Reed stated that, with the economy the way it is, the least that the people can be burdened, the better, and he feels this would be an unnecessary burden to all. He also visited the IT Department in Johnson Co. and was advised that there are 14,283 dwellings in the City of Greenwood, and 11,081 dwellings in unincorporated White River Township. (A dwelling is defined as a residential structure, therefore, doubles or duplexes are considered a single dwelling). There are 65 apartment complexes in Greenwood, and 2 in unincorporated White River Township. A new census will be conducted soon, and these figures will be increasing. Mr. Reed also noted the cost of replacing city signs, and the international problems with the name recognition (i.e. efforts with Japan, and other countries to locate their businesses in Greenwood).

Based on his research, Mr. Reed feels strongly that the name of the new community should remain Greenwood.

Mr. Sherman asked the opinions of the Committee Members, and Mr. Tumey advised that, although he understood the desire of some residents to have their area name included in the city name, it would create a much too bulky name. He noted that the school corporation is not involved in this merger, therefore, Center Grove will still have an identity with their schools, just as Greenwood will. He felt it would make more sense to have the name Greenwood, that then people could identify themselves according to what area they live in.

Mr. Hanlin agreed, and stated that Center Grove is a school system, not a city. He added that there is the Clark-Pleasant school system and Whiteland school system. He noted that Zionsville used the wording:

“...Eagle Township, Union Township, the current Town of Zionsville, (the Old Town of Zionsville) be consolidated into one government entity known as the Town of Zionsville (the New Town of Zionsville).”

WHITE RIVER TOWNSHIP – GREENWOOD REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Greenwood Council Chambers, 2 N. Madison Ave., Greenwood, IN

March 5, 2009

Page 3 of 6

Mr. Hanlin added that, in documents, he felt that they would show “Old City” and “New City”, but legally, the name would stay the same.

Dr. Kapke, acknowledging that he is the business owner of Greenwood Animal Clinic, stated that the expense in changing the name would be great. As this business has been in existence since 1959, there is a certain amount of name recognition involved. He added that Greenwood, the city, has a certain amount of name recognition also. He felt that changing the name could set back the progress of bringing new businesses into the area.

Mr. Payne advised that he was in agreement with the rest of the Members, noting that there would be a lot of hurdles that would need to be covered, if the name was changed. In discussions he has had with friends in White River, they advised him that they thought they lived in Greenwood. Adding to that, the challenge of asking the Federal Government to change the Post Office addresses, would not be likely to be successful. Mr. Payne felt that the name should remain Greenwood.

Mr. Sherman advised that, although he does not have a business with the name Greenwood in it, he has lived in White River Township since 1970, and he agreed that it would be extremely expensive, and a hardship on businesses to change the name. He noted that people in White River have come and tried to vote in Greenwood elections, not knowing that they actually did not live in Greenwood.

A motion was made by Mr. Paul Reed that the city remains known as the City of Greenwood. Mr. Don Hanlin seconded the motion.

White River Township Board President Mark Messick asked if it was taken into consideration, the number of people that have Bargersville addresses and asked Mr. Reed if he had secured that number. Mr. Reed advised that he did not, as he had reviewed the map of the area, which reflected the postal service area. Mr. Reed thought that the Bargersville addresses came to Whiteland Rd. Mr. Messick wanted to make the Committee aware that this is a concern of some people in that area, and consider the effect that this may have on people residing in that area. Mr. Hanlin recalled that, several years ago, a petition had been presented to allow a Greenwood zip code be assigned to an area in Bargersville.

Mr. Sherman advised that, if the process does move forward, there could be people with a Bargersville Post Office address that actually live in Greenwood, noting that there are other areas existing that are also like this. Committee Advisor Mr. John Griffin added that, in the formation of the Greenwood Comprehensive Plan, there was a consideration of the varying districts within the City of Greenwood, itself. The approach taken at that time, was that the varying districts would maintain their individuality. It was not specifically explained, but it was a concept that was put in place. Mr. Griffin advised that he thought that this concept would also apply to this reorganization. If there are areas within the White River Township that have a great affinity for the idea of “Center

WHITE RIVER TOWNSHIP – GREENWOOD REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Greenwood Council Chambers, 2 N. Madison Ave., Greenwood, IN

March 5, 2009

Page 4 of 6

Grove”, those areas could receive the same type of concept that had been adopted for the City of Greenwood. He suggested this could include naming a park, street, gateway signs, etc. in the new Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Sherman requested that the comments from Mr. Messick and Mr. Griffin be incorporated into the work being done by the Planning and Land Use Sub-committee, in order to maintain the individuality of some of the areas. Smith Valley and Mount Pleasant were other areas for consideration.

Mr. Payne asked if it would be appropriate to table the motion until other information was gathered. Mr. Sherman advised that the Post Office issue was one that would probably prevent any change, along with the expense, and he felt that the Committee should move forward with a decision.

With no further discussion, the motion to leave the name of the city as the City of Greenwood was voted upon, and passed with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Sherman introduced the concept of “multiple service areas”, or what has been commonly referred to as “urban vs. rural” areas. This issue appears to be an eventuality, and it is necessary to make certain that the issues of the agricultural community be addressed, as well as the urban community. Mr. Sherman felt that all of the Sub-committees should deal with this issue, but that the Committee should first determine whether or not multi-services areas will exist, with differing governing approaches. Taxes, and enforcement of ordinances, resolution and statutes, are some of the subjects that could be affected. He solicited the opinions of each Member concerning this.

Mr. Tumey advised that his Sub-committee, Planning and Land Use, have not had any meetings yet, therefore, his opinion would be he personal one. He felt there should definitely a rural, or agricultural area, with the farmer’s rights to farm protected, along with protecting the rights of the urban area also. He cautioned against any type of restriction that could hinder farmers.

Mr. Hanlin agreed, and stated at least two areas should be considered, noting that in the Zionsville reorganization, it was stated that for a period of 2 years, a rural area could not be changed to an urban area. He added that the farmer’s rights should be protected if they want to continue farming, or if they chose to, develop their property.

Dr. Kapke also agreed that there should be at least two districts, also citing security issues.

Mr. Reed recalled that when Unigov was brought to Indianapolis, the farms in the rural areas were allowed to continue, and their rights were protected.

Mr. Payne suggested that, perhaps there was not enough information at this time to determine this issue. Mr. Sherman agreed that the details will require investigation, and possibly there will be more than two areas identified, but wanted the Committee's consensus that there would be more than one, and allow the Sub-committees to conduct their work with that knowledge. He added that he wanted the farming community to know that this is being considered and that their rights are to be protected.

Mr. Reed noted that this issue will also affect the east and south area of Greenwood. Mr. Sherman agreed and stated that this reorganization plan is a plan that will affect the entire community, including some areas to the south that are in Greenwood.

Mr. Payne felt that, perhaps the Committee was putting the "cart before the horse" in that, the Sub-committees should do their work first, then come back with information to the Committee for consideration. Mr. Sherman advised that, in his meetings with the White River Township Board, the concerns of the agricultural area were stressed. Since this cannot be accomplished if all were governed as one, more than one service district must be allowed. Mr. Sherman felt that this was actually putting the "wheels on the cart" in order to allow the Sub-committees to do their work. Mr. Payne advised that he was not in disagreement that there should be more than one district, but still felt more information would be helpful. Mr. Tumey advised that he thought that this agreement would give the Planning and Land Use Sub-committee a general guidance to proceed, noting that the Committee is not setting any hard and fast rules, but allows the Sub-committees to know that more than one set of rules is involved. Mr. Sherman agreed, and advised that he hoped that this would send a message to the agricultural community that the Committee is concerned with their welfare and to encourage participation from them.

Mr. Hanlin requested clarification as to whether the districts will be contiguous or not, noting that the town probably would be, but rural areas could not. Mr. Sherman advised that the Sub-committees will need to work on that, noting that those are big decisions and the Sub-committees will need input from their Members and the community. Mr. Reed thought that this issue was allowing the public to know that the Committee is open-minded to all concerns, and wants the public's input.

Dr. Eric Kapke made a motion that the Committee approve the concept of Multiple Services Areas. Mr. Dale Tumey seconded the motion, and it passed with a vote of 6-0.

#### **Other business of the Committee**

Mr. Sherman explained that the Sub-committee meetings were still public, however, with the investigative nature of their meetings, including location changes, is not easily advertised as a "Public Meeting", but he wanted to assure the public that they were certainly welcome to attend any of the Sub-committee meetings. Mr. Sherman stressed that all of the meetings were open to the public.

WHITE RIVER TOWNSHIP – GREENWOOD REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE  
Greenwood Council Chambers, 2 N. Madison Ave., Greenwood, IN  
March 5, 2009  
Page 6 of 6

With no further business before the Committee, Sub-committee meetings were held, with final adjournment at 8:20pm.



---

Patrick A. Sherman, Chairman

### **RECAP OF MOTIONS**

Minutes of 3/2/09 Committee Meeting Approved, 6-0.

New City Name to Remain City of Greenwood, 6-0.

Multiple Service Areas Approved, 6-0.