

## City Officers, Boards and Commissions

### Mayor

- Chief executive officer
- Elected official
- Four year term

### Clerk Treasurer

- Elected official
- Four year term

### Board of Zoning Appeals

I.C. 36-7-4-902 requires:

- Five members
- Each is a four year term
- Board not required to be politically balanced

- One member Appointed by Council - not member of Plan Commission
- One member Appointed by Mayor - not member of Plan Commission
- One member Appointed by Plan Commission - is member of Plan Commission
- One member Appointed by Mayor - is member of Plan Commission
- One member Appointed by Mayor - not member of Plan Commission

### Board of Public Works and Safety

Three members: the Mayor, and two members appointed by the Mayor

### Plan Commission

I.C. 36-7-4-207 requires:

- Nine members
- Each is a four year term except where noted
- Board is required to be politically balanced
- Terms begin January 1

- One member Board of Public Works and Safety appointment
- One member City Council appointment (one year term)
- One member City Engineer
- One member Park Board appointment
- Five members Citizen appointments by Mayor

### Redevelopment Commission

I.C. 36-7-14 requires:

- Five members
- Three appointed by Mayor; two appointed by Council
- One year terms

## IN THIS CHAPTER

- City Officers, Boards and Commissions
- Department Interviews

### City Council

- Elected office
- Four year term
- 5 district reps
- 2 at-large reps



### 2004-07 City Council

Bill Bloss, Julia Gautsche,  
Daniel Grimes, Chic Lantz,  
Don Minter, Paul Scott  
and Everett Thomas

## Board of Parks and Recreation

### I.C. 36-10-3-4 requires:

- *Five members:* 1 appointed by Goshen Community Schools board, 4 (politically balanced) by the Mayor
- *Four year terms*

## Board of Aviation Commissioners

- *Four members*
- *Mayor appoints them to four-year terms*

## Economic Development Commission

### I.C. 36-7-12 requires:

- *Three members:* one selected by Mayor, one nominated by County Council, one nominated by City Council
- *Four year terms*

## Shade Tree Board

- *Seven members:* three members appointed by Mayor (one with forestry degree or equivalent), four members appointed by Council
- *Three year term*
- *Not required to be politically balanced*

## Department Interviews

### Mayor's Office

The Mayor appoints and directly supervises all department heads: Director of Public Works, Police Chief, Fire Chief, Building Commissioner, Planning Director, Street Department Superintendent, Water/Wastewater/Sewer Utility Superintendent, City Attorney, Cemetery Caretakers, and Park Superintendent (with concurrence of the Park Board). Supervision of switchboard operator is the responsibility of the Mayor's Assistant, who also directly supervises custodial staff. Maintenance positions are supervised within Engineering Dept.

All staff were pleased with the communication in their department and felt they knew where to go if they ran into difficulty. Mayor Allan Kauffman lauds the dedication of department employees and also noted that Goshen has a strong ethic of volunteerism.

Initially, a new phone system provided some challenges at the switchboard and there were, at the time of this writing, still some kinks to work out.

Concerns were expressed that the cemeteries need a dog leash ordinance and that more signs are needed to slow down traffic.

The Mayor expressed frustration that the City doesn't have all the resources it requires to fulfill community needs. He attributed the tight budget to state property tax laws. He said the City would be best served by fiscal home rule.

Several staff said they were interested in seeing every neighborhood have sidewalks. They also told of being stretched to handle snow removal on



*Indiana's first Carnegie Library was preserved and has become Goshen City Hall.*



sidewalks, maintenance, and cars parking on sidewalks and in yards. Further concern was expressed about how the community is responding to immigration. Staff mentioned the difficulty of communicating, the prejudice in the community as well as the desire for new city residents to work to understand the dominant culture. Several staff worried that landlords are exploiting immigrants.

### Clerk-Treasurer's Office

The Clerk-Treasurer's office consists of four staff who include the Clerk-Treasurer and the first, second, and third deputy. They are the accounting and record-keeping arm of the City and take responsibility for paying bills, payroll, reconciliation, tax filing, receipts, assorted billings, record-keeping and maintenance of the cemetery books.

Everyone in the office felt they knew their jobs well and worked together as a team. They also felt they have the staff and informational resources to get their jobs done.

Challenges mentioned included record-keeping and accounting requirement changes at the State level that mean relearning the job, and may provide no guidance on methods that can help meet the requirements. Complications in the payroll system, based particularly on the division of utility and general city payroll, was also mentioned. Some city employees receive a portion of their salary from the City and a portion from the utilities department. The books are presently managed separately but must be combined for tax filing. Staff also mentioned communication issues between departments that result in inconsistent methods of conducting transactions. Suggested standards were offered that would apply at the department level and make record-keeping easier.

A new optical scanning system is expected to make the department staff's job easier. Records will be more accessible and easier to find. They hoped the future might hold some job title/category changes, computerized cemetery books which would require new software and possibly hardware upgrades, and an updated code book.

Cash flow for the City has been jeopardized by state property tax reassessment legislation. Expenditures need to be evaluated line by line and the hope is that Tax Anticipation Notes will carry the city through, especially for payroll, which constitutes over 80 percent of expenditures.

The Mayor often cites the State's controlled tax levy structure for maintaining an unlevel playing field between efficient reuse of land, and sprawl. The system rewards cities for encouraging fringe development, because once annexed, the increase in assessed valuation gives the city additional property tax levy (more revenue). But not so for interior redevelopment: even the most creative commercial/industrial infill brings no additional funds whatsoever. He frequently tells State representatives that this 'unintended consequence' of Indiana tax law means that Indiana isn't "walking the walk" of smart growth.



*Goshen is the county seat, its historic courthouse one of the most beautiful in Indiana.*

## The Planning Department

As the lead agency for the Comprehensive Plan process, the Planning Department carries significant responsibility for land use planning and adherence. In 2004, the Goshen Planning and Zoning Department consists of two people. They feel that, for a small office, they serve the customer well. They participate in the building permit process and respond to requests from builders and developers, those seeking variances, and zoning-related complaints. They work hard to serve everyone—from a resident building a garage, to a developer building a subdivision.

There is some frustration that the department is primarily reactionary, spending most time on zoning enforcement and little time on proactivity and planning. They are primarily a zoning office but would like to see a better balance.

This Comprehensive Plan process has only added to the planners' drive toward neighborhood initiatives. They've concluded that residents respond with great interest to neighborhood building because it includes them as co-owners of the decision-making process. They see neighborhood building as their top planning priority.



*The “old high school” is today “the municipal annex” to City Hall, a block north along Fifth Street. This renovated building retains many of Goshen High School’s original features. Marking the corner of Fifth and Jefferson. It is home to the planning, building, engineering, human resources and other departments of Maple City government.*

*It is also a picturesque part of Goshen’s historic district, established by the National Trust for Historic Preservation a quarter century ago.*

## Legal, Human Resources, Code Compliance

This department is combined under the direction and supervision of the part-time City Attorney and his full-time assistant. The legal part of the department deals with any legal issues associated with boards and commissions, contract writing and review, ordinances, and resolutions. Much of their expertise is applied to annexation and development issues. They participate in negotiations and provide some supervision to the one-person Human Resources department.

Human Resources is responsible for hiring tasks including advertising for and interviewing potential employees. The department also deals with day-to-day personnel issues, workers compensation, management of the health insurance plan, and trouble shooting. HR is responsible for compliance with Equal Opportunity legislation, state and federal civil rights laws, OSHA compliance, and personnel policies. Employee training falls under this heading as does a wellness program.

Code compliance, or enforcement, is handled by two people. They work closely with the police department because ownership of parked cars must be established with a license plate number. There is a sense of needing better police support and some confusion about assigned responsibilities. Code enforcement requires knowledge of six or seven ordinances and communication with almost all City departments. Most calls are a response to complaints but some are from observation.

Staff cites growth in the city for strain in every City department. They also point out issues that are observed in the community but over which non-City jurisdictions have enforcement. These issues relate particularly to environmental hazards and threats to air and water quality that would require attention by county and state agencies.

Citywide, the staff of this department looks forward to resolution of some traffic issues. In addition, they feel the City needs to give more attention, improve communication, and resources for the growing Hispanic population.

# PLAN HISTORY AND STRATEGY

## Drafting the 2004-13 Goshen Comprehensive Plan

In early 2001, the Goshen Plan Commission, knowing that its current (1992) comprehensive plan would soon complete its term, decided to embark on a rigorous and exciting way of writing its next plan. **It would come from residents themselves.**

Also unique to their approach was independence from land use mapping, which often locked planners into zoning swaths that don't anticipate significant opportunities in the marketplace, or effects of growth on services or the environment. A simpler set of core principles would form the comprehensive land use plan, concepts that state clear values that will be carried forward with an updated zoning ordinance.

Nothing about this plan happened quickly, and it's unfinished, by design. The chapters that follow recommend scrutiny of more than three dozen current ordinances. What may be more ambitious is that this plan will not succeed upon passage of new laws alone, but on *meeting the goals in the plan, through programs, incentives, public awareness*, as well as zoning and other implementation ideas, over the next ten years.

And we will be grading ourselves along the way. Past plans, written by non-local consultants, did not call for built-in monitoring and reporting, mid-course benchmarks, or annual reviews. Ready-made vision statements never took on the force of a community to-do list. The people responsible for doing the work—specifically City departments, elected officials, volunteers and residents—had little ownership of those ideas. As such things go, goals were achieved as much because they were already points on the community's *internal* compass. But now, the Plan Commission's resolve for a new-millennium comprehensive plan will reflect residents' own resolve to improve Goshen's prosperity and livability.

The Maple City's prevailing comprehensive plan had been prepared in 1992. It seemed prudent to repeat the process on a decade-to-decade basis. Discussion next turned to who would handle the intensive community-based plan construction. The Plan Commission searched for a local resource or group to collect and record the ideas, concerns and solutions that are so abundant among Goshen residents. The right coordinating agency was, amazingly, just coming into being.

In March of 2001, the Goshen-based not-for-profit Community Sustainability Project, Inc. (CSP) held an urban sustainability conference at the Mill Race Center Farmers Market that attracted nearly 150 people. Among those were city and county planners, board and commission members, city council members, engineers and architects, park and recreation professionals, attorneys, teachers, community activists and residents from all walks of life. The strong interest in sustainable community planning led the staff of CSP and the Goshen Planning Department to conclude that a partnership between the two organizations might provide the kind of energy and momentum necessary to develop a dynamic, sustainable growth plan.

In autumn 2001, the Planning Department contracted with CSP to manage the plan process. Work began immediately. The contract contained a clear directive to include the community at all levels of input and to develop a strong implementation component. In addition, the contract stated, "The City is generally interested in preparing a Plan that is centered around the concept of **Smart Growth**." Newly-introduced concepts included alternatives to sprawl, restoring the city center, transportation alternatives, environmental conservation, and land use stewardship.

### IN THIS CHAPTER

- The comprehensive planning and visioning process
- The partnerships that built the plan will be followed by implementing teams of government, civic, business and residential stakeholders, coordinated by the Goshen Plan Commission.
- Smart Growth: the economic, social and environmental ingredients for sustained growth.

*SMART GROWTH is described on the last page of this chapter.*

The process began with two critical steps. The first was the development of a liaison committee composed of representatives from various segments of the community. This group would provide planning direction and leadership for topical focus groups formed to address each of eight elements of the Plan. Second, a residents' survey was created that would be mailed to every Goshen resident. The first liaison committee meeting was held in January of 2002 and the resident survey was mailed in February.

With significant input from **the liaison committee, eight focus groups** were formed, each with between eight and twelve members. These groups spent six months developing a vision and a set of goals for each of the Plan elements.

Out of the focus group process evolved **seven (later eight) advisory councils**, each with 8 - 12 members (some overlap with focus groups.) Late in 2002, need for an economic redevelopment element was identified and an advisory council was formed to address redevelopment issues and provide counsel to the Goshen Redevelopment Commission. After focus group input, the utilities, energy, and waste element was further developed with direct assistance from engineering consultants and City staff. The people and neighborhoods element had input beyond the focus group format from community-wide neighborhood meetings. More than **125 people** were involved in focus groups and advisory councils.

The advisory council process included review and revision of focus group visions and goals and development of programs and implementation strategies for realizing those goals. Groups included field professionals and City staff. Their recommendations were informed by community input from the survey and neighborhood gatherings, focus group outlines, professional experience and 'best planning practices' literature provided by planning coordinators. Most groups met for between three and four months, concluding in March, 2003.

Resident survey results were tabulated in March and April of 2002. Surveys were color coded so results could be traced back to nine regions. Just over eight percent of city residents returned surveys, and return rates varied significantly by region. It became clear that, not only were certain areas of the city poorly represented by survey results, certain populations were also poorly or not represented (Spanish speakers, for instance.) Survey results did show, though, that Goshen residents identified strongly with their neighborhoods, few had neighborhood associations, and a **high percentage (about 70 percent) said they would participate if a neighborhood association were available.**

It was decided to incorporate a strong neighborhood component into the Plan. Key people, especially those associated with or working with segments of the community that were poorly represented in the survey, were asked to suggest **residents who might provide leadership in a neighborhood organizing process.** Flyers were sent home to all Goshen Community Schools parents to solicit interest in neighborhood organizing. Church leaders were contacted as were other community organizations and agencies. **A list of 120 residents** was compiled and contacts were made to gauge interest in neighborhood organizing.

Out of the original eleven neighborhoods with three or more contact people, five neighborhoods (described in the People and Neighborhoods chapter) were interested in taking on responsibility for launching the neighborhood organizing process. These became the **"model" neighborhoods** for developing the process. Of the others, all participants were interested in the neighborhood organization concept but felt more people were needed to make it a reality.

### *Liaison Committee Representation*

*Builders' Association. of Elkhart County  
Commission on Human Relations  
Community Sustainability Project  
El Puente News  
Elkhart Co. Planning & Development  
Elkhart Co. Cooperative Extension Service  
Elkhart Co. Soil and Water Conservation  
Face of the City Main Street Program  
Goshen Chamber of Commerce  
Goshen City Council  
Goshen College  
Goshen Community Schools  
Goshen Engineering Dept.  
Goshen Housing Authority  
Goshen Mayor's Office  
Goshen Ministerial Association  
Goshen Parks and Recreation Dept.  
Goshen Plan Commission  
Goshen Redevelopment Commission  
Goshen Utilities Dept.  
Greencroft  
Habitat for Humanity  
La Casa of Goshen  
Merry Lea Environmental Center  
Michiana Area Council of Governments  
Oaklawn  
Old Town Neighborhood Assn.  
Rollpak  
The Truth*

*The neighborhood was identified as the focus for cultivation and change.*

The planning team decided to focus on these goals:

- Facilitate the process of neighborhood organizing in the five “model” neighborhoods.
- Gather information citywide from residents about the direction they want the City to go. Do this on a **neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis**.
- Delineate proposed neighborhood boundaries. Invite residents from every neighborhood to participate in a **regional meeting**.
- Distribute information about neighborhood organizing at each of **eleven regional meetings** to build interest in the process.

A format was developed to pursue each goal. Five neighborhood organizing committees were created who worked together to plan a neighborhood gathering. Each gathering took the form of a neighborhood block party. Two of the summer meetings were ice cream and watermelon socials and the two winter meetings were carry-in snack parties. The fifth meeting was held in association with a block party already scheduled by the North Goshen Mennonite Church and neighborhood representatives attended that meeting to gather input from attendees. It was later determined that the input was not sufficient to represent the entire neighborhood so a door-to-door survey was conducted. Three of the neighborhoods also held ‘walks’ in which physical features of the neighborhood were evaluated.

The purpose of these activities was to build relationships between neighbors, inform and invite residents into the planning process, and gather input about their neighborhood likes and dislikes...features they valued and those that concerned them, that could advise planners about resident concerns.

Planners learned several things in the ‘model’ neighborhood process. First, they received input about what features residents believe constitute their particular neighborhood boundaries, what neighborhood size they were comfortable with, and what characteristics identify their neighborhood. This information was used to create proposed boundaries for **39 neighborhoods in eleven regions** throughout the rest of the city.

Second, planners identified appropriate meeting formats that would facilitate discussion and provide neighbors with a meaningful opportunity to be heard. From that, methods were developed to conduct introductions (neighbors were asked to ‘interview’ each other), gather likes and dislikes (often, a ball was passed around a circle to give everyone a chance to speak and limit input to a reasonable time,) and (in most groups) sort and prioritize information (residents were given sticky dots to identify their top concerns.)

Third, planners gained a better sense of how to disseminate information to attract the highest level of participation. Door-to-door contact provided the greatest return but wasn’t feasible on a citywide scale. A combination of radio announcements on Spanish language stations, contacts with key people, and colorful invitations sent to all households within each region resulted in an average of 19 people at each of 16 meetings for **total neighborhood participation of about 300 people**. Invitation flyers were sent out in English, and Spanish and translation was provided at every meeting, but only a handful of Spanish speakers participated.

**The neighborhood meeting process** was conducted from late summer of 2002 until April of 2003 with the establishment of two neighborhood associations and the initiation of two more. Some interest was shown at every regional meeting for neighborhood building activities and strong interest (resulting in contacts to planners after the meetings) was shown in at least half. All identified priorities were entered into a data base to be presented as addenda to this document.

*Block parties  
and  
neighborhood  
walks*

*The process of learning  
about each one’s bound-  
aries, uniqueness, and  
problems spawned several  
neighborhood based  
associations and improve-  
ment projects... and  
a powerful new way of  
getting things done  
in Goshen.*

*“Casting the net wide”  
to hear  
from everyone*

*City staff and  
departments  
contributed to the Plan*

*And what about you?*

*Action-oriented  
committees will use the  
implementation sections  
as their primer, or work-  
book, to get the Plan done.*

Even with strong resident participation in advisory councils and neighborhood meetings, the planners felt that some segments of the community were not well represented. To address that gap, and to enhance the human element further, **community profiles** were gathered from people throughout the city who belonged to or represented groups that had not been sufficiently heard (social service agencies, Hispanics, boards and commissions, etc.) Their profiles are interspersed throughout the document.

Finally, City staff were urged to participate in departmental meetings, describing their responsibilities and voicing successes and challenges in their duties. Staff were asked to add to the planning team’s understanding of the evolving community as a whole. Their input is incorporated into the chapters of the Plan.

## Implementing the 2004-13 Comprehensive Plan

The chapters that follow, unlike the core principles of the Comprehensive Plan, are flexible and full of great ideas that can be put on a fast track, or re-prioritized, or finessed, as resources and conditions allow. The implementation process is a fluid one, **but once a year each chapter will get a thorough going-over** by the Plan Commission and City department managers. In fact the comprehensive plan is now on the agenda of every Plan Commission meeting, and will frame the discussions of City staff retreats and other forums in the foreseeable future.

And what about your role in the plan? As much as it is important for leaders to know the tenets of the comprehensive plan, they are also yours to explore, and to add to interesting ideas and creative approaches throughout the document. Many of the implementation steps identify the who-what-where-when they get done, and your own solutions are welcome too!

You can join or send ideas to the ad hoc, **area-specific groups that will prioritize implementation strategies based on available dollars, organizations, volunteers and other resources. Those advisory/steering groups will support City department managers as they carry out the plan in their areas.** And some of these approaches will change with circumstances. We won’t implement all these ideas, but the overriding vision for the next ten years will hold fast: *Goshen, a place that inspires, innovates, learns, prospers, and manages resources.*

Resident input throughout the planning process indicated expectations for the City that include protecting the small town atmosphere; creative strategies to fuel growth and reduce negative impact to its character, social fabric, and environmental integrity; and a broad referendum for neighborhood-based involvement in planning and decision-making. Leveraging opportunities to apply “best planning practices” and respected information resources gives our community a document that can help us turn vision into reality.

New themes are emerging in community planning, most springing from the conflict between our American spirit of “unlimited horizons” and the realities of limited land and resources. Those flashpoints include: development, job growth and business recruitment ideals, weighed against unintended consequences on other aspects of the community; knowing the full ripple of short range land use and economic opportunities on sustainable growth; and steering legislation to local control. Goshen enjoys the ‘luxury’ of charting its **growth opportunities**, and following its destiny... if through the rifts it throws all its muscle on the helm.

The City of Goshen faces **great challenges**, too, over the next ten years. These include physical and population growth, dramatic demographic and cultural shifts, dependence on a manufacturing economy, budget constraints, and the unknown.

Please get involved, roll up your sleeves, and join your neighbors to make Goshen what it can be at its very best.

## What is Smart Growth?

The Goshen Comprehensive Plan and implementation strategies subscribe to a far-sighted philosophy of sustainable, well-managed growth, often called ‘smart growth’.

“Smart growth is growth that enhances the value and character of existing business and community investments, and accommodates growing regional populations. Smart growth acknowledges that new growth is necessary, and when done well, is critical to the health of existing neighborhoods. New collaborations between the public and private sectors are aimed at rewarding development that accomplishes this goal. Communities that successfully meet the challenge not only will improve quality of life for their citizens but will also retain their investment value longer. These places will be attractive sites for new investment and growth, which will improve their ability to compete in the world economy.

Smart growth strategies include: mixed land uses, compact building design, housing opportunities and choices, walkable communities, preservation of open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environment areas, strengthening and directed development toward existing communities, provision for a variety of transportation choices, predictable, fair, and cost-effective development decisions, community and stakeholder collaboration, and the fostering of distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place.”

### THE SMART GROWTH NETWORK

<http://www.smartgrowth.org>  
 also includes news by state

#### *Other resources:*

- SMART GROWTH AMERICA  
<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.com>
- BROOKINGS INSTITUTION  
[http://www.brook.edu/urban/publications\\_200403\\_smartgrowth.htm](http://www.brook.edu/urban/publications_200403_smartgrowth.htm)
- ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
[http://www.epa.gov/livability/getting\\_to\\_sg2.htm](http://www.epa.gov/livability/getting_to_sg2.htm)
- AMERICAN FARMLAND TRUST  
[http://www.farmland.org/policy/issues\\_smartgrowth.htm](http://www.farmland.org/policy/issues_smartgrowth.htm)
- JUSTICE TALKING: Smart Growth debated (audio and online forum)  
<http://www.justicetalking.org/viewprogram.asp?progID=432>
- LINCOLN INSTITUTE of LAND POLICY  
[http://www.lincolninst.edu/topics/urban\\_regional.asp](http://www.lincolninst.edu/topics/urban_regional.asp)
- REASON PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE  
<http://www.rppi.org/smartgrowthtypes.html>
- NATIONAL CENTER for SMART GROWTH RESEARCH and EDUCATION  
<http://www.smartgrowth.umd.edu/pdf/HealthSprawl8.03.pdf>
- CATO INSTITUTE  
<http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv24n3/otoole.pdf>
- THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION  
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/SmartGrowth/wm137.cfm>
- THE TRUST for PUBLIC LAND  
<http://www.tpl.org/index.cfm>
- NEW URBAN NEWS  
<http://www.newurbannews.com>
- ON COMMON GROUND (National Assn. of Realtors, many viewpoints)  
<http://www.realtor.org/SG3.nsf/Pages/oncommoninfo>

*This list represents various viewpoints toward land use, development, smart growth and related issues. They are included to show the complexity of land use policies and decision-making, not as an endorsement of all the positions on these sites.*

*Each of these links is active at the time of Plan publication.*