



STATE OF INDIANA

MIKE BRAUN, Governor

PUBLIC ACCESS COUNSELOR
BRITTNEY A. LONG

Statehouse Room 105
200 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2745
Telephone: (317) 234-0906
Fax: (317) 233-3091
Toll Free: 1-800-228-6013
Email: pac@opac.in.gov
Website: www.IN.gov/pac

October 23, 2026

Re: Complaint 26-FC-211
Linda Thompson (Complainant) v.
Pittsboro Redevelopment Commission/Pittsboro Town Council
(Respondent)

This advisory opinion is issued in response to the above-referenced complaint filed on April 23, 2026.

A Notice of Complaint, along with a copy of the complaint, was sent to the Respondent on May 11, 2026, requesting a formal response by June 9, 2026. A formal response, submitted by attorney, James Buddenbaum, of Parr Richey Frandsen Patterson Kruse, on behalf of Respondent, was received in this office on June 6, 2026.

The complaint alleges that Respondent violated the Open Door Law when it failed to properly notice a public meeting held on April 7, 2026.

ANALYSIS

The Open Door Law (ODL) requires public agencies to conduct and take official actions openly, unless otherwise expressly provided by statute, so the people may be fully informed. Indiana Code (IC) 5-14-1.5-1. As a result, the ODL requires all meetings of the governing bodies of public agencies to be open at all times to allow members of the public to observe and record the proceedings. IC 5-14-1.5-3(a).

On April 7, 2026, a meeting of the Redevelopment Commission (RDC) was held. This was a reconvening of the March 19, 2026 meeting due to a failure to have a quorum. Respondent states the new date of April 7, 2026 was announced at the March 19, 2026 meeting to those who were in attendance. The information was emailed to the non-present members that evening via email.

Complainant alleges that notice was not properly posted 48-hours in advance, pursuant to IC 5-14-1.5-5. Complainant submitted photos with the complaint, but this office cannot decipher when the photos were taken as they are not file

stamped, nor can this office decipher what is written on the documents in the photographs due to the poor quality of the photos.

Respondent, in its formal response, states that on April 3, 2026 proper notice was posted on the front doors of the Town Administration Building and the Town Hall. In addition, it states the agenda for the meeting was posted on the Town's website.

This office will note that the photographs provided with Complainant's complaint do not appear to be of any doors.

ODL provides,

(a) Public notice of the date, time, and place of any meetings, executive sessions, or of any rescheduled or reconvened meeting, shall be given at least forty-eight (48) hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting. This requirement does not apply to reconvened meetings (not including executive sessions) where announcement of the date, time, and place of the reconvened meeting is made at the original meeting and recorded in the memoranda and minutes thereof, and there is no change in the agenda.

IC 5-14-1.5-5(a). *Emphasis added.*

Further,

(b) Public notice shall be given by the governing body of a public agency as follows:

(1) The governing body of a public agency shall give public notice by posting a copy of the notice at the principal office of the public agency holding the meeting or, if no such office exists, at the building where the meeting is to be held.

IC 5-14-1.5-5(b).

Here, if Respondent recorded the announcement of the new date and time in the memoranda and minutes of the March 19, 2026 meeting and did not change the agenda, then it was not required to repost notice of the April 7, 2026 meeting at all. However, Respondent did post notice of the April 7, 2026 meeting on the doors of the building where the meeting was to be held. There has been no information provided to this office to suggest that notice was not on the doors of the building on April 3, 2026, as stated by Respondent.

Respondent does note there may have been confusion about having posted notice on both the doors of the Administrative Building and the Town Hall. It further recognizes there may have been confusion about posting in the display cases versus posting on the actual doors. Respondent has indicated it intends to develop a streamlined process for a more consistent notice posting in the future.

CONCLUSION

This office finds that Respondent did not violate ODL as alleged in the complaint.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brittney A. Long", is written over the printed name and title.

Brittney A. Long
Public Access Counselor