

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

Be it Remembered that the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana, met in regular session on April 10, 2023. The meeting was held in the Council Chambers, on the second floor of the City Building, 124 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, Indiana and was called to order at 6:40 p.m.

Mayor Senter led the Pledge of Allegiance and Councilman Ecker offered prayer.

Mayor Senter presided for Council Members Greg Compton, Duane Culp, Don Ecker Jr., Jeff Houin, Robert Listenberger, Randy Longanecker and Shloh Carothers Milner. City Attorney Surrisi and Clerk-Treasurer Gorski were present. The public was able to see and hear the meeting through Microsoft Teams.

Council Members Culp and Ecker moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the regular session of the Common Council on March 27, 2023 as presented. The motion carried.

Council Members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to open the public hearing for Plymouth Hospitality LLC Tax Abatement. The motion carried.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING Notice is hereby given to the citizens of Plymouth, Marshall County, Indiana, that a public hearing will be conducted by the Common Council of the City of Plymouth on a request for tax abatement on real property by Plymouth Hospitality, LLC, located at 2840 Miller Drive, Plymouth, IN. A statement of	benefits is on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's office, 124 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, IN. The real estate has been designated within an Economic Revitalization Area pursuant to IC 6-1.1-12.1-1 on March 27, 2023. A description of the affected area is available and can be inspected in the County Assessor's Office. Said hearing will be held on Monday, April 10, 2023, in the Council Chambers of the City Building, 124 N. Michigan St., (Garro Street entrance), Plymouth, IN at the Common Council meeting at 6:30 p.m.	Persons appearing at such public hearing shall have the right to be heard on the proposed project. Disabled persons needing special accommodations, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 574-936-2948. Dated this 29th day of March, 2023. Lynn M. Gorski Clerk-Treasurer City of Plymouth, Indiana April 11, 2023 - P April 1, 2023 PM044959 hmgxap
---	--	--

Greg Hildebrand would like to speak in favor of granting this request. He states this hotel will provide 15 jobs with an additional \$425,000 annual payroll. He explains this will be an additional source of innkeeper's tax for the county and it will also bring in through the 10-year abatement process over \$1 million in tax revenue for the city.

Ecker asks if he can touch more on the building proposed as far as the number of floors, rooms and so on.

Hildebrand responds by stating it is a four-story building with 75 sleeping units. He states it will be in the first lot east of where Mancino's is currently located. He explains they are looking forward to breaking ground this Spring and it will probably be a year and a half until construction is complete.

Mayor Senter asks what brand it is.

Hildebrand responds by stating it will be a Hampton Inn.

Council Members Longanecker and Compton moved and seconded to close the public hearing for the Plymouth Hospitality LLC Tax Abatement. The motion carried.

Council Members Houin and Milner moved and seconded to open the public hearing for AK Industries Inc./ S & S Properties, LLC Tax Abatement. The motion carried.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given to the citizens of Plymouth, Marshall County, Indiana, that a public hearing will be conducted by the Common Council of the City of Plymouth on a request for tax abatement on personal property by AK Industries, Inc./S & S Properties, LLC, located at 2055 Pido Drive/1420 Stanley Drive, Plymouth, IN. A statement of benefits is on file in the Clerk-Treasurer's office, 124 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, IN.

The real estate has been designated within an Economic Revitalization Area pursuant to IC 6-1-1-12-1-1 on March 27, 2023. A description of the affected area is available and can be inspected in the County Assessor's Office.

Said hearing will be held on Monday, April 10, 2023, in the Council Chambers of the City Building, 124 N. Michigan St., (Garro Street entrance), Plymouth, IN at the Common Council meeting at 6:30 p.m. Persons appealing at such public hearing shall have the right to be heard on the proposed project. Disabled persons needing special accommodations, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 574-936-2948.

Dated this 29th day of March, 2023.

Lynn M. Gorski
Clerk-Treasurer
City of Plymouth, Indiana
April 1, 2023 - P
April 1, 2023 PM34460 hspawp

Greg Hildebrand states that he is in favor of granting this request. He states this is a personal property tax abatement that is seven year phased in. He explains this is for a rather large piece of equipment, a rotary mold that they fashion sewer basins with. He adds they also do some fiberglass winding out there. He states this is for a \$3 million piece of equipment that will create 10 new jobs and retain about 107 jobs that are out there now. He adds those are \$20/ hour jobs.

Council Members Houin and Longanecker moved and seconded to close the public hearing for the AK Industries Inc./ S & S Properties, LLC Tax Abatement. The motion carried.

City Attorney Surrisi presented Ordinance No. 2023-2212, Ordinance Re-Establishing the Cumulative Capital Development Fund Under Indiana Code 36-9-15.5 on second reading.

Council Members Ecker and Houin moved and seconded to approve Ordinance No. 2023-2212, Ordinance Re-Establishing the Cumulative Capital Development Fund Under Indiana Code 36-9-15.5 on second reading. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Compton, Culp, Ecker, Houin, Listenberger, Longanecker and Milner
Councilman Opposed: N/A

City Attorney Surrisi presented Ordinance No. 2023-2212, Ordinance Re-Establishing the Cumulative Capital Development Fund Under Indiana Code 36-9-15.5 on third reading.

Council Members Houin and Ecker moved and seconded to approve Ordinance No. 2023-2212, Ordinance Re-Establishing the Cumulative Capital Development Fund Under Indiana Code 36-9-15.5 on third reading. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Compton, Culp, Ecker, Houin, Listenberger, Longanecker and Milner
Councilman Opposed: N/A

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

City of Plymouth, Indiana
ORDINANCE NO. 2023-2212
ORDINANCE RE-ESTABLISHING THE
CUMULATIVE CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND
Under Indiana Code 36-9-15.5




BE IT ORDAINED by the Common Council of the City of Plymouth of Marshall County, Indiana that a need now exists for the reestablishment of a Cumulative Capital Development Fund for all uses as set out in IC 36-9-15.5.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this Council will adhere to the provisions of Indiana Code 36-9-15.5. The proposed fund will not exceed:

\$0 0500 per \$100 of assessed valuation beginning with taxes payable in 2024.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that proofs of publication of the public hearing held on the 27th day of March, 2023, and a certified copy of this Ordinance shall be submitted to the Department of Local Government Finance of the State of Indiana as provided by law. This Cumulative Fund is subject to the approval of the Department of Local Government Finance.

Duly adopted by the following vote of the members of said Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana this 10th day of April 2023.

AYE	NAY
	
	
	

Attest:  Fiscal Officer

City Attorney Surtisi presented CF-1's for tax abatements which is presented as follows:

- CF-1 PP – Pretzels, Inc. 2016
- CF-1 PP – Pretzels, Inc. 2018
- CF-1 RP – Pretzels, Inc. 2013
- CF-1 RP – Pretzels, Inc. 2016
- CF-1 PP – AK Industries, Inc.
- CF-1 RP – AK Industries, Inc.
- CF-1 RP – Riverside Commons Apartments LP

Council Members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to approve all the CF-1's as presented. The motion carried.

City Attorney Surtisi presented Resolution No. 2023-1045, A Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth to Approve the Application of George Schricker for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program Grant. George Schricker was present to speak on behalf of this requested application.

Schricker states there are four different parts of this and one is the roof which he applied for twice before but never got done because it was suggested he bundle that into the state grant which he got from OCRA. He states there are four projects. He lists the first as stripping all the paint from the front then zip out all the mortar, tuck point that, then seal it. He lists the second project as painting the front of the building. He lists the third as putting awnings on the front. He lists the last as are two

sections of roof that extend out over what is now Aldridge Medical and the Wild Rose Moon. He states they are getting redone; everything is being torn off and redone.

Compton asks if he has received the OCRA Grant already.

Schricker responds by stating he has received part of those monies already but he has not gotten any of the work done yet as it has to be scheduled in. He states that obviously all the front is dependent on the brick work.

Compton asks if he is applying for the cost of all the repairs plus the state money.

Schricker responds by stating that is what he was told he had to do. He states that however wasn't how he was approached about this initially. He states when the grant was first suggested to him by Brent Martin that the monies would come off the total amount. He states he was then informed by the Mayor and the City Attorney that did not happen so that comes off the remaining amount.

Surrisi states they had a meeting and they just informed Schricker that there had been some discussion among some the Council Members and the Clerk-Treasurer about the State Grant. He states the purpose of the rebate program is to incentivize investment in the exterior buildings by the property owners and how much they are serving the purposes of that incentivizing if they were paying a percentage of what the state had already provided. He states they didn't inform Schricker that wasn't a possibility but it is within their purview of the existing ordinance that they choose to make that full grant but these were some of the discussions they were hearing among the leadership. He believes that exception has only been made once before and that was under different circumstances with the Vinnall building that the 20% was off the whole amount.

Ecker states that he saw some sales tax figures factored in there.

Gorski explains that was on the estimate for BH Awning. She states there was sales tax included in that estimate and the city cannot pay the sales tax.

Schricker states he was unaware and says we are free to cut out the sales tax.

Surrisi states that one other factor he would offer for their consideration is that when

Schricker went and got their approval last year for just the roof work that he has not performed yet. He states that he had asked for consideration as the roof was being torn off and there is uncertainty what is going to be discovered in the decking there. He states they added the language last year to the resolution that says, "however, the rebate amount may be proportionally increased in the event that the applicant's actual cost incurred exceeds the base bid amount for any decking replacement or other now unknown, but reasonably foreseeable, additional repair costs that may be identified during

the roof replacement project.” He explains that was just contemplating the nature of replacing an old roof and that there may be cost that might contribute 20% to those addons.

Houin states he wants to address something Surrisi touched on and he does not want to mischaracterize what he meant by it but it sounded like the purpose of the program was to incentivize the property owners investing in improvements. He states he does not see anything anywhere in the ordinance that talks about who is making the investment. He states that certainly the program is to incentivize improvements throughout the city but he has had this conversation with some of the other council members and in his mind, he can't remember and he wasn't on the Council when the City Center building was improved. He states that in the time he has been on the Council and paid attention to these programs that he has not recalled a time when they ever even inquired where the rest of the funding was coming from. He states it is certainly possible that they have granted these funds in the past to a project that also received other grant money and they just didn't know about it. He states that if Schricker didn't include the information about the press release regarding the OCRA Grant then he does not think they would have known about it in this case. He states in his mind the application meets all of the requirements that are in the ordinance currently and he does not see why they would not grant the request for the 20% rebate off the full amount and not the reduced amount. He explains he certainly understands the concern on if there is state money coming in from other grant sources that they would not want to do that but he believes that is a conversation to have about revising the ordinance for future applications. He states that he does not believe it is fair to change the rules in the middle of this application.

Surrisi states that he believes that is a fair statement and he has no clue on where the other applicants had acquired the rest of their money. He states this was a flashy press release from OCRA that they saw on the news and everyone was proud that we won this grant for Plymouth and investment of state money in our downtown. He explains this is definitely within your discretion to make any award up to 20% under the ordinance.

Compton states that one point they have to keep in mind is that this is all taxpayer's money. He states if the state puts in money, federal government or they do as a city that it all comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. He states he is really in favor of improving the city and he appreciates improving the building and he would certainly wish to support him minus the OCRA money.

Culp states that he really appreciates what he is doing and he thinks it is a great idea but he has to sit up here and make a decision based off of him receiving the OCRA grant and he looks at it

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

as if they give the whole 20% off the thing. He states he may be looking at it wrong but then they are giving 20% more free money off the OCRA grant and he struggles with that decision.

Schricker states they have their legalistic thing to do and all he can do is account for his own investment which has been hundreds of thousands of dollars over the last 45 years and that is how he looks it. He states if he just accounts for his sweat equity that it would be a huge amount to keep that old building alive and kicking. He states that all of these old buildings require a lot to keep alive and kicking. He states he has also demonstrated that one can take an old building like that and renovate it top to bottom and make it something that can be positive for the city. He expressed that he has invested a lot of his own personal time into that building.

Compton agrees with him that Schricker has and he is speaking as someone who was on the board of the Wild Rose Moon for so many years. He states that Schricker had donated all his time into that and a lot of time and a lot of his own money with the building. He states his contribution to our city and the culture of our city is greatly appreciated and he believes that is worth mentioning.

Schricker states taking on a project like this, a building like this or any downtown building is going to be from anyone's standpoint, whether it be the new people that moved in down the block from him, that they are going to be surprised by all the various kinds of things that have to be done with an old building to keep it running. He states in a historical district that it is just an ongoing project that is never-ending. He explains you are keeping some heritage alive here in the city.

Listenberger asks Ecker if he has done the math and knows the dollar amount difference they are talking about. He states that he did not do the math.

Milner responds by stating the amount is \$7,789.50.

Longanecker adds that Gorski had already done the math on it.

Ecker asks Surrisi about the possibility of the roof estimate being more than what it is quoted at.

Schricker responds by stating that it won't be substantially higher than that.

Surrisi states that he was saying when they approved a rebate application last year for just the roof that he held off on executing the work because he was considering the OCRA Grant. He states he had come back and asked for their approval for perhaps some additional cost that could be only uncovered after they tear off the roof. He states that may be only another couple thousand dollars for putting totally new roof decking that couldn't be salvaged and he could submit those claims and there would be an extra 20% of that from what was approved last year.

Gorski states that last year's roof estimate including the skylight lens was \$27,243.09.

Ecker asks if that was with the same people.

Schricker responds by stating that it is the same people with Morris Roofing.

Listenberger asks Gorski about the funds where these come from and how much they are sitting on.

Gorski responds by stating they have enough to cover this.

Listenberger asks for a rough estimate of what they have sitting in that account.

Gorski responds by stating \$1.5 million.

Listenberger states they are talking about \$7,789.50 if they subtract out the OCRA grant versus \$15,579 if they don't include the OCRA grant. He states if they go back to what the ordinance or resolution says.

Gorski adds that it is an ordinance.

Listenberger states he doesn't see why they are talking about \$8,000 when they are giving tax abatements like crazy all the time while this is something that supports a business, plus it helps our arts and culture. He states in his opinion they stay with the ordinance.

Houin states that aside from that, even though he agrees with what Listenberger said, that they can all sit here and say they know Schricker and what he has done for the city over the many years and that is great and appreciated. He does not believe that really matters as it can be any applicant if they say that they are going to add this restriction and reduce what they are willing to award because of the source of other funding that this is sending a message to any other applicant that they are willing to change the rules in the middle of the process because they arbitrarily do not like the result. He believes that is unfair to Schricker, any other applicant and to the applicants that have already come to them that they followed the ordinance for and then future applicants who do not know whether they will follow the ordinance or not. He states if they want to talk later about changing the ordinance then that is a very reasonable discussion to have and perhaps, they want to put a restriction on it moving forward but he does not think they can arbitrarily change that right now and have it be a fair application.

Compton explains that is why it is brought to the council for them to discuss and decide.

Gorski states that she cannot speak on the ordinance from 2013 because she gave her copy away but she highlighted the wording eligible costs.

Houin states there is nothing in the ordinance that tells them what is eligible or what is not.

Gorski states that is their decision what the eligible cost is.

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

Houin rephrases that and states that it does say what is eligible and what is not. He states that it talks about eligible properties, eligible work, eligible owners and if you meet all those requirements that it would require their approval. He states what he believes what it is contemplating is a review of the application to see if it meets the eligibility requirements that are currently in the ordinance and not that they simply make up new rules because they believe there ought to be additional rules.

Surrisi states that he would just qualify that he appreciates what he is saying that they have not done this in maybe the expectation of past and future applicants might be very based on the decision here but he feels if the council board were to choose to award a lessor amount that this would not be following the ordinance. He believes that it is baked into the ordinance that they have discretion to award up to 20% and generally he can't recall in his 11+ years that they have not worked under the same ordinance but that it has changed a little. He states that it used to go to a committee that made recommendations to the council and it was always rubber stamping them so they got rid of the committee. He explains that he cannot remember a time where they ever awarded less than 20% as it has been very standard but he believes it is within the ordinance and their discretion that it can be a lesser amount.

Ecker states that he is going to make a motion that they modify the request. He states that he is wrestling with the grant as well and he understands and respects Houin's point on this but he is also concerned about the roof. He states that because you can get hit with some unknown costs that he would propose they modify this request instead of the \$38,947.50 that he would make a motion that they approve this at 20% of \$45,000.00 to give him some additional cushion if there is additional roof expense that they do not anticipate. He states they are already looking at \$1,000 more than what it was a year ago and there is guarantee it is going to get better. He states with material costs and other hidden things that have not been discovered.

Houin asks if there is a basis to \$45,000.00 or is that just an arbitrary number that is more than \$38,947.50.

Ecker states that instead of the \$38,947.50 that he is anticipating additional expenses that will be unforeseen at this point and so if they modify that up to \$45,000.00 and grant the 20% off that then that would give him some additional funding there to support that potential cost.

Mayor Senter asks how long he has owned the building.

Schricker responds by stating that it has been in the family since his great-grandfather so it has been passed down since then.

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

Mayor Senter asks how many roofs it has been in that time frame.

Schricker states that he has kept this roof limping for 40 years by just going up and recoating it every year himself.

Listenberger explains that he has seen him do that and he does not need to be up there on that roof like that.

Council Members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to approve Resolution No. 2023-1045, A Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth to Approve the Application of George Schricker for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program Grant with a modification to the base amount of the cost incurred to \$45,000.00. The motion was defeated by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Culp, Ecker and Longanecker

Councilman Opposed: Compton, Houin, Listenberger and Milner

Listenberger states that they have \$1.5 million in this fund and he does not know why they are even discussing this. He states that it was never done any differently. He asks if the reason is just because of the OCRA grant. He states we should incent people to do that and above and he does not see why they would change it up now.

Houin states the OCRA grant is what is allowing the applicant to go from the simple roof repair that he applied for previously and they approved to a complete of the façade as well as the needed roof repairs. He states this is the exact type of improvement in Plymouth they need to be encouraging and they should encourage it by following the same procedure that they have done for everyone else.

Compton states that he does agree this should be an incentive and he is sorry that they need to have this discussion but he is really amazed they do not realize why they are trying to adapt this to the OCRA grant. He states that is their tax money going to OCRA. He states the state has been kind enough to deduct \$45,000 from this project and they are going to put in another almost \$7,800 toward it and he believes that is great. He apologizes that they have to put such a negative spin on that.

Schricker states this was presented wrongly to him in the beginning from Brent Martin that this money would be available to him.

Compton states that he is sorry that happened.

Schricker states that he would just like them to know that this is how it was presented to him.

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

Houin states that he does not believe that was presented wrong to him and that was always the way they applied the program and why he makes his motion.

Council Members Houin and Listenberger moved and seconded to approve Resolution No.

2023-1045, A Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth to Approve the Application of George Schricker for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program Grant for 20% of the full cost of the estimate submit. The motion was defeated by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Houin, Listenberger and Milner

Councilman Opposed: Compton, Culp, Ecker and Longanecker

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-1045

A RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH TO APPROVE
THE APPLICATION OF GEORGE SCHRICKER
FOR A COMMERCIAL REVITALIZATION REBATE PROGRAM GRANT

WHEREAS, the City has established the Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program to encourage property owners to renovate existing buildings and to make other real property improvements. The encouragement is in the form of a rebate to the property owner of an amount not to exceed twenty percent (20%) of the actual project costs directly related to the eligible improvements, not to exceed Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000.00); and

WHEREAS, George Schricker, has made application to the Plymouth Common Council for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program grant to assist in the renovation of commercial property at 113 & 115 N. Michigan St. for a new roof, new awning, masonry work, and painting. The Council met in a public meeting on April 10, 2023, and heard evidence on the application demonstrating eligible expenses for the renovation with a bid totaling \$84,162.00 minus the OCRA Grant George Schricker is to receive from the State of Indiana, leaving the eligible expense of \$38,947.50. The purpose and intent of this resolution is to approve the application as set forth below.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Common Council of the City of Plymouth as follows:

Section 1. George Schricker's application for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program grant for 113 & 115 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, Indiana is hereby approved.

Section 2. The Clerk-Treasurer is authorized to disburse from the appropriate fund, and in accordance with established procedure, a rebate to the applicant consisting of Twenty Percent (20%) of the actual cost incurred by the applicant for eligible expenses for the renovation completed on 113 & 115 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, Indiana. In no event shall the rebate to the applicant exceed Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Eighty-Nine Dollars and Fifty Cents (\$7,789.50).

Section 3. The Clerk-Treasurer is further authorized to transfer money from the City Development Fund to the Community Improvement Fund in an amount necessary to cover the costs of the eligible expenses approved by this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 10th day of April, 2023.

ATTEST:

Aym M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer


Mark Senter, Presiding Officer

Council Members Compton and Houin moved and seconded to approve Resolution No.

2023-1045, A Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth to Approve the Application of George Schricker for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program Grant by subtracted out the OCRA money and additionally the sales tax money making the 20% be \$7,789.50. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Compton, Culp, Ecker, Houin, Listenberger, Longanecker and Milner

Councilman Opposed: N/A

Houin states that he would second as they need to award some type of grant for this program and that he will vote in favor under protest.

Ecker states that he was really hoping they would get the \$45,000.00 approved.

Kathy Bottorff asks for clarification on what money the \$1.5 million is.

Gorski responds by stating that is money that is the City Development Fund.

Bottorff asks if that came from the sale of the hospital many years ago and they are using the interest off of that. Mayor Senter states that is correct.

City Attorney Surrisi presented Resolution No. 2023-1047, A Resolution of the City of

Plymouth Confirming the Adoption of a Declaratory Resolution Designating Certain Real Estate

Within the City of Plymouth to be Within an "Economic Revitalization Area" for Purposes of

Personal Property Tax Abatement Pursuant to I.C. 6-1.1-12.1 et. seq. (AK Industries, Inc./ S & S Properties, LLC).

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-1047
RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH
CONFIRMING THE ADOPTION OF A DECLARATORY RESOLUTION
DESIGNATING CERTAIN REAL ESTATE
WITHIN THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH TO BE WITHIN AN
"ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION AREA" FOR PURPOSES OF
PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT
PURSUANT TO I.C. 6-1.1-12.1 *et. seq.*
(AK INDUSTRIES, INC./S & S PROPERTIES, LLC)

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2023, the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, adopted Resolution No. 2023-1047, entitled a "Resolution of the City of Plymouth Declaring Certain Real Estate to be within an "Economic Revitalization Area" Pursuant to I.C. § 6-1.1-12.1 *et seq.*," and,

WHEREAS, the Declaratory Resolution found that a certain area in the City of Plymouth was an economic revitalization area within the meaning of I.C. § 6-1.1-12.1, (the Act) as amended, for the purpose of allowing deductions from the assessed value of personal property acquisitions; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 2.5(b) and 2.5(c)(2) of the Act, the Clerk-Treasurer has filed the Declaratory Resolution, and related documents with other appropriate taxing units and the Marshall County Assessor; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2.5(c)(1) of the Act, notice of the adoption and substance of the Declaratory Resolution has been published in accordance with I.C. § 5-3-1; and,

WHEREAS, at a public hearing held by the Common Council on the 10th day of April, 2023 at 6:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 124 N. Michigan St. (Garro St. Entrance, Second Floor), Plymouth, Indiana, the Council heard all persons interested in the proceedings and received any written remonstrance and objections, and considered the same, if any, and all other evidence presented; and,

WHEREAS, the Common Council now desires to take final action and make the necessary findings in accordance with Section 3 and Section 4.5 of the Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana, as follows:

Section 1. After consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on the 10th day of April, 2023, the Common Council finds the qualifications for an economic revitalization area have been met.

Section 2. Accordingly, the Common Council hereby confirms the Declaratory Resolution designating the area described as an economic revitalization area for the purposes of

tax abatement. This designation is for personal property tax abatement and is limited to two (2) calendar years from March 27, 2023, the date of the adoption of the Declaratory Resolution.

Section 3. Based upon the totality of benefits of this project, as evidenced in the currently submitted Statement of Benefits, and pursuant to Section 17 of the Act, the Common Council hereby determines the property owner is qualified for and is granted personal property tax abatement for a period of seven (7) years, according to the following schedule:

YEAR OF DEDUCTION	PERCENTAGE
1 st	100%
2 nd	85%
3 rd	71%
4 th	57%
5 th	43%
6 th	29%
7 th	14%

Section 4. By the Common Council determining the public utility and benefit of the proposed personal property improvements in the revitalization area, this resolution constitutes final action pursuant to Section 2.5(c) of the Act. Further, this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption by the Common Council, approval by the Mayor, and due attestation.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Common Council this 10th day of April, 2023.

ATTEST: 
Mark Seifert, Presiding Officer


Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Council Members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to approve Resolution No.

2023-1047, A Resolution of the City of Plymouth Confirming the Adoption of a Declaratory

Resolution Designating Certain Real Estate Within the City of Plymouth to be Within an "Economic

Revitalization Area" for Purposes of Personal Property Tax Abatement Pursuant to I.C. 6-1.1-12.1

et. seq. (AK Industries, Inc./ S & S Properties, LLC) as presented. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Compton, Culp, Ecker, Houin, Listenberger, Longanecker and Milner

Councilman Opposed: N/A

City Attorney Surrisi presented Resolution No. 2023-1048, Resolution of the City of

Plymouth Confirming the Adoption of a Declaratory Resolution Designating Certain Real Estate

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

Within the City of Plymouth to be Within an “Economic Revitalization Area” for Purposes of Real Property Tax Abatement Pursuant to I.C. 6-1.1-12.1 et. seq. (Plymouth Hospitality, LLC).

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-1048

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH
CONFIRMING THE ADOPTION OF A DECLARATORY RESOLUTION
DESIGNATING CERTAIN REAL ESTATE
WITHIN THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH TO BE WITHIN AN
“ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION AREA” FOR PURPOSES OF
REAL PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT PURSUANT TO I.C. 6-1.1-12.1 et. seq.
(PLYMOUTH HOSPITALITY, LLC)

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2023, the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, adopted Resolution No. 2023-1039, entitled a “Resolution of the City of Plymouth Declaring Certain Real Estate to be within an “Economic Revitalization Area” Pursuant to I.C. § 6-1.1-12.1 et seq.,” and,

WHEREAS, the Declaratory Resolution found that a certain area in the City of Plymouth was an economic revitalization area within the meaning of I.C. § 6-1.1-12.1, (the Act) as amended, for the purpose of allowing deductions from the assessed value of the real property improvements; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 2.5(6) and 2.5(6)(2) of the Act, the Clerk-Treasurer has filed the Declaratory Resolution, and related documents with other appropriate taxing units and the Marshall County Assessor; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2.5(6)(1) of the Act, notice of the adoption and substance of the Declaratory Resolution has been published in accordance with I.C. § 5-3-1; and,

WHEREAS, at a public hearing held by the Common Council on the 10th day of April, 2023 at 6:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 124 N. Michigan St. (Garro St. Entrance, Second Floor), Plymouth, Indiana, the Council heard all persons interested in the proceedings and received any written remonstrance and objections, and considered the same, if any, and all other evidence presented; and,

WHEREAS, the Common Council now desires to take final action and make the necessary findings in accordance with Section 3 of the Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana, as follows:

Section 1. After consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on the 10th day of April, 2022, the Common Council finds the qualifications for an economic revitalization area have been met.

Section 2. Accordingly, the Common Council hereby confirms the Declaratory Resolution designating the area described as an economic revitalization area for the purposes of tax abatement. This designation is for real property tax abatement and is limited to two (2) calendar years from March 27, 2023, the date of the adoption of the Declaratory Resolution.

Council Members Longanecker and Ecker moved and seconded to approve Resolution No.

2023-1048, Resolution of the City of Plymouth Confirming the Adoption of a Declaratory

Resolution Designating Certain Real Estate Within the City of Plymouth to be Within an “Economic Revitalization Area” for Purposes of Real Property Tax Abatement Pursuant to I.C. 6-1.1-12.1 et. seq. (Plymouth Hospitality, LLC) as presented. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Compton, Culp, Ecker, Houin, Listenberger, Longanecker and Milner

Councilman Opposed: N/A

Surtisi states they need to discuss the approval of funds within the cumulative capital development fund.

Gorski states that it doesn’t acquire council approval because it is within the same group of funds but they would move funds from improvements to be able to buy the cars.

Compton asks about the funds they had this year regarding covid. He states that some of those funds were moved into the rainy day fund for the fire department or they said to use those. He asks if they those needed to be moved into a future capital expense fund or is that how that works.

Surtisi responds by stating the rainy day fund does not have any specific funds underneath it for specific purposes.

Compton explains that is why he is asking and whether they should move it or not.

Section 3. Based upon the totality of benefits of this project, as evidenced in the currently submitted Statement of Benefits, and pursuant to Section 17 of the Act, the Common Council hereby determines the property owner is qualified for and is granted real property tax abatement for a period of ten (10) years, according to the following schedule:

YEAR OF DEDUCTION	PERCENTAGE
1 st	100%
2 nd	90%
3 rd	80%
4 th	70%
5 th	60%
6 th	50%
7 th	40%
8 th	30%
9 th	20%
10 th	10%

Section 4. By the Common Council determining the public utility and benefit of the proposed real property improvements in the economic revitalization area, this resolution constitutes final action pursuant to Section 2.5(6) of the Act. Further, this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption by the Common Council, approval by the Mayor, and due attestation.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Common Council this 10th day of April, 2023.

ATTEST:

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Mark Senf, Presiding Officer

Surrisi believes that it was in the minutes that is what their intent when that was put in there but that is a possibility in the future if the council chooses to create a separate fund to transfer funds from the rainy day to a particular fund.

Compton states to segregate the future capital expenses is what he is asking. He asks if they should consider doing that. He believes that his question was answered but he wanted to clarify.

Surrisi responds by stating it is an option they can consider but what the Clerk-Treasurer and him discussed is that they would bring that resolution for utilizing the special purchasing method to the Board of Public Works who is the purchasing agent for the Police Department. He states while transferring money within lines within the cumulative capital development fund didn't take their formal approval, they just wanted to bring it to your attention that that will be taking place to support the police department as it was a large purchase and an unusual procedure.

Mayor Senter asks Surrisi if he wants to explain where he will be going this week.

Surrisi responds by stating he will be participating with a team of folks lead by Garden Court here locally in the Indiana Housing Institute which is a four-month long conference that is held down in Bloomington, Indiana. He states they were one of six teams that were selected to participate in this. He states their team has members from Garden Court, Bowen Center, Linda Yoder (Community Foundation & United Way), Jeff Conifer (SRKM Architecture) and himself. He states that this is sponsored by the Indiana Housing Community Development Authority (IHCD A) and a team has been admitted to this institute program and successfully completes it that IHCD A commits to some point in the future providing grant funding in the form of tax credits for the development of a permanent support housing development. He states what is under consideration is a proposed mixed-use development that would be something similar to townhomes that would be probably be about 80% affordable housing and 20% of the units would be permanent supportive housing units such as what was developed by Garden Court's Serenity Place on West Jefferson Street. He states that this is for folks that may have been experiencing homelessness or have some other needs provided by support services from folks at the Bowen Center and other resources. He explains this is an exciting project and a lot of the details of it are still being decided and worked out with the team over these coming months and it will be concluded with another three-day session next month and there is the possibility of Garden Court being ready to move forward with applying for the grant yet this year which would be at the end of June or it would be that they wait until that grant cycle rolls around again next year. He states that a lot of that depends on their readiness and locked down a location within the city for that and also how many other six teams are ready to go and competing for those

REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, April 10, 2023

same grant funds in the cycle. He states that he feels Serenity Place has been a success so far and having more housing units that aren't just dedicated to that special need in the city with the help of state funding is an encouraging prospect.

Gorski wished to clarify that money to move would be from improvements that's already been appropriated for to equipment in the cumulative capital development fund.

Surrisi states for Stellar Communities there isn't much to share at this time.

Council Members Ecker and Houin moved and seconded to accept the following

communications:

- Minutes of the Board of Public Works and Safety meeting of March 27, 2023
- April 10, 2023 Check Register
- March 28, 2023 Technical Review Committee Minutes
- February 21, 2023 Redevelopment Commission Minutes
- March 7, 2023 Plan Commission Minutes
- March 7, 2023 Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
- Confidential Memo from Salary Committee

The motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Council, Council Members Longanecker and Senter moved and seconded to adjourn, Mayor Senter declared the meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.


Lynn M. Gorski
Clerk-Treasurer

APPROVED


Mark Senter, Mayor