

PLYMOUTH REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

July 20, 2021

Page 1 of 5

The Plymouth Redevelopment Commission met in regular session in the Council Chambers on the second floor of 124 North Michigan Street, Plymouth, Indiana on July 20, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.

President Mike Miley called the meeting to order for Commissioners Billy Ellinger, Nancy Felde, Craig Hopple, Dr. Tom Pedavoli and Melissa Christiansen who were present at the meeting. Other attendees included City Attorney Sean Surrisi, Mayor Mark Senter, Utility Superintendent Donnie Davidson and Clerk-Treasurer Jeanine Xaver. The public was able to see and hear the meeting through Microsoft Teams.

Commissioners Felde and Pedavoli moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last Regular Session meeting and the Executive Session meeting, both of June 15, 2021 as presented. The motion carried.

TIF #1: U.S. 30 / Oak Road Economic Development Area

Update on the Hoham Drive Reconstruction Project - There were no updates at this time.

Veterans Parkway Project Discussion

City Attorney Surrisi explained that the Veterans Parkway Project is a proposal in cooperation with Marshall County to extend Veterans Parkway from Michigan Road to Pioneer Drive. An application to INDOT had been completed for this project previously, but was unsuccessful. This was in part due to a lot of other communities also applying for funding. At the time, INDOT did not have enough funds to award funding to the project. Since then, Kathrine McLear and Greg Wendling of USI Consultants had been working on a way to get the application to be more competitive this time around. Surrisi stated that the Resolutions that were going to be presented were just to get this project on the list of projects for the commission under their respective TIF districts.

Kathrine McLear, of USI Consultants, was present to talk about the potential project. She stated that since the unsuccessful attempt to get the project funded, they had continued talks with INDOT on how to make the application more competitive this time around. One of the recommendations was to have both the city and county apply separately and tie the projects together afterward, instead of as one large project with an interlocal agreement. They also suggested to get started on preliminary engineering, which would be locally funded. This suggestion was due to the fact that INDOT has a hard time denying funding to a project that was already backed by a community and had some financial investment in it. She then provided the breakdown of the funding of the potential project to the commission. She said that this breakdown was very similar to the previous breakdown, with the county supporting 2/3 of the project and the city supporting 1/3 of the project.

McLear suggested that the city only give permission to complete up to stage one design for the project in order to minimize the local financial burden of the project. She stated that the total cost of the preliminary engineering would be \$1.4 million with the city being responsible for \$469,000.00 of the project. Just for stage one of the projects the city would be responsible for \$210,389.49 of the costs. She explained that the first stage of preliminary engineering would be completed by the end of 2021 as the applications for INDOT were typically due in December. The notification of award would be in January, February or March. This awarding of funding would be for construction in 2027. After talks with INDOT there may be funding available for construction in 2024. If the city were to go with the suggestion of USI to complete the preliminary engineering, the project would be ahead of schedule, and have a higher possibility to be moved up. This in turn could result in some cost savings in terms of construction.

Christiansen asked if they were not picked the first time around would the preliminary engineering still be good, and for how long it would remain good. Wendling stated that this would be much more than an engineering report, but would also include surveys, design plans, etc. He believes that these would be good

PLYMOUTH REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

July 20, 2021

Page 2 of 5

for the duration. Previously, they had completed an environmental document for the entire corridor. Since this would just need to be updated, he believes that this would also be another contributing factor to getting the project accelerated since one of the biggest hurdles in the engineering stage was typically the environmental work.

Felde asked who was making the recommendations for the new application. McLear stated that INDOT had been making the suggestions.

Felde asked what would happen if the city's portion of the project were to be approved, but the county's portion were to not be approved. McLear stated that it was not very likely that this were to happen since INDOT had made that recommendation. Wendling added that it could be possible that one section could be funded while the other not be funded right away. This could still allow for half of the project to be built and would build momentum for the other half to be funded.

Felde added that the city portion of the project included a rail road crossing. In the breakdown that was provided to the commission this cost would be covered by the county. McLear stated that the county would be responsible for this since this would be a bridge, and counties are responsible for bridge maintenance and inventory. She stated that they would definitely suggest putting together an interlocal agreement as they had done the last time that would specify the responsibility of each party.

Felde asked what would happen if the city were to be funded and not the county. She also asked if they would just build part of the road and stop at the rail road and then continue the work after the rail road. McLear stated that that's why they would have the interlocal agreement to coordinate with the county on who is to do each item. Surrisi stated that there may not be a certain answer to Felde's question. If the city were to get approved and not the county, there were have to be some work with the county in rescoping the plan.

Hopple asked if the city were to not get the funding would the city be pulling money from the TIF district to fund the city's portion of the project. Surrisi stated that for the preliminary engineering costs the money would be pulled from the TIF district, but if the city were to not get the funding the rest of the engineering work would wait to be done until funding was available.

Miley asked what would be the responsibility of the county for that railroad crossing. Wendling stated that since this would just be a rail road crossing and not a bridge, if the entire crossing was in the city limits it would be the city's responsibility and not the county.

Felde asked if the county acted like they wanted to proceed with stage one planning. McLear stated that they had received full support from the county council and commissioners.

Felde asked if the project were to be delayed a couple of years would the public hearing on Task 6 need to be held once again. Miley stated that he did not see any public hearing costs for the city on this line. Surrisi added that this may also be a type of hearing that may not need to be held if there was no request for it or requirement for it. Wendling added that the environmental document had a public hearing in order to get it approved. As they work to update the environmental document it in turn may require a public hearing from INDOT.

Felde asked if the city/county would have to pay the fee if the public hearing were to not be required. McLear stated that the fee would not have to be paid if the hearing did not need to be held.

PLYMOUTH REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

July 20, 2021

Page 3 of 5

Miley asked if this project would be paid out of Redevelopment Funds. Surrisi confirmed this, and stated that this initial stage was just to get this on the project list for the commission. He added that for the initial funding there may other sources for the payment of this project. For example, there was about \$216,000.00 that MCEDC has that was designated by the Redevelopment Commission for the hotel project. Surrisi stated that he had talked to Laura Walls about this, she agreed to transfer back these funds if needed.

Felde asked if the public hearing was only for environmental topics, or could it be for other topics related to the project as well. Wendling stated that the public hearings tend to include environmental items, but also would give notice to residents along the corridor and would allow them to talk about concerns. If INDOT were to say that the previous public hearing was enough, he would suggest to have a public informational session in order to inform the public and address their concerns at a lowered cost.

Miley asked at what stage that Baker Tilly would come into this project. Surrisi stated that it would be preferable to have it done as soon as possible. Miley asked if these would be ready at the next meeting. Surrisi stated that it would not necessarily be needed by the next meeting since a bulk of the project would be occurring years in the future.

City Attorney Surrisi presented Resolution No. 2021-960: A Declaratory Resolution by the Plymouth Redevelopment Commission Amending the Economic Development Plan for the U.S. 30/Oak Road Economic Development Area (TIF #1) as Originally Established by the Adoption of Resolution No. 93-1 and as Subsequently Amended.

Commissioners Pedavoli and Felde moved and seconded to approve Resolution No. 2021-960: A Declaratory Resolution by the Plymouth Redevelopment Commission Amending the Economic Development Plan for the U.S. 30/Oak Road Economic Development Area (TIF #1) as Originally Established by the Adoption of Resolution No. 93-1 and as Subsequently Amended. The motion carried.

Clerk-Treasurer Xaver asked for authorization for Baker Tilly to prepare a Feasibility Analysis for the Veterans Parkway Project for TIF1 and TIF 3.

Commissioners Ellinger and Hopple moved and seconded to give authorization to Baker Tilly to prepare a Feasibility Analysis for the Veterans Parkway Project for TIF1 and TIF 3.

TIF #3: U.S. 30 / Pine Road Economic Development Area

Veterans Parkway Project Discussion

City Attorney Surrisi presented Resolution No. 2021-961: A Declaratory Resolution by the Plymouth Redevelopment Commission Amending the Economic Development Plan for the U.S. 30/ Pine Road Economic Development Area (TIF #3) as Originally Established by the Adoption of Resolution No. 2004-161 and as Subsequently Amended.

Commissioners Ellinger and Pedavoli moved and seconded to approve Resolution No. 2021-961: A Declaratory Resolution by the Plymouth Redevelopment Commission Amending the Economic Development Plan for the U.S. 30/ Pine Road Economic Development Area (TIF #3) as Originally Established by the Adoption of Resolution No. 2004-161 and as Subsequently Amended. The motion carried.

PLYMOUTH REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

July 20, 2021

Page 4 of 5

Aquatic Center Update

City Attorney Surrisi updated the commission on the aquatic center. He stated that the refinancing of the bonds had been completed and they were progressing to the point of trying to transition to the new operating company for the aquatic center.

Manufacturing Center Update

City Attorney Surrisi updated the commission on the manufacturing center. He said that the walls of the building are now up. After talking to Laura Walls, he was informed that the completion of the project was delayed a bit due to rain. The new completion date for the project would be the beginning of September. He added that there had been a lot of leads on the purchase of the completed building. They were moving toward an agreement with the potential purchaser.

TIF #2: East Jefferson / Central Business Economic Development Area – Nothing at this time

TIF #4: South Gateway / Western Downtown Economic Development Area– Nothing at this time

TIF #5: Western Avenue Economic Development Area

Miley asked if the building had been sold yet. Surrisi said that they were still trying to lease the southern portion of the building. He and Donnie Davidson had recently taken a tour of the building with a prospective lessee.

TIF #6: Plymouth/Goshen Trail Economic Development Area

Update on Centennial Crossings

City Attorney Surrisi gave an update on the Centennial Crossings Project. He said that they were continuing to make progress at a steady pace.

Felde asked if they had laid down any pavement for the road yet. Surrisi stated that they had not, but they expect to do so soon.

Miley asked if they had been working on drainage still. Utility Superintendent Davidson stated that they had mainly been working on drainage, but had also been putting in curbs recently.

Other Business:

There was no other business.

Approval of Redevelopment Invoices

Commissioners Ellinger and Felde moved and seconded to approve of the following Redevelopment Invoices:

- Payment of \$156,520.00 to Old National Bank for the lease payment on City Hall Reconstruction Project to be paid from TIF 1.
- Transfer to other funds in the amount of \$62,560.00 for the Semi-Annual Bond and Interest Payment on the 2012 Series Bonds to be paid from TIF 2.
- Payment of \$178,812.41 to the 1st Source Bank, Trustee for the 2021 Refunding Bond to be paid from TIF 3.
- Payment of \$69,788.15 to the 1st Source Bank, Trustee for the 2018 Redevelopment Commission Bond Series A/2021 Refunding Bond to be paid from TIF 3.
- May Progress Payment to Lochmueller Group in the amount of \$3,446.75 for the Hoham Drive Project Professional Services to be paid from the Hoham Drive Grant Fund.

PLYMOUTH REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

July 20, 2021

Page 5 of 5

- Closeout Payment to Lochmueller Group in the amount of \$1,669.03 for the Pioneer Drive Project Professional Services to be paid from the Pioneer Drive Grant Fund.
- Payment to Bank of New York Mellon in the amount of \$62,560.00 for the Semi-Annual Bond Payment for 2012 Series Bonds to be paid from the TIF Principal and Interest Fund.

The motion carried.

The following communications were provided to the Commissioners:

- 1993 TIF Trial Balance – June 2021 (TIF #1: U.S. 30 / Oak Road Economic Development Area)
- 2000 TIF Trial Balance – June 2021 (TIF #2: East Jefferson / Central Business EDA)
- 2005 TIF Trial Balance – June 2021 (TIF #3: U.S. 30 / Pine Road Economic Development Area)
- 2006 TIF Trial Balance – June 2021 (TIF #4 South Gateway / Western Downtown EDA)

Commissioners Felde and Hopple moved and seconded to accept the communications as presented. The motion carried.

Other Business

The next meeting is scheduled for August 17, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. There being no further business to discuss the meeting was declared adjourned at 6:10 p.m. after a motion and second by Commissioners Pedavoli and Ellinger. The motion carried.



Jeanine M Xaver, IAMC, CMC, ACPFIM
Clerk-Treasurer

