Be it Remembered that the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana, met in regular session on January 12, 2026. 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.

Councilwoman Starr offered prayer, and Mayor Listenberger led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Robert Listenberger presided over Council members Duane Culp, Kayla Krathwohl, Randy Longanecker, Shiloh Carothers Milner, Dave Morrow, and Linda Starr, who were physically present. Council member Don Ecker Jr. was absent. City Attorney Houin and Clerk-Treasurer Lynn Gorski were also present. The public was able to see and hear the meeting through Zoom and streamed live at https://www.youtube.com/@CityofPlymouth.

Council members Krathwohl and Culp moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the regular session of the Common Council on December 22, 2025, as presented. The motion carried.

Clerk-Treasurer Gorski provided a list of mayoral appointments as follows:

Historic Preservation Commission – Mike Miley, Bob Garrison, Kurt Garner

For Council Appointments, the Mayor had suggested the following:

Board of Zoning Appeals Alternate – Mark Record

Council members Culp and Starr moved and seconded to approve the council appointment as presented. The motion carried.

Plan Director Ty Adley introduced PC 2026-02, Certified Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Plymouth.

Adley reviewed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Morrow asked, as far as a representative, if that could be anybody who would come in and say that they're the representative. He asked if they had to be tied to the project in some sense.

Adley replied that it was often somebody tied to that project. He stated that a random individual isn't going to be that.

Morrow stated he understood that and stated he didn't mean random. He stated we shouldn't have to deal with, for example, a friend, where somebody sends their buddy.

Adley stated they usually tie it back to the owner or the developer of that project. He stated that individuals are often there to provide supplemental information to provide clarity on that project. He stated it was very rare that they had a representative of minimal decision-making capability attending; otherwise, that would be a huge risk for the developer to send an individual to that meeting who would not be able to make a final determination.

Longanecker added the same question was asked at the Plan Commission meeting.

Morrow asked if he was okay with it.

Longanecker replied he was fine with the representative, but he had a little heartburn about giving up the sidewalks because he felt like if we were going to have a rule, we should follow it, but it does get governed by the Board of Zoning Appeals. He stated he ultimately voted in favor of this.

Council members Longanecker and Starr moved and seconded to approve PC 2026-02, Certified Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Plymouth as presented. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF PC 2026-02 BY THE PLYMOUTH COMMON COUNCIL

This matter comes before the Plymouth Common Council on the Plymouth Plan Commission's Certified Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Plymouth. After certification, pursuant to Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(e)(l) and Indiana Code§ 5-14-1.5-5, public notice was provided of the Council's intention to consider the Proposal at its regularly scheduled January 12, 2026 meeting. Said meeting was conducted and the Proposal has been considered pursuant to Indiana Code § 36-7-4-603, giving reasonable regard to: (1) the comprehensive plan; (2) current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district; (3) the most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted; (4) the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and (5) responsible development and growth.

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

Section 1. The Certified Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Plymouth is adopted and, pursuant to Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(e)(2), upon adoption, the Proposal takes effect as other ordinances passed by the Council.

Section 2. Pursuant to Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-610(b), a copy of the now adopted amendments to the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Plymouth shall be printed and a copy thereof shall be located in the office of the City of Plymouth Clerk-Treasurer.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Presented by me to the Mayor of the City of Plymouth, Indiana on the 12th day of January, 2026, at 2:30 o'clock p m.

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Approved and signed by me this 12th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Mayor

Plan Director Adley introduced PC 2026-03, Certified Proposal to Amend the Subdivision Control Ordinance for the City of Plymouth.

Adley reviewed the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Morrow asked if the adjustment would still be true if they wanted to make it one large lot.

Adley replied that you could still remove the lot line itself and you'd be creating one less lot within that subdivision, as there's been no issue with that. He explained that, in a recent request to amend an existing lot line, the only way they could do that was by going back through the surveyor, creating a minor subdivision only to simply adjust that lot line itself, and then coming before the Plan Commission, which could be a couple of months at that point. He stated it would be easier to work with the surveyor, get it drafted and done, and then Manuwal could sign off on it within probably 48 hours or less depending on his schedule and the time frame provided. He stated this would make it simpler and more business friendly.

Council members Longanecker and Starr moved and seconded to approve PC 2026-03, Certified Proposal to Amend the Subdivision Control Ordinance for the City of Plymouth as presented. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF PC 2026-03 BY THE PLYMOUTH COMMON COUNCIL

This matter comes before the Plymouth Common Council on the Plymouth Plan Commission's Certified Proposal to Amend the Subdivision Control Ordinance for the City of Plymouth. After certification, pursuant to Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(e)(l) and Indiana Code§ 5-14-1.5-5, public notice was provided of the Council's intention to consider the Proposal at its regularly scheduled January 12, 2026 meeting. Said meeting was conducted and the Proposal has been considered pursuant to Indiana Code § 36-7-4-603, giving reasonable regard to: (1) the comprehensive plan; (2) current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district; (3) the most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted; (4) the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and (5) responsible development and growth.

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

Section 1. The Certified Proposal to Amend the Subdivision Control Ordinance for the City of Plymouth is adopted and, pursuant to Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(e)(2), upon adoption, the Proposal takes effect as other ordinances passed by the Council.

Section 2. Pursuant to Indiana Code§ 36-7-4-610(b), a copy of the now adopted amendments to the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Plymouth shall be printed and a copy thereof shall be located in the office of the City of Plymouth Clerk-Treasurer.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Presented by me to the Mayor of the City of Plymouth, Indiana on the 12th day of January, 2026, at 7:30 o'clock P m.

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Approved and signed by me this 12th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Mayor

City Attorney Houin introduced Ordinance No. 2026-2254, An Ordinance to Repeal and Replace Sections of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Plymouth Concerning the Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program on first reading.

Houin stated this was a result of a lot of work in the last couple of years from a subcommittee of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, and he already had a recommended adjustment to it from the Clerk-Treasurer, so the version that would come to them at the next meeting for second and third reading may have some minor changes to it. He added he would love to hear feedback from anybody else, and he had not heard any other recommendations from that committee, so he believed they were satisfied with the changes.

Culp stated in the beginning that there had been a lot of money taken out of that account.

Houin stated in the preamble, the purpose and intent section, to explain what this was about. He explained that over a million dollars of private investment has been leveraged in this grant program, but not that we have spent a million dollars. He stated we were looking at amending the fund agreement with the Marshall County Community Foundation to realize better returns on that investment. He stated that it would allow us to continue to grow that fund and have more money available in the future.

Culp asked why there was a reduction down to a $10,000 maximum.

Houin replied that the committee reviewing it looked historically at the projects and the rebate grants that had been awarded. He stated that traditionally most of them had been relatively small projects well under that $10,000 threshold. He stated the idea was that if they were going to be smaller projects and we're going to limit the amount of money that's appropriated for this fund every year, then bringing it up to a 50% match can be a greater incentive while keeping the overall project size lower so that it doesn't get used up in one or two projects.

Culp stated a new roof alone on one of the old downtown buildings could be $150,000, so the most they could receive would be $10,000. Houin agreed. Culp stated he would like to see it be a bit more than $10,000.

Krathwohl asked what it was currently.

Houin replied that it was currently limited to 20% of the project with a $25,000 cap. He stated the committee felt it would be more effective if it were a greater incentive but kept it small enough that it could be spread out among many projects, rather than the larger projects that use up a lot of the budget.

Longanecker asked what the annual average amount of requests was.

Houin replied that he was not sure if he could give an average.

Gorski replied that there were six or seven last year, with two at $25,000, while all the rest of them were under $10,000.

Houin stated many have been smaller, but they have had a lot of larger ones recently, and that was part of the consideration of that committee. He stated this was not a large enough fund to be able to continue doing those large rebate grants and to be most effective, it should be spread out among smaller projects.

City Attorney Houin introduced Ordinance No. 2026-2255, An Ordinance of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana Implementing a Fee for Non-Emergency Responses and Lift Assistance at Residential Care Facilities on first reading.

City Attorney Houin introduced Resolution No. 2025-1189, A Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana Adopting Indiana Code § 5-23, Authorizing the Release of a Request for Qualifications and Proposals Under Indiana Code § 5-23, and Taking Certain Other Actions Related Thereto.

Houin stated that the city had been working on a preliminary design for a new fire station, police station, or a combined emergency services building. He stated they were looking at the possibility of using the Build, Operate, Transfer (BOT) method under Indiana Code. He stated it was a purchasing program that the City of Plymouth had not utilized before, but the result would be a

Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for the entire project in some way similar to the programs that had been used by the Wastewater Department in the past, except that this would also incorporate the design work and any other aspect of the project. He stated the idea was that they have one final price that's competitive at the beginning, and once you select the team that would work on it, you already know what that maximum final price would be even if you adjust and have some flexibility throughout the design and construction process. He stated that to even consider this action, the first step would be the adoption of this resolution saying you want to utilize the above section of Indiana Code. He stated that if this was approved, then our next step would be to put together an RFQ and RFP proposal that we would then send out to many of the partners that we've talked to that may want to bid on that project.

Council members Longanecker and Krathwohl moved and seconded to approve Resolution No. 2025-1189, A Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana Adopting Indiana Code § 5-23, Authorizing the Release of a Request for Qualifications and Proposals Under Indiana Code § 5-23, and Taking Certain Other Actions Related Thereto as presented. The motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-1189

COMMON COUNCIL OF PLYMOUTH, INDIANA

ADOPTING INDIANA CODE § 5-23, AUTHORIZING THE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSALS UNDER INDIANA CODE § 5-23, AND TAKING CERTAIN OTHER ACTIONS RELATED THERETO

WHEREAS, the Common Council of Plymouth, Indiana (the "Council") has considered the provisions of Indiana Code § 5-23; and

WHEREAS, the Council now desires to adopt the provisions of Indiana Code § 5-23 by this resolution pursuant to Indiana Code § 5-23-1-1; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Council to issue a request for proposals and qualifications (the "RFPQ") under Indiana Code § 5-23 to explore the development, construction, financing, operation, and/or transfer of projects that meet an economic development, public safety, infrastructure, or other public purpose (the "Projects").

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF PLYMOUTH, INDIANA AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Adoption of Indiana Code § 5-23. The Council hereby adopts the provisions of Indiana Code § 5-23.

SECTION 2. Authorization. The Council hereby authorizes and directs the Mayor to issue RFPQs under Indiana Code § 5-23 to study the development, construction, financing, operation, and/or transfer of Projects at any date hereafter, to establish a selection committee when appropriate, and to make recommendations for Council consideration at future public meetings under the terms of Indiana Code § 5-23.

SECTION 3. Other Actions. Any officer of the Council and the Mayor are hereby authorized to take any and all actions and execute any documents or certificates that such officers deem necessary or desirable to effect the foregoing resolutions. Any such actions taken or documents or certificates executed and delivered are hereby ratified, confirmed and approved.

SECTION 4. No Conflict. All ordinances, resolutions, and orders or parts thereof in conflict with the provisions of this Resolution are to the extent of such conflict hereby repealed. After the issuance and execution of Agreement and so long as the Agreement remains in place, except as expressly provided herein, this Resolution shall not be repealed or amended, nor shall the City adopt any law, ordinance or resolution which in any way adversely affects this Resolution.

SECTION 5. Severability. If any section, paragraph or provision of this Resolution shall be held to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Resolution.

SECTION 6. Effectiveness. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Common Council of Plymouth, Indiana, this 12th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Center Township Trustee Amy Knapp explained that the townships have three functions. She listed fire protection, township assistance, and the third can vary from township to township. She provided examples of parks and recreation, community centers, and cemeteries. She added that she had nine old cemeteries and a historic church that she took care of. She stated she mostly wished to talk about township assistance tonight and brought a screenshot from her State Board of Accounts approved TFMS Web Software. She stated that, with housing being talked about a lot at the last meeting, she thought some of her numbers might be the missing piece of the puzzle that might help you all. She stated that in her position, she spent a vast majority of her time taking applications and assisting people with township assistance. She stated that in 2025, she had 1,002 requests and financially assisted 808 individuals or households with some financial assistance from one of her line items. She stated her total budget in 2025 was $136,500, of which she spent $102,264.16 on helping individuals and households, and she thought that information may help them all to decide by seeing how much was needed or how much was already spent. She added it was important to add that this money was taxpayer money, as townships are funded by property taxes. She reviewed the following line items and provided amounts spent in 2025:

- 2C Shelter: Assisted 167 people for 689 nights for $21,640.
- 2D Rent Housing: Assisted 98 households for $29,949.48.
- 2E Utilities: Assisted 115 households for $27,761.46.
- 1E Burials and Cremations: Assisted 8 families for $10,200.
- 2G Marshall County Council on Aging Contract for Transportation was $5,000.
- 2F Bread for Life Contract for $4,000.

Knapp wished to thank her partners in Marshall County and listed the Neighborhood Center, Link to Hope, Salvation Army, Sister Connie Bach, Catholic Charities, other churches in the area, and the Bread of Life. She felt they helped a lot of people who are needy and just need a helping hand up. She stated that next year she budgeted a little more for each line item because there was such a need with rents, utilities, and housing. She stated she hoped this helped because it’s taxpayer money and wasn’t sure if they were aware individually how much the township did help. She stated that a lot of money was spent with the town and she can handle emergencies. She provided the example of The Pointe Apartments where she was the first one there, and they did help pay for the first week.

Mayor Listenberger stated that before becoming Mayor, he didn’t realize all that the townships do, but he has learned over the last couple of years. He stated he really appreciated this information, as this was something that he would have loved to see when he was a councilman.

Knapp wished to highlight that it was all for Plymouth because Center Township only encompassed Plymouth.

Mayor Listenberger also wished to thank her for all that she does for our Fire Protection Services too, as it was a big help.

Knapp stated she did have her numbers approved from her budget for the Fire Contract at $220,772 and that was made in two payments in June and December.

Krathwohl asked if she had the numbers for 2023 and 2024 prior to the Pointe Apartments.

Knapp replied that she did not bring them with her tonight, but she could provide them. She believed that every year she had been spending more. She was hoping the hotel expenses would ease off now that the Red Rock Inn was closed and they only have one hotel now. She stated that rent payments have gone up and a lot of people are struggling to afford an additional few hundred dollars. She stated it could range from an illness, missing work, or being between jobs, etc., but there were a lot of different reasons that people ask for assistance. She believed the numbers had steadily gone up.

Culp asked if there was a certain requirement that she asked of people.

Knapp replied that they fill out the township application that was about 7-8 pages long; they must first show me their ID, it must be up to date, and they must be in Center Township for them to get help in her office. Otherwise, they would be referred to the appropriate Township Trustee. She stated she looks at income, number of people in the household, and she follows the same guidelines that energy assistance uses to see if they qualify or if they’re over the income limit. She stated she does an investigation as to why they are there and seeking assistance.

Culp asked if any of this was long-term assistance.

Knapp replied that township assistance was supposed to be short-term help and what she has followed since she has become Township Trustee was that people could come twice within 6 months. She stated that you could ask for assistance four times within one year. She stated that for some she sees them once and never again, while she sees other families year after year. She stated long-term poor was everywhere.

Council members Milner and Morrow moved and seconded to take the Marshall County SAFE Housing Response Team off the table. The motion carried.

Mayor Listenberger reminded the council that the request was for $25,000 and they tabled it when they got to the point of discussing what monies to use that for. He stated that, in general, you all supported it, and he apologized for not discussing with the Clerk-Treasurer where he wants to pull money from, but he wanted to use the Opioid Settlement Unrestricted Fund. He stated there was

roughly $46,000 there, and they want to ensure there was enough money in there for the K-9. He stated that Weir received another quote on the dog and it was $17,000, so there should be enough to make both requests. He stated there should be enough money there for a muzzle, gear, and whatever else the dog may need.

Culp asked regarding installation of cages if he was going to use the same squad car.

Weir replied that he was because that car was put into rotation as a 2022 model. He stated he was trying to work his squad cars on a five-year rotation. He stated that this year he only gets to ask for three squad cars, but he only had three 2020 models, so it worked out. He stated the 2022 model should still have another two years to go on it.

Culp asked if it needed any repairs.

Weir replied that it did not, as most of the equipment was still good.

Culp asked how they paid for veterinarian bills.

Weir replied that it was paid out of the K-9 Fund.

Gorski added there was a K-9 Fund and then there was a line item in his budget in the general fund for K-9.

Culp asked if $17,000-$18,000 would take care of that dog in its entirety.

Weir replied that $17,000 was for a new dog and training of the officer.

Culp asked if that was all they needed to be ready to go. Weir agreed.

Starr asked how long they had the previous dog.

Weir replied that they got the K-9 that they still have back in 2018. He added that he has been getting a lot of vet bills lately, so he was getting up there in age.

Morrow brought it back to the original motion he made, and he really did believe this program was beneficial to the city, especially because we've had people displaced unlike they had in the past. He stated it was very possible to happen in the future, and working with the Township Trustee needs to have a ready group of people committed to help assist these folks.

Krathwohl stated that after the meeting, she reached out to the Clerk-Treasurer and asked her how much we've given to United Way and Marshall County Community Foundation in the last 5 years, and she presented the following information:

United Way – Marshall County Hope had been given a total of $134,084.01 for 2023 & 2025 (Opioid Restricted and Unrestricted Funds)

United Way – Campaign was given $75,000.00 in 2024 (ARPA Funds)

Marshall County Community Foundation – Lifelong Learning Network was given $600,000.00 (ARPA Funds)

Krathwohl acknowledged that this was completely different from that, but her question was about the money already given of the Opioid and Campaign money, where all that money had gone.

Linda Yoder of United Way replied that Marshall County Hope was still active and the primary function of them was peer recovery coaches because that's been proven to be the most effective way to change a story for those that have experienced substance use disorder. She stated that the group consistently meets on the first Wednesday at 9:00 AM at the Community Foundation and United Way offices. She stated it was a very active group, and it was not unusual for there to be 30-40 people around the table. She stated that food assistance goes fast, with the increases being steady year by year. She stated that in November and December, our food pantries had record-breaking gifts coming in with the uncertainty around SNAP. She stated it was a year-round issue for them with rising prices and groceries, so that $75,000 was very much needed and appreciated. She stated that the Community Foundation was a holder of the fund at the Career Innovation Center and that's why those funds came to the Community Foundation.

Culp asked if they had reached out to any other location in Marshall County yet and if they were willing to donate as well.

Yoder replied that they had reached out but they had not gone before those councils yet. She stated they made preliminary outreach in Culver. She stated the County Councils were unanimously in support, but they had not gone back to the Commissioners yet.

Culp asked if this would benefit all of Marshall County and not just the City of Plymouth residents.

Yoder replied with the incidents they are discussing; they have people coming from other parts of the county that are staying there as well, so they view it as a Marshall County issue.

Longanecker asked if they had an understanding as to why other people are coming to Marshall County or Plymouth.

Yoder replied that the one rumor they heard was that people were being dropped off at the hotels from other communities, but they were only able to find one case, and it was one where people were repeating that story. She stated they would really like to have the data behind it, so the surveys they are doing now ask for more detail about that kind of thing. She stated these were individual stories, and that the case managers would tell you that the stories were so broad and there was a multitude of reasons why people are there. She listed disabilities, felony convictions, or having had an eviction before. She explained all of those were barriers to finding housing, while other times their options are limited, struggling to make ends meet, so getting enough for deposits for another

rental unit are difficult. She added it was extremely difficult to generalize the reasons with one broad brush stroke due to the difference from case to case.

Starr stated the more clarity we have with everything that's going on, the better the decision. She believed the feeling from people who are very quick to criticize was that they do not know because they don't. She stated she was giving this a lot of thought and prayer, with her heart and head saying different things. She stated she does know people that live there and that they all have a story, and that was her heart. She stated her head, she said we're going to set a precedent, and this was not my money, this was the taxpayer's money that we're talking about. She stated in this instance her heart had won.

The original motion where Council members Morrow and Ecker moved and seconded to approve the $25,000 request out of the Opioid Settlement Unrestricted Fund was then voted upon. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Culp, Milner, Morrow, and Starr

Councilman Opposed: Longanecker

Councilman Abstained: Krathwohl

Councilman Absent: Ecker

There were no updates for ONE Marshall County.

There were no updates for the Comprehensive Plan.

Council members Starr and Krathwohl moved and seconded to accept the following communications:

- Minutes of the Board of Public Works and Safety meeting of December 22, 2025
- January 12, 2026 Check Register
- December 9, 2025 Technical Review Committee Minutes
- November 4, 2025 Plan Commission Minutes

The motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Council, Council members Longanecker and Milner moved and seconded to adjourn. Mayor Listenberger declared the meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

_____
Lynn M. Gorski
Clerk-Treasurer

APPROVED

_____
Robert Listenberger, Mayor