REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, January 26, 2026

Be it Remembered that the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana, met in regular session on January 26, 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 6:37 p.m.

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

Mayor Robert Listenberger presided over Council members Duane Culp, Don Ecker Jr., Kayla Krathwohl, Randy Longanecker, Shiloh Carothers Milner, and Linda Starr, who were physically present. Council member Dave Morrow attended virtually. 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 Starr and Krathwohl moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the regular session of the Common Council on January 12, 2026, as presented. The motion passed by roll call vote with all in favor.

Clerk-Treasurer Gorski introduced the 2026 Baker Tilly Engagement Agreement. She stated there was an increase of $1,400 from 2025. She stated the monthly amount for this would be $11,100, with $3,100 being split between the TIF districts and $8,000 being split between the Financial Board and Utilities.

Mayor Listenberger stated that we have added a few more services to the agreement.

Tyler Coffel of Baker Tilly stated the first addition was continuing disclosure that was required for open market bonds that the utilities have. He explained that it had historically been billed separately and was just not built into this contract. He stated the second addition involved Senate Bill One with a parcel-by-parcel tax analysis, which allowed them to get the best understanding of your property tax impacts related to the new legislation at the state level. He stated those were the two services being built in, while the rest was just small increases related to our costs as a firm.

Mayor Listenberger asked when they would expect that parcel-by-parcel report.

Coffel replied that it would be part of the Comprehensive Plan that they provide. He stated the initial results would be in Spring and you'll see the impacts after you adopt your budget in Fall.

Morrow stated he saw great value in the information we see from Baker Tilly.

Council members Ecker and Starr moved and seconded to approve the 2026 Engagement Agreement with Baker Tilly as presented. The motion passed by roll call vote with all in favor.

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

Houin stated that, after discussion with the Clerk-Treasurer, she requested that we add language to specify that if an applicant was awarded an amount but then spent less than they estimated in their application, their grant amount be based upon what was spent. He stated they would not receive the full amount approved if they did not spend it all.

Culp stated that the Moose Lodge submitted a quote for $26,000, but only spent $12,000-$13,000; he asked what they would receive.

Gorski presented the hypothetical of someone submitting a quote of $20,000, and in the resolution, they were awarded $4,000. She explained that if they only ended up spending $8,000 instead of $20,000, they would only receive 20% of that $8,000.

Culp asked with this new resolution that it would be 50%.

Gorski replied that it would be 50%, not to exceed $10,000.

Culp asked if the transportation fee would still come out of this every year. Gorski agreed. Culp asked if that was out of the money that held the interest.

Houin replied that the interest of the grant fund goes into that budget line, and other items came out of that budget line, and other money could be appropriated into that fund as well. He hoped the language here encapsulated that, as it was important that we track how much money was distributed from that Community Foundation fund each year, so they knew how much was available to appropriate for this rebate program. He stated part of the review process was to verify what funds are available that are from that grant administration.

Culp asked if it would be worth putting in a timeline, so they only have so long to complete the work. He clarified that some applications have been sitting for years.

Houin replied that it was discussed, and it was not recommended by the committee members, but they could certainly look at amending it in the future if that were to become a problem to track.

Culp stated it was a nightmare to keep track of something and when it would be complete while accommodating that into the budget.

Houin stated they could investigate those amendments while continuing to revise and improve the program. He explained that one of the things that was key from the Comprehensive Plan with these subcommittees doing different work in different areas was that some of these items get complete and then it becomes a set it and forget it situation. He said that we need to take a more active role in reviewing how the program was operating and improve it as we go rather than just ignoring it and letting it sit. He believed this was the first step in that effort and we would continue to make improvements as needed.

Council members Longanecker and Starr moved and seconded to approve Ordinance No. 2026-2254R, An Ordinance to Repeal and Replace Sections of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Plymouth Concerning the Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program on second reading. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Culp, Ecker, Krathwohl, Longanecker, Milner, Morrow, and Starr

Councilman Opposed: N/A

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

Council members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to approve Ordinance No. 2026-2254R, An Ordinance to Repeal and Replace Sections of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Plymouth Concerning the Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program on third reading. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Culp, Ecker, Krathwohl, Longanecker, Milner, Morrow, and Starr

Councilman Opposed: N/A

**ORDINANCE NO. 2026-2254R**

**AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL AND REPLACE SECTIONS OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH CONCERNING THE COMMERCIAL REVITALIZATION REBATE PROGRAM**

**Statement of Purpose and Intent**

For many years, the City of Plymouth has offered a Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program (CRRP) to assist with repairs and improvements to commercial properties within the city. In the last decade alone, the CRRP has helped to generate over a million dollars in private investment to revitalize commercial properties.

On March 11, 2024, the Plymouth Common Council adopted a Resolution to Establish a Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee to achieve the goals of the Plymouth Forward 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Since then, a subcommittee of the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee was formed to review and recommend improvements to the City of Plymouth's CRRP to continue and build on its success. The subcommittee reviewed past awards of commercial revitalization rebate grants, as well as the effectiveness of similar grant programs in other communities, to formulate its recommendations.

The purpose and intent of this ordinance is to amend the City of Plymouth Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program to implement the recommendations of the subcommittee toward the goals of the Plymouth Forward 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

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

**Section 1.** Title 3, entitled Administration; Chapter 33 entitled Departments, Board, and Commissions; Subchapter III, entitled Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program is hereby repealed in its entirety.

**Section 2.** Title 3, entitled Administration; Chapter 34 entitled Finance; City Funds is hereby amended to add a new Subchapter XXIII, entitled Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program which shall be as follows:

**Subchapter III Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program**

**§ 34.380 Eligible Properties**
**Any commercial building or structure located within the City of Plymouth that may benefit from exterior rehabilitation or renovation may be eligible for assistance through the Commercial Revitalization Rebate Program (CRRP). The exterior design of any project proposed for a Commercial Revitalization Rebate grant must be approved by the Common Council to be eligible for a rebate. After rehabilitation or renovation, the funded improvements must meet all applicable ordinances and building codes.**

**§ 34.381 Eligible Applicants**
**The owner of an eligible property may apply for a rebate grant under the CRRP. A tenant of an eligible property may apply if authorized in writing by the owner to complete the proposed rehabilitation or renovation activities.**

**§ 34.382 Eligible Activities, Costs, and Rebate Amount**
**Activities eligible for a rebate grant under the (CRRP) are generally limited to exterior building repairs and improvements, such as exterior walls, roofs, facades, signs, awnings, and landscaping. Projects may include the development or improvement of parking facilities that are available to the public. Costs eligible for a rebate include labor and materials but not sales tax. The cost of demolition of dilapidated buildings may be eligible if the Common Council makes a finding that historic structures or areas will not be adversely impacted. CRRP funds will not be available for any project that results in the displacement of a household or a business. The Common Council determines the amount of a rebate, but in no case shall a rebate exceed 50% of eligible costs; and in no event shall the amount of the rebate exceed $10,000.**

**§ 34.383 Application Requirements**
**Applications to the CRRP must include:**

1. **Competitive cost proposals by at least 2 reputable contractors (no DIY work will be reimbursed). Contractors must be approved to perform work within City Limits as required by the City Building Department. If the CRRP request includes reimbursement for engineering or architectural services, fee estimates by at least 2 reputable engineers or architects shall be included with the application.**
2. **Photos of the current state of the project location as well as drawings, renderings, inspiration photos, or other visual depiction of what the project will look like post renovation.**
3. **A copy of a deed, mortgage, land contract or other verification of ownership. If the applicant is a tenant, the application must include written approval from the property owner to complete the proposed project.**

**§ 34.384 Application Procedure**

1. **An application form for the CRRP shall be approved by the City Clerk-Treasurer. The application and all required documentation shall be submitted to the Office of the Clerk-Treasurer. Except under emergency conditions or extenuating circumstances, the completed application should be submitted prior to the work commencing.**
2. **Each application shall be reviewed by the Clerk-Treasurer and City Attorney to ensure the application is complete. Once it is determined the application is complete, the Clerk-Treasurer shall determine the availability of funds and shall then forward the application and accompanying documents to the Common Council members for consideration at the Common Council's next regularly scheduled meeting.**
3. **The applicant shall appear at the meeting to present evidence and answer all reasonable inquiries of the Common Council. The Common Council shall by resolution approve or disapprove the application and determine the amount of rebate, if any.**
4. **Upon completion of the work and submission to the Clerk-Treasurer evidence of payment to the contractor, the Clerk-Treasurer will then be authorized to disburse the rebate to the applicant in the approved amount according to the restrictions in §34.382.**

**§ 34.385 Application Deadline and Timing**
**Applications for CRRP rebate grants shall be accepted at any time and complete applications shall be considered by the City of Plymouth Common Council in the order received during any budget year.**

**Section 3.** This Ordinance shall take full force and effect upon passage, due attestation and publication if required by law.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 26th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Presiding Office

ATTEST:

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Presented by me to the Mayor of the City of Plymouth, Indiana on the 26th day of January, 2026, at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Lynn M. Gorski, Clerk-Treasurer

Approved and signed by me this 26th day of January, 2026.

Robert Listenberger, Mayor

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 second reading.

Ecker stated he would like Assistant Fire Chief Mike Jernstrom to explain the reason behind this, as there were some valid reasons why this was being brought before the council.

Jernstrom stated this was brought to their attention due to the overwhelming number of non-emergent lift assists that we have received over the last couple of years. He stated they ran numbers over a two-year period, and we are seeing that we are being pulled away from quite a few emergency calls when we're going out to do a lift assist for these facilities. He stated this was to help curb some of these lift assists, and it was not saying that we would not go out there to help with lift assist, but instead of charging people's loved ones, we're going to be charging the facility that was calling us when they're giving 24-hour care.

Houin added that Fire Chief Holm, Assistant Chief Jernstrom, and Human Resources Manager Jen Klingerman did a lot of research on this, and he would not take any credit for drafting this proposed ordinance, as several other cities in the state have adopted similar ordinances. He stated you could see progression if you look at what they've done, how they've been refined and improved over the course of time. He stated this was a combination of what other cities had reviewed and approved as that trend continues.

Morrow asked if the billing had been sent to the resident directly for the lift and assist.

Jernstrom replied that the patient was always billed for the lift assist when we were out there for non-emergency calls. He stated this would be going towards the facilities instead of the patient and putting that burden on them since they are calling us instead of the patient.

Morrow asked what the cost was to the patient for the lift and assist.

Klingerman replied that it was $150 per call, whether they called or the facility called.

Morrow asked if that would now be $500.

Klingerman replied that the first three calls would be $500 per call and the fourth call would be $1,000 per call.

Morrow asked if there was a representative of Miller's present.

Bryan Zehr, Executive Director at Miller's Senior Living Community, introduced himself.

Morrow asked if their intention was to pass that $500 cost on to the patients.

Zehr replied that they most likely would.

Morrow stated that the patients would now be charged $500 instead of $150. Zehr agreed. Morrow asked if there are residents in an assisted living facility, and if that should be part of their monthly fee for getting assistance in an assisted living home.

Zehr replied that he believed the council was confused about exactly what they are offering at assisted living. He stated it was a non-licensed assisted living facility, so under Indiana Law, we follow the social model. He explained that even though there was a person there 24 hours a day, that person was not a medical person. He stated that, for the residents, it was as if they were living in their own home. He explained that if someone were to fall and they wanted us to call in, then we are going to make that telephone call to 911 for non-emergency lift. He stated their job at assisted living was not to assess, but over at the nursing facility side, they have 24-hour care with licensed nurses there all day. He explained that was the biggest difference between the two facilities.

Morrow asked if all the calls for lift and assist were initiated by the resident or if the staff called and requested assistance.

Zehr replied that most of them are made by the staff after we talk with the residents.

Morrow stated he had some heartache with this as it did not seem right to him that the city would impose a fee of $500 on the residents, even though we are billing the facility. He said that it did not sit right with him.

Zehr agreed and stated that was why he was here. He stated he could only speak for Miller's, but he felt there should be some leeway as they had 25 calls so far this month, with 19 of them going out to the hospital or needing assistance at the time. He stated that when they are calling, we need assistance most of the time.

Morrow asked if the city was being compensated for every call, whether it was transport or not.

Holm replied anytime we provide assistance to anyone, whether they go to the hospital or not. He stated that if they do not go to the hospital and we assist them, they would be billed a refusal fee, which was the $150 they receive for the lift assist.

Morrow asked how many lift assists they had a month on average.

Holm asked for clarification on the entire response area or just the nursing homes and assisted living facilities.

Morrow clarified to the assisted care facilities.

Holm replied that in the past two years they had 73 no-transport lift assists to Autumn Trace, 24 to Miller's Assisted Living Facility, and 6 to Miller's Nursing Home.

Morrow replied that, if he understood Zehr correctly, the nursing home facility has the capability of the lift and assist.

Holm replied in agreement that they had licensed caretakers there.

Morrow commented that he liked that they were right next door.

Holm stated that part of this was not us being unwilling to go and treat the patients to assess them and ensure that they're okay, but rather a lot of it came down to the many times where they were called strictly when the only problem with the patient was that they are not able to get up on their own. He stated they are not hurt, and they have been to many places where they just say they need help getting up and that they are not hurt at all. He stated they are being taken out of their emergency setup just to pick someone up when there are people there to do that. He stated that he was not sure what their company policies are.

Morrow stated it still did not sit right with him that the people were going to get an additional billing for the lift and assist when we're billing the assisted living facility directly and they're passing it to the residents. He stated that his mother lived out there for many years, and most of the residents out there are on fixed incomes, and it was expensive to live there anyway. He stated that when you start adding those additional fees, there's going to be some unhappy residents.

Longanecker stated they are hearing from one facility currently and have not heard from everyone else if they were going to pass the cost on, so we could only assume that hopefully they're not in one instance. He believed there was some value in looking at what the true costs are to this. He stated the city has fees passed onto us and listed that we pay a 911 fee, insurance, equipment, maintenance on the rig, vehicle insurance, fuel, and labor. He stated those were true costs to the city. He asked if it was two people per rig.

Holm replied that it was usually two, but at times they are required to have three.

Longanecker stated that, on top of it, there was more paperwork and time involved, so there were true costs to the city. He stated that $150 was probably never right to begin with, and $500 was more along the lines of that and probably cheap if you are looking at the costs involved. He stated he would hate to pass this on because that was what he felt was going to happen, as it always has. He stated that was the concern of everyone who has reached out to him. He stated it was important for people to understand that there was a true cost to the city, and if that was the taxpayer's burden to pay that $500, as one resident or facility called for that.

Holm stated a lot of this does not come down to money, but he did appreciate what Longanecker had to say about that and recouping our costs. He explained that in our job we care for those in true dire emergencies and when we usually get called out, it was somebody's worst day. He stated we had to call ambulances from outside our area to take care of a call for us because we are on a non-emergency call. He stated it was those situations that eat at them, along with the additional workload when we're already going out on more calls every single year. He stated that was where a lot of this was stemming from, as it was not necessarily about the money. He explained it was more about the idea that we need to concentrate on our true calling and what we need to provide over non-emergency calls.

Culp asked if there was another agency that could take those calls.

Holm replied that there are private facilities, but they're going to take way longer for non-emergency calls, so that person would have to sit there for longer than they normally would. He stated that, as far as medical goes, there isn't really anybody else around to take care of it if they want to be assessed. He stated they often don't get assessed but rather just being picked up off the ground.

Starr asked if this also applied to someone who fell at their home and they repeatedly call about falling.

Holm replied in agreement and stated that if someone repeatedly fell, they would get billed that $150 for us to come out and do something for them. He stated that a lot of times they are in their private home, and he understood Zehr's point that it was like their private home. He stated that, from the outside looking in, he believed that the residents are paying for these facilities to live there and help them in multiple ways. He stated he was not sure how that goes as far as how much they could provide help in those situations.

Culp asked where the $500 amount came from.

Holm replied that Houin alluded to the point that they are not creating this but instead that this has been occurring all over Indiana. He believed that Westfield, Indiana, may have been the

first place to start this, and every department around the Indianapolis area has done this. He stated there were multiple counties throughout the state and surrounding states that have started to implement this.

Culp agreed with what he was proposing, but he had received multiple phone calls from people saying that these people are still paying taxes and now we're going to throw it on to the facilities. He stated he understood that and what Longanecker was explaining earlier.

Longanecker emphasized that the city was not throwing the cost on the residents but rather the facility.

Morrow stated that, at the very least, there should be some consistency, as this was also private residency with assisted living. He stated there ought to be some consistency in our billing, whether it was in someone's private home or an assisted living facility, if the services are the same. He explained there was going to be more calls from an assisted living facility just because of the mass group living together compared to a single-family home. He believed it should be the same both ways. He recommended we take a closer look at it and table it. He recommended looking at the cost, maybe narrowing down what Autumn Trace was doing, and then maybe incorporating the households into the increase as well. He did not believe it should be different for the same service.

Longanecker asked if they had the lift assist numbers for the private residences.

Klingerman replied that she was not provided with those numbers.

Mayor Listenberger believed that, going into this, they would have this discussion and, rather than tabling it, we don't need to hear it on third reading while we do research in the meantime.

Ecker stated he would like to proceed with second reading and if it passes, then we gather more information as there are questions regarding private residents and things like this. He believed they did a lot of good work, but there's just a little bit more data that needed to be delved into to continue to support what they are trying to accomplish. He agreed that Longanecker and Morrow had asked great questions, as it was important to understand our costs and what we needed to do to continue with the service we are able to provide.

Zehr stated he only wanted to clarify the difference in the model of care that we are offering over at the assisted living side. He stated it was labeled as assisted living regarding the amount of staff. He explained there was one person there at night. He stated that it may be a corporate issue, but he just wanted to be treated the same as somebody who fell across the street and called three or four times a week. He stated he was not sure if there was a better way regarding

leeway for one or two free calls. He stated he knows that the city does that with false alarms because if we forget to report to them when we do fire drills every month, we receive a fine for that, and he understood that. He also said that if their power goes out and their elevator does not work and we must call, which we have done a few times, then we are willing to take on that cost to help get people upstairs. He stated he was discussing if somebody fell in their room, then it was the same as someone fell in their apartment.

Longanecker thanked him for coming in and clarifying that.

Culp asked if the assisted living facility received the bill and if they could bill the resident's insurance company for that.

Zehr replied that they would have to discuss and investigate all of that. He stated that in the other towns, our facilities are skilled nursing facilities, so that billing would be a lot different than what the assisted living side was. He stated he could get that information for them and that could solve a whole different issue. He stated they were in our infancy to get this information, and it sounded like you guys were too. He appreciated the opportunity to speak and have you all listen.

Culp asked if they vote on this for second reading; they were voting on it as is. The Council agreed.

Houin added that, in the discussions other cities had about the $500 and $1,000 fee, he did not see anywhere where it was calculated based upon the actual cost for providing the service but rather that it was intended more as a deterrent for the non-emergency calls. He stated he also wished to clarify, based upon how the ordinance was written currently, that the fee increase would only apply to residential care facilities and it would not increase the cost to individuals in their homes that refuse transport for non-emergency care.

Morrow stated he would vote against this as it was not consistent with other residents in the community.

Council members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to table 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 second reading. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Councilman in Favor: Culp, Ecker, Krathwohl, Longanecker, Milner, and Starr

Councilman Opposed: Morrow

City Attorney Houin introduced an Amended Fund Agreement with Marshall County Community Foundation.

Houin stated he also provided some historical documentation alongside this. He explained that this was the endowment fund with the Community Foundation that earned interest and was distributed annually, with that amount intended to support the commercial revitalization rebate grant program that we heard about in the earlier ordinance.

Gorski added it also supported the Transportation Agreement for Older Adults Services through the Community Improvement Fund.

Houin stated there were a couple of items paid for through the Community Improvement Fund and whether more money was appropriated into that fund was an annual budget decision. He stated this fund with the Community Foundation was established in 1995 with a $1 million contribution that came from a grant program that was related to the construction of the new hospital. He stated that since that time in 1995, the intent of any fund at the Community Foundation was that it would continue to grow, even as distributions are made. He believed their distribution formula was based on a four-year rolling average of the return on all their funds. He stated the problem was that when this fund was created for the city, there was a limitation placed that said the funds could only be invested in securities of the United States Treasury or any agency of the United States government, which was a very secure investment, but it does not have the same rate of return as other investments. He stated they do not know for sure, but in discussing it with the Clerk-Treasurer, we believe that the reason for that was because in 1995, there were legal limitations on how municipal funds could be invested. He stated that those limitations no longer exist and we can invest funds in accounts that return a reasonable rate of interest. He stated this amended fund agreement would propose reinvesting those city funds in a new endowment that follows the standard investment procedures of the Community Foundation, so hopefully we grow the fund over time instead of depleting it over time. He stated he did not know the exact balance right now.

Gorski stated as of October 30, 2025, the balance was $947,079.

Houin stated it had been reduced by over $50,000 since 1995, when theoretically it should have continued to grow with those annual distributions.

Ecker stated we invest these funds for 2026 so the growth would come forward in 2027.

Houin stated the way the Community Foundation determined their distribution was not based upon that individual fund, but rather it was based on the average return across all their funds.

Ecker stated he spoke with the Clerk-Treasurer, and she continued to remain in support of this agreement. He stated we need to look at ways to improve our returns on investments. He believed the intent was to keep it at that base level over the years and take whatever that growth was

and use that towards the revitalization program. He stated that it was his understanding of this program.

Houin replied there were some restrictions because it was invested as a permanent endowment fund with the Community Foundation. He stated their policy was that they don't want to distribute all the growth because they want the funds you invest to continue to increase even as they're making those distributions.

Council members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to approve the Amended Fund Agreement with Marshall County Community Foundation as presented. The motion carried.

City Attorney Houin updated the council on ONE Marshall County. He stated they are starting the process of hiring the first employee who would help the non-profit agencies that are helping to fund that position. He stated we are working to schedule some board members to give you an update sometime in February.

Plan Director Ty Adley updated the council on the various subcommittees of the Comprehensive Plan:

Zoning Subcommittee – Passed several zoning amendments and working on several more.

Marketing Subcommittee – Coordinating with the High School on a video series for "Where You Belong."

Complete Streets Subcommittee – Coordinating with Engineering and the Street Departments on the 2026-2027 paving plan, as well as looking at other additional improvements for pedestrian and residential safety.

Business Attraction and Retention Subcommittee – Working on surveys.

Adley stated another big item was that they were coordinating with Ball State University to begin an area update to the Comprehensive Plan. He stated they were looking at the east side of Plymouth, bounded by US 30/31 with the CSX rail line and Michigan Street downtown. He stated the reason we're looking to make this amendment was that not only have we accomplished about 75% of the Comprehensive Plan Action Items, either by completing them or having them ongoing, but also because the Northern Indiana Passenger Rail Association (NIPRA) plans to bring rail back to the CSX line. He stated they were moving at a significantly faster rate than originally anticipated, so we need to be prepared as the City of Plymouth as we move forward into that process. He stated the east-hand side of Plymouth plays a major role in that process, so we've coordinated with Ball State to be able to provide that Comprehensive Plan amendment update to that region. He stated we wanted to ensure we were setting up correctly because that area was currently slated for rural management only, which does not allow a lot of development.

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

- Minutes of the Board of Public Works and Safety meeting of January 12, 2026
- January 26, 2026 Check Register
- December 2025 Clerk-Treasurer Financial Reports
- Plymouth Q4 2025 Council Report – Baker Tilly
- December 9, 2025 Board of Aviation Commission Minutes
- December 16, 2025 Redevelopment Commission Minutes
- November 19, 2025 Urban Forest & Flower Committee Minutes
- Baker Tilly Engagement Agreement

The motion passed by roll call vote with all in favor.

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 7:26 p.m.

/s/ Lynn M. Gorski
Clerk-Treasurer

APPROVED

/s/ Robert Listenberger
Mayor

****THIS SECTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK****