



GOSHEN COMMON COUNCIL

Minutes of the DECEMBER 15, 2025 Regular Meeting

Convened in the Council Chambers, Police & Court Building, 111 East Jefferson Street, Goshen, Indiana

Mayor Gina Leichty called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. Youth Adviser Abril Reyes led the Pledge of Allegiance. Abril is a student at Goshen High School.

Mayor Leichty asked Clerk-Treasurer Richard R. Aguirre to conduct the roll call. The result:

Present: Linda Gerber (At-Large) Phil Lederach (District 5) Doug Nisley (District 2)
Donald Riegsecker (District 1) Matt Schrock (District 3)
Council President Brett Weddell (At-Large) Youth Adviser Abril Reyes (Non-voting)
Attending online (via Zoom): Megan Peel (District 4)

Approval of Minutes:

Mayor Leichty asked the Council's wishes regarding the Nov. 17, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes prepared by Greg Imbur of the Clerk-Treasurer's Office. Councilor Nisley moved to accept the minutes as presented. Councilor Riegsecker seconded the motion. **Motion passed 6-0 on a voice vote (Councilor Peel was not yet visible).**

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

Mayor Leichty presented the agenda as prepared by the Clerk-Treasurer. Councilor Nisley moved to approve the agenda as presented. Councilor Riegsecker seconded the motion. **Motion passed 7-0 on a voice vote.**

1) City financial report and budget update

Mayor Leichty and Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre delivered a financial and budget update to Councilors.

BACKGROUND:

In a Dec. 11, 2025 memorandum to the Common Council, Amber Nielsen, Senior Manager for Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors, wrote that she prepared financial reports summarizing the budget and cash balance performance for Civil City funds included in the 2025 budget, which was approved by the Council in October 2024. These reports were intended to provide a reasonable understanding of the City's financial position. They were unaudited and may require some interpretation.

Fund Balance Report: Nielsen wrote that this report provided the reconciled cash balance of the budgeted funds for Nov. 30, 2025, illustrating the City's liquidity position across all funds and demonstrating that each fund maintained a sufficient balance to support budgeted expenditures.

Budget Report – Revenues: Nielsen wrote that this page summarized revenue collections for each fund through Nov. 30, 2025, showing progress toward projected revenue levels. She cautioned that some funds receive the levy in two allotments in June and December (General, Debt Service, MVH, Cumulative Fire, Park & Recreation, Aviation, CCD, Cumulative Sewer).

Budget Report – Expenditures: Nielsen wrote that this report displayed expenditures incurred to date for each fund, allowing for an assessment of spending trends relative to annual appropriations, with an expected 45% of the budget left at this point in the year.



Budget Report – Expenditures in the General Fund: Nielsen wrote that the final page broke down the General Fund by department, providing a focused view of each department's budget performance to date.

Before the meeting, Mayor Leichty provided Councilors with a supplemental three-page "Financial Report for Council," dated Dec. 15, 2025, which summarized the City's financial position as of Nov. 30, 2025 (EXHIBIT #1).

Highlights of the Mayor's report:

Overall Financial Position – Across all funds, the City began the year with \$105.5 million, has received \$478 million in revenue, and spent \$60.5 million, resulting in an ending balance of \$92.7 million as of Nov. 30. The decline in cumulative balances reflects typical annual timing patterns: spending occurs steadily throughout the year while significant revenues arrive in June and November. The City's liquidity remains strong across major operating funds.

Revenue Performance and Timing Considerations – Citywide revenue collections now reflect both major November distributions and stand at approximately 75 percent of the budgeted annual revenue.

Expenditure Performance – Total expenditures through November are \$60.5 million, representing 55 percent of the annual budget. This remains within expected ranges for this time of year.

Fund Balance Conditions – Overall fund health remains strong despite mid-year fluctuations.

Key Issues for Council Awareness – *A. Revenue Timing Now Mostly Resolved:* The November LIT distribution and the fall property tax settlement significantly corrected the revenue underperformance in October. The remaining variances are due to posting lag rather than structural issues; *B. Departmental Spending Trends:* Police, Fire, and several operational divisions remain above 80 percent of their year-end budgets. These levels are consistent with their annual cost curves but should continue to be monitored in December; *C. ARP Fiscal Recovery Fund:* Just under 32 percent of ARP funds have now been expended (1.79M of 5.5M), with substantial balances remaining for allocation planning in 2026.

Summary – The City's financial condition remains stable as we approach year-end. November revenues show significant improvement due to major distributions, resolving most temporary imbalances from prior months.

Expenditures stay within expected ranges, and fund balances across significant operating funds are strong. A final year-end report will clarify any remaining timing variances once all December postings are complete. I am happy to prepare charts, a presentation, or further analysis at the Council's request.

SUMMARY OF DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION OF CITY BUDGET AND FINANCIAL REPORT:

Mayor Leichty presented a supplementary financial report. Key points

- The City is in a healthy financial position.
- The City had planned on spending down some surplus funds this year and that's reflected in the report.
- Last month's report showed that City had not yet received some of its expected tax distributions and they have now been received, so overall revenues are looking better.
- Overall, the City's General Fund expenditures are on target to where they were anticipated; City Departments have spent about 81% of their budgeted funds.
- Some departments are a little bit closer to spending all of their anticipated budgets, but all departments are managing funds as carefully as possible going into next year.
- Funds to watch include the TIF fund for East College Avenue, and the City has made a large expenditure from its opioid settlement-restricted funds, but that was a planned expenditure for this year.



Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre also provided a brief report. Key points:

- The November expenditures have not yet been reconciled.
- Additional revenues are still coming in; in fact, about \$2 million came today from Elkhart County, including Local Income Taxes and property tax revenue.
- Those revenues will be reflected in next month's report which will be presented to the Council on Dec. 29.
- That report should show almost all year-end financial activity.
- The Clerk-Treasurer's Office will be proposing some additional appropriations from the 2025 budget, including three tonight and more at the Dec. 29 Council meeting.

There were no questions or comments from Councilors about the reports.

Mayor Leichty invited a motion to approve the financial and budget report.

Councilors Weddell and Nisley made a motion to approve the budget and financial report as presented. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously, by a 7-0 vote.

2) Ordinance 5243, Amend Ordinance 4899, City of Goshen Building Department Fee Ordinance (proposed increase in the fees for the licensing and registration of electrical and mechanical contractors)

Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5243, *Amend Ordinance 4899, City of Goshen Building Department Fee Ordinance*. Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5243 by title only, which was done.

Weddell/Nisley moved to approve Ordinance 5243 on First Reading.

BACKGROUND:

Before the Council was Ordinance 5243, *Amend Ordinance 4899, City of Goshen Building Department Fee Ordinance*. Ordinance 5243 would establish that:

- Ordinance 4899, Building Department Fee Ordinance, as amended by Ordinance 4919, Ordinance 5001, and Ordinance 5206, establishes the various fees for permits, inspections, certificates, registrations, licensing, and other services provided by the City of Goshen Building Department.
- City administration finds it necessary to increase the fees for the licensing and registration of electrical and mechanical contractors.

If Ordinance 5243 was approved, it would be ordained that Ordinance 4899, SECTION 6, Licensing and Registering of Contractors Ordinance, shall be amended to read as follows:

6.01 Effective January 1, 2026, the following fees shall be charged for the licensing and registering of contractors under the Licensing and Registering of Contractors Ordinance of the City of Goshen as amended from time to time:

- (A) Annual Electrical/Mechanical Contractor Licensing and Registration \$123
- (B) Examination Administrative Fee \$ 42

This ordinance specifically repeals and replaces Ordinance 5206.

This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and adoption according to the laws of the State of Indiana.



DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASAAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5243:

Mayor Leichty invited comments from Building Commissioner Myron Grise who said each year the Building Department conducts "an evaluation of where we're at for our costs and overhead for our department, and each year we usually only to go up the cost of living. So, that's what we raised the rates for the licensing which was just the cost of living for this year, for 2025."

Councilor Riegsecker asked about the proposed increase. City Attorney Stegelmann said it was a 3% increase. There were no additional Council questions or comments.

At 6:12 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited comments from the public on Ordinance 5243.

James Loewen of Goshen said that in reviewing the agenda for this and other proposed fee increases being considered tonight, he did not see the actual cost increases – what the current costs are and the percentage of increases. He asked, "How and in what way are those numbers and language changing from existing? How much is it increasing?"

Loewen also asked, "Why can't that be in the written record that we're looking at, either as a redline version or the way they do in some legislatures, where there's a legislative analyst's summary of what's being adopted? If you're interested in letting the public know what's happening here, I would recommend either a redline or a summary of the adopted changes. That's all I got."

Mayor Leichty thanked Loewen for his comments.

Council President Weddell clarified that the proposed changes were \$123 for the electrical, mechanical and contractor licensing and registration and then the examination administrative fee of \$42. He asked City Attorney Bodie Stegelmann to provide the previous amounts prior to the proposed changes. Stegelmann said for annual electrical, mechanical contractor licensing and registration, the prior amount was \$119 and the examination administrative fee was \$41.

Council President Weddell thanked Stegelmann and acknowledged the validity of Loewen's request. He then repeated that annual electrical fee is going up by \$4 and the examination administration fee is going up by \$1. But he noted the previous fees were not included in the information provided to the Council and the public.

Councilor Lederach affirmed Council President Weddell observation and added, "I would second that. I think I was asked this week as well." Other Councilors agreed.

There were no further comments, so the Mayor closed the public comment period at 6:14 p.m.

Councilors affirmed that they were ready to vote on Ordinance 5243 on First Reading.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5243, Amend Ordinance 4899, City of Goshen Building Department Fee Ordinance, on First Reading by a 7-0 margin, with all Councilors present or online voting yes at 6:16 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted "yes."

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5243, so the matter was to be placed on the agenda of the Dec. 29, 2029 meeting.

3) Ordinance 5244, City of Goshen Cemetery Fees (for the sale of burial rights and burial spaces, burials, scatterings and disinterments at Oakridge Cemetery, Violett Cemetery and West Goshen Cemetery)



Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5244, *City of Goshen Cemetery Fees*. Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5244 by title only, which was done. **Weddell/Nisley moved to approve Ordinance 5244 on First Reading.**

BACKGROUND:

Before the Council was Ordinance 5244, *City of Goshen Cemetery Fees*.

It would establish that the Board of Cemetery Trustees of the City of Goshen “finds it necessary to establish new cemetery fees for the sale for burial rights and burial spaces, burials and disinterments at Oakridge Cemetery, Violet Cemetery and West Goshen Cemetery, and recommends to the Goshen Common Council the new cemetery fees set forth in Exhibit A attached to this ordinance.”

Section 1. Cemetery Fees

(A) Effective Jan. 1, 2026, the cemetery fees set forth in Exhibit A attached to this ordinance shall be charged and collected for the sale of burial rights and burial spaces, burials, scatterings, and disinterments at Oakridge Cemetery, Violet Cemetery and West Goshen Cemetery.

(B) From all cemetery fees collected, five percent (5%) shall be deposited into the Cemetery Capital Improvement Fund and five percent (5%) shall be deposited into the Cemetery Permanent Maintenance Fund in accordance with Ordinance 4252.

Section 2. Other Ordinances

This ordinance repeals and replaces Ordinance 5113.

Section 3. Effective Date

This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and adoption according to the laws of the State of Indiana.

DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASSAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5244:

Mayor Leichty invited comments from Director of Cemeteries Burt Matteson.

Matteson said the Cemeteries Department has been part of past City fee increases, which are multi-year and are planned 3% increases for each line item. So, he said it was a 3% increase per year. He said, “It’s over the next 10 years, and those numbers, those 3% increases, are rounded off to the nearest \$5 mark, just to make them easier to remember for those of us that deal with those numbers frequently, and also for the public.”

Mayor Leichty invited questions from Councilors.

Councilor Gerber asked if the 3% increase was in keeping with previous years. Matteson said it was, adding, “throughout the duration of my tenure, there’s been 3% increases every year.”

Mayor Leichty said, “I can confirm that that does not keep up with the cost of inflation by any stretch of the imagination. If you want an expensive business venture, open a cemetery.”

Commenting on the various proposed fee increases before the Council tonight, Council President Weddell said “I would just say I think there’s about 38 different fees here. I won’t ask you or the Legal Department to tell us what they were in 2025. We’ll just realize that they’re 3% more than that. How’s that.”

Councilor Schrock responded, “Thank you, Brett. I was thinking the same thing.”

At 6:19 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited public comments on Ordinance 5244. There were none.



Councilor Gerber asked, "So, if we're not keeping up with inflation, are we adequately covering our costs?" Mayor Leichty responded, "No. Those are being subsidized from the General Fund."

Council President Weddell asked, "Is there any estimation on the percent increase that would be required to break even?" The Mayor said, "I'll have to bring that analysis to a future meeting. I mean, there's costs of labor, there's costs of the equipment. And we maintain cemeteries into perpetuity, so there's a one-time fee, and that's maintained forever."

Council Weddell replied, "Considering the restraints of our finances, is this something that we should consider moving forward to make sure that our expenses are covered?" Mayor Leichty said, "It could be something that we do a more in-depth analysis for next year, if that's something the Council would like to see. We could engage Baker Tilly (Municipal Advisers) to do a comprehensive analysis on what it would take to really cover those fees."

Council President Weddell said, "But of course, then I wonder what the cost to have that analysis would be. That may not be worth it financially."

Mayor Leichty said, "We could get an estimate from them on what it would cost for them to provide us with that detailed analysis. I know (Public Works Director) Dustin Sailor has done a considerable amount of research, too, so we could probably come up with some kind of basic ballpark (number), but if you really want to now, it would be better to engage them (Baker Tilly) and they can do an additional market study, too, and talk about what others are charging as well."

Councilor Lederach said, "It would be nice to have a ballpark (number), and maybe after the January session downstate, we'll have a better idea of what financing will be moving forward, that would make a difference, I think, too, in how we have to approach things like this."

In response to a question from the Mayor, Councilors indicated they were ready to vote.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5244, City of Goshen Cemetery Fees, on First Reading by a 7-0 margin, with all Councilors present or online voting yes at 6:21 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted "yes."

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5244, so consideration was placed on the agenda of the Dec. 29, 2029 meeting. Council President Weddell said there would not be unanimous consent to pass any of the proposed fee increases tonight.

4) Ordinance 5245, Amend Park Rules and Regulations To Allow for the Possession and Consumption of Alcohol for Limited Events

Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5245, *Amend Park Rules and Regulations To Allow for the Possession and Consumption of Alcohol for Limited Events*. Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5245 by title only, which was done.

Weddell/Nisley moved to approve Ordinance 5245 on First Reading.

BACKGROUND:

Before the Council for consideration was Ordinance 5245, *Amend Park Rules and Regulations To Allow for the Possession and Consumption of Alcohol for Limited Events*.



If approved, Ordinance 5245 would establish that:

- The Goshen Common Council passed Ordinance 4294 to establish the rules and regulations for parks and other recreational areas in the City of Goshen. Ordinance 4294 is codified in the Goshen City Code at Title 7, Article 1, Chapter 1.
- The Goshen Parks and Recreation Board from time to time finds it necessary to amend the park rules and regulations and did recommend the adoption of amendment to the City Code by a vote of 5-0.
- The proposed amendment furthers the purposes of the Goshen Parks and Recreation system.
- The proposed amendment is intended to allow for the possession and consumption of alcohol during rentals of Park Pavilions and Facilities.

If Ordinance 5245 was approved, it would be ordained that:

SECTION 1. Possession and Consumption of Alcohol.

Goshen City Code Title 7, Article 1, Chapter 1, Section 10 shall be amended to read as follows:

7.1.1.10 Possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages.

(a) General Rule. Except as provided herein, no person shall possess, consume, sell, offer for sale, barter, or exchange any alcoholic beverage in any park or other recreational area.

(b) Exceptions. The Goshen Parks and Recreation Department, with approval of the Goshen Parks and Recreation Board, may permit the possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages:

(1) In conjunction with the rental of a park pavilion or facility, provided that:

(a) The renter completed a Facility Rental Agreement and an Alcohol Permit Authorization Addendum approved by the Goshen Parks and Recreation Department;

(b) All possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages are restricted to the premises or footprint of the rented pavilion or facility, unless otherwise approved in the rental agreement;

(c) The renter complies with all rules and conditions imposed by the Goshen Parks and Recreation Department; and

(d) All persons comply with the laws and regulations of the Indiana Alcohol and Tobacco Commission.

(2) In connection with a program or event sponsored, organized, or conducted by the Goshen Parks and Recreation Department or the City of Goshen, provided that all possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages are restricted to the area designated for the event or program and that all persons comply with the laws and regulations of the Indiana Alcohol and Tobacco Commission.

(c) Definition. For purposes of this section, "alcoholic beverage" means a liquid or solid that is, or contains, one-half percent (0.5%) or more alcohol by volume; is fit for human consumption; and is reasonably likely, or intended, to be used as a beverage.

SECTION 2. Effective Date

This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and adoption according to the laws of the State of Indiana.

DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASSAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5245:

City Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Tanya Heyde made a presentation about Ordinance 5245.

Heyde said this proposed ordinance was coming from the City Parks and Recreation Department and with the unanimous support and recommendation by the Parks and Recreation Board. She said Goshen parks "serve as gathering spaces for residents to celebrate, connect, and to build community."



Heyde said this ordinance “proposes a limited and regulated allowance for alcohol consumption in the parks in conjunction with permitted facilities and by special events, hosted or sponsored by the, Goshen Park Department. The purpose of this ordinance is to enhance the community use of parks and also modernize some of the policies to be able to expand, special events and facility uses within the park system.”

Mayor Leichty discussed the impetus for Ordinance 5245 and why it came up this year.

The Mayor said, “The City is already allowing specific cases of limited use of alcohol on our property. So, for example, the Arts on the Millrace event that takes place in September, and the Hispanic Heritage Festival.”

Both events, she said, have taken place at Powerhouse Park, which is land that is owned by the Redevelopment Commission, but managed by the Parks Department. However, she said allowing alcoholic beverages to be served there can be complicated.

“And so, part of the idea here is that if it's okay to do under certain very strict guidelines in one area, could we allow it in other areas that people have called and asked about, for specific events,” Mayor Leichty said. “So, for example, the Float Fest asked about the possibility of setting up a designated food court area where they would also be able to sell beer or wine during their event, so they have a progressive music festival along the Millrace, and as a means for them to generate additional revenue, they wanted to bring in food trucks and have a designated beer and wine area for that event. But of course, we had to say ‘no,’ because the area that they would want to do that, instead of being owned by Redevelopment, is owned by Parks.

“So, there's just some complexity that exists within the City that we'd like to make it possible for people who want to do special events in cooperation with the City to not have that bureaucratic additional layer. We do want to be exceedingly careful. This is not a ‘bring your six-pack to the park’ kind of ordinance.”

If Ordinance 5245 was approved, Mayor Leichty said applicants would have to go through a process of applying for an event permit, have special alcohol service, insurance and licensure in order to be able to do that. She said, “This is not just a free-for-all. I just want to be very clear about that.”

Mayor Leichty said she hoped the Council would give Ordinance 5245 due consideration “because it does also open up some additional potential revenue for Parks who have had to turn people away in the past when they wanted to do, a wedding reception or something like that ... and at a time when we are looking at revenue-generating opportunities, I see this as being one additional tool that could be very useful to the Park Board and our Parks team.”

Councilor Schrock asked if future events at the parks have to follow those guidelines. Mayor Leichty said they already do and would. She added, “In my former life, when I would facilitate the Arts on the Mill Race events, we had to get special liability insurance in order to be able to serve alcohol. We had to go through the ATC permitting process. I mean, we went through all of that, it just happened to be on Redevelopment-owned land rather than Parks Department land. Everybody that's served has to be a licensed bartender.”

The Mayor said the strict procedures required to serve alcoholic beverages for events on Redevelopment Commission land would be required on Parks Department land.

Councilor Gerber asked if the Parks Department has received any feedback from surveys about allowing alcoholic beverages in City parks. Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Heyde said there have not been surveys but “we do have an idea, from the community or those who call to rent facilities that are turned away or don't end up renting a facility because alcohol is not permitted. So, we do have an idea of that, but the community has not been, outraged with this specific question.”

Councilor Riegsecker asked Heyde if other parks departments in the area allow alcoholic beverages to be served in parks.



Heyde said, "Elkhart City does allow it through the same type of permitting that is proposed here. Elkhart County sounds like they do allow it for park-sponsored events and that is taken to the board for each event for permission. And then I know that Mishawaka does allow it, both for facility rentals and events, St. Joseph County Parks does as well."

Councilor Riegsecker asked City Police Chief José Miller if the City has had much problem with alcohol in the parks. Chief Miller said, "I would say we haven't had a major problem with it. We have problems from time to time of people coming in with alcohol, but it's a very sporadic case-by-case situation, usually."

Councilor Lederach noted that the ordinance has a provision requiring security at events where alcoholic beverages are served. He asked if such events would require a police presence.

Chief Miller said, "I would say 'no,' because we usually don't perform security where there's alcohol served, unless it's a City-sponsored type of event, and then it would be like outside overtime situation similar to First Fridays. But if it's just a private individual that would want security, it would have to be a private security company."

Councilor Lederach asked, "So you wouldn't necessarily see this as an increased demand on the police department?" The Chief said, "No."

Councilor Nisley asked, "And would that security company be a licensed security company, or just friends that are friends of the people (holding the event)."

Mayor Leichty said, "It can be handled different ways. A lot of the responsibility of the security personnel and events that I've been involved with has to do with keeping people from leaving their contained area where they're supposed to be, so, ensuring that people aren't just walking around in other areas besides the designated area where they're allowed to have alcohol. And then, in any of the events that I've been involved with, we would pay for off-duty police overtime or hire through a private security service."

Council President Weddell said, "Councilman Nisley, according to the contract here, it says, 'shall employ a licensed security company.' So, I think, more directly, the answer is 'yes.' And that paragraph continues on, which was one of my concerns, too, is the size of the event.

"The Park Department and staff would determine the number of safety licensed security members they would need. So, I'm sure if you rent a small facility and you have 25 people versus a larger facility and you have 100, you would then make the determination through the Park Department on the required number of licensed security members, obviously."

Mayor Leichty said that was correct. Councilor Riegsecker asked, "Will that kind of be standard? I mean, like the number of people, you'll already have it set, how many" security personnel are required?

The Mayor said, "We would certainly standardize that in a policy. And we already have that online with other events, so if you're going to the Board of Works, like, if you're going to close down Main Street for an event, there's a whole list of things that could engage City resources, whether that's having trash services available or Street Department services, or security services.

"And there are different fees associated with that, and then there's a calculation on, based on the size of your event how much would be needed. And typically, if it's any kind of event over 100 people where we have a multi-departmental meeting with the individuals having the event, and the same could be true of the Parks Department, or anybody that's going to be affected has a joint meeting to make sure that we're all on the same page before that petition is granted. So, typically, those petitions come before the Board of Works on non-parks land. In this case, it would go before the Parks Board for their consideration, so they have to fill out the application, meet with the affected departments, and then make their petition before the Parks Board for final approval."



Councilor Nisley asked about the alcohol permit fee of \$150, and whether that was the State fee. The Mayor said that would be the City's fee and a separate fee would have to be paid to the State.

Councilor Riegsecker said, "This has been very well presented and laid out. It looks like we have everything covered, so I appreciate that. And I wouldn't... wouldn't expect anything less from Tanya (Heyde) anyway."

Councilor Riegsecker said he hasn't heard any public comments about this proposal. He asked if other Councilors had heard any comments from the public.

Councilor Schrock said, "I've heard some that wish we had alcohol at the parks, but not against it."

Councilor Nisley said he has heard some opposition but appreciated the way it has been proposed. He said he was initially worried that people could be drinking alcoholic beverages openly, but "you still have to have your licensed bartenders you've got a place designated for where you can drink the alcohol at, you've got to have maps ... I think you've done a real good job."

Council President Weddell said this idea was discussed a number of years ago "but it wasn't laid out this well. We had like an hour conversation, ultimately to vote it down, and a lot of it revolved around security and licensing and whatnot. And so, I appreciate the thought and detail that came into what's presented to us this evening. And I will say, too, I'm not an organizer of Arts on the Millrace, but I've been a participant and a frequent attendee of that event, and I think that's a perfect example of the process ... and it's really worked out well. To my knowledge, there's never been a problem with that."

Council President Weddell said the Redevelopment Commission owns a number of these properties, and part of the reason why it has maintained ownership "is so that we can, I hate to use the word 'circumvent' the rules of the Parks Department ..." Mayor Leichthy chuckled and quickly added, "So, we could meet the needs of the community, I think is what you meant to say, Councilor." Council President Weddell said, "Yes."

Noticing that Parks and Recreation Board President Megan Hessl was present, Mayor Leichthy asked if she wanted to address the Council about Ordinance 5245. Hessl also is a member of the Redevelopment Commission. Hessl said, "I've seen both sides of this coin. We did not take upon this ordinance easily. We had a nice discussion as a group. We don't want, as Councilor Nisley said, people just showing up at the park with a cooler of beer and having a party. There are park-organized events where we would like to be able to offer a beer garden, and we currently can't do that within our constraints."

"So, I would love if you guys would consider voting 'yes' on this today, just to give Tanya (Heyde) and her team a little bit more flexibility with some of the amazing events that they plan and then about a dozen people throughout the year that want to use our park space for this need. We all want to generate a little more revenue for the City right now, so if we can do our part this way as the Park Board, we'd like to do that."

At 6:38 p.m., Mayor Leichthy invited public comments on Ordinance 5245. There were none.

Councilors indicated they were ready to vote.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5245, Amend Park Rules and Regulations To Allow for the Possession and Consumption of Alcohol for Limited Events, on First Reading by a 7-0 margin, with all Councilors voting yes at 6:40 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted "yes."

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5245, so consideration was placed on the agenda of the Dec. 29, 2029 meeting.



5) Ordinance 5246, Goshen Water Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges

Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5246, *Goshen Water Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges*. Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5246 by title only, which was done.

Weddell/Riegsecker moved to approve Ordinance 5246 on First Reading.

BACKGROUND:

Before the Council was Ordinance 5246, *Goshen Water Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges*. Ordinance 5246 would establish:

- The rates and charges for services of the Goshen Water Utility must produce an income sufficient to maintain the utility property in a sound physical and financial condition to render adequate and efficient service;
- The rates and charges for services of the Goshen Water Utility must be nondiscriminatory, reasonable and just;
- The reasonable and just rates and charges for services provided by the Goshen Water Utility must produce sufficient revenue to the utility to meet the requirements of Indiana Code § 8-1.5-3-8(c) and (d);
- A recent financial study of the Goshen Water Utility by Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors, LLC, indicates that its current rates and charges are not sufficient to meet the reasonable financial requirements of the Water Utility; and
- The Common Council finds it necessary to increase certain rates and charges for the services of the Goshen Water Utility.

If the Common Council passed Ordinance 5246, the following would be ordained:

Section 1. Water Rates and Charges

A. Monthly Water Usage Charge. Each customer shall pay the monthly water usage charge in accordance with the following schedule based on the metered volume of water per one hundred (100) cubic feet supplied.

Cubic Feet of Water Supplied	2026
First 3,000 cubic feet	\$3.67
Next 97,000 cubic feet	\$2.39
Next 100,000 cubic feet	\$1.86

B. Monthly Water Service Charge. Each customer shall pay the monthly water service charge in accordance with the following schedule based on the applicable size of the meter installed. If there is a compound meter, only the larger meter will pay a service charge. This service charge pays for administrative costs, billing charges, fire protection charges and meter maintenance. This service charge is in addition to the monthly water usage charge.

Meter Size	2026
5/8-inch meter	\$12.61
3/4-inch meter	\$15.74
1-inch meter	\$23.06
1 1/2-inch meter	\$41.74
2-inch meter	\$64.14
3-inch meter	\$116.42



4-inch meter	\$191.11
6-inch meter	\$373.57
8-inch meter	\$573.91

C. Monthly Water Service Charge for Sprinkler Meters. Each customer with a sprinkler meter shall pay the monthly water service charge for sprinkler meters in accordance with the following schedule based on the applicable size of the meter installed. The amount is different than the service charges set forth in paragraph (B) so that customers are not billed twice for fire protection.

Meter Size	2026
5/8-inch meter	\$6.90
3/4-inch meter	\$7.20
1-inch meter	\$8.80
1 1/2-inch meter	\$13.25
2-inch meter	\$18.50
3-inch meter	\$30.90
4-inch meter	\$48.55
6-inch meter	\$88.45
8-inch meter	\$117.70

D. Fire Protection Charges.

(1) Public Fire Protection Charge.

i. **Public Fire Protection Charge for Water Utility Customers.** The monthly public fire protection charge for customers of the Goshen Water Utility is included in the monthly water service charge set forth in paragraph (B).

ii. **Public Fire Protection Charge for Sewer-Only Utility Customers.** Each customer of the Goshen Sewer Utility whose premises is not connected to the services provided by Goshen Water Utility shall pay a monthly public fire protection charge in accordance with the following schedule based on the applicable size of the meter installed. A customer of the Goshen Sewer Utility who does not have a meter installed will be charged a monthly public fire protection charge based on the rate for a 5/8-inch meter.

Meter Size	2026
5/8-inch meter	\$5.70
3/4-inch meter	\$8.55
1-inch meter	\$14.26
1 1/2-inch meter	\$28.51
2-inch meter	\$45.62
3-inch meter	\$85.54
4-inch meter	\$142.56
6-inch meter	\$285.12
8-inch meter	\$456.19

(2) **Private Fire Hydrants.** Each customer with a private fire hydrant shall pay the annual private fire hydrant protection charge in accordance with the following schedule.

2026
\$619.10



(3) Private Fire Sprinkler Lines. Each customer with a private fire sprinkler line shall pay the annual private fire sprinkler line protection charge in accordance with the following schedule based on the applicable size of the sprinkler line connection.

Connection Size	2026
1 1/2-inch connection	\$39.53
2-inch connection	\$68.19
3-inch connection	\$153.40
4-inch connection	\$275.22
6-inch connection	\$619.11
8-inch connection	\$1,306.55
10-inch connection	\$2,349.60
12-inch connection	\$3,795.23

E. Building Water Repair Program.

(1) Building Line Assessment (the combined water/sewer charge) - \$1.10 per month

F. Miscellaneous Charges. The charge for new meters and related accessories will be charged to each customer at cost plus applicable taxes, without any mark-up.

Section 2. Other Ordinances. This ordinance repeals any provision of a prior ordinance that conflicts with the terms, conditions, rates and charges established by this ordinance. Terms, conditions, rates and charges of prior ordinances that are not in conflict with this ordinance shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and adoption according to the laws of the State of Indiana.

DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASSAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5246:

Mayor Leichy invited comments from City Director of Public Works & Utilities Dustin Sailor.

Sailor said this was the First Reading of Ordinance 5246, a proposed water rate increase. He said the Second Reading would be in January.

Sailor said, "We've talked numerous times about where the water utility is at and the need for additional capacity. We're currently working on expansion of the South Wellfield. We were fortunate enough to receive grant funding for the development of that. We are also in the process of purchasing an additional parcel by the Kercher Wellfield and looking to expand that for wellfield improvements.

"Along with that, we've got capital costs that are continuing to increase, along with other inflationary things. In the construction industry and in the water industry, inflation is increasing faster than your standard inflation in the residential scenario, and so we're looking at increasing this."

Sailor said City staff met with the City's rate consultant who recommended a higher rate. He said, "We picked a rate increase less than what they recommended. We have proceeded with engaging them to do a full rate study to look at our rates going forward beyond this rate increase."

(At this point, 6:42 p.m., Council President Weddell stated that Councilor Peel informed him that she was not feeling well and was discontinuing her participation in the meeting. She apologized for this.)

Councilor Schrock asked if the proposed water rate increase was 3% like the other increases tonight.



Sailor said "no." He said, "What we look at is a standard customer for a three-quarter inch meter, which is 4,000 gallons, and we measure based upon cubic feet, so it's 535 cubic feet. The increase for a standard residential three-quarter inch meter is \$2.61 a month and that's the base for that. The original rate in 2025 is \$3.40, and the new rate is \$3.67."

Councilor Riegsecker asked when the last rate increase took place.

Sailor said, "We have had a regular progression of rate increases, so 2023, 2024, and 2025, so we're at the last one of our rate increases we've had previously identified. We looked at, again, you know, at another progression of rate increases but felt it appropriate to go ahead and do a full cost of service study at this point.

"So, we're just doing a general across-the-board increase for 2026. And then with the cost-of-service study in place, we'll be able to come back to the Council with a better, handle of what the rate should be across all customer service classes, so residential, commercial, and industrial."

Councilor Riegsecker asked if the proposed rate was determined four years ago. Sailor said, "No, 2026 is a new rate based upon current conditions."

In response to a question from Council President Weddell, Sailor said all of the proposed rates in Ordinance 5246 have been increased. Council President Weddell asked if each was increased by 3% or if the rates varied. Sailor said, "We try to avoid percentages on this, but just looking at this one, it's 8%. We're going to go to the next one for sewer after this, and that one is, 6%. But as a customer would see, both an 8% and a 6%, their overall bill would just increase 6.7%. So that's why we try to avoid the percentages."

Council President Weddell said, "I'm going to echo something that was stated 30 minutes ago. It might be beneficial to all of us, including the public, to see what the previous rate was adjacent to, just for future reference."

Sailor said, "Sure, and so for the Second Reading, we'll be happy to provide that." The Mayor said, "We can do that across the board for all the rates that have been considered this evening."

There were no further Councilor questions, so at 6:45 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited public comments on Ordinance 5246. There were none.

Councilors indicated they were ready to vote.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5246, *Goshen Water Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges*, on First Reading by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 6:45 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted "yes." Councilor Peel was no longer available to vote.

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5246.

6) Ordinance 5247, Goshen Sewer Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges

Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5247, *Goshen Sewer Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges*. Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5247 by title only, which was done.

Weddell/Nisley moved to approve Ordinance 5247 on First Reading.



BACKGROUND:

Before the Council was Ordinance 5247, *Goshen Sewer Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges*. Ordinance 5247 would establish:

- The rates and charges for services of the Goshen Sewer Utility must produce an income sufficient to maintain the utility property in a sound physical and financial condition to render adequate and efficient service;
- The rates and charges for services of the Goshen Sewer Utility must be just and equitable;
- The just and equitable rates and charges for services provided by the Goshen Sewer Utility must produce sufficient revenue to the utility to meet the requirements of Indiana Code § 36-9-23-25;
- A recent financial study of the Goshen Sewer Utility by Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors, LLC, indicates that its current rates and charges are not sufficient to meet the reasonable financial requirements of the Sewer Utility; and
- The Common Council finds it necessary to increase certain rates and charges for the services of the Goshen Sewer Utility.

If the Common Council passed Ordinance 5247, the following would be ordained:

Section 1. Sewer Rates and Charges.

A. Monthly Sewer Rates and Charges. Each customer shall pay the monthly sewer rates and charges in accordance with the schedules set forth below.

(1) Metered Customers.

i. Monthly Sewer Usage Charge. Each metered customer shall pay the monthly sewer usage charge in accordance with the following schedule based on the volume of sewage per one hundred (100) cubic feet discharged.

2026
\$8.19

ii. Monthly Sewer Service Charge. Each metered customer shall pay the monthly sewer service charge in accordance with the following schedule based on the applicable size of the meter installed. If there is a compound meter, only the larger meter will pay a service charge. This service charge pays for administrative costs, billing charges, and meter maintenance. This service charge is in addition to the monthly sewer usage charge.

Meter Size	2026
5/8-inch meter	\$12.84
3/4-inch meter	\$16.26
1-inch meter	\$25.64
1 1/2-inch meter	\$53.92
2-inch meter	\$89.85
3-inch meter	\$201.06
4-inch meter	\$346.57
6-inch meter	\$782.94
8-inch meter	\$1,391.32

(2) Unmetered Customers.



i. City Water Available - Monthly Sewer Usage Charge and Service Charge. Each customer receiving sewer services for an unmetered residential lot, or unmetered residential building that has city water available shall pay the following monthly sewer usage charge and service charge in accordance with the following schedule.

2026

\$115.81

ii. City Water Not Available - Monthly Sewer Usage Charge and Service Charge. Each customer receiving sewer services for an unmetered residential lot or unmetered residential building that does not have city water available shall pay the following monthly sewer usage charge and service charge in accordance with the following schedule.

2026

\$83.03

B. Surcharges. The following treatment surcharges shall be charged per pound in accordance with the following schedule.

Surcharges (per pound)	2026
BOD (in excess of 200 mg/l)	\$0.15
SS (in excess of 200 mg/l)	\$0.15
NH3-N (in excess of 30 mg/l)	\$0.61
Phosphate (in excess of 10 mg/l)	\$0.90
FOG (in excess of 200 mg/l)	\$0.83

C. Building Sewer Repair Program.

(1) Building Line Assessment (the combined water/sewer charge) - \$1.10 per month.

(2) Building Sewer Claim Fee - \$350.00 per claim.

Section 2. Other Ordinances. This ordinance repeals any provision of a prior ordinance that conflicts with the terms, conditions, rates and charges established by this ordinance. Terms, conditions, rates and charges of prior ordinances that are not in conflict with this ordinance shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and adoption according to the laws of the State of Indiana.

DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASSAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5247:

City Director of Public Works & Utilities Dustin Sailor said Ordinance 5247 is proposing a sewer utility rate increase for 2026. He said "the 2025 rate is \$7.73 per 100 cubic feet, and the 2026 proposed rate is \$8.19 per 100 cubic feet. Again, this would be an across-the-board increase. For a three-quarter inch meter, the increase for a customer would be \$3.38."

Mayor Leichty asked if there were questions or comments from Councilors, There were none.

At 6:47 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited public comments on Ordinance 5247. There were none.

Returning to Ordinance 5246, Councilor Riegsecker asked about the proposed new fire protection charges. He said it appeared his charge would increase from \$7.92 for a three-quarter-inch meter to \$8.55. He asked if that was correct. Sailor said he would check and verify that. Councilor Riegsecker said, "That's okay. I just wanted to make sure that we weren't accidentally misleading anyone by saying (there was a) 6% across the board (increase)."



Councilor Gerber said, "I just want to clarify, the overall combined increase that people will see on their bills is 6.7%?" Sallor said, "That's correct. That's the average customer."

At 6:49 p.m., Mayor Leichty again invited public comments on Ordinance 5247. There were none.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5247, *Goshen Sewer Utility Schedule of Rates and Charges*, on First Reading by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 6:49 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted "yes."

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5247.

7) Ordinance 5248, Additional Appropriations

Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5248, *Additional Appropriations*.

Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5248 by title only, which was done.

Weddell/Lederach moved to approve Ordinance 5248 on First Reading.

BACKGROUND:

Before the Council was Ordinance 5248, *Additional Appropriations*. If approved by the Common Council, it would appropriate more money than the amount appropriated in the current year's annual budget.

In a Dec. 15, 2026 memorandum to the Common Council, Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre wrote that Ordinance 5248 was requesting authorization from the Council and Mayor to spend additional and available money from various accounts. He wrote that the Mayor and Clerk-Treasurer were requesting this ordinance because the Common Council is the City's fiscal body which authorizes the City's budget and any budget adjustments.

Aguirre wrote that an appropriation is "permission to spend available money" and is tied to a specific fund. Within a fund there are four spending categories and multiple accounts. It is possible to get permission to move budgeted spending between accounts and categories, but sometimes the total appropriations within a fund are insufficient for the fund's total spending, due to emergencies, unforeseen circumstances, or budget errors.

In this case, Aguirre wrote that the Mayor and Clerk-Treasurer propose an additional appropriation if the expenditures are necessary and paying the expenditure might otherwise overspend the budgeted appropriation. After Council approval, the Clerk-Treasurer submits the additional appropriation to the Department of Local Government Finance ("DLGF") for final approval. The DLGF will only approve an additional appropriation if the Clerk-Treasurer proves that the City has cash available for the additional appropriation and the following year's budget.

Description of the requested appropriations in Ordinance 5248:

The Goshen Fire Department continues to provide services for Elkhart Township and needs to use a portion of the 2025 budget for capital expenditures. This appropriation increases the Equipment line in the Township Fire budget for purchases necessary at the end of 2025.

The Redhawk Academy, under the supervision of the Goshen Fire Department, budgeted for the Spring 2025 expenses but ran into additional expenses for Fall 2025. The additional appropriations will open up additional funds for the Fall 2025 student cohort, which are reimbursed from various sources such as the State of Indiana and donations from local organizations.



The Redevelopment Commission is currently spending funds to complete the Brownfield cleanup in the Aerial Cycle Works project. The Brownfield Revolving Loan Fund provides relief for such projects but is very difficult to anticipate when expenses will occur. This appropriation opens up funds for the Brownfield expenses necessitated throughout the year.

Aguirre wrote that each affected fund has sufficient cash balances to spend these appropriations. If the Council approves Ordinance 5248, the Clerk-Treasurer will submit the necessary information to the DLGF for final approval. If approved by the Council, Ordinance 5248 would make the following additional appropriations of money in excess of the current year's budget for the fund(s) named:

TOWNSHIP FIRE SUPPORT

2258-5-00-4450500	TWPFIRE / Other Equipment	\$150,000.00
-------------------	---------------------------	--------------

REDHAWK ACADEMY

2508-5-00-4220310	RDHWK / Fire Uniforms	\$12,000.00
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------

2508-5-00-4360200	RDHWK / Fire Equipment	\$10,000.00
-------------------	------------------------	-------------

BROWNFIELD REVOLVING LOAN FUND

4653-5-00-4390500	BRLF / Grant Awarded	\$412,000.00
-------------------	----------------------	--------------

DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASSAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5248:

Mayor Leichty invited comments from City Director of Public Works & Utilities Dustin Sailor.

Sailor said City Redevelopment Director Becky Hutsell informed him that the appropriation from the Brownfield Revolving Loan Fund was to complete the Brownfield cleanup in the Aerial Cycle works project site and not the Cherry Creek project, as mistakenly stated in the memorandum for Ordinance 5248.

Mayor Leichty thanked Sailor for the clarification and added, "I know that was a question that popped up for a number of Councilors."

The Mayor asked if Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre had anything else to add.

Aguirre said, "We did provide a description there that's pretty clear that the two others are for the Fire Department. One from funds that we have available from the Elkhart Township for capital expenditures and the other for expenditures having to do with the Red Hawk Academy."

Mayor Leichty said, "I do want to verify for the Red Hawk Academy. We get a reimbursement through the school system for that, but we didn't know when we were budgeting how many students would apply. So, we didn't budget for the full amount that we would need to expend on those supplies for those students who participated, but we do have a revenue source for those items. So, I just want to make sure that that's clear."

"And then for the township line ... I had a conversation with (Fire Chief) Anthony (Powell) just this afternoon. He was explaining it was actually an allocation. We had budgeted for hiring additional firefighters, which we did not budget for in that line, and then we had not budgeted for some of the remodeling and some other expenditures for a vehicle. So, instead of doing a category transfer, he's asking for an additional appropriation, and then the funds that were budgeted for the additional salaries will just go back into that township fund."

Council President Weddell said as a Redevelopment Commission member he was "a little embarrassed" to just learn about the proposed appropriation for the Brownfield Revolving Loan Fund for Aerial Cycle Works. He said, "They're already very far along in the process. Unless I forgot something, which is very possible, and we've got another Redevelopment Commission member here and she doesn't remember either. I'm trying to think what they still need to have money."



Council President Weddell said he sent a message to Redevelopment Director Hutsell about this but hasn't received a response. He said he didn't know what this would be for.

Redevelopment Commission member Megan Hessl said, "I recall two items that we approved for, like, almost \$800,000 of moving dirt out of there. So, that's why this surprised me as well, too, because we had already approved a large amount of money for cleanup. And I could be wrong, but that's what I recall from about three months ago."

Mayor Leichty said, "If there are additional questions that need to be resolved, it could be possible to table, or we could vote on First Reading. Council President Weddell said he would be OK approving Ordinance 5248 on First Reading but asked if there was urgency for final approval tonight. Mayor Leichty said, "It could it happen on Dec. 29th as long as we get it resolved by year end."

Council President Weddell said he would feel better delaying final approval.

At 6:55 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited public comments on Ordinance 5248. There were none.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5248, Additional Appropriations, on First Reading by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 6:55 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted "yes."

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5248, so the matter will be back before the Council on Dec. 29.

8) Ordinance 5242, Amending Goshen Common Council Rules of Order

Mayor Leichty called for the introduction on First Reading of Ordinance 5242, *Amending Goshen Common Council Rules of Order*. Council President Weddell asked the Clerk-Treasurer to read Ordinance 5242 by title only, which was done.

Weddell/Lederach moved to approve Ordinance 5242 on First Reading.

BACKGROUND:

Before the Council was Ordinance 5242, *Amending Goshen Common Council Rules of Order*. Ordinance 5242 would establish:

- The Goshen Common Council adopted Ordinance 4897, amended by Ordinance 4925, Ordinance 4998, and Ordinance 5036, which established Goshen Common Council Rules of Order;
- The Goshen Common Council adopts rules of order to facilitate the orderly transaction of business and provide a basis for resolving questions of procedure that may arise;
- The Goshen Common Council embraces the following principles as important in facilitating the orderly transaction of its business and in promoting the best interests of the City of Goshen:
 - Respect for each other and for each other's rights;
 - Open communication and engagement;
 - Honesty;
 - A safe community;



- Acceptance that change has positive and negative consequences;
- Tolerance of differences;
- Support for equality and freedom from discrimination; and
- And the Goshen Common Council seeks to amend its Rules of Order by making appropriate revisions thereto.

If the Common Council passed Ordinance 5242, there would be revisions in the following sections of the Goshen Common Council Rules of Order:

Section 1. Application of Rules.

Section 2. Common Council Powers and Duties.

Section 3. Deputy Mayor.

Section 4. Common Council President Role.

Section 5. Common Council Presiding Officer Powers and Duties.

Section 6. Motions.

Section 7. Debate.

Section 8. Option for Written Vote.

Section 9. Privilege of the Floor.

Section 10. Prohibited Conduct.

Section 11. Public Notice of Meetings.

Section 12. Agenda Items.

Section 13. Sign-In for Speakers.

Section 14. Common Council Seating.

Section 15. Canceled Common Council Meetings.

Section 16. Minutes.

Section 17. Appointments of the Common Council

Ordinance 5242 was considered on First Reading by the Common Council on Nov. 17, 2025 .There was extensive discussion and amendments to Ordinance 5242. The matter was then continued to Dec. 15, 2025 for further consideration.

DEC. 15, 2025 COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND PASSAGE ON FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 5242:

Mayor Leichty said some questions about the ordinance came up from Councilors after the last meeting. She said Councilors had an opportunity to read proposed language for the ordinance that had to do with facilitating the meeting and what the implications would be if the Deputy Mayor was facilitating that meeting.

The Mayor said there was some proposed language several Councilors believe could address and resolve that issue. She said there might be other questions that Councilors might want to address this evening.

Council President Weddell suggested talking about the duties of the presiding officer first. He said the following amended language was suggested as follows: "If a tie vote occurs when the Deputy Mayor is presiding, the motion does not pass. The Council may then, by majority vote, postpone the item to a future meeting, or reconsider the matter at the same meeting."



Council President Weddell said, "At first glance that seemed reasonable, but then as I read Robert's Rules (of Order), which is what we govern ourselves by. If there's a tie, that motion dies."

Mayor Leichty said, "Well, we use Home Rule." **Council President Weddell** said, "That's why I wanted to have clarification on that because if there is a tie, then it dies. It's not that you can then, after you've voted on it, you can't then come back and say, 'We're going to postpone to another time,' because we've already voted. And neither group in 3 to 3 ties is in the winning side because it's a tie.

"So, then can you even call a reconsideration? Because my understanding with the reconsideration is it has to be someone from the winning side."

City Attorney Bodie Stegelmann said, "I guess the way I'd answer that is that the general rule under the current version of the ordinance would be 'the Common Council shall endeavor to follow Robert's Rules of Order.' I think you're correct that if it's a tie, then the motion does not pass."

Council President Weddell said if this occurred, the matter could not come back for consideration by the Council unless it was substantially different. **Stegelmann** said that was correct.

However, the **City Attorney** added, "If this suggested language were adopted, it would basically create an exception to that rule ... Basically in essence what you're doing by adopting these rules in the first place is saying for our purposes, this is how we're going to conduct the meetings and conduct ourselves. So, the general rule is, yeah, tie vote, the item would not pass."

Council President Weddell asked, "But because we're creating our own special situational rule, it would supersede the Roberts Rules?" **Stegelmann** said, "Correct."

Council President Weddell asked **Councilor Gerber** for her opinion.

Councilor Gerber said, "I think it gives that missing Councilor an opportunity. What I mean, we don't know why people miss meetings. I assume most of the time it's outside of someone's control. So, I am comfortable with this carve out to allow someone that opportunity, but I'm open to hearing what other people have to say."

Council President Weddell said, "I'm okay with it, too. I just wanted to make sure that I understood the difference between strictly following Robert's Rules and then having this."

City Attorney Stegelmann said he wanted to clarify that this would only apply when the Deputy Mayor was presiding. He said, "If a Council member was absent, it was 3 to 3, and the Mayor was presiding at the meeting, then the Mayor would break the tie." **Council President Weddell** agreed.

Council President Weddell said he was prepared to make a motion. Councilors then discussed the appropriate location in the ordinance to place the amendment. It was ultimately agreed to place the amendment in Section 3.

Council President Weddell made motion to amend Section 3 and add new Point A as follows:

"In the event that the Mayor is absent from the City, ill or injured, the Deputy Mayor may serve as Acting Mayor as provided by the laws of the State of Indiana. In such (case), the Deputy Mayor would serve as the Presiding Officer of the Common Council meeting. If a tie vote occurs when the Deputy Mayor is presiding, the motion does not pass. The Council may then, by majority vote, postpone the item to a future meeting or reconsider the matter at the same meeting."

Council President Weddell said this paragraph would be the new point 3A and the existing points 3A, 3B, 3C would all shift down by one letter to become points 3B, #C and 3D.

Councilor Gerber seconded the motion.

(Note: The placement of the proposed amendment was later changed.)



Mayor Leichty asked if Councilors had questions or comments about the motion.

Councilor Riegsecker said, "I still think you need Common Council, Deputy Mayor, and President role."

Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre asked Council President Weddell to re-read the third sentence of his motion. He said, "If a tie vote occurs when the Deputy Mayor is presiding, the motion does not pass. The Council may then, by majority vote, postpone the item to a future meeting or reconsider the matter at the same meeting."

Mayor Leichty asked Councilor Riegsecker if he was requesting that Councilor Weddell to adjust his amendment.

City Attorney Stegelmann explained his rationale for his recommendation on where to place his amendment.

Ultimately, Councilors Weddell and Gerber agreed to modify their proposed amendment to create a new Section 3 about the role of the Deputy Mayor, with the previous Section 3 becoming Section 4.

Councilor Nisley asked whether the "may" language in the provision should instead be "shall." Council President Weddell said he preferred to leave it as "may."

At 7:09 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited comments from the audience about the proposed amendment. There were none.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed the Weddell/Gerber motion to amend Ordinance 5242 by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 7:10 p.m.

The Weddell/Gerber motion adds a new Section 3 as follows:

"In the event that the Mayor is absent from the City, ill or injured, the Deputy Mayor may serve as Acting Mayor as provided by the laws of the State of Indiana. In such (case), the Deputy Mayor would serve as the Presiding Officer of the Common Council meeting. If a tie vote occurs when the Deputy Mayor is presiding, the motion does not pass. The Council may then, by majority vote, postpone the item to a future meeting or reconsider the matter at the same meeting". Note: This becomes a new Section 3 and Section 4 becomes Section 4.

Mayor Leichty asked if there were any other proposed amendments to Ordinance 5242.

Councilor Gerber proposed an amendment on page 5, Section 12, "Sign-In for Speakers," Point C. She said, "The language reads, 'Individuals who arrive after the meeting begins and did not sign in will be allowed to speak if time permits after those who signed in.'"

Councilor Gerber then made a motion to strike the words "if time permits." Council President Weddell seconded the motion.

Mayor Leichty invited questions or comments from Councilors. There were none.

At 7:10, the Mayor invited comments from audience members. There were none.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed the Gerber/Weddell motion to amend Ordinance 5242 by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 7:10 p.m.

The Gerber/Weddell motion strikes the words "if time permits" from Point C from Section 12, "Sign-In for Speakers" (on page 5).

Mayor Leichty asked if Councilors had additional questions or comments on Ordinance 5242. They did not. Councilors indicated they were ready to vote.



On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed Ordinance 5242, Amending Goshen Common Council Rules of Order, on First Reading by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 7:11 p.m. Youth Adviser Reyes also voted “yes.”

Councilors did not give unanimous consent to proceed with the Second Reading of Ordinance 5242, so the matter will be continued to the Dec. 29, 2029 meeting.

9) Review and approval of 2026 Common Council Meeting Schedule

Mayor Leichy presented the following draft Common Council meeting schedule for 2026.

1	January 9	City Council: Exec. Session Board Applicant Review**	1:30	3:30	Second Friday
2	January 26	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
4	February 23	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
3	March 13	City Council: Q1: Information Session	1:30	3:30	Second Friday
5	March 23	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
6	April 27	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
8	May 18	City Council	6	7:30	Third Monday*
7	June 12	City Council: Q2: Information Session	1:30	3:30	Second Friday
9	June 22	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
10	July 27	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
11	August 24	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
12	September 11	City Council: Q3: Information Session Budget Detail	1:30	3:30	Second Friday
13	September 14	City Council: Budget Hearing 1	6	7:30	Second Monday
14	September 28	City Council: Budget Hearing 2 & Wage Ordinances	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
15	October 26	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday
16	November 13	City Council: Exec. Session - Board Applicant Review**	1:30	3:30	Second Friday
17	November 23	City Council	6	7:30	Fourth Monday



18	December 14	City Council	6	7:30	Second Monday*
19	December 28	City Council (Optional)	6	7:30	Fourth Monday

**Regular meeting adjusted for a holiday*

***All meetings at Council Meeting Chambers, 111 E Jefferson St, except those denoted with the **, which will take place at City Hall, 202 S. 5th St., in the Mayor's office.*

Mayor Leichty asked Councilors to please reserve the second Tuesday of each month in the event that the Council needs to have a special meeting to consider additional items. She said that would be the time at which additional meetings would need to be held.

The **Mayor** said, "We have 19 proposed Council meetings, and more than 200 City meetings scheduled for next year, so if you can keep those available as much as possible, that would certainly be welcome. It makes scheduling a whole lot easier."

Council President Weddell asked if the **Mayor** meant to ask Councilors to reserve the second Tuesday of the month. **Mayor Leichty** said, "I'm sorry. Did I say Tuesday? Holy cow. Second Monday of each month."

"In the past, we had done the second and fourth Monday of the month, but we have the additional education sessions, the quarterly education sessions, plus multiple sessions scheduled for our budget hearings, and we will be coming to you with at least one additional proposed meeting sometime in late fall. That is for the adoption of our unified planning and zoning ordinance ... probably October or November."

Council President Weddell said, "I'm just going to make one quick comment for all of us to consider. If we do what the **Mayor** is suggesting and just reserve that second Monday and we have to hold a meeting, our Clerk-Treasurer then spends money to publish that meeting."

"If we automatically schedule every single second Monday, and we end up canceling quite a few of them, he still has to spend money to publicly notify everyone, and so it may be probably more cost effective to not automatically have those scheduled. Is that a fair statement?"

Mayor Leichty said, "It certainly would aid in convenience, and it's less confusing for staff and those involved for the community. I know when we cancel meetings, that's when I received frustration from people. It's really difficult to let people know, broadly in the community that there's not a meeting happening because of the multitude of ways that people receive communication."

Mayor Leichty asked if there were any other questions about the proposed schedule.

At 7:15 p.m., a man seated in the audience stepped forward and spoke in Spanish. He wanted to speak about an unrelated matter, so the **Mayor** asked him to speak to her later.

When the meeting resumed, **Councilor Nisley** said he had a problem with the Friday meetings in the middle of the day. He said, "That's going to be tough for me, you know, with my business. That's a very busy day. Plus, I'm already committed to and will probably have to back away from the ordinance committee because of Friday meetings. So, those meetings won't work for me at all."

Councilor Nisley asked if the education meetings could be moved to the second Monday of the month.



Mayor Leichty said, "The purpose of having the daytime meetings, as we've talked about in the past, is that anytime that we're engaging staff, there's a large number of staff that would participate in those educational sessions. So, like when we've done the PASER study or things like that, the intention of those meetings is to include not just our department heads, but multiple people throughout our departments who can provide insight.

"So, like, we did the Mobile Integrated Health presentation, we've done a PASER presentation. We do the full budget presentation and review. and in order for the City to avoid incurring extra overtime costs or comp time expenditures, I'm asking Councilors to make those times available, at least quarterly, so that we can engage more of our staff."

Councilor Nisley said, "I guess for me, that would be so I incur the cost of hiring somebody or bringing people who need to cover me to do my work, so I'm losing that cost, too. Plus, if the other people that work have to take away from their vacation time to come to the meetings, I just feel that it's just not accommodating."

Mayor Leichty said, "Well, there are quite a few meetings that require Council participation during the day."

Councilor Nisley said he was talking about members of the general public having to take a vacation day to attend a day-time Council education session. If they want to come to them, he said the Council should engage with the public and that can't as easily happen in the middle of the day.

Mayor Leichty said Councilors are expected to make a time commitment to serve and that includes during the day.

Councilor Nisley responded that day meetings were not an expectation when Councilors were elected and meetings were previously held on a Monday or Tuesday, at night.

Mayor Leichty said, "Yes, and this is something different. These are information sessions to make sure that not only are we deliberating ordinances or resolutions, but this is an opportunity for a deeper dive and an education session that equips counselors to make more informed decisions when it does come time for a vote.

"So, that's why there are longer meeting times, and they're planned at times during the day where we can work collaboratively with City staff to make sure that not only are you getting the packets ahead of time, but you have time to interact and ask staff in a group setting, and we can have a discussion in a group setting, so that when it does come time to make those important decisions, you are as well-educated as we can possibly be, and there's an opportunity for you to dig into some of those tougher discussions."

Councilor Nisley said the ordinance review commission will also meet in Friday and with the Council education sessions, "that means it eliminates my whole Friday." He said the Council could instead meet during evenings. He also said he would not vote for the Mayor's proposed meeting schedule.

Councilor Gerber said, "I agree with Councilor Nisley. I appreciate the informational sessions. They are very valuable. I'm not arguing, certainly, that we would not have them, but when we do have this additional option, as he's saying, I think we should take advantage of it. And I understand you would rather not pay overtime or have people take comp time, but I guess I would want to know how much that is actually costing the City?"

Mayor Leichty responded, "It's the cost. it's also morale if you're forcing lots of people to attend a late meeting after hours, it impacts a lot of people beyond just the Councilors."

Council President Weddell said the proposed Friday afternoon Council education sessions would not affect him or his work schedule. If it was on another day of the week, he said it would affect his work, but he would just take off the time from work.

Council President Weddell said, "I'm inconveniencing myself coming at 1:30, but I'm not inconveniencing 25 city staff members. And again, if you want to hold these on a day that affects me directly ... that's fine. We can change it. I will just adjust my work schedule accordingly."



Council President Weddell added, "I can't imagine sitting here at 6 o'clock, 6 to 8 o'clock at night on an informational session, I think that'd be pretty tough. It would be pretty tough for all of us, concentration-wise, and also for the City staff that has to then not only work that full day but then prepare for another two-hour lengthy thing."

Councilor Schrock said, "I don't personally have a problem with the 1:30 meetings either. If there's any problem, it's the ability of the general public to come to those meetings being in the middle of the day."

Council President Weddell asked if informational sessions were for Councilors to learn or for the public.

Mayor Leichty said, "We don't take public comment, but they are livestreamed and recorded, like any other meeting. But the intention is to give more depth and understanding. It's an education session for the Council.

"So, it's an opportunity; it's like a learning seminar about some topic that will relate to things that you will need to make decisions about. It gives you an opportunity to engage and ask staff those questions while the public is there. And so, they are recorded and available for the public to listen to at their convenience. And they can also attend, and the media also attends and has participated in the past as well. But it's not a time for making decisions. It is just a time for learning."

Mayor Leichty added that the education sessions allow Councilors to "hear from one another. You know, some ideas that might percolate during those sessions, so that when it does actually come up and we're considering an ordinance. We've all been in the room together, and we've been able to have those conversations and learn together about what the implications of those future decisions might be."

Councilor Schrock asked if members of the public could also ask questions. The **Mayor** said they could not, but they could also learn about issues and learn more about how the Council makes certain decisions.

Councilor Schrock said this is how the Council could be better informed. The **Mayor** said, "Exactly."

Councilor Gerber said she wanted to return to **Councilor Weddell's** point about scheduling Council meetings on the second Monday and fourth Monday in the calendar and then canceling them when there are no agenda items.

Councilor Gerber said she would support more Council meetings because she said "it feels disjointed to just meet once a month ... I think it's really because we can only legally have conversations once a month, if we're meeting just on the 4th Monday of the month.

"And good things have come, collaborations have come, from the informal conversations we have in the elected official reports at the end of the meeting. And if we do that once a month, I think it kind of kills momentum, and to me it feels disjointed. And I think it's an important role that can be played if we meet more frequently. So, that's where I'm coming from."

Councilor Schrock and **Councilor Nisley** said they agreed with **Councilor Gerber**.

Council President Weddell asked if Councilors would hold meetings to only convene and then close after Privilege of the Floor. "So, what you're suggesting is you want to have these meetings, but if there's no agenda, are you open to canceling them versus not having them purposely scheduled and then scheduling them as needed."

Councilor Gerber said, "The option of not having them scheduled, but, holding them in our calendars, that's hard to do to plan not to be out of town every second Monday of the month."

Council President Weddell said, "So you would rather have them scheduled and then cancel them, spend the money to cancel them, and then have the public show up when we cancel them because they don't know that we're not having a meeting." **Councilor Gerber** said, "No, I don't want that."

Council President Weddell said, "But according to what the Mayor said, and I would agree completely, you're going to have people going, 'You've got it on your schedule that you meet every second and fourth Monday, but I wasn't aware that you canceled the meeting because you don't have an agenda.'"



Council President Weddell said, "On top of that, again, I mean, if you want those collaborative conversations, then you're going to hold the meeting, whether there's an agenda or not. You're going to open the floor, the privilege of the floor, and then we're going to have a report on the Traffic Commission, and then we're going to close the meeting."

Councilor Gerber said, "Well, I guess my question is, how many times have agenda items been added to the next meeting? Like, if it's been a light agenda, if it's possible to move it to the next meeting and cancel."

Council President Weddell said he didn't have the answer to that question. He then added, "What I will say is my concern going into this calendar year that we're finishing up was one meeting a month where we're going to have three- and four-hour meetings because we're having one meeting a month instead of two. And that hasn't happened. I mean, tonight we're talking a very long time, and we're on an hour and a half."

Mayor Leichty said the budget meetings have been longer, but typically Council meetings are done within an hour or two. **Council President Weddell** said, "The fact that the meetings haven't been extended very lengthy tells me that agenda-wise, it hasn't been necessary to have that second meeting a month."

"And I didn't think about it until the Mayor mentioned this, where I think it does create a tremendous amount of confusion for the public to have meetings scheduled that are then canceled quite frequently."

Councilor Riegsecker said, "I thought the schedule worked well last year, and I thought that most of us attended most of those Friday meetings and we were all available. Some of the concerns we're talking about the public, and I always care about the public, but if we had 50 people out here Monday nights when we had a meeting, then that would make a difference to me ...

"I don't really receive many phone calls from people, and my number's plastered all over the City website, too. So, I'm available, but it doesn't seem like there's a big interest in what we do, for some reason. Maybe we're doing our job right? I don't know. I assume we are, you know? So, I think it works well this way, and I understand about City employees being able to come on Friday. Friday works out okay for me. I've got to take off work too, but I don't own a business like Doug, where he has to be there all the time, either."

Councilor Nisley responded, "The only thing about that, Don, as you said, you know, are there not 50 people? To me, it doesn't matter if there's 50 or if there's one. What their problem is that they want to talk to us is the most important problem we've got that night."

Councilor Riegsecker said, "Sure. That's not what I was saying. We're always available to anybody, right? And we have one meeting a month. So, is there anything pressing? No, but if we schedule it for that fourth Monday, then everybody knows it's that fourth Monday, and that's the Monday they would come."

Council President Weddell said, "A couple of us received a concern from a taxpaying citizen of Goshen this afternoon – a pressing issue in their mind and it will be addressed. Tomorrow the person will be contacted. That person reached out to a number of us today via email and whatnot. They could have come here tonight, but they didn't. They could have expressed their concerns right there at that podium, but instead they decided what I probably would have done if I were in their shoes. I would have emailed the appropriate people."

"And so, you're right, **Councilman Nisley**. People can come. It's important that we're here for them, but from my perspective, from my experience in all these years, people aren't as comfortable sitting there and talking, but they are more comfortable reaching out to us via phone or email or text, and I think that's how they're, generally speaking, going to reach out to us now," **Council President Weddell** said.

"I welcome anyone who has the courage to stand up there at that microphone and speak their mind and their opinion. you know, I'm kind of echoing what **Councilman Riegsecker** saying. From our experience, people can reach out to us via email first."



Councilor Lederach said he wanted to share some thoughts since he hadn't spoken yet on this issue.

Councilor Lederach said of the draft schedule, "If you look down through the list, there are quite a few months where there are two meetings. I mean, if you just look at the months that are there, January, for example, March, June and there's three meetings in September, so it's not like we're going without two meetings a month.

"One of the advantages of being an old, retired guy is that, personally, it doesn't matter to me which way you go, so I'm almost hesitant to vote, because I can go with any of them. And I think that the only real concern I have is the ones in September.

"And it seemed like this year, with the budget drawing a great deal of attention, I would prefer to have a little more time between the informational meeting and the first, budget meeting, but I can understand that there are deadlines and logistics that would overcome that. So, with the danger of being wishy-washy, I'm okay with this, and I'd be okay with scheduling them regularly on that second Monday of the month as well."

Mayor Leichy said, "So, we have 19 (meetings) before you, and one still to be planned, so there will be at least 20 meetings, and there are more than 200 public meetings scheduled for next year. Quite often, the concerns of our citizens have to do with things like zoning petitions, or traffic commission, or redevelopment.

"So, there are a multitude of ways, in addition to coming to Council, that people can get their needs addressed. And, of course, the Mayor's Office receives and fields calls every day, and we get calls, inquiries through our website, aiding people and making sure that whatever concerns or questions they have are getting addressed, so I feel like the City is doing a good job of making itself available.

"I'm not sure that adding another four meetings to our 200 will significantly change the way in which we engage with our residents. And I do feel like the proposed schedule has worked very well in the past year, and I would be extremely disappointed to miss that opportunity to engage our team with you in those education sessions. I feel like that's been incredibly valuable, and I would be very disappointed to see that go away, because it just it's not going to be feasible in the same way to mandate that many people to participate. I mean, sure, I can do it, but it wouldn't be prudent leadership for me to do that.

Councilor Schrock asked about the Mayor's request for Councilors to reserve the second Monday of each month just in case an additional meeting was needed. The Mayor said, "Yes, I had asked for you to just hold those so that, you know, if there's something coming up."

Council President Weddell said the Council also could meet remotely if necessary, although that wasn't his preference. The Mayor said that was a newer option.

Council President Weddell asked if Councilors had any amendments to the Council schedule.

Councilor Gerber said she and **Councilor Nisley** already had a meeting scheduled, from 1 to 3 p.m. on Jan. 9.

So, **Councilor Gerber** made a motion that the starting time of the Council education session on Jan. 9 be delayed from 1:30 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. **Councilor Nisley** seconded the motion.

The Mayor asked if Councilors had any questions or comments about the motion. They did not.

Councilors said they were ready to vote.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously passed the Gerber/Nisley motion to delay the start of the Jan. 9 Council education session to 3:30 p.m., by a 6-0 margin, with all Councilors present voting yes at 7:43 p.m.



Council President Weddell made a motion to accept the Council meeting schedule for 2026 as amended. Councilor Riegsecker seconded the motion.

Councilors requested a roll call vote.

Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre asked if the public would get a chance to comment on the Council schedule. The Mayor said no one from the public asked to speak.

On a roll vote, Councilors approved the 2026 Council meeting schedule as amended by a 4-1-1 vote with Councilors Lederach, Riegsecker, Schrock and Weddell voting "yes," Councilor Nisley voting "no" and Councilor Gerber voting "pass" at 7:45 p.m. The youth advisor also voted "yes."

Privilege of the Floor

At 7:45 p.m., Mayor Leichty invited public comments for issues not on the Council agenda.

Salvador Flores Silva of Goshen said (through a translator) that he has lived here since 1987. He said he was one of the first Latinos to come to Goshen. He said there was a big issue affecting Latinos with sexual predators who have attacked children.

Mayor Leichty affirmed the importance of the issue and said she was sorry about the situation. She said the City would like to support Flores Silva and help him with this problem. She said she would like to connect him with people who can help but cannot address such issues in this setting. The Mayor said she would meet with him immediately after the meeting to learn about his concerns and offer help.

There were no further comments, so Mayor Leichty closed the public comment period at 7:52 pm

ELECTED OFFICIAL REPORTS:

Mayor Leichty asked if there were any reports from Councilors.

Councilor Nisley gave a report from the last meeting of the Cemetery Board. He said the Board is not having enough people to apply to serve and they would like to change the qualifications for membership. Members are required to be residents of Goshen and to own Goshen cemetery plots.

Councilor Nisley said board members don't object to members having to own a plot but would like to allow membership by people who live outside the City, in either Elkhart Township or Elkhart County. He said apparently State Statutes would allow some flexibility of residency and other cities have opened up cemetery board membership to county residents.

Council President Weddell said he hears about this issue all the time.

Mayor Leichty said, "It would certainly be something we can follow up with (Cemeteries Director) Burt (Matteson) and see if that's something he'd like to recommend as a consideration for the Council as a modification to that ordinance. I can understand it's difficult to get people to volunteer, to participate but it's an important role."

Councilor Schrock asked if it would be possible to allow the Abshire Park sledding hill to be used at night. He said these days it is dark at 5:30 p.m. and children already continue playing there at night.



Councillor Schrock said he wasn't asking for the cabin to remain open but wondered if an outdoor light at the top of the hill could be kept on. If the light stayed on, he said there would be less of a chance of an accident.

City Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Tanya Heyde said allowing the park to remain open at night would likely take an amendment to the ordinance that states that parks close at dusk.

Councillor Riegsecker asked how Shanklin Park was handled night visitors with its display of holiday lights. **Heyde** said that was allowed because the light display is a Parks Department event.

Heyde said after-hours sledding could be allowed through an official night sledding event. She said she would prefer to bring this issue to the Parks and Recreation Board before making any proposal to the Council.

Councillor Riegsecker clarified that the fire protection issue he raised earlier in the meeting involved the water ordinance. He also said the City replaced his water meter because he had an old one. He said, "We scheduled a time. The young man was on time, and he came in and out. He did everything perfectly. He answered all my silly questions, and with no complaints."

Councillor Riegsecker also said he also worked with **Utilities Manager Kelly Saenz** to get some information. He said, "She ran me a couple of reports, and it's like, the things that you can get out of the Water Department are amazing. And I can see when I do laundry or use heavy usage of water and when I have no water. So, it's very interesting what the Water Department can track through I'm assuming it's through the meter and something else. It's scary, but I appreciate our **Water Department**."

Councillor Lederach said the **Board of Aviation Commission** met today. He said, "The runway rehab is on track to start in April of 2026. There are now 67 aircraft based at Goshen Airport, which increases them to it being a regional airport, and allows them to get more grant money.

"The Boys and Girls Club airplane being built out there is progressing well. We saw pictures of it today. It's sort of an amazing thing that they're putting together. And finally, New Horizon Aviation is on track to give out 60 pilot licenses and instrumental license this calendar year. There's a lot of stuff happening out there at the airport."

Councillor Nisley said, "I'd encourage you to go look at it, because it's a hidden gem in Goshen that people just don't know about. It's a great airport."

Council President Weddell said, "Our **Red Hawk Fire Academy** was highlighted in one of our local TV shows this morning."

Councillor Gerber said, "I want to thank everyone. I had conversations with all of you this week about a concern that's been raised by some neighbors, in the **Racemere neighborhood and Carter Road**, and I appreciate the conversations we had, and I think we will be taking that up in the future."

Clerk-Treasurer Aguirre reminded Councillors that the **last Council meeting of the year is Dec. 29th**, "and that's the day I'll need you to come a little early ... to sign those annual certifications that you understand the nepotism policy and the contracting policy. Those have to be notarized. If you're not going to be able to go to the Council meeting, if you could let me know. You could arrange to come into the Clerk-Treasurer's Office and ... sign the form and have it notarized."

Aguirre also said, "The other thing I wanted to ask is more of a logistics question, and I don't know who can answer this, but a lot of the matters today were held over till the next meeting (Dec. 29). Traditionally, the meeting on the 29th has been a very short meeting. With all of those matters, it is probably not going to be a short meeting unless these items are carried over until the January meeting. I don't know If you were going to talk about that at some time and decide whether to have a regular meeting on the 29th or carry over some of these items to January."



Mayor Leichthy said, "The next official meeting would be at the end of January, so I anticipate we'll need to have a regular meeting on Dec 29th." Council President Weddell said, "I think that the consensus is that we would like to see those agenda items be present on the December 29th meeting." Aguirre said, "They'll be there then." The Council President thanked the Clerk-Treasurer for inquiring about the Dec. 29 agenda. Councilor Riegsecker said, "One more thing. I just want to say how proud I am of this Council because we had some contentious discussions tonight and nobody screamed at anybody, nobody called anybody a name. And it just makes my heart smile when politicians can get along. And I really appreciate everyone on this group." Council President Weddell joked, "I think after the meeting someone's going to call both of us some names." Mayor Leichthy asked Youth Adviser Reyes if she had a report. Reyes said, "Really quick. Okay. We're going to buy toys for Greencroft. They're collecting toys for kids. And then we're partnering with the Red Hawk Entrepreneurship Program. They got a really big poster-making machine, so we're making motivational posters for the finals because finals season starts after Christmas break, so we just want to motivate kids to pass the finals. And we're just talking about our event for February." There were no further comments by the Mayor or by Councilors.

Adjournment:

Councilor Nisley made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Councilor Lederach.

On a voice vote, Councilors unanimously approved the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mayor Leichthy adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

EXHIBIT #1: *Before the Council meeting, Mayor Leichthy provided Councilors with this supplemental three-page "Financial Report for Council," dated Dec. 15, 2025, which summarized the City's financial position as of Nov. 30, 2025.*

APPROVED:

A blue ink signature of Gina Leichthy, Mayor of Goshen, written over a horizontal line.

Gina Leichthy, Mayor of Goshen

ATTEST:

A black ink signature of Richard R. Aguirre, Clerk-Treasurer, written over a horizontal line.

Clerk-Treasurer Richard R. Aguirre

Exhibit #1



GINA M. LEICHTY
Mayor of Goshen, Indiana
City Hall • 202 South Fifth Street, Suite 1 • Goshen, IN 46528-3714
mayor@goshencity.com •
(574) 533-9322

Dec. 15
Council
exhibits

Financial Report for Council

To: Goshen City Council
From: Mayor Gina Leichty
Date: December 15, 2025
Subject: Financial Summary Report as of November 30, 2025

1. Purpose of This Report

This memo provides a high-level overview of the City's financial position as of November 30, 2025. It summarizes revenues, expenditures, and fund balances nearing year-end. Because November includes both the fall property tax settlement and the second Local Income Tax (LIT) distribution, this report reflects a more complete revenue picture than October's.

2. Overall Financial Position

Across all funds, the City began the year with \$105.5M, has received \$47.8M in revenue, and spent \$60.5M, resulting in an ending balance of \$92.7M as of November 30.

The decline in cumulative balances reflects typical annual timing patterns: spending occurs steadily throughout the year while significant revenues arrive in June and November. The City's liquidity remains strong across all significant operating funds.

3. Revenue Performance and Timing Considerations

Citywide revenue collections now reflect both major November distributions and stand at approximately 75 percent of the budgeted annual revenue. Several key timing issues have now resolved:

A. November Local Income Tax (LIT) Distribution

The November LIT distribution is now included in the financials and significantly improves revenue performance in:

- General Fund (1101)
- Public Safety LIT (2240)
- Economic Development LIT (2209)

Each of these funds shows substantial movement toward expected revenue levels after appearing under-collected in October.

B. Fall Property Tax Settlement

The fall settlement is also reflected in this report. This improves revenue alignment for:

- General Fund

- Debt Service Funds
- TIF allocation areas tied to tax increment

Debt service-related funds that showed negative balances in October are now largely corrected or significantly improved.

C. Remaining Variances

Some funds still appear below their expected annual percentage due to posting delays noted in the Clerk-Treasurer's cover memo. These will reconcile in the final December report.

4. Expenditure Performance

Total expenditures through November are \$60.5M, representing 55 percent of the annual budget. This remains within expected ranges for this time of year.

General Fund

- Expenses total \$27.83M of the \$34.45M budget (81 percent spent).
- Spending trends continue to align with operational expectations.

Departments to monitor as we approach year-end include:

- Police (8.28M of 9.77M)
- Fire (7.50M of 8.69M)
- Central Garage (1.49M of 1.95M)
- Engineering (0.89M of 1.27M)
- Mayor / Legal / Clerk-Treasurer all trending in normal ranges

Infrastructure and Capital Funds

- Stormwater Management remains active with 1.68M spent of its 1.94M budget.
- Unsafe Building Fund shows high activity due to ongoing enforcement and abatement cases.
- Several TIF funds continue to show low spending relative to appropriations, reflecting project timing rather than underperformance.

Debt Service Funds

Most debt service-related shortfalls noted in October have been resolved with the fall property tax settlement.

5. Fund Balance Conditions

Overall fund health remains strong despite mid-year fluctuations. Key highlights from the Fund Balance Report include:

Strong Balances

- General Fund: \$17.30M
- TIF South East ED: \$22.71M
- TIF Consolidated RR/US33/DT: \$9.91M
- Rainy Day Fund: \$2.65M

Funds to Watch

- TIF East College Ave remains negative due to the timing of expenditures relative to incoming

- revenue.
- The Opioid Settlement Restricted Fund shows a significant drawdown due to planned disbursements.

6. Key Issues for Council Awareness

A. Revenue Timing Now Mostly Resolved

The November LIT distribution and the fall property tax settlement significantly corrected the revenue underperformance in October. The remaining variances are due to posting lag rather than structural issues.

B. Departmental Spending Trends

Police, Fire, and several operational divisions remain above 80 percent of their year-end budgets. These levels are consistent with their annual cost curves but should continue to be monitored in December.

C. ARP Fiscal Recovery Fund

Just under **32 percent** of ARP funds have now been expended (1.79M of 5.5M), with substantial balances remaining for allocation planning in 2026.

7. Summary

The City's financial condition remains stable as we approach year-end. November revenues show significant improvement due to major distributions, resolving most temporary imbalances from prior months. Expenditures stay within expected ranges, and fund balances across significant operating funds are strong.

A final year-end report will clarify any remaining timing variances once all December postings are complete. I am happy to prepare charts, a presentation, or further analysis at the Council's request.