



City of Lawton
**Lawton Economic
Development Authority**

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

Minutes

Thursday, January 15, 2026

2:00 PM

**Lawton City Hall
3rd Floor Conference Room**

Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call

"Official action can be taken only on items which appear on the agenda. The Authority may adopt, approve, ratify, deny, defer, recommend, or continue any agenda item. The Authority may also propose and enact floor amendments to any matter presented before them. When more information is needed to act on an item, the Authority may refer the matter to City Staff. Under certain circumstances, items are deferred to a specific later date or stricken from the agenda entirely."

Chairman Madigan called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM in the 3rd floor conference room of City Hall.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: David Madigan, Rick Walker, Larry Neal, Kirby Brown, Mark Brace, Ron Nance, Randy Warren, Brandie Page

ABSENT: Jason Hensley

OTHERS PRESENT: Richard Rogalski, LEDA Executive Director; John Ratliff, City Manager; Tammy Branstetter, City Clerk's Office; Rusty Whisenhunt, Director of Public Utilities; Charlotte Brown, Deputy Director of Community Enrichment; Matthew Modeste, Hatch, Croke & Associates; Mark Scott, Arvest Bank; Eric Swanson, The Lawton Constitution

Statement of Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314

Chairman Madigan confirmed with Branstetter that the meeting notice and agenda were posted by the City Clerk's Office as required by the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act.

Business Items

1. Consider approving the minutes of the December 18, 2025, meeting.

A copy of the minutes from the December 18, 2025, meeting may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Motion by Walker, **Second** by Warren, to approve the minutes from the December 18, 2025, meeting as presented. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

2. Consider approving the November 2025 Financial Report from Hatch, Croke and Associates.

Matthew Modeste, Hatch, Croke & Associates, presented the November 2025 Financial Report. A copy of the report may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Modeste said the financials for November will start on page 18 of your agenda packets. The statement of net position under your current assets, you have your seven bank accounts, which total \$6.7 million. The interest receivable from BOK, \$398, was received in December. Property tax receivable was November property tax, which was received in December: TIF 1, \$6,501. TIF 2, \$168,992.71. No change in the state matching. So total current assets for the month, \$7.5 million. No change in fixed assets. No change in other assets. So your total assets, \$11.97 million.

Modeste said the next page is the liabilities and net position. The total current liabilities were \$186,822.41. There was no change in the long-term liabilities from the prior month. And so your total liabilities and net position at the bottom of the page, \$11.97 million.

Modeste said page 20 is the combined statement of revenue and expenses. For your revenues, we had October hotel motel tax of \$28,943 and property tax for November, \$175,493.71. So total revenues, \$204,436.71. Total operating expenses, \$80,630.61. The negative in license and fees was a voided check written in a prior month. So your change in net position at the bottom of the page, \$135,926.35.

Modeste said page 21, if we look at the bottom of the page, we will see that there was a net increase in cash of \$42,183.09. If we add that to the cash at the beginning of the period, we end up with \$6.7 million cash at November 30th. Page 22 to 26 of the packets are the details of the combined expenses, which we looked at on page 20.

Warren said excellent job.

Motion by Warren, **Second** by Brace, to approve the November 2025 Financial Report as presented. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

Chairman Madigan said we're going to jump down to business item #4. We have Rusty to present that for us.

3. Discuss, make recommendations, and consider approving a Term Sheet for an agreement with CCIDA regarding acquisition of the 320-acre property that is planned as the future site of the Firehawk Aerospace development.

A copy of the proposed Term Sheet for an agreement with CCIDA regarding acquisition of the 320-acre property that is planned as the future site of the Firehawk Aerospace development may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Chairman Madigan said you have a term sheet in your packet — hopefully you've had the chance to review that term sheet.

Neal stepped out of the meeting at 3:08 PM.

Motion by Page, **Second** by Warren, to approve the term sheet as discussed in the packet, but I'd also like to add that the Chairman directs the Executive Administrator to form an ad hoc committee to explore the possibility of additional real estate property acquisitions. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

Neal returned to the meeting at 3:10 PM.

4. Receive a report from the City of Lawton Department of Public Utilities and consider approving Pay Application 008 from Fisher59 Properties in the amount of \$107,036.99 for the cost of public improvements associated with the construction of a new warehouse and distribution center made in accordance with the First Amended Redevelopment Agreement between LEDA and Fisher59 Properties, approved on January 14, 2025.

Rusty Whisenhunt, Director of Public Utilities, gave a report regarding Pay Application 008 from Fisher59 Properties in the amount of \$107,036.99. A copy of Pay Application 008 from Fisher59 Properties may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Whisenhunt said you received a request on Fisher59. All the documents were in order. It shows that the project is 53% complete with this payment. Really, the major outstanding item is concrete pavement on the project, which is in place, but they have not billed for. That's approximately \$460,000 that you're still waiting to bill on, so that's the majority of the last billing. This pay application here was for a total to be paid of \$107,036.99.

Richard Rogalski, LEDA Executive Director, said one thing that Rusty and I talked about, and he's kind of mentioned in this report, is that they're actually getting close to being done. Physically, it's really close, other than a whole bunch of punch list items, but they've got to bill for it. You know, you see we're only at 53% of billing, so I was hoping that they were going to bill a whole lot less, but I'm not sure that's going to be the case.

Whisenhunt said the concrete is the major item that they haven't billed for, and that's for the street pavement.

Motion by Brace, **Second** by Warren, to approve item #4. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

Warren requested to move the executive session item up to before item #3.

Chairman Madigan said yes, we're in a good spot to do that.

The Authority next considered the item for executive session.

5. Consider directing the Executive Director to open two accounts at Arvest Bank for TIF funds received pursuant to the Lawton Downtown Economic Development Project Plan and then transfer funds and close the two accounts for that purpose at IBC Bank.

Rogalski provided background information on this item.

Rogalski said we've discussed this in the past, and I've made some inquiries, and we've sort of gotten stuff ready to go on that. If you recall, we had issues with the transfer of funds for the note payment last fall. I ended up having to run to City National Bank, make the note transfer out of the STEDI money, and then transfer the money from IBC to the STEDI money. It was very awkward, it was very difficult, because they just simply stop sending wire transfers at 2 o'clock, and at any rate, that was one of the issues.

Rogalski said just to give you some background for those members that don't know, LEDA has two kind of series of accounts. We have the STEDI Project Plan funding, which is at City National Bank. That's all our industrial TIF districts, and also the STEM funding account is over there. Then you have your IBC account, which is the Downtown Project Plan, and you have one account for TIF 1, which is the larger area, and one account for TIF 2, which is just the Lawton Town Center. So those are the two accounts you have there, and up until now, all of that money has been used to pay the note, which is through BOK. So, you have accounts at BOK that we transfer that money to, and then they sweep that money out for the note payments. You have one coming up in March. It's interest only, it's about \$230-something thousand dollars. You have the money to do that. It's not going to be a problem. You have 2 million due in September.

Rogalski said it's different when you have local folks at your bank that are part of your community. So that's why this was kind of brought up. It was actually Fred that had directed me to look into it in the past and discussed it. But I just felt like now that we're sort of ready to do it, I would bring it to you all to see what your direction would be.

Warren said I just had one question. As a general rule, the city, I think if I remember right, we do RFPs for banking accounts.

Rogalski said I didn't know that.

Ratliff said the public competitive bidding contract doesn't pertain to service contracts,

so you don't have to. Now, our purchasing policy may require it. I'd have to look, but this isn't a public construction contract.

Warren said I just was wondering. I remembered seeing that we do that.

Ratliff said we've done it for some things in the past. I'd have to look at the purchasing policy. There are some exceptions for professional services, like legal and banking. I feel like banking is one of those. But I don't know that off the top of my head.

Walker said this is nothing against David or Arvest — if this was being moved to BancFirst or City National, I would still have the exact same comments I'm about to make — but I would appreciate a shot at it.

Rogalski said how do you guys respond? Do you give rates or something like that? How do you compete?

Walker said like on the city's, we do bid it. We pay the four-week treasury, which is about, I think it's 3.58% right now.

Rogalski said what I meant is how do banks compete with each other.

Brace said sometimes they're a proposal, and sometimes they're just wanting quotes.

Rogalski said we can do that. I don't have a problem with that. That's why I brought it to your attention. I'm thinking that you're just wanting me to get quotes, from what I'm hearing.

Madigan said I think that's fair. Optics-wise, I was concerned with it getting on the agenda with everything changing over from me to Fred, but to his point, I think they were talking about this a while ago.

Neal said it was several months ago.

Rogalski said it was several months ago, and we were just trying to get stuff done. We finally got it all lined up and then thought we needed to take some action.

Ratliff said why don't we table this, and then we'll look at the purchasing policy? And then we can come back next month and do an RFP, obtain quotes, or whatever we need to do.

Brown said do you need to make a motion of some kind?

Ratliff said motion to table until the next meeting.

Brown said I don't understand the table. Why can't we just make a motion that says go put out RFPs and bring it back to the next meeting.

Warren said because they don't know what kind. He's going to have to look and see if it's required, and I don't know how that works at a bank, but maybe you want to bid more than just interest.

Walker said it typically deals with the fees and the interest.

Ratliff noted that it might be an RFQ.

Brown said you answered my question.

Motion by Walker, **Second** by Warren, to table this item until the next regularly scheduled meeting. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

6. Discuss the TIF revenue projections for 2026, provide direction to the Executive Director, or take other action as deemed necessary.

Rogalski provided background information on this item. A copy of the TIF revenue projections for 2026 may be obtained from the City Clerk's Office upon request.

Rogalski said you can see in your packets, I went ahead and there are two kind of separate ones and, just like I mentioned, you have revenue from the Downtown Project Plan, that's TIF 1 and 2, then you have revenue from the STEDI Project Plan, that's 3, 4, 5 and 6. Those are the totality of the ones that you've activated so far.

Rogalski said this is just sort of a guess for this coming year and so it's really just a projection, but it's probably a decent enough projection. And all I'm trying to do is show you that, as I mentioned in the past, like for instance, the Downtown Project Plan has never had money. I mean, we've been working this since 2008, and it's never had money. And now all of a sudden, your projected expense versus income is plus \$700,000. You get about \$430,000 a year from TIF 1. TIF 2 is doing very well now. Those retailers are doing much better. And now that you have Best Buy about to open, it's going to be doing even better. And so it's just really doing very good. You see we got \$3.1 million in sales tax revenue, including the state match. Now, it's a completely different thing if you take out that \$1.3 million from state match. So it's a big deal that we have that leverage act. And then your expenses are: you have Lawton Lodging where you rebate two-thirds of the hotel motel tax, then you have your note payment for interest on one side, and then you have your September note payment, and those are actual amounts from the note. And then I just throw in an administrative amount, which is just a guess. But look — you've got positive revenue. We haven't gotten to reports yet, but what's important is that the city just approved LURA moving forward with an urban renewal expansion, or review. That's your Downtown Project Plan that would be expanded along with that urban renewal plan, probably. So we'd be looking at that kind of process going forward.

Rogalski said next is your STEDI TIF revenue. You've got about \$1.2 million from

Republic Paper, and now in this one I'm tracking all your debts individually that you have, and so I haven't cut the check for the first check to Republic, but it's last year's money. So I'm showing that it's down a little bit, and then you have your dispersed to taxing entities. Those first two items are set in the plan. You disperse a certain amount to taxing entities, you put some to STEM, and that's set - that automatically happens. I went ahead and put 7.5% for admin on each one of these. You probably spend more than that depending on the number of projects that come up. New agreements and administering the project plan — that's where your administration costs come in. Then you have next year's Republic payment at \$216,012. So, there's your unallocated funds for your whole STEDI project plan right there, because if you look at PepsiCo, you can see the debt that's still sitting there — the debt that was originally there to the LEDC. It's \$164,000 in revenue, but, you know, you still have about \$485,000 of debt to pay that off, so that's going to be another three or four years before you see positive revenue out of PepsiCo. Then the bottom is the same sort of thing. We're showing that we'll be paying LEDC. Now, it looks like you're paying LEDC more than the city or a higher percentage, and that's because you've already paid the city \$250,000 without giving the LEDC anything, and so this catches them up to exactly the proportion of the city's investment to the LEDC's investment. So the original proportion would be paid up.

Rogalski said and then the same thing on Fisher59, you can see all of the debt is still sitting there. We haven't paid any of that down. Now I actually looked at the assessor's page for today. This is their property tax that they've been billed last year. It looks like it's going to be about \$160,000 for next year, which is what we expected. So what you'll have is, Fisher59 will start earning \$160,000 a year, and it might even go up because remember they're not finished, so the assessor might assess a little more next year. Then we'll start paying that down as well.

Rogalski said then you have Westwin. Westwin was also billed \$157,000, but they didn't pay it yet, so that's why we haven't seen it. And I expect that next year would be the same, depending upon how everything happens in the spring. It's the \$2.7 million that's been so far provided - that's how that's being set apart. \$1.8 was to CCIDA, and \$900,000 to the city. That's what we owe them. Obviously, if this thing works out where Westwin buys the pilot plant, all that debt comes off because we're paying everything off, and then really you just have TIF revenue and no specific expense other than to pay the city for the approximately \$5 million in the water line they put out there. So there really is debt that we have to pay back, but the way we work this is like you saw in PepsiCo and Fisher59. It's specific to that project and part of that project plan. That debt is nailed down with your TIF district, and other debt that is just sort of like, I mean, you have Lee Boulevard that we owe the city for, Neal and Ard - there's all this infrastructure that potentially LEDA can pay back the city for. It's being compiled in a list that we'll just put in. These debts show up on your financials. Neal and Ard don't yet. The waterline for Westwin isn't on your financials yet because it's not entered as debt as part of the agreement. And so what we'll do is as we get positive revenue, we'll start adding those things to your financials so we can pay them off, but it's going to be a while. Now I say it's a while, but if a big project comes in with a very large investment that we've been talking about — and there's several that we're talking about right now

— those come in, and all of a sudden your revenue stream perks up very, very well. The dream of all this is that this revenue, it pays back the city's CIP and then the CIP money gets to get re-CIP'd. So it's almost like it never runs out, kind of. And that's kind of the dream that we have on this. You know, we're kind of getting there. I mean, right now \$600,000 positive is still pretty good, but it's not what we can do in the future, obviously.

Warren said much better than that period of time where we didn't know what was going to get paid.

Chairman Madigan said thanks for that overview - that's really helpful.

No action was taken on this item.

Reports

1. Receive a report from the LEDA Executive Director

Rogalski said I already mentioned with LURA, the City Council approved a blight study, and it's probably twice as big as the existing urban renewal plans. It includes a lot of areas to the west of Old Town North, but a lot more south of the mall, in that neighborhood that is all in the floodplain. And I should say as an engineer, it's not just in the floodplain, it's in the floodway. When you have buildings and yards in the floodway, it's just terrible. So I think there's a vision for a major renovation in there, but it's going to be incremental. It's going to have to just get started and get moving and all that, but LEDA will be involved in all that.

Rogalski said the other thing is on Republic Paper, I mentioned that we haven't paid them the \$216,000 from last year. I created an invoice so that we could track it properly, and I sent it to Andrea. She's their CFO, and she's looking at it. She asked me a couple of questions, and she's going to send me the invoice, then we make the payment, and it tracks it. So now we have this paper trail. So every invoice is going to say "2 of 20", "3 of 20", etc., and it'll track down how that stuff is being sent out. And she liked it, she appreciated it, so that's kind of moving forward.

Rogalski said I want to talk about the state match. We haven't applied for the state match from January through June of 2025. There were some issues with the amount of use tax that we were going to apportion. The city approved a resolution; it said same as always. But now the City Attorney wants the City Council to approve the certification of that match, and so that will probably be on the next Council meeting. They'll approve the certification, and then we can send it off to the state. Now, it won't be long when they'll have the numbers from, you know, July through December, probably another month. And so we'll get that one done. Now that we have everything all worked out, that one should be much faster.

Brown said the state match is what percent? How is that broken down? Is that the

match of state tax?

Rogalski said no. Actually, it's a wonderful deal. It's called the Leverage Act. This is considered a military benefit project. And so we have this huge number that the state would be allowed to match. So, what that means is the net benefit to the state has been shown that this project benefits the state by a very large number. So we get matched 100% of the sales tax that is collected and apportioned to the TIF district. The sales tax includes the actual retail sales tax, the retail use tax, and even hotel tax is considered a sales tax by the state. So all of that revenue that the city apportions to LEDA, LEDA then applies to the state for matching funds. So it's dollar for dollar.

Brown said it's a direct match? So, if I pay 9% sales tax in this TIF district, eventually you'll get that entire 9% back?

Warren said just the state's apportion.

Rogalski said no — it's the city's apportion — whatever the city apportions to LEDA. So, if the city apportions more, we'd get more, but whatever the city apportions to LEDA, that's what the state matches. But they're not using the state's portion of the sales in that project as the net state benefit. They're using a much larger benefit that they calculated back in 2005 or 2008, or whatever it was, and that has to do with Fort Sill. So we have like a 37% net benefit, or some number like that.

Brown said that showed in the financials?

Rogalski said yes.

Executive Session

Motion by Warren, **Second** by Brace, to convene in executive session. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

The Authority convened in executive session at 2:08 PM and remained in executive session until 3:07 PM.

Motion by Warren, **Second** by Walker, to return to open session. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

1. Pursuant to Section 307(B)(3), Title 25, Oklahoma Statutes, consider convening in executive session for the purpose of conferring on matters pertaining to the sale, purchase, lease, acquisition, or appraisal of real property and Section 307(C)(11), Title 25, Oklahoma Statutes, pertaining to economic development, including the transfer of property, financing, and the creation of a proposal to entice a business to locate within their jurisdiction if the public disclosure of which would violate the confidentiality of prospective business entities, and in open session, take action as necessary.

Chairman Madigan said I'll just disclose we have no business to conduct that is a result of the executive session, so we're going to move to business item #3 on the agenda.

No action was taken on this item.

Adjournment

Motion by Brace, **Second** by Nance, to adjourn the January 15, 2026, meeting. **AYE:** Brown, Warren, Madigan, Brace, Nance, Neal, Walker, Page. **NAY:** None. **MOTION PASSED.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Minutes of the January 15, 2026, meeting, were approved by the Authority at the February 19, 2026, meeting.