

THE RAYMORE CITY COUNCIL MET IN REGULAR SESSION ON MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2026, IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT 100 MUNICIPAL CIRCLE, RAYMORE, MISSOURI. MEMBERS PRESENT: MAYOR PRO TEM ABDELGAWAD, COUNCILMEMBERS BAKER, BARBER, BURKE III, CIRCO, ENGERT, HOLMAN, AND MILLS. ALSO PRESENT: CITY MANAGER JIM FEUERBORN, CITY ATTORNEY JONATHAN ZERR, AND RECORDING SECRETARY CATHERINE ALEGRE.

1. Call to Order

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre called roll; quorum present to conduct business. Mayor Turnbow was absent.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation/Awards

5. Personal Appearances

6. Staff Reports

Development Services Director David Gress and Chief of Police Jim Wilson reviewed their staff reports included in the Council packet.

City Manager Jim Feuerborn noted that the January 19 work session is cancelled in observance of Martin Luther King Jr. Day.

7. Committee Reports

8. Consent Agenda

A. City Council Regular Meeting minutes, December 22, 2025

B. Resolution 26-01: Appointments and Affirmations of Membership to Incentive District Boards

C. Resolution 26-03: 2025 Curb Replacement Project - Acceptance and Final Payment

D. Resolution 26-04: Appointment of Yvette Sabur to the Raymore Arts Commission

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

DISCUSSION: None

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Aye
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Aye

9. Unfinished Business

A. Good Ranch Tract 12 Federal Records Storage Facility Rezoning: A to BP-P

BILL 4002: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, AMENDING THE ZONING MAP FROM "A" AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO "BP-P" BUSINESS PARK, PLANNED DISTRICT OVERLAY, A PART OF TRACT 12 OF THE GOOD RANCH, RAYMORE, CASS COUNTY, MISSOURI."

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the second reading of Bill 4002 by title only.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the second reading of Bill 4002 by title only.

DISCUSSION: Councilmember Baker stated we are placing warehousing next to a single family residential area, conflicting with the comprehensive plan. He disagrees with finding of fact six regarding impacts on nearby properties. He also noted traffic concerns at the Dean Avenue and North Cass Parkway, stating there are current issues with the intersection and foresees greater issues when the area of warehouses is built out.

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Nay
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Abstain
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Nay

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad announced the motion carried and declared Bill 4002 as **Raymore City Ordinance 2026-001**.

B. Timber Trails (Iconic) Chapter 100 - Multi-Family Phase

BILL 3992: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, AUTHORIZING THE TAXABLE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE

BONDS (RESIDENCES AT TIMBER TRAILS PROJECT), SERIES 2025 RELATED TO AN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN THE CITY AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS AND TAKE CERTAIN OTHER ACTIONS.”

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the second reading of Bill 3992 by title only.

City Manager Jim Feuerborn noted media inquiries regarding Chapter 100 projects in the City. He called on the city’s bond counsel to respond to their questions.

Sarah Granath, Gilmore and Bell, stated Chapter 100 usage for both industrial and commercial projects is a well accepted practice. This structure started back in the 1980s, noting that Gilmore and Bell has done many, specifically on commercial, with the multifamily or retail aspect of that totaling over a billion dollars of principal amount just in their firm alone. She stressed that this is a very common structure used for this purpose.

There was a question about Chapter 100 not specifically mentioning commercial projects and how we are able to go outside of the true industrial projects. Chapter 100, or industrial revenue bonds, are found both in Chapter 100 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri and the Missouri Constitution. Chapter 100 authorizes cities to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of constructing a facility to be leased to a private entity and then for that lease to be paid for out of revenues of the project. It then lists industrial development projects such as warehouses, distribution, offices. This Chapter 100 then outlines the process for issuing bonds. Commercial projects are not mentioned in Chapter 100, but it is found in the Missouri Constitution Article 6 Section 27(B), stating that cities are authorized to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of constructing facilities to be leased to a private entity and then for that lease to be paid back with revenues of the project. However, this constitutional provision lists a different set of allowable projects: manufacturing, commercial, warehouse, and industrial purposes. State statutes in Missouri cannot take away powers that the Missouri Constitution grants. We lean on Chapter 100 to show us a method of implementing this revenue bond process, but the constitution to give us that commercial as an identified allowable project. That constitutional provision predates the statutes, so this process has been going on since before the Chapter 100 statute. It is just commonly referred to as Chapter 100 industrial development revenue bonds.

Ms. Granath explained what “commercial” is. She stated retail is what you think of as being commercial. It's authorized as commercial under the state statutes and state law and then it's also categorized by the assessors as a commercial use. Under state law, multifamily residential is classified as a commercial enterprise. It is run with that purpose behind it.

The Missouri Department of Economic Development website has a summary of Chapter 100 projects. There are three parts that it categorizes under a Chapter 100 incentive. The first is property tax abatement, which is what we typically think of as real and personal property tax abatement. That's over the life of the project. This is the portion that the city has control of. You follow the outlined steps. There's no state approval or certification. There is a state form that gets filed by January 31 of the following year to notify the state that you have done this project for their economic development marketing and informational purposes. The second is the sales tax exemption on construction materials. This has been involved in every Chapter 100 project that the City has authorized in recent years. This is the City lending their sales tax exemption for this public purpose. Again, no state approval or certification required. The third is the sales tax exemption on the purchase of personal property. This is not an ongoing abatement, it's on the initial purchase of a personal property. There are some items of personal property that are exempted by right by state statute if you were to go buy them, such as pieces of machinery and equipment that are found in other state statutes. There are other pieces of personal property that there is a possibility of purchasing without paying sales tax on that purchase. That provision is referenced in Chapter 100. That approval would be for items of personal property that are integral to a company's primary business activity. The state's Department of Economic Development approval and certification is required. The company completes an application on the state's website and the city or their representative will certify and provide copies of ordinances showing there is a Chapter 100 project for this equipment. After that, the state will approve the personal property sales tax exemption. This state approval is buried on their website and does state that commercial purposes such as retail and residential are not allowed. She explained why cities are allowed to do something but the state won't approve it, noting the statute versus constitution aspect. The state's authority to grant this additional personal property sales tax exemption is found in Chapter 100, which is a statute, and Chapter 100 only lists the industrial projects as the allowable projects, so the state is only allowed to operate within that Chapter 100 framework. Whereas the City is specifically authorized in the constitution to do projects for a larger scale. The constitutional provision does not include the sales tax exemption for personal property.

This project only has abatement on real property and the sales tax exemption on construction materials. Those two pieces are within the City's control. The state does not certify and does not need to provide approval. She stated there was a question if the City gives their sales tax exemption and then that's found to be either incorrectly given or incorrectly used by the developer. This is covered in Section 6.11 of each of the leases. There is a specific indemnity provision that covers improper use of a sales tax exemption on construction materials. It requires the developer to pay all costs, expenses, fees, fines, etc. for any investigation. There is also a general broad indemnity in the performance agreement that was signed two and a half years ago when the project was initially approved and in the leases going forward.

Ben Bigham, Polsinelli, on behalf of Timber Trails, stated the developer, Jake Loveless, was in attendance. He reviewed the process this project's Chapter 100 has been through. In 2023, there was a development agreement entered into between the City and the developer. Included in that development agreement, it contemplated the passage of a Chapter 100 plan. Within that Chapter 100 plan, it contemplated the Chapter 100 bonds that are being presented on the retail and multifamily phases. Since 2023, there haven't been any other Chapter 100s that have come before this Council. There is a delay in issuing the bonds due to construction timing, securing a lender, i.e. everything necessary for movement on a project of this scale. Now, they are here to get the Chapter 100 bonds approved and the abatement structure in place.

He stated there were questions regarding debt service and payment details. This Chapter 100 bond is a book entry special obligation bond. Under special obligation bonds, specific revenues are pledged to the repayment of the bonds. In this case, the revenue that's being pledged for the repayment of the bonds is the PILOT payment - the tax payments made under this Chapter 100 structure. In this case, the developer purchased the bonds and the developer is the one obligated to make the PILOT payments. The City has no obligation or liability under the Chapter 100 structure to make any payments.

He noted confusion on the dollar amounts that are associated with these bonds. He referenced the multifamily phase Chapter 100 bonds, which are listed at \$56.6 million. This amount is the developer's anticipated cost of the project. The City has no obligation to pay debt service on the \$56 million. It is merely identifying that the project is anticipated to cost approximately \$56 million. The same applies to the retail phase for \$3.6 million.

He explained the PILOT structure for both phases. The multifamily phase has a fixed PILOT, meaning that the payments can be projected with certainty for the life of the Chapter 100 plan, 25 years in this case. For 25 years, the developer and the City will know how much in taxes are paid on this project. The starting amount was \$1,426.35 per unit. To find the tax payment in year one, we would take 300 (the number of units in the multifamily project) times \$1,426.35. The per unit amount increases every two years by 1.5%, which is what we see in Cass County as an average escalator for the increase of taxes over the course of the lifespan of this PILOT schedule. He stated the \$1,426.35 per unit value was determined by Cass County. The developer came in, wanted a fixed PILOT which gives them certainty moving forward so they can go finance and have a static payment schedule they can look at and finance the project around. The City wanted to benefit from this, so asked Cass County for a value. Cass County, said in year one (2023) the per unit market value would be \$1,426.35. The current tax generation of the location of the multifamily property is around \$1,000. With 300 units, the year one tax payment will be \$427,905.

The retail phase utilizes a floating PILOT, where the developer will pay taxes which are otherwise due and then take an abatement percentage out of it. In this case the abatement is 25%. This means the assessor issues a bill, \$100 for

example. The developer will pay \$75, 75% of the amount that was billed by the Cass County Assessor. If certain conditions are met, that abatement can rise to as high as 50% by having more sales tax generating tenants. If more sales taxes are being generated then that helps fill the gap of the abatement that's being provided through this Chapter 100 structure. These retail tenants are secured by triple net leases. The intent with this abatement scale is that flow through savings of the property taxes can be used to entice higher quality users and types of users that constituents want to have there: retail users, restaurant users, etc. The more abatement that exists, the lower rent payment you can offer to the tenant and thereby entice them to come into this development.

He discussed what would happen if the developer defaulted under these Chapter 100 bonds and the recourse of the City. The City's recourse is that if the developer fails to perform form or doesn't make the PILOT payments, they can dissolve this Chapter 100 transaction pursuant to the agreement. If the developer fails to fulfill their requirements, the Chapter 100 structure dissolves and the developer would be obligated to make tax payments on the property just like it would or any other property owner. In the case of the multifamily, instead of having the fixed 25-year tax payment structure, the Chapter 100 would go away. Cass County would give them their tax bill for that year and the developer would be obligated to pay that tax bill. The City has no obligation to make the county whole or make any taxing jurisdiction whole for the developer's failure to either deliver the project or make any tax payments under the Chapter 100 bonds. The same goes for the retail phase of the project. If the developer fails to pay and they can't make the payments on the regular tax payments that will then be assessed against the property, the lender would actually step into the shoes of the developer here and make these tax payments. If we go even one layer further and the lender is not in place to make the tax payments, it'd be like any other property owner that fails to pay taxes, the county can place a lean against the property and that's their recourse. There would be interest penalties and the typical things associated by state statute.

Councilmember Baker stated that in the enhanced abatement schedule for the retail phase, it is tied to a restaurant at the hotel and/or this retail center. The retail phase is a vote, the apartment phase is a vote, and the hotel, if that ever comes about, would be a vote. He asked how we can tie this enhanced schedule together to two different projects.

Ms. Granath stated the bond issuances are three separate groups. However, the overall plan of development is a singular unit and so there was a single Chapter 100 plan and a single development agreement. Within that development agreement there are different standards that refer to the separate bond issuances. It's under that combined plan that we have that option. As the hotel doesn't exist yet, we default to that first portion. If and when the hotel is built and meets those standards, then that could also be used because the retail as its own entity and then the restaurant at the hotel were both seen as good outcomes for the City by staff and the decision makers at the time, noting these

are things that we want to promote and look for in our community. There is the flexibility because both were targeted by the City.

Councilmember Baker stated then if or when the hotel comes in front of us with a restaurant, the Chapter 100 funds would be voted on and could be used on the restaurant in the hotel.

Ms, Granath answered yes. The hotel phase would come forward as a single bond issuance under the plan and could include the entire hotel building that could include a restaurant.

Development Services Director David Gress added that the sales tax generated from a restaurant, either in a hotel or on a pad site, and/or a hotel would be used to calculate what the enhanced abatement percentage would be.

Councilmember Baker asked if square footage from a restaurant would offset the square footage of the strip mall and then automatically go to a higher abatement because you have a big restaurant offsetting a relatively small strip mall.

Ms. Granath stated the strip center will be the same size no matter what. It would theoretically allow more of the retail center to be non-sales tax generating.

Councilmember Circo asked if, for instance, eight years down the road, and the multifamily project is done, if they go upside down, who it goes back on.

Mr. Bigham answered that the Chapter 100 transaction would fall apart, it goes away. The assessor would bill the taxes to the property owner like any other owner would have and then the property owner would owe those taxes. If the developer's not there, the lender would step in and make the payments.

Councilmember Circo clarified that this is a kind of protection for the City.

Mr. Bigham answered correct. He stated the Chapter 100 payment is dispersed to taxing jurisdictions like it normally would be.

Councilmember Circo asked if there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding this.

Mr. Feuerborn stated absolutely. In August 2023, the development agreement was approved, which also approved the financing structure that included the bonds. All this is doing is authorizing the sale of the bonds that were approved in that agreement in 2023. There is a full development agreement and MOU in place on this.

Councilmember Circo asked for clarification that the City isn't slammed with a project that might be built.

Ms. Granath stated that in that case, the City has specific authorization in the the development agreement, the indenture, and the lease to immediately deed the property back to the company. During a chapter 100 project, the City has title to the property and so your remedy is to deed that back to the company with no action on their part. You can do it unilaterally and that puts it back on the tax rolls just like any other property.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the second reading of Bill 3992 by title only.

DISCUSSION: Councilmember Baker stated Chapter 100 is not automatic and is not something that the City has to do. His concern is a 25 year agreement. Everything we've done prior has been 23 or less. This one is also \$56 million which is the largest Chapter 100 we've done with apartments. Over the last several years we've done four apartment complexes, 1,125 units totaling \$173 million plus in Chapter 100. He and Councilmember Mills are hearing from constituents that there are a lot of apartments, a lot of Chapter 100, and what are we getting back in return.

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad stated to remember that the question that we're looking at is whether or not to approve issuing the bonds. The Chapter 100 has already been approved. We can't take that back. We're deciding whether we are going to approve these bonds that we've promised with a Chapter 100 agreement with this developer. She asked to make sure that discussion is relevant to the topic.

Councilmember Baker stated he's voting no so that people are clear that he's representing constituents who have these concerns. The concern is at what point is the City going to look at this and say this is too much. Once this is approved, it is a lot of money that we're giving up. We get a few hundred on agricultural land and now we're going to get \$400,000 with this, but at what cost, having potentially five to 600 residences, 450 cars and whatever else with the pull factor being .74. Some of the money is going to be spent in Raymore but much more will be spent elsewhere. Bringing in this development with this many people and cars, what the strain is on our City resources is the ultimate question.

Councilmember Holman asked Councilmember Baker if he supported this and voted for it in 2023.

Councilmember Baker stated he was correct.

Councilmember Mills stated the previous council may have approved this concept and this development, but it's not a rubber stamp that the citizens of

Raymore have to enter into a finance agreement for multifamily properties, which he doesn't believe is a wise use. There are other financing mechanisms for developments. He does not believe that the citizens of Raymore should be publicly financing multifamily units. What we're receiving in PILOTs if this is fully rented out will only cover two police officers. What additional drain with all of these apartments are going to do to law enforcement, roads, schools, etc.

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad stated Chapter 100 is not the City financing the project.

Councilmember Burke called the question.

City Attorney Jonathan Zerr reviewed the process to call the question.

MOTION: By Councilmember Burke III to call the question. The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilmember Baker stated he wanted to reply to Councilmember Holman. He stated he was newly elected in 2023. When he initially looked at it, he thought that the direction of what we were doing with Chapter 100s would be much different than what it is now. People have the opinion to change their mind and I have changed my mind for my constituents who have told me over and over they don't support this. I represent the people that vote for me and that is why I have changed my mind. I've changed my mind for quite some time now on this. So I just wanted to explain what he had asked.

Councilmember Mills stated this property will be owned by the City of Raymore. The citizens are the citizens of Raymore. So this is public financing. It's just like any general obligation bond is considered public financing um because the city owns it. I am not incorrect when I say the citizens of Raymore are financing this project.

Ms. Granath answered that the City will be the owner on the real estate records of the property. However, they will not have any obligation to finance, pay, anything on this. The developer is both the debtor and the purchaser of the bonds. It's unlike general obligation bonds in that the City will owe no money on it. They cannot raise taxes for it and they have no liability to pay on it.

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad stated the citizens are not paying for this development.

The citizens would be the beneficiaries of property taxes that are being abated, that is where the citizens would not see all of the revenue that they could potentially see.

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Nay
	Councilmember Barber	Aye

Councilmember Burke III	Aye
Councilmember Circo	Aye
Councilmember Engert	Aye
Councilmember Holman	Aye
Councilmember Mills	Nay

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad announced the motion carried and declared Bill 3992 as **Raymore City Ordinance 2026-002.**

C. Timber Trails (Iconic) Chapter 100 - Retail Phase

BILL 3993: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, AUTHORIZING THE TAXABLE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS (TIMBER TRAILS RETAIL PROJECT), SERIES 2025 RELATED TO AN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN THE CITY AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS AND TAKE CERTAIN OTHER ACTIONS."

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the second reading of Bill 3993 by title only.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the second reading of Bill 3993 by title only.

DISCUSSION: Councilmember Baker feels a 25 year chapter 100 on a retail strip center sets a precedent we don't need to set.

Councilmember Circo asked who is responsible for securing tenants.

Ben Bigham, Polsinelli, stated the developer is responsible.

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Nay
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Nay

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad announced the motion carried and declared Bill 3993 as **Raymore City Ordinance 2026-003.**

D. Amendment to Chapter 130 of the Raymore City Code

BILL 4006: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, AMENDING PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 130 OF THE RAYMORE CODE OF

ORDINANCES TO ADJUST THE OPERATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT.”

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the second reading of Bill 4006 by title only.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the first reading of Bill 4006 by title only.

DISCUSSION: None

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Aye
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Aye

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad announced the motion carried and declared Bill 4006 as **Raymore City Ordinance 2026-004.**

10. New Business

A. Tax Increment Financing Plans and Redevelopment Projects Annual Report (public hearing)

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad opened the public hearing at 6:57 p.m. and called for a staff report.

Economic Development Director Jordan Lea reviewed the information included in the Council packet. In accordance with RSMo. 99.865, staff reviewed the progress of the various Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Plans throughout the city to determine if the plans and redevelopment projects associated with such plans are making satisfactory progress under the proposed time schedules outlined with the approved plans. Staff provided a summary of the following TIF Plans and Redevelopment Projects with the city: Foxwood Village Shops TIF Plan, Highway 58 West Extended Redevelopment TIF Plan (Galleria), and Highway 58 and Dean Avenue TIF Plan (Raymore Marketplace).

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad opened the floor for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 7:02 p.m.

B. Intergovernmental Agreement with the Belton Police Department Municipal Jail

BILL 4010: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, ESTABLISHING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE BELTON POLICE DEPARTMENT MUNICIPAL JAIL TO PROVIDE INMATE HOUSING."

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the first reading of Bill 4010 by title only.

Chief of Police Jim Wilson reviewed the information included in the Council packet. The City of Raymore has a successful history of utilizing the Belton Police Department Municipal Jail. The service provided continues to be quality. The cost will be \$63.93 per inmate per day for a contract period of two years from the date of approval.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the first reading of Bill 4010 by title only.

DISCUSSION: Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad stated that she has confirmed with City Attorney Jonathan Zerr that she does not need to abstain on this item as her husband works for the Belton Police Department.

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Aye
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Aye

C. Award of Contract - Website Hosting and Design

BILL 4009: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH REVIZE LLC FOR WEBSITE DESIGN AND HOSTING SERVICES."

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the first reading of Bill 4009 by title only.

Communications Director Melissa Harmer reviewed the information included in the Council packet. The City received 10 responses to its Request for Qualifications for Website Hosting and Design Services. Staff determined Revize LLC to have the best proposal and recommends awarding the contract to Revize LLC. The contract is for one year with two automatic extensions of one year each under the same terms and conditions unless one or both parties submit notice. The first year cost is \$68,500 and includes six phases of planning, design and implementation, as well as user training (one time fee) and website hosting for

the first year. After year one, the annual services for hosting, tech support, etc., are roughly 17 percent lower than the hosting fees of the current provider.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the first reading of Bill 4009 by title only.

DISCUSSION: None

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Aye
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Aye

D. Budget Amendment Website Hosting and Design Services

BILL 4011: "AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RAYMORE, MISSOURI, AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2026 OPERATING BUDGET, FOR THE PURCHASE OF WEBSITE DESIGN AND HOSTING SERVICES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$68,500."

Recording Secretary Catherine Alegre conducted the first reading of Bill 4009 by title only.

Finance Director Elisa Williams reviewed the information included in the Council packet. The City desires to enter into a contract to redesign the city website as well as for website hosting services. It is necessary to amend the FY26 General Fund Operating budget in the communications department in order to enter into this agreement. The amount of this budget amendment is equal to the contract amount of \$68,500.

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to approve the first reading of Bill 4011 by title only.

DISCUSSION: None

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Aye
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Aye

11. Public Comment

12. Mayor/Council Communication

Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad and Councilmembers expressed appreciation for the questions and answers this evening, noted the increase in the single family home permits in 2025, appreciated the positive interaction of Shop with a Cop of from the Police Department, and thanked staff and counsel for their additional information on tonight's items.

13. Adjournment

MOTION: By Councilmember Holman, second by Councilmember Burke to adjourn.

VOTE:	Mayor Pro Tem Abdelgawad	Aye
	Councilmember Baker	Aye
	Councilmember Barber	Aye
	Councilmember Burke III	Aye
	Councilmember Circo	Aye
	Councilmember Engert	Aye
	Councilmember Holman	Aye
	Councilmember Mills	Aye

The regular meeting of the Raymore City Council adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Alegre
Recording Secretary

***These minutes transcribed by Erica Hill, City Clerk*