

Mayor Cal Sheehy
Vice Mayor David Diaz
Councilmember Nancy
Campbell
Councilmember Jeni Coke
Councilmember Jim Dolan
Councilmember Michele Lin
Councilmember Cameron
Moses



Lake Havasu City
Council Chambers
92 Acoma Boulevard South
Lake Havasu City, Arizona
86403
www.lhcaz.gov

City Council Regular Meeting

Minutes - Final

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

5:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Sheehy called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

2. INVOCATION

Pastor David Bybee, Christ Chapel, gave the invocation.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Vicki Hart with Troop Box Convoy led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. ROLL CALL

Present: 7 - Mayor Cal Sheehy, Councilmember Nancy Campbell, Councilmember Jeni Coke, Councilmember Jim Dolan, Councilmember Cameron Moses, Councilmember Michele Lin and Vice Mayor David Diaz

*Councilmember Jim Dolan was present via remote conferencing.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 [ID 26-5131](#) Action: Approve the February 24, 2026, City Council Regular Meeting Minutes (*Kelly Williams*)

5.2 [ID 26-5132](#) Action: Call for Executive Session Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A) 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 24, 2026 (*Kelly Williams*)

Councilmember Coke moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, seconded by Councilmember Moses, and carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mayor Sheehy, Councilmember Campbell, Councilmember Coke, Councilmember Dolan, Councilmember Moses, Councilmember Lin and Vice Mayor Diaz

6. CORRESPONDENCE, COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, CITY MANAGER REPORT

- 6.1 [ID 26-5128](#) Fiscal Year 2025-26 2nd Quarter Contracted Agency Reports - H.A.V.E.N. Family Resource Center (*Chief Stirling*)

Mayor Sheehy noted that this item was for informational purposes only.

- 6.2 [ID 26-5133](#) Announce Vacancies on Lake Havasu City Boards, Committees, and Commissions (*Kelly Williams*)

City Clerk Kelly Williams announced the current vacancies on various Lake Havasu City Boards, Committees, and Commissions. She noted that applications are available at City Hall and on the City's website.

- 6.3 [ID 26-5134](#) City Manager's Report (*Jess Knudson*)

City Manager Jess Knudson reported on the following:

- Announced various ceremonies, events, and proclamations.
- Acknowledged the retirement of Ed Godwin with 20 years of service (Public Works Department), Robert Shoemake with 19 years of service (Police Department), and Kenneth Smith with 18 years of service (Police Department).
- Teen Break will be held March 17, 2026, to March 19, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at Rotary Community Park Ballfields.
- Vietnam Veterans Day Event will be held March 29, 2026, 10:30 a.m. at SARA Park Rodeo Grounds.
- Republic Services will be holding a Household Hazardous Waste Event on Saturday, April 18, 2026, from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., at 2065 Kiowa Boulevard North (Fire Station No. 2).

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 7.1 [ID 26-5110](#) Discussion and Action: Ordinance No. 26-1379 Amending Lake Havasu City Code Section 3.20.040, Schedule of Fees and Service Charges, to Add and Revise Fees and Service Charges for Pavement Restoration, Utility Permits, and Special Events (Introduction) (*Jill Olsen*)

Administrative Services Director Jill Olsen advised that this item is an introduction of an ordinance amending Lake Havasu City Code Section 3.20.040, Schedule of Fees and Service Charges, to add and revise fees and service charges for pavement restoration, utility permits, and special events.

Public Works Director Ron Foggin reviewed the proposed pavement restoration and utility permit fees and inspection fees that would be issued based on the street cut ordinance that was recently adopted to protect new pavement and ensure road cuts are being done properly throughout the system.

Discussion ensued related to the proposed restoration fee structure based on pavement age. Mr. Foggin reviewed the proposed restoration fees for pavement ages 0-12 months, 13-24 months, 25-36 months, 37-60 months, and older than 60 months. Councilmember Campbell thought every street cut regardless of the age of the pavement should be addressed with proper compaction and base. Mr. Knudson explained that while the restoration fees are based on the age of the pavement, the same standards for compaction, base, and inspections would apply to all streets regardless of the pavement age.

Assistant City Manager Anthony Kozlowski reviewed the proposed fees for special events held on publicly owned property, including parades and the Bridgewater Channel. Mr. Kozlowski added that the proposed fixed rates for street closures on McCulloch (Mainstreet) and reduced rates for police and fire services would have a positive benefit for promoters in the downtown area for special events.

Discussion ensued regarding the current special event application/permit fees and City facility use fees for non-profit organizations.

Councilmember Lin expressed concern that this item was coming before the City Council as one agenda item and thought the fees should be presented as two separate agenda items as they are completely different.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dave Johnson, citizen, addressed the council and questioned what the current and proposed rates were to close McCulloch (Mainstreet) for a special event.

Mr. Kozlowski explained that currently the rates to close McCulloch (Mainstreet) for a special event depend on the size of the event. He said on average a typical street closure event ranges between \$3,000 and \$7,000. He said the proposed fee structure reduces the costs for police and fire services by 50 percent and also proposes a substantial reduction in public works service costs for street closures.

Mr. Johnson spoke on the proposed fees for pavement restoration and utility permits and suggested the City install PVC under the roadway every 500-600 feet so utilities could be run through the PVC versus cutting into the pavement.

Mr. Rich Fountain, President of Lake Havasu City Relics and Rods Car Club, addressed the council and highlighted their annual Run to the Sun Event and the ways they give back to the community. He requested the City Council consider waiving the street closure fees for their annual Run to the Sun Event as all profits raised from their event go back to the community and local charities.

Councilmember Campbell asked if the Relics and Rods Car Club receives any marketing or sponsorship from Go Lake Havasu, to which Mr. Fountain replied no.

Mr. James Jimerson, President of Lake Havasu City Over the Hill Gang, addressed the council and requested the City Council take careful consideration of the rates when it comes to non-profit organizations that hold events that give back to the community and bring in revenue.

Ms. Bonny Toy, citizen, addressed the council and questioned whether the proposed fees would really be a reduction as she thought she heard organizations say they were currently not paying any fees.

Mayor Sheehy explained that the two previous speakers were asking for the street closure rates to be waived, and the rates as proposed would be a reduction to the current rates.

Councilmember Lin asked if the City had specific requirements or criteria that must be met to close the street, to which Mr. Kozlowski said the street closure requirements in the downtown area are based on specific criteria outlined in the City Code.

Mr. Tim Murray, citizen, addressed the council and questioned whether the City had standard specifications that must be met for road cuts.

Mr. Foggin said there is a standard street cut drawing that must be followed for compaction levels and required repairs for all street cuts.

There being no further comments, Mayor Sheehy closed the public hearing.

*Due to technical difficulties, Councilmember Dolan was not present for voting on Item 7.1

Councilmember Coke moved to introduce Ordinance No. 26-1379 amending Lake Havasu City Code Section 3.20.040, seconded by Vice Mayor Diaz, and carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mayor Sheehy, Councilmember Campbell, Councilmember Coke, Councilmember Moses, Councilmember Lin and Vice Mayor Diaz

7.2 [ID 26-5135](#) Discussion and Possible Action: Purchase of Lighting Improvements for SARA Park Ball Fields 3 and 4 (*Gabby Vera*)

Parks and Recreation Director Gabby Vera advised that at a previous meeting the Council approved the purchase of lighting improvements to ball fields at Rotary Park and SARA

Park Ball Fields 1 and 2 and directed staff to bring back an action item for Council's consideration to install lighting on the remaining ball fields at SARA Park (Fields 3 and 4). She noted that as mentioned within the staff report, Council has the option to approve the use of contingency funds in the amount of \$463,000 this fiscal year or defer this item to the Fiscal Year 2026-27 budget.

Vice Mayor Diaz asked what the total cost was for the original bid (ball fields at Rotary Park and SARA Park Ball Fields 1 and 2) without Fields 3 and 4, to which Ms. Vera said \$468,000.

Discussion ensued related to the total cost for Fields 3 and 4 and balance remaining (\$763,000) in available General Fund Contingency.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing. There being no comments, he closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Moses moved to approve the cooperative purchase of LED lighting improvements for SARA Park Ball Fields 3 and 4 in the amount of \$463,000; authorize the use of General Fund contingency funds in the amount of \$463,000 for Fiscal Year 2025-26; and authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary documents on behalf of the City, seconded by Vice Mayor Diaz.

Vice Mayor Diaz had questions regarding the project timeline, to which Ms. Vera explained that the lighting project would be phased so they would not have to shut down any of the fields or impact any of the practice or game schedules for the current user groups. She added that staff was reassured that the project would be completed by the end of this fiscal year. Vice Mayor Diaz asked if the timer feature which was discussed at a previous meeting and would allow for fields to be used at night was something that could be included in the project scope, to which Ms. Vera said yes.

Councilmember Campbell expressed concerns regarding the project costs as the City has pavement and infrastructure that is failing and asked why the parking lot project at the Aquatic Center was removed from the budget, to which Mr. Knudson noted that he did not have those project details at this time but would gather the information and send to council.

Councilmember Lin asked about the timeline of the project if the additional field lights were deferred until next fiscal year, to which Mr. Vera noted that if deferred, depending on the procurement process and quote, the project could be completed within the first couple of months of the new fiscal year. Councilmember Lin thought that between the two options there was only a difference of approximately five months and wondered if

deferring the project would create any complications, to which Ms. Vera said she did not foresee any complications or issues, noting that their biggest concern was just ensuring that the user groups are not impacted. Councilmember Lin said she did not want to delay the project but was not in favor of using contingency funds when the Fiscal Year 2026-27 budget is just a few months away.

Discussion ensued regarding the two options in terms of timeline and costs. Parks Maintenance Superintendent Guy Reynolds said the timeline for the current project is approximately two weeks. He said if Fields 3 and 4 were tied in with the current project the contractors have indicated that they would be able to complete the additional fields within the same timeframe. Mr. Reynolds stated that if deferred, he did not anticipate any cost difference in materials as the City received an extension on the quote for materials through July 1, 2026, only a difference in the timeline in terms of waiting for the contractors to come back to finish the two additional fields.

Mayor Sheehy called for a vote on the motion and second on the floor. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mayor Sheehy, Councilmember Campbell, Councilmember Coke, Councilmember Dolan, Councilmember Moses and Vice Mayor Diaz

Nay: 1 - Councilmember Lin

7.3 [ID 26-5136](#) Discussion and Action: Job Order Contract Task Order Agreement No. 3 for the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Chip Seal Program with Cactus Asphalt (*Bill Young*)

Deputy Director of Public Works Bill Young advised that this item is requesting approval of Task Order Agreement No. 3 for the annual Chip Seal Program with Cactus Asphalt in the amount of \$1,997,451.20. He said the project would begin around the end of April/early May and be completed in May.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing. There being no comments, he closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Campbell moved to award the JOC Task Order Agreement No. 3 for the Fiscal Year 2025-26 Chip Seal Program to Cactus Asphalt in the amount of \$1,997,451.20, seconded by Councilmember Moses, and carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mayor Sheehy, Councilmember Campbell, Councilmember Coke, Councilmember Dolan, Councilmember Moses, Councilmember Lin and Vice Mayor Diaz

7.4 [ID 26-5125](#) Discussion and Possible Direction Regarding Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Process (*Councilmember Campbell*)

Mayor Sheehy stated that this item was requested by Councilmember Campbell as a future agenda item at a previous meeting.

Councilmember Campbell said she requested this item due to concerns and questions about the Request for Qualifications process. She explained that a Request for Qualifications is different than a Request for Quote and said a Request for Qualifications (“RFQ”) is nothing more than an application where there is a scope of work and the person puts down as much information to prove that they are the best person for the job. She said Arizona Revised Statutes (“State Statutes”) states that in an RFQ there should never be any form of communication regarding fees or anything financial. She added that in an RFQ, the City has a group that comes together as the steering committee to review the RFQ applications; however, through that process the City is not allowed to discuss price, only the qualifications of the job. She said when it comes to the group that reviews the applications, it is mandatory that the City have one outside contractor, designer, or architect that is not in-house or the RFQ becomes null and void. She said she has had questions regarding the RFQ process and transparency and would like to ensure that the City does not have contractors with special interests. Councilmember Campbell spoke on the Request for Proposal/Bid/Quote process and noted that when it comes to an RFQ it should never move forward on procurement or quotes or bidding until the RFQ is determined to be the most qualified and approved by the City Council. Councilmember Campbell noted that with the last RFQ for the pool project, which did not happen, one particular contractor was informed that the RFQ was a done deal and they moved forward and leveraged over \$10,000 and then the City Council decided to push the project to the next budget session. Councilmember Campbell said as part of the RFQ process she thought contractors should know why they were denied or why they were disqualified, and after doing some research she found information on the “gold standard” for municipalities which provides transparent scoring, written documentation for procurement files, defensible process for protests, easy public records compliance, and clear ranking for council approval. She provided the Council with several handouts on the “gold standard” which explained that having a city council approve the final RFQ in Arizona municipalities ensures transparency, legal compliance, and accountability. It allows elected officials to confirm that the RFQ reflects community priorities, follows state procurement laws, and mitigates risks of bias or disputes in the selection process. Council approval also provides an official record of authorization before public funds or resources are committed. Councilmember Campbell provided an example of an RFQ evaluation sheet with instructions and explained that the scoring is all public knowledge with the firm’s qualifications and experience, project team qualifications, relevant project experience, and understanding and approach. She said the RFQ evaluation sheet would be no different than the bids that come before the City Council that provide all the information, the scoring mechanism, and the reason they were selected or denied. She spoke on the recent RFQ process for the pool project and denial based on the requirement of having an

in-house engineer; however, she said according to all the other contractors none of them had an in-house engineer. She suggested the City move forward with implementing the “gold standard” for the RFQ process noting that the only change being that the procurement process or RFQ does not go out until the City Council approves the contractor/architect.

Mayor Sheehy stated that the procurement process for RFQ’s is guided by State Statutes (Chapter 34) and states that the selection committee can have an outside person, but it can also have an in-house person. Councilmember Campbell said the selection committee is required to have an outside person or the RFQ is considered null and void, to which Mayor Sheehy said the selection committee must have an engineer or an architect, but they can be on staff. Mayor Sheehy asked if what Councilmember Campbell is requesting is for the RFQ process to happen and then staff would bring the RFQ with the scoring evaluation to the City Council for approval, to which Councilmember Campbell replied yes. Councilmember Campbell explained that through the RFQ process, staff would recommend who scored the highest and why but if there is any debate or confusion amongst other contractors, they then can have a two-way conversation with the City Council. She stated that it is no different than the bid process that includes a scope of work. She said what she is asking for is public transparency and what communities in Arizona have taken as a “gold standard” because staff alone should not be doing all the procurement information behind closed doors. Mayor Sheehy reiterated that what Councilmember Campbell is requesting is for the process to happen the way it currently is and then when the selection committee chooses the highest scoring person on the RFQ it is brought before the City Council for action, to which Councilmember Campbell said yes with an RFQ evaluation sheet that is redacted with any information that is not pertinent or cannot be disclosed.

Mayor Sheehy asked how many RFQ’s the City has done over the course of a year, to which Procurement Official Lynette Singleton said in the last two years the City has done approximately seven RFQ’s. There was discussion regarding the total number of solicitations versus RFQ’s. Councilmember Campbell stated that what she is suggesting is the “gold standard” of procurement for what she just heard is only a small number of RFQ solicitations each year. Mayor Sheehy said when it comes to the RFQ’s that the City processes, he asked if there is anything in State Statutes that would prohibit the selection committee from selecting the highest rank vendor or supplier and then having that come before the City Council, to which Ms. Singleton explained that the City currently takes the evaluation ranking to the City Council with the top evaluated firm and recommendation to award the contract. Ms. Singleton stated that she researched other cities and could not find any other cities that take the ranking before the council prior to going through the negotiations for the pre-construction on an RFQ. Mayor Sheehy asked if all the firms and rankings in an RFQ could be provided as part of the packet that goes before the City

Council, to which Ms. Singleton explained that some cities provide it and some do not; however, there is a fine balance when it comes to confidentiality and disclosing information prior to the award. She said if an award was terminated or did not happen then the solicitation would be considered canceled, and the City would not want to disclose that information if it were going to go back out for solicitation. Councilmember Campbell said realistically an RFQ process has no dollar amounts and the only thing she has seen redacted are the names of the outside general contractor, architect, or designer. She added that she is only asking for transparency and does not think any of the changes she is suggesting are illegal or against State Statutes. Ms. Singleton further explained that State Statutes indicates that proposals and the detailed scoring of proposals are confidential until after awarded.

Discussion ensued regarding the RFQ process for the pool project. Ms. Singleton explained that the term “proposal” can mean qualification proposal or pricing proposal; however, for the pool project RFQ it was a qualification proposal. She said in researching other cities they take the RFQ to the council once the contract has been negotiated, which at that time the contract is pricing, but it is only negotiated with the top evaluated firm. She noted that she did not find any other cities that take the RFQ to the council prior to negotiations.

Councilmember Campbell said her direction would be to move forward with the “gold standard” and the RFQ being approved by the City Council. She said being that there are only three RFQ’s a year it should not be too difficult and noted that she received the information on “gold standard” from someone in the state. Mayor Sheehy asked who in the state provided the information, to which Councilmember Campbell said she would not disclose the name. Mayor Sheehy said Councilmember Campbell keeps referring to the “gold standard” however the City experts are saying that there is no other city that does this, to which Councilmember Campbell replied that was not true. Mayor Sheehy stated that when Councilmember Campbell asked for this item to come before the City Council she mentioned the City of Kingman; however, he reached out to the Mayor and the City Manager in Kingman who said that they do not do this and actually advise against doing what she is suggesting. Councilmember Campbell stated that she reached out to the City of Kingman but they never got back to her. Mayor Sheehy questioned where the information on “gold standard” came from then or who gave it to her, to which Councilmember Campbell said she did not understand the disagreement and questioned whether all RFQ’s are supposed to go before the City Council before moving forward?

City Attorney Kelly Garry said she thinks the City Council is referring to procurement under State Statutes (Title 34) which has to do with public buildings and improvements and are very specific to construction and employing technical registrars. Ms. Garry explained that there is nothing in State Statutes (Title 34) that requires an RFQ to come before the City Council for approval before it goes to a solicitation. Councilmember

Campbell said that is not the information she received and thought the council heard that the RFQ is supposed to go in front of the City Council and then goes into a solicitation but that nothing should move forward nor should any of the council consider an RFQ having a dollar amount as it is against State Statutes. Ms. Garry stated that no one has said that the City has done that and believes Ms. Singleton was referencing the award, and until after the City goes through an award of an RFQ and if a certain level threshold, then it goes for approval before the City Council. Ms. Garry further explained the process and said once the City initiates an RFQ then it goes out and there is a committee that is put together and when the proposals are received back the committee then reviews and scores the proposals which may include just the scoring or may also include interviews that are scored and once the scores are compiled then the City may begin entering into negotiations with the highest score. She said once an agreement is reached between the parties then the contract comes before the City Council for approval. Ms. Garry explained that the City outlines in the council communication the proposals that are received and the recommendation from the selection committee which is based on the negotiations that staff had with the highest scoring proposal. Councilmember Campbell asked if it is illegal for the City Council to approve an RFQ before negotiations because she is arguing the fact that other municipalities without a doubt say it is the “gold standard” way of doing it that they want the approval of the city council and stated that at no time should there be biases on a dollar amount for the next process. Ms. Garry asked if what Councilmember Campbell is asking is for the City to draft an RFQ for the City Council to review before it goes to solicitation, to which Councilmember Campbell responded no. Ms. Garry asked if what Councilmember Campbell is asking is for the City Council to review the RFQ scoring, to which Councilmember Campbell responded yes and added that she has procurement people that have stated that this is a very good way to do it. Ms. Garry said staff is happy to look at anything additional that the council would like to provide. She said City staff has researched and cannot find any other cities that review the scoring before a contract. She explained that there are very specific rules on what happens during the scoring process and when all of those are being followed and graded and added up and then you have this list and then bring the list to the council the only thing staff could do is start over. She said the council would not be able to look at the list and say that they do not agree with the scoring committee or how it was scored, or add or take points away, as that would be messing with the integrity of the scoring process. Ms. Garry stated that staff could bring it to Council and then Council could say they do not like it, but it would have to be a good reason because the City is just going to get a protest. She noted that she understands that there were concerns and some questions that came up with the procurement for the pool project, but the City has done many other RFQ’s in the past that did not have these types of issues. She said if there is something that staff cannot uncover in the process or did not know, she does not know how Council would have known that. Councilmember Campbell responded that the constituents or contractors would come up to complain or dispute the fact that they were denied and aware. Ms. Garry said that it is assuming everybody is

aware of all the facts at that point in time. Councilmember Campbell stated that she would provide staff with the information.

Councilmember Moses asked if it would be appropriate to provide the scoring sheets as part of the final proposal, to which Ms. Garry said after it has been awarded yes, until that point of it being awarded it is possible that it could come before the council and for some reason not be awarded or something could fall through and then negotiations would have to start with the next person. Councilmember Moses asked if it was possible or appropriate for the City Council to review the scoring sheets before the City Council awards the contract, to which Ms. Garry asked if Councilmember Moses was asking if it was appropriate to have all the information before the council makes the award, to which Councilmember Moses clarified if the scoring sheets could be provided at the time the contract comes before the City Council after the scoring and negotiations have taken place, to which Ms. Garry said she thinks there is an argument of whether that would be appropriate or not for the reason that until a contract is awarded (approved by the City Council) and signed by both parties it is not final so there could still be a possibility that it could fall through and then the City would have to start negotiations with the next highest proposal. She said she does not know if it is common to do that until you are all the way through that process and then release the information.

Councilmember Campbell said she is not asking the City Council to do anything that jeopardizes the City. She said what she is asking is a legal thing that you can do and should be a part of the RFQ process.

Vice Mayor Diaz suggested Councilmember Campbell work with procurement and the City Attorney to gather more information on what other cities are already doing this and have a follow-up discussion at the next council meeting. Councilmember Campbell said there are people that have worked for the City and things that they are concerned about, and she would like to be very careful on what we are doing as this is personal and is trying to keep it near and dear to her heart because the people are saying that there is no reason why the RFQ process cannot be approved by the council and then move on to procurement. Mayor Sheehy also recommended that Councilmember Campbell work with procurement and the City Attorney to come up with whatever she is looking to do to accomplish her goal and bring it back to the City Council at a future meeting.

Councilmember Lin asked about the City's RFQ evaluation sheet, to which Ms. Garry said the City follows State Statutes (Title 34) which outlines the process. Councilmember Lin asked if RFQ's are different based on the project, to which Ms. Garry explained that there is a template for RFQ's but the information contained within the template is different depending on the project. She added that there is a process with evaluation sheets and criteria set up for each RFQ but they are not all exactly the same. Councilmember Lin said

she thought the challenge with some of the contractors was that some of the requests within the RFQ (pool project) were not appropriate. She asked how the City determines the evaluation criteria as this has never been brought up before and questioned if the RFQ process for the pool project was different than other projects, to which Mayor Sheehy said he thinks the only thing that was different with the RFQ for the pool project is that councilmembers were involved with contractors directly which is the least transparent thing. Councilmember Lin said there were contractors that did not understand the process or who to contact so the contractors were coming to the City Council and they had to give them some direction. Mayor Sheehy said the City Council can direct contractors and questions to the City's Procurement Office. Ms. Garry added that the RFQ solicitation outlines all the criteria, selection process, and who to contact with questions. Councilmember Lin said she heard from contractors that they had a challenge with the process and reaching out to get the information they needed. Ms. Garry noted that the pool project was a complicated RFQ. Councilmember Lin asked why the pool project RFQ was more complicated than other RFQ's, to which Ms. Garry said it was more complicated because of the process the City had to use for the type of RFQ that staff was asked to do. Mayor Sheehy stated that the City Council asked for a design-build RFQ. Councilmember Campbell stated that the City had issues with the last RFQ and some transparency issues and when a project goes south the City Council is blamed for it as if they were involved with it. She said the City Council depends on the staff to do a good job, and thought what she was proposing was absolutely a simple step for the City Council to review the RFQ before moving forward and to give certainty to the contractor as well that the community supports them. Mayor Sheehy said what Councilmember Campbell is suggesting is a big departure of what every other city does. Councilmember Campbell said that was not true.

Councilmember Moses asked Councilmember Campbell what other cities are doing the process she is suggesting, to which Councilmember Campbell said she would not get into that right now and would go back to the people that told her and was also told the City of Kingman, which she will follow through with and call. Councilmember Moses said he was open to going along with what Councilmember Campbell was saying but that she was not bringing evidence and asked where the "gold standard" process came from, to which Councilmember Campbell said she would get the City Council all the information but would not disclose the names of the people for the sake of respecting them.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing.

Mr. Taylor Harrison, citizen, addressed the council and said he was relatively familiar with the request for proposal process and asked if, in an RFQ, the City is locked into only the highest scoring contractor throughout the entire process or if the City could negotiate with all qualified contractors that responded.

Mayor Sheehy and Mr. Knudson explained the RFQ negotiation and approval process.

Mr. Martin Stansbury, citizen, addressed the council concerning the issue of the in-house engineer requirement for the pool project RFQ and also not informing a contractor of why they were disqualified. He questioned the process of only negotiating with one contractor and thought it made more sense to get as many people over the minimum requirement as possible and then negotiate with all of them but stated that he understood that government does not operate the same as a business.

Ms. Toy addressed the council and suggested the City provide a link on the City's website where the public can view the City Council meeting video that reviewed the procurement process.

Mr. Don Wisdom, citizen, addressed the council regarding the RFQ process and wondered if the only way the process could be changed was through legislation.

There being no further comments, Mayor Sheehy closed the public hearing.

Mr. Knudson provided some clarification regarding the RFQ process for a design-build versus a design-bid-build.

There was a consensus from the Council for Councilmember Campbell to work with procurement and the City Attorney to come up with some more information about the "gold standard", where it is coming from, and what other cities are doing this and bring back to the City Council for further consideration.

8. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Ms. Sheila Walker, citizen, addressed the council regarding a dispute she is having with her neighbor and requested the City Council create an ordinance that protects people from their neighbors being able to record conversations in their own yard.

Ms. Sharon Napp, citizen, addressed the council and said she is having a similar issue with a neighbor who has cameras and is recording her property and conversations.

Ms. Toy addressed the council regarding the parking lot improvements at Rotary Park.

Mr. Murray addressed the council and expressed his appreciation to City staff for putting together the Havasu Residents Academy and said he was looking forward to the upcoming sessions.

9. CURRENT EVENTS

There were no Council committee reports.

10. FUTURE MEETINGS

Tuesday, March 24, 2026 @ 5:30 p.m. – Regular Meeting

Tuesday, April 14, 2026 @ 5:30 p.m. – Regular Meeting

11. FUTURE DISCUSSION ITEMS

There were no requests from Council for future discussion items.

12. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full and true copy of the Regular Meeting Minutes of the Lake Havasu City Council held on the 10th day of March, 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and posted, and that a quorum was present.

Kelly Williams, City Clerk/MMC