

Mayor Cal Sheehy
Vice Mayor Michele Lin
Councilmember Nancy
Campbell
Councilmember Jeni Coke
Councilmember David Diaz
Councilmember Jim Dolan
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, November 25, 2025

5:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Sheehy called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. INVOCATION

Kay Zimmerman, City On A Hill International Church, gave the invocation.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Paul Lindsey, River Riders, led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Mayor Cal Sheehy, Councilmember Nancy Campbell, Councilmember Jeni Coke, Vice Mayor David Diaz, Councilmember Cameron Moses and Vice Mayor Michele Lin

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jim Dolan

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- 5.1 [ID 25-5011](#) Action: Approve the October 28, 2025, City Council Regular Meeting Minutes (*Kelly Williams*)
- 5.2 [ID 25-4986](#) Action: Resolution No. 25-3879 Ratifying the Execution of a Funding Agreement with the Arizona Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, to Support Veterans Treatment Court Services for Veterans with Substance Use Disorders and Mental Health Conditions (*Mitchell Kalauli*)
- 5.3 [ID 25-4988](#) Action: Resolution No. 25-3880 Approving the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Lake Havasu Unified School District for the Disclosure of School Surveillance Video Footage in Instances of Catastrophic Health and Safety Emergency (*Chief Stirling*)
- 5.4 [ID 25-4992](#) Action: Resolution No. 25-3881 Approving a Payroll Deduction Agreement with Lake Havasu Unified School District No. 1 to Allow Participation by City Employees in the Extracurricular Tax Credit Program Through Payroll Deductions for Tax Year 2026 (*Jill Olsen*)

- 5.5 [ID 25-5012](#) Action: Call for Executive Session Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A) 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, December 9, 2025 (*Kelly Williams*)

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

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

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Dolan

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

- 6.1 [ID 25-4991](#) Fiscal Year 2025-26 (July through September) Report from Western Arizona Humane Society (*Chief Stirling*)

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

- 6.2 [ID 25-4993](#) Investment Report as of September 30, 2025 (*Jill Olsen*)

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

- 6.3 [ID 25-5014](#) 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 were available at City Hall and on the City's website.

- 6.4 [ID 25-5013](#) City Manager's Report (*Jess Knudson*)

City Manager Jess Knudson reported on the following:

- Announced various awards, ceremonies, events and proclamations.
- Recognized the retirement of Sergeant Mark Doyle, Police Department, with 31 years of service.
- Recognized the first graduates of the Havasu Resident Academy.
- An Electronic & Household Hazardous Waste Recycling Event will take place on Saturday, December 13, 2025, at Fire Station 2 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
- The Lake Havasu Aquatic Center pool will be temporarily closed for maintenance and cleaning from November 26th through December 15th.
- The deadline to submit applications for Invocations at 2026 City Council Regular Meetings is Wednesday, December 3, 2025.
- A Coffee with the Mayor and City Manager will be held on Friday, December 5th at 8:30 a.m.
- A Lunch & Learn Doing Business with the City Event will be held on February 11,

2026, in the City Council Chambers from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

7.1 [ID 25-5010](#) Discussion and Action: Partnership Agreement with the Military Moms Organization for the Military Tribute Banner Program (*Anthony Kozlowski*)

Assistant City Manager Anthony Kozlowski advised that before the Council is a partnership agreement with the Military Moms Organization for the Military Tribute Banner Program to recognize military men and women in the community. He said the program includes relocating some of the military banners currently at The Shops at Lake Havasu to Wheeler Park to provide more visibility and recognize those in the community who are serving our country. He said the banners would remain up at Wheeler Park during their length in service and will be retired once they are no longer in service and given to the family.

Ms. Cindy Ritter, Military Moms Organization, addressed the council and spoke on their organization and efforts in the community.

Councilmember Diaz asked how much involvement the City would have in this program, to which Mr. Kozlowski said the City would be involved in the application process and installation of the poles and flags in Wheeler Park.

Vice Mayor Lin asked how many banners are currently at The Shops at Lake Havasu, to which Ms. Ritter said they currently have ten. She said five are KIA banners which they would like to put behind the fence located behind the fountain at Wheeler Park. She said they would only have one banner at this time that would be at Wheeler Park as they have one active in service that graduated from Lake Havasu City, which is one of the requirements of the program. Vice Mayor Lin asked how many banners could be placed at Wheeler Park, to which Mr. Kozlowski replied that at this time the City has plenty of room to sustain approximately 25 banners.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing.

Ms. Bonny Toy, citizen, addressed the Council and asked if homeschool students would qualify for the program.

Mayor Sheehy said anyone who received their education from Lake Havasu City would be eligible.

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

Councilmember Diaz moved to approve the Partnership Agreement with the Military Moms Organization for the Military Tribute Banner Program in Lake

Havasu City, seconded by Councilmember Campbell, and carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Dolan

- 7.2** [ID 25-4997](#) Discussion and Action: Ordinance No. 25-1373 Approving the Planned Development Rezone and Amended General Development Plan of 5601 Highway 95 Building I, Tract 2396, Lot A-3, Approximately 4.54 Acres, from General Commercial/Planned Development (C-2/PD) District to General Commercial/Planned Development (C-2/PD) District to Allow Multi-Family Residential, a Maximum of 32-Foot Above the Approved Designed Building Pad Height for Each of the Buildings, and an Exception to the Covered Parking Requirement (*Trevor Kearns*)

City Planner Trevor Kearns advised that the subject property is located on the south side of The Shops at Lake Havasu with a commercial retail building to the east and undeveloped Arizona State Land to the west. The property measures a total of 4.54-acres and consists of a theatre, restaurant and parking area. He said the adjacent properties are zoned General Commercial (C-2) District and General Commercial/Planned Development (C-2/PD) District. Mr. Kearns stated that the General Plan designates this area as commercial mixed-use and noted that if approved will conform with the existing land use which is in conformance with the goals and policies of the General Plan including high density residential. Mr. Kearns said the applicant's letter of intent states that they are proposing a 102-unit multi-family project that will consist of six buildings with a mix of one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. The buildings will be three-story buildings with exterior access to the units, each unit will have a balcony or patio at the rear, and the structures will be modular construction (built offsite and brought on location to be assembled). He said the applicant has committed to developing a high-quality community that meets City standards, complies with The Shops at Lake Havasu Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs), and provides well designed and energy efficient homes. Mr. Kearns explained that The Shops at Lake Havasu CC&Rs require shared parking and cross access easements through the majority of the mall properties. He stated that the owner provided a parking calculation for the current existing uses at the mall, after being reviewed by staff, there are currently 713 parking spaces more than the current code requires. This project will remove 322 spaces and provide 176 new spaces. He noted that after the project's completion there will be 567 parking spaces more than the current code requirements.

Mr. Kearns outlined the following exceptions requested from the zoning requirements:

1. Allow multi-family residential uses in the C-2 zoning district pursuant to the Amended General Development Plan provided.

2. Allow 32-foot maximum building height measured from the approved maximum grade.
3. Parking spaces shall be exempt from the requirement to provide covered parking.

Mr. Kearns outlined the following staff conditions for code compliance:

1. The development of the property shall substantially match the General Development Plan.
2. Multi-family residential is allowed only on the northern half of the subject property as identified on the Amended General Development Plan. A lot alteration is required to create a separate lot for the proposed multi-family project. The lot alteration and parcel plat must be completed prior to any future City approvals.
3. The current shared parking agreements and cross access easements for the subject property and surrounding properties must remain shared.
4. Building Permits and Design Review for compliance with City Codes are required prior to development of the property.

Councilmember Campbell asked what the current maximum building height is at The Shops at Lake Havasu, to which Mr. Kearns explained that the maximum height for C-2 is 25-feet; however, the current PD allows 46-feet for the tower on the movie theatre, 42-feet for the architectural features on the corners, and 35-feet for the Walmart building.

Mr. Chad Nelson, applicant with Come-Together at The Shops at Lake Havasu, addressed the council and presented on the average age and number of apartment buildings in Lake Havasu City, available vacant land, parking requirements and costs to build tiny homes versus apartments, infrastructure development, and the housing cost burden. He explained that this project introduces mixed-use housing to The Shops at Lake Havasu with jobs, amenities, grocery stores and entertainment within walking distance, and noted that with commercial zoning, eliminates the need for expensive residential parking requirements. Mr. Nelson said the project brings modern, smart, and model gorgeous apartment homes that offer quality housing at below-market rents. He added that more information regarding the development could be found on their website at come-together.com.

Vice Mayor Lin asked about the building and if it would be maintained by an association, to which Mr. Nelson explained that the property would be managed by a property management company called RENU, and noted that they have a goal of being under-the-market rent but it would not be a low-income housing development.

Councilmember Moses asked about the construction and safety of the modular

construction structures, to which Development Services Director Jeff Thuneman addressed the Council and explained that these are factory-built buildings that are State regulated. He further explained that the City has an Inspection Service Agreement (ISA) with the State for factory-built buildings and added that City staff is trained and has the expertise to permit and inspect this type of construction.

Discussion ensued regarding the available infrastructure to support this project.

Councilmember Diaz said he has heard that this development is not in conformance with the goals and policies in the General Plan and asked the City Attorney if she could provide more information regarding this amendment and the General Plan, to which City Attorney Kelly Garry said this item does not have anything to do with amending the General Plan. She said there may be some confusion as it relates to rezoning and an amendment to the General Development Plan. She explained that the General Development Plan is specific to this development. She said there is no request to amend the General Plan and the current use that is being proposed, and for the City Council's consideration, is allowed within the land designation that is already in existence under the General Plan for this property.

Councilmember Campbell said while she agrees with the City's covered parking requirements, she understands the exception to the covered parking requirements for this project.

Councilmember Coke asked if RENU would have a property manager on site, to which Mr. Nelson said they have not completely developed all of that yet; however, there will be representatives on-site to show the properties. Councilmember Coke asked if they would have an office for day-to-day operations, to which Mr. Nelson said they would not have an office on-site in the development but there could be one nearby.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing.

Mr. Emiliano Torres, citizen, addressed the council and said the project seemed very practical and reasonable except for the elimination of the covered parking. He asked what the actual cost savings was for eliminating the covered parking – how much per unit, and what costs savings would be rational for future developers. He said the zone C-2 rational takes away all the private parking for the residents and the mall becomes the owner of the parking, not the residents. He presented some potential issues with parking and tenants, and said other developments like this have dedicated entrance and exits and private parking.

Mr. John Parrott, citizen, addressed the council and said he is in the commercial real estate

business but does not have any relationship with this project. He said he is a strong supporter of this project and apartment buildings. He said Lake Havasu City is so diverse when it comes to population and workforce and needs a wide spectrum of housing opportunities. He said the positive aspects of the project outweigh any small negatives and strongly encouraged the City Council to approve the project.

Ms. Kim Shore, citizen, addressed the council and asked about designated handicapped parking spaces in front of each of the buildings, what the price point of the rent would be, and who would be responsible for maintenance and landscaping.

Mr. Nelson stated that the project would be required to meet all City standards with curbs, sidewalks, and handicapped parking. He said there will be CC&Rs in place to regulate activity and address any issues. He said to answer the question regarding the price point, they are hoping to be about ten percent below the market, right around \$1,200 for one-bedroom and \$1,500 for two-bedrooms.

Mr. Don Cantrell, partner of Come-Together, addressed the council and spoke regarding the property management company and CC&Rs. He said they are looking to build a quality community with a targeted objective being quality housing experience for those that do not have that opportunity.

Vice Mayor Lin asked if pets would be allowed, to which Mr. Cantrell said yes and added that the property would have a dog park.

Councilmember Diaz asked if the price point included all utilities, to which Mr. Cantrell said they were still determining what utilities would be included in the rent.

Ms. Toy addressed the council concerning the need for additional handicapped accessibility parking in the community.

Mr. Kelly Lutz, citizen, addressed the council concerning the development not having on-site management and asked if the property was an entity on its own and private property that does not necessarily pertain to City rules and ordinances related to overnight parking.

Mr. Kearns explained that the mall (property) could have its own rules; however, any city ordinances such as overnight camping would take precedence over the rules of the CC&Rs. He noted that Walmart is not included in the mall (property) CC&Rs and is separate from this development. He explained that the property can have rules that are more stringent but cannot be less stringent, and anything that does not meet the City Code would go through the code enforcement process.

Mr. Jarrett Portz, partner and landowner of The Shops at Lake Havasu, addressed the council and said he believes this project has met a need and is an awesome opportunity for the community. Mr. Portz said they would address all ADA requirements and want to do everything correctly. He added that from an on-site management standpoint they have a team of 15 staff at the mall that handle security, landscape, and a variety of things and plan to either expand their staff or work with the Come-Together team depending on the maintenance needs. Mr. Portz said he believes this project enhances the area and opportunities for those working in the community to have a wonderful place to live and thanked the team for all they have done for a number of years to try and make this happen.

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

Vice Mayor Lin said she was in support of the project but expressed concerns with the proposed price point for rent.

Vice Mayor Lin moved to adopt Ordinance No. 25-1373 approving the Planned Development Rezone and Amended General Development Plan of 5601 Highway 95 Building I, Tract 2396, Lot A-3, from General Commercial/Planned Development District to General Commercial/Planned Development District to allow multi-family residential, a maximum of 32-feet above the approved designed building pad height for each of the buildings, and an exception to the covered parking, seconded by Councilmember Campbell, and carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Dolan

7.3 [ID 25-5017](#) Discussion: Presentation on Pavement Condition Index (PCI) from Nichols Consulting Engineers (*Bill Young*)

Deputy Director of Public Works Bill Young introduced Mr. Vivek Jha, with Nichols Consulting Engineers, who gave a presentation to the Council on the Pavement Management Program.

Mr. Jha reviewed the following in his presentation:

- Who We Are?
 - o Asset Management
 - o Pavement & Materials
 - o Environmental
 - o Civil Engineering

- o Water Resources
- o Landscape Architecture
- What is Pavement Management Program?
 - o Approach used to make cost-effective decisions
 - o It answers 4 main questions:
 - What streets does the City own/maintain?
 - What condition are the streets in?
 - What repairs are needed and when?
 - How much funding is needed to maintain or improve streets?
 - o It typically employs software (StreetSaver or MicroPaver)
- Understanding Key Concepts
 - o Pavement Management Program (PMP)
 - o Pavement Condition Index (PCI)
 - o Maintenance & Rehabilitation (M&R) Activities
 - o Deferred Maintenance
 - o Planned Projects
 - o Budget Analysis & Scenarios
- City's Inventory
 - o Minor Arterial:
 - 69.3 Centerline Mileage
 - 161.2 Lane Miles
 - 241 Number of Sections
 - 17,220,818 Pavement Area (Square Feet)
 - 23% Pavement Area
 - o Major Collector
 - 35.9 Centerline Mileage
 - 79.2 Lane Miles
 - 137 Number of Sections
 - 7,383,392 Pavement Area (Square Feet)
 - 10% Pavement Area
 - o Local Collector
 - 104.9 Centerline Mileage
 - 209.7 Lane Miles
 - 420 Number of Sections
 - 18,038,015 Pavement Area (Square Feet)
 - 24% Pavement Area
 - o Residential/Local
 - 206.5 Centerline Mileage
 - 413.0 Lane Miles
 - 1,441 Number of Sections
 - 31,929,010 Pavement Area (Square Feet)

- 42% Pavement Area
- o Alley
 - 16.1 Centerline Mileage
 - 32.2 Lane Miles
 - 102 Number of Sections
 - 1,800,920 Pavement Area (Square Feet)
 - 2% Pavement Area
- What Do We Need for Automated Data Collection?
 - o Data Collection Tools
 - LiDAR Scanner
 - High-Resolution Camera
 - High-Accuracy GPS
 - Distance Measuring Instrument
 - o Support Teams
 - Robust GIS Team
 - Programming Team
 - o Data Collection Team
 - Trained, Experienced, and Certified
 - o Detection Models
 - Distress Detection
 - Asset Detection
 - o Quality Assurance
 - Pavement Expertise
 - QA/QC Processes
- Data Collection Vehicle & Output
- Current Street Condition
 - o Condition Category
 - Very Good = 5.1% (% of Network)
 - 86-100 PCI Range
 - 10.9 Minor Arterial
 - 7.0 Major Collector
 - 2.4 Local Collector
 - 1.7 Residential/Local
 - 0.0 Alley
 - 22.0 Network
 - Good = 23.1% (% of Network)
 - 70-85 PCI Range
 - 14.9 Minor Arterial
 - 6.8 Major Collector
 - 24.0 Local Collector
 - 54.0 Residential/Local

- 0.3 Alley
- 100.0 Network
- Fair = 52.6% (% of Network)
 - 56-70 PCI Range
 - 26.1 Minor Arterial
 - 15.4 Major Collector
 - 64.3 Local Collector
 - 115.0 Residential/Local
 - 6.6 Alley
 - 227.6 Network
- Poor = 15.9% (% of Network)
 - 26-55 PCI Range
 - 15.5 Minor Arterial
 - 5.2 Major Collector
 - 10.5 Local Collector
 - 31.0 Residential/Local
 - 6.4 Alley
 - 68.6 Network
- Very Poor = 3.4% (% of Network)
 - 0-25 PCI Range
 - 2.0 Minor Arterial
 - 1.3 Major Collector
 - 3.7 Local Collector
 - 4.8 Residential/Local
 - 2.7 Alley
 - 14.5 Network
- Totals = 95% (% of Network)
 - 69.3 Minor Arterial
 - 35.9 Major Collector
 - 104.9 Local Collector
 - 206.5 Residential/Local
 - 16.1 Alley
 - 432.7 Network
- Where Are We Going Next?
 - o Building of a Decision Tree
 - o Projected Pavement Condition
 - o Budget Scenarios
 - o Deferred Maintenance

Discussion ensued related to the total number of center line miles and lane miles, and preserving and extending the roadways through pavement preservation and maintenance.

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

There were no further questions or comments from the Council.

7.4 [ID 25-4985](#) Discussion: Presentation on Procurement Fundamentals for a Municipal Government
(Lynette Singleton)

Procurement Official Lynette Singleton advised that this presentation would provide an overview of procurement fundamentals, including statutory requirements, approved procurement methods, public communication protocols, vendor selection processes, contract oversight responsibilities, and upholding the principles of fiscal responsibility. She noted that the information presented is intended to promote a shared understanding of procurement roles, responsibilities, and expectations across the organization, enhance transparency in decision-making, and support consistent compliant procurement practices that support efficient services delivery and public trust.

Ms. Singleton reviewed the following in her presentation on Procurement Fundamentals:

- Procurement Objective
 - o To familiarize the Mayor, Councilmembers and the public with the basic processes required for procurement at the City.
- What the City Buys?
 - o Commodities: Supplies, Equipment, Materials, and Apparatus
 - o Construction, Repair and Maintenance: Architecture and Engineering Professional Services (A.R.S. Title 34)
 - o Services: Operational and Specialized Professional Services
 - o Technology: Hardware, Software, Software-As-A-Service, Consulting Services, Licenses, Maintenance and Support, Network, Infrastructure, and Security
- City's FY 2024/25 Spend Statistics
 - o Local Suppliers: \$29,408,326.99 spent = 41 % of total spend with 333 Suppliers
 - o Arizona Suppliers (excluding Local): \$19,490,419.60 spent = 27% of total spend with 408 Suppliers
 - o Out-of-State Suppliers: \$22,660,590.49 spent = 32% of total spend with 802 Suppliers
 - o Capital Improvement Projects: \$15,157,973 total spend; \$5,167,376 local spend = 34% (includes both Contractors and Subcontractors)
- Private Sector – vs – Public Sector Procurement
 - o Public Sector Procurement
 - Bound by law: Every expenditure must be explicitly authorized by legislation, regulation or code.

- Transparency and accountability are paramount due to use of taxpayer funds.
- Procurement officials must follow strict procedures (e.g., competitive bidding).
- If it is not allowed by law, it cannot be done – even if it seems reasonable.
- o Private Sector Procurement
 - More flexibility: Companies can spend money in any way that supports their business goals, as long as it is legal.
 - Decisions are often driven by efficiency, profitability, and strategic value.
 - Internal policies and control still apply, but they are generally less restrictive than public sector rules.
- o Competition Requirements
 - Private Entities
 - None by law, only by company practice to achieve favorable pricing and terms
 - Public Entities
 - Competition required by law, unless exceptions as authorized by law or code.
- o Changes in Contract Scope
 - Private Entities
 - No limitations, governed by company practice.
 - Public Entities
 - Strictly regulated; changes require legal compliance, adherence to original bid terms, and formal approvals to ensure transparency and proper use of public funds
- o Bonds (Bid, Performance & Payment)
 - Private Entities
 - None by law, only by company practices
 - Public Entities
 - Required by law for construction contracts
- How the City Buys: Compliance with Federal, State and Local Law
 - o As stewards of public funds and public trust, our city must follow federal, state and local laws, respect established spending limits and use competitive procurement methods. This isn't just about rules – it's about making smart, responsible decisions that support city growth, strengthen services, and improve the quality of life for everyone in our community.
 - Arizona State – A.R.S. Titles
 - Title 34 – Construction / Technical Registrants
 - Title 32 – Professions and Occupations / Technical Registrants
 - Title 41 – Procurement Code
 - Title 38-501 – Conflict of Interest

-
- Title 39 – Public Records
 - Title 28-8413 – Transportation – Airport, FAA Grants procurement must comply with Federal laws and regulations
 - Public Notices
 - Title 28-8425, 30-Days (Lease land authority; Airport)
 - Title 34-103, 30-days (RFSQ-A/E/CMS)
 - Title 41-2533, 2-Weeks (all other requirements of notice)
 - Local City Codes
 - Procurement – Title 3: Revenue and Finance, §3.10
 - Employment of Unauthorized Aliens, §3.30
 - Business License – Title 5: Business Licenses and Regulations, §5.04
 - Federal Grants
 - 2CFR Part-200 Requirements for Federal Awards
 - How the City Buys: Procurement Thresholds and Methods
 - 1) Purchase Order – Commodities, Materials, Supplies, Equipment
 - 2) Construction Services – CMAR, Design-Build
 - 3) Professional Services – Architecture, Engineering, Construction Management
 - 4) Specialized Services
 - 5) Software-As-A-Service & Technology Services
 - 6) Cooperative Purchase Agreements
 - Bidder Notifications – Informal Solicitations
 - Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce
 - Internet Search Engines
 - DemandStar (if requested by internal City department)
 - Bidder Notifications – Formal Solicitations
 - Newspaper – Legal Notice Section
 - Lake Havasu Chamber of Commerce
 - LHC Website Bids & RFPS
 - DemandStar (is becoming EUNA OpenBids)
 - Pre-Bid and Pre-Proposal Meetings & Site Visits
 - Understanding Solicitation Requirements: Supplier Learning Opportunities
 - Informal Request for Quote:
 - Departments notify potential bidders for informal quotes.
 - Determine if a site visit is needed for accurate quotes.
 - Schedules a pre-bid meeting with ALL potential bidders. Questions suggest a meeting would be beneficial.
 - RFQ:
 - Applies to both informal and formal solicitations.
 - ITB

-
- All questions must be in writing.
 - RFP
 - All answers are shared via addendum.
 - RFSQ
 - Ensures fairness, transparency, and trust.
 - Formal Solicitations
 - Project Manager decides if a Pre-Bid meeting or Site Visit is needed
 - Questions with Material Impact must be submitted in writing
 - Deadlines allow time for response and addendum
 - Bid Deadlines may be extended if needed
 - Communication Rules
 - Send questions to both the Project Manger and Procurement
 - Procurement issues all Addenda
 - No Contact Policy
 - All communication must go through authorized contacts
 - No contact with other city staff involved in evaluation and selection
 - This includes the selection committee members, leadership, Mayor and Councilmembers
 - Confidentiality
 - All documents are confidential until award notification
 - Clarifying the Size of Solicitation Packages
 - o CIP Construction Solicitations
 - CIP Construction ITBs – Avg. 190 pages (mostly technical specs & drawings)
 - Complex Example: South Intake Influent Screens ITB – 345 pages
 - Bidders Information & Bid Forms – Avg. 30 pages
 - o Other Solicitation Documents
 - RFQs – Avg. 9 pages (excluding attachments, i.e. feasibility study)
 - RFPs – Avg. 29 pages (excluding attachments, grant requirements)
 - ITBs – Goods/Materials/Supplies – Avg. 26 pages
 - Evaluation and Award Criteria
 - o As a best practice, the City evaluates and awards contracts utilizing a number of criteria methods.
 - Local and Arizona Preference
 - City Code – Procurement §3.10.030.2
 - A.R.S. §§ 34-241 and 34-242
 - Overview
 - Preference given to vendors with:
 - o A business location within Lake Havasu City limits
 - o A valid city business license for 12+ months prior to award
 - Quote or Bid Evaluation

- Local quote of bid wins if:
 - o Quality & suitability are equal
 - o Price is within the city's transaction privilege tax difference (currently 2%)
 - Tax is excluded from local bids and included in non-local bids for comparison only. Tax still gets paid on the product or service, if applicable.
 - Informal Quotes & Formal Bids
 - Local preference applied in evaluation
 - Documented only if it changes the award outcome
 - Requests for Proposals (RFPs)
 - If price is a factor: local preference affects scoring
 - If price is not an evaluation factor: preference may be used as a non-price criterion
 - o Example: Outdoor Pool RFSQ – up to 5 points based on firm proximity
 - Construction Contracts (A.R.S. Title 34)
 - §34-241: 5% price adjustment for plant or equipment bids from AZ-taxpaying licensed contractors (2+ years)
 - §34-242: 5% preference for AZ-produced or manufactured materials
 - Federal Solicitations
 - Local preference not allowed under federal funding rules
 - o Evaluation Criteria
 - Qualifications
 - Pricing
 - Experience
 - Local-Business Location
 - References
 - Responsible
 - Approach and Solutions to Statement of Work
- A.R.S. Title 34 Procurement Models: Pricing Differences
 - o Design-Bid-Build
 - Pricing Basis:
 - Complete, sealed design documents
 - Lump-sum construction bid
 - Award to lowest responsive, responsible Bidder
 - Negotiation Prohibited
 - Characteristics:
 - Prescriptive scope and specifications
 - Limited pricing flexibility after award
 - Change orders require formal approval
 - o Design-Build

- Pricing Basis:
 - Design not fully complete at proposal
 - Cost integrated with qualifications & technical approach
 - Best-value selection
 - Negotiated
- Characteristics:
 - Collaborative design development
 - Pricing re-defined through preconstruction (e.g., GMP)
 - Open-book transparency and shared risk
 - Unable to negotiate, terminate, cannot recommence. Negotiate with next firm on list or cancel solicitation determination
- o Key Takeaway
 - DBB = Finished design + low bid
 - DB = Partial design + best value
- Increasing Local and Statewide Supplier Participation
 - o Participation is a supplier's business decision
 - o Our commitment: Increase local and Arizona-based engagement
 - o 2026: Expanded outreach through key initiatives
- Key Outreach Initiatives – 2026
 - o Community Workshop, Meet and Greet providing sessions on how to do business with the City
 - o New eSourcing System: Supplier registration required
 - Updated Documents: Best-in-Class templates and terms
 - Launch targeted for 2026
 - o Marketing Videos: Supplier education via new website
- Communication & Accessibility
 - o One-on-one calls and “how-to” conversations available
 - Scheduled meetings preferred
 - o Department line: 928-453-4188
 - o Group email: purchasing@lhcaz.gov
 - o Response by next business day
 - o Business hours: Mon-Fri, 8 AM – 5 PM
 - o Website: lhcaz.gov/budget-and-finance/bids-rfps
 - o Business Cards available at City Hall Front Counter at Development Services
- Why Compliance Matters
 - o Protects public funds and ensures fair competition.
 - o Promotes transparency, accountability, and trust.
 - o Reduces risk of audit findings and project delays due to supplier protests or lawsuits.
 - o Maintains eligibility for state and federal funding.
 - o Every purchase reflects our integrity in public service.

- Noncompliance – Legal Consequences
 - o Civil Penalties: Contract cancellation, repayment of grant funds
 - o Criminal Charges; Fraud, bribery, felony convictions
 - o Administrative Actions: Employee discipline, loss of public trust
- Noncompliance Prevention
 - o Staff training on procurement policy, procedures and laws
 - o Regular internal audits
 - o Transparent bidding and contracting
 - o Public access to procurement records
- Role of City Council
 - o Approving contracts and budgets
 - o Asking questions and ensuring accountability
 - o Supporting policies that promote compliance
- Procurement Resources
 - o American Bar Association - Model Procurement Code
 - o DemandStar – How to Submit a Free and Fast eBid Response
 - o Global Best Practice
 - NIGP The institute for Public Procurement
 - Transparency in Public Procurement
 - o Arizona State – A.R.S. Titles
 - o Local – City Codes

Discussion ensued related to bidder notifications, electronic and paper submittals, the City’s solicitation packages, template and form updates, and upcoming educational workshops.

Councilmember Campbell expressed concerns regarding a recent solicitation that was reopened for several days due to a technical error.

Ms. Singleton explained in detail the parameters and process of the selection committee, the no-contact policy, and the cancellation of a solicitation.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tim Murray, citizen, addressed the Council and said procurement is in place to protect both parties, the seller and the buyer, and the most important piece is the bid package. He suggested that only one person be responsible for responding to procurement inquiries and questions.

Ms. Toy addressed the Council and asked if the presentation would be available on the City’s website and questioned the language in contracts regarding no boycotting.

Mayor Sheehy explained that there is specific language that is required by State Statutes and added that the presentation is available on the City's website with the agenda materials.

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

There were no further questions or comments from the Council.

7.5 [ID 25-5009](#) Discussion and Action: Agreement for Professional Services (Design) for the Pima Wash #8 Stabilization Project with Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. *(Mike Wolfe)*

Engineering Division Manager Mike Wolfe advised that this item is requesting approval of an agreement for Professional Design Services for the Pima Wash #8 Stabilization Improvements Project with Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. He said in October 2025, the City Council adopted the 2025 Wash Management Plan which identified Pima Wash #8 as a high priority. He said this project will provide wash improvements for bank protection due to scour and meander along the corridor. He reviewed the scope of work and fee that was negotiated for design services with Kimley-Horn, Inc.

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

Councilmember Moses moved to approve the Agreement for Professional Services for the Pima Wash #8 Stabilization Improvements Project to Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc., in the amount of \$143,610, seconded by Councilmember Coke, and carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Dolan

7.6 [ID 25-4979](#) Discussion and Action: Design-Build Manager Pre-Construction Services Contract for the Aquatic Center Outdoor Pool Project to Concord General Contracting *(Jason Hart)*

Capital Program Manager Jason Hart advised that this item is to award a Design-Build Manager Pre-Construction Services Contract for the Aquatic Center Outdoor Pool Project to Concord General Contracting in the amount of \$180,230. He said the pre-construction services would include the following tasks:

- Task 1 – Schematic Design/Site Investigation
- Task 2 – Design Development
- Task 3 – Construction Documents
- Task 4 – Design Allowance if needed

Mr. Hart reviewed the Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) process. He said three firms responded and two firms were selected for interviews. The interviews were scored and ranked by the selection committee and Concord General Contracting was selected as most qualified. He said the price was then negotiated with the selected firm. Mr. Hart said if awarded the work would begin immediately and all tasks would be completed by the end of April 2026.

Discussion ensued related to grant funding opportunities for this project. Mayor Sheehy explained that the City continues to seek grant opportunities; however, no grant funding has been allocated for this project at this time and the funding is currently identified in the CIP. Vice Mayor Lin said she would like the City to explore more grant opportunities before awarding this contract.

Vice Mayor Lin expressed concern with the community impact language in the council communication noting that there are other users that will benefit from the outdoor pool besides the current swim teams. She also expressed concerns with the procurement process for this project and that there was no representation from the Parks & Recreation Department present.

Discussion ensued regarding the services and contract. Councilmember Diaz asked if the City would go out to bid for construction after the design-build is completed, to which Mr. Hart said no. He said as part of the design-build, the contractor is part of the team and once the design-build is completed they will determine the Gross Maximum Price (GMP). Councilmember Diaz expressed concerns regarding the process and the contractor selected for this project. He suggested the City Council wait on moving forward and look for grant opportunities.

Mayor Sheehy asked if the design services included the construction documents, to which Mr. Hart replied yes.

Discussion ensued regarding the pool decking, design-build process, proposed contract, and scope of work. Councilmember Campbell expressed concerns regarding the ownership of the construction documents after completion of the design services and that the RFSQ documents do not state that the City will go out for separate bid for construction (build) services.

Mayor Sheehy said the City Council asked for this project to be a design-build which is what is before the City Council tonight. He said he does not know if this is the right pathway and asked the City Council if they wanted to move forward with a second pool, and if yes, then what are the methods/options to do that as there are some concerns that

the contract before the City Council is entering into services to see the project all the way through. Mr. Knudson asked the City Council to consider what they would like to do in terms of an outdoor pool and implored the City Council to give direction on what that looks like for next steps. Mr. Knudson asked Ms. Singleton what options the City Council has once the design-build services are completed and the City has a GMP, to which Ms. Singleton said in accordance with State Statutes once the City executes a pre-construction services contract resulting from a RFSQ statement, that procurement is considered concluded. She further explained that in terms of a contract that subsequently ends or is terminated, the City is prohibited from using the same solicitation or the associated final ranking and a new procurement must be initiated.

Discussion ensued related to the State Statutes pertaining to selection committees.

Mayor Sheehy asked for a consensus from the Council on whether they wanted a second pool.

Councilmember Moses said it was his understanding based on previous discussions that this project was of the utmost importance and needed to move forward as fast as possible.

Councilmember Coke said at the April 8th meeting there was an urgency to get this project completed as quickly as possible and now the City Council is finding every excuse to say no. She said she supports the project but is not going to have an argument every time the pool project is discussed because the City Council keeps changing the way they want it done.

Councilmember Diaz said he supported a second pool but wanted to get it done the right way.

Councilmember Campbell said she did not support the second pool from the beginning or spending \$200,000 for design services. She said she supported moving forward with a second pool if the City explores more grant funding opportunities, fixes the procurement issue, and sends the solicitation back out again.

City Attorney Kelly Garry explained that the contract is specifically for pre-construction services. She said when the City gets to the next step, then the City Council will consider whether they want to move into the construction phases with this DMB or enter into a separate agreement. She said when it comes to ownership of the documents, there is a difference between retaining the intellectual properties and the actual work product. She said the City would retain the actual work product and the company would retain any of their copyrights, patents, and other intellectual property. She explained that the selection committee process, in accordance with State Statutes, does not come before the City

Council for consideration or approval. She said what is before the Council today for consideration is the negotiations with the highest selected from the selection committee for a design-build.

Mayor Sheehy said the consensus from the City Council is to have a second pool and asked how the City Council wanted to do that. Ms. Garry advised that if the City Council is not going to award this contract it has to be for a legitimate reason. She added that there are specific steps that the City can take when it gets to the GMP and said the City is not locked in by entering into this agreement. She explained that the City can get an independent person/estimator to come in and review what is submitted as the GMP, and said if the City does not approve of the GMP proposal, the City can accept the proposal as submitted, make adjustments, request that the DMB submit a revised GMP, or can decline to approve the GMP proposal. Ms. Garry advised that there are options built into the contract.

Mayor Sheehy opened the public hearing.

Ms. Toy addressed the council and suggested the City Council table this item for a future meeting.

Mr. Murray addressed the council and said he did not think this project should be rushed and suggested the City Council take a step back.

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

Discussion ensued regarding the Mainstreet Commons (Downtown Catalyst) Project, project costs with Concord General Contracting, and changes to the procurement process and outreach.

Councilmember Campbell said she would like to see the City explore further grant funding, clean up the City's procurement process and outreach, and resubmit the project.

Councilmember Campbell said the community would be much happier if the City was not using the same contractor as the Mainstreet Commons (Downtown Catalyst) Project that stopped mid-way and had another contractor finish the job.

Mayor Sheehy stated that this project has turned into a political issue and that is why people are having concerns about what contractors are doing. He said at the end of the day if the City Council does not want a pool, then we do not want a pool, but that is not what he is hearing from the community.

Discussion ensued regarding grant funding opportunities. Mr. Kozlowksi explained that the City applied for grant funding at the federal level for the MainStreet Commons Project that is still in the waiting process on whether funds will be awarded. He noted that if awarded those funds must be expended before the City can apply for another project.

Mr. Ted Knisely, representative with Concord General Contracting, explained that the contract before the Council is a design-build, but the City is paying a fee for the design and that does not mean that they have to build it. He added that when it comes to the design documents, they will belong to the City.

Councilmember Campbell moved to deny the RFQ to get all the information on the grants and restart the RFQ process after updating the procurement reports, seconded by Councilmember Diaz.

Mr. Knudson asked for direction from the City Council on what they are looking for in terms of cleaning up or improving the procurement process. Councilmember Campbell said she would like to see improvements in the procurement communication process and cleanup in the contract as the language regarding the design-build can be interpreted in two ways.

Discussion ensued related to the State Statutes that define the design-build procurement process.

Vice Mayor Lin said she has a huge problem with the contractor admitting to making past mistakes and asking the City Council to let them make it up.

There was clarification regarding the motion and second on the floor. Ms. Garry said the motion was to deny the RFQ which is not what is before the City Council.

Councilmember Campbell said her motion was to deny the \$180,000 for this RFQ for the design-build at this time and go back out and submit a new RFQ with better direction in the scope of work.

Mayor Sheehy suggested that the motion and second on the floor be withdrawn, and the City Council motion to go into Executive Session to have discussion with legal counsel. Councilmember Campbell withdrew her motion on the floor, Councilmember Diaz withdrew his second. The motion on the floor was withdrawn.

Councilmember Moses moved to go into Executive Session.

The City Council adjourned to go into Executive Session at 9:34 p.m.

The City Council reconvened the regular meeting at 9:57 p.m.

There were no further questions or comments from the City Council

Councilmember Diaz moved to deny the Design-Build Manager Pre-Construction Services Contract for the Aquatic Center Outdoor Pool Project to Concord General Contracting, in the amount of \$180,230, and to move it for further evaluation coming up in the next budget session, seconded by Vice Mayor Lin, and carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Dolan

7.7 [ID 25-5008](#) Discussion and Action: Bid for the Water Treatment Plant Improvement Project to KEAR Civil Corporation (*Jason Hart*)

Capital Program Manager Jason Hart advised that this item is to award bid for the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Improvement Project to KEAR Civil Corporation in the amount of \$2,718,200. The project consists of replacing the existing gaseous chlorine system with a sodium hypochlorite system and constructing a new masonry building. Mr. Hart said the City received two bids with the low bid from KEAR Civil Construction and added that if awarded, the project is expected to take approximately six months.

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

Councilmember Moses moved to award the base bid of the WTP Improvement Project to KEAR Civil Corporation in the amount of \$2,718,200, seconded by Councilmember Coke, and carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Dolan

7.8 [ID 25-4987](#) Discussion and Possible Direction Regarding Selection of Vice Mayor (*Councilmember Campbell*)

Mayor Sheehy stated that this item was brought forward by Councilmember Campbell as a future discussion item. Councilmember Campbell said the City Code allows the City Council direction on the selection of the Vice Mayor. She spoke on the recent changes for boards and commission members running for office and wanted to get feedback from the

Council on whether a councilmember running for election should be considered for the Vice Mayor position, and whether the Council believes the Vice Mayor position has influence.

Mayor Sheehy explained that the citizens directly elect the Mayor and six Councilmembers while the Vice Mayor position is selected by the City Council in December each year. He explained the recent code changes relating to the resign to run for boards and commission members, and said he does not share the same concerns as Councilmember Campbell with the Vice Mayor position running for election.

Councilmember Moses said he does not see the correlation or influence and spoke on the difference between the roles of boards and commissions members and City Council members.

Councilmember Coke said she does not see a correlation and does not believe the City Council has ever selected a Vice Mayor based on whether they are running for office.

Vice Mayor Lin said she disagreed and does believe that the Vice Mayor position has influence and is an extremely important role during election years.

Councilmember Diaz said he believes the Vice Mayor position has influence if running for election. He said he does not see the difference between this and having to resign to run for boards and commission members.

Councilmember Campbell said she has no interest in running for Vice Mayor, as her intention is not to try and influence or leverage to have that title, but believes having the Vice Mayor title and being with the Mayor definitely has influence when it comes to elections.

Mayor Sheehy said the citizens elected all members of the City Council so when it comes to influence all members have the same influence regardless of title, which is where he sees the differentiating point between a councilmember and a board and commission member. He stated that what Councilmember Campbell is saying does not have to be codified. He explained that during the selection of the Vice Mayor position, the City Council has the ability to say that they do not want someone that is running for office serving as the Vice Mayor, which leaves the most flexibility for future councils.

8. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Shawn Buckley, CEO of Go Lake Havasu, addressed the Council and said an opportunity was presented to them by event organizations from IRONMAN Arizona who are looking to relocate their event to Lake Havasu City. He said they will be meeting tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. to have discussions that will set the tone for the next steps in terms

of feasibility and conversation to determine if the city has the manpower, infrastructure, and will to host the IRONMAN Arizona in Lake Havasu City.

Ms. Toy addressed the Council concerning the proposed increase to the business license fee that was presented to the City Council with the Master Fee Schedule at a previous meeting. She said the City's fee is higher than most other cities and towns in Arizona and asked the City Council to consider not raising the business license fee.

9. CURRENT EVENTS

There were no council committee reports.

10. FUTURE MEETINGS

Tuesday, December 9, 2025 @ 5:30 p.m. - Regular Meeting

Tuesday, December 23, 2025 @ 5:30 p.m. - CANCELED

11. FUTURE DISCUSSION ITEMS

There were no requests for future discussion items.

12. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 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 25th day of November, 2025. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and posted, and that a quorum was present.

Kelly Williams, City Clerk/MMC