

City of Prescott
Charter Review Committee



March 16, 2026 | 2:30 PM
201 N. Montezuma Street
Legal Conference Room, 3rd Floor
Prescott, AZ 86301

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair McMinn called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Bonnie McMinn - Chair
Rod Moyer - Vice Chair (Excused)
Michael Broggie - Member
Michael Gjede - Member
Ralph Hess - Member

3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Approval of Minutes from the February 25, 2026 Charter Review Committee Meeting.

MOTION BY MEMBER BROGGIE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY MEMBER GJEDE: PASSED (4 - 0)

B. Approval of the Charter Amendment Review Criteria.

Chair McMinn commented that the additional section which Member Hess requested was added by staff based on their previous discussion. Because the group has moved items forward, she felt it was appropriate to have items that have some criteria. She asked staff about the ability to have the meetings in Chambers.

City Clerk Sarah Thornhill stated that they could, however, there have been scheduling conflicts to this point, so staff has not scheduled that room yet.

Member Hess commented that he would like to have them in Chambers. He feels if they were more accessible in that room it would be easier to get the public to come.

Staff will update the title to reflect the correct name of the Committee.

MOTION BY MEMBER GJEDE TO APPROVE THE COMMITTEE'S REVIEW CRITERIA WITH UPDATED TITLE; SECONDED BY CHAIR MCMINN: PASSED (4 - 0)

C. Update to Committee Regarding Council Action on Forwarded Proposed Charter Amendments as Follows: 1) Article IX Section 6, "Majority to Elect in Primary"; and 2) Article XI Section 4, "City Court".

Ms. Thornhill advised the Committee that at the March 10 Voting Meeting, City Council approved the ballot language forwarded for both Article IX, Section 6 and Article XI, Section 4. Based on that, the Clerk's Office has forwarded the Resolution calling for a Special Election and obtained Proposition numbers from the County. The city will conduct a Special Election in alignment with the Tuesday, November 3, 2026 Election. If the Committee wishes to include any additional proposed amendments those would have to be forwarded to and approved by the Council no later than the Tuesday, June 23 Voting Meeting.

Member Gjede asked about what the Charter language would be if the voters don't approve the amendments as provided.

Ms. Thornhill stated that it would remain as it is now.

This item was for discussion only, no formal action was taken.

4. FUTURE MEETING DATES & AGENDA TOPICS

- A. Committee Discussion Regarding Upcoming Meeting Dates & Agenda Topics. Member Hess reviewed the three sections he had submitted for possible amendment.

Article II, Section 18 - Consideration of Petitions:

* Suggestion is to have the section amended to conduct at least one public hearing and act upon such petition in the regular course of business within sixty (60) days in order to overrule the Council Rules of Procedure process that was adopted

Chair McMinn commented that a petition should allow for public participation, and this would move the item off of the Consent Agenda as the process is now and make sure that the Petition is being discussed.

Committee and staff discussion regarding voting at the next meeting in order to have it presented to the Council at the April 28 Voting Meeting to be added to the ballot. Committee consensus to have this item on the April 6 Agenda.

Article VI, Section 17 - Voter Approval for High-cost Roadway Projects:

* This would be a super majority rather than voter approval

Member Hess stated that the proposal adds a section requiring a super majority before high-cost projects are approved. Initially, the proposal had an option for voter approval as well, however, he feels that super majority is more appropriate, and he would like feedback and assistance from legal on this item.

Chair McMinn commented that she agrees and this would allow for more public input on larger price point projects. Many Charter Cities have these types of Charter provisions at various levels. She added that she feels this should just be high-cost projects and not specific to roadways only.

Member Hess stated that the Council has the ability to schedule Study Sessions

before they vote on things, but they don't seem to be doing that, so these requirements need to be in the Charter.

Member Gjede stated that he likes the \$15 million threshold so that it doesn't just become every project.

Chair McMinn added that each of the meetings should be separated by 14-days.

Assistant City Attorney Alane Moore stated that she would like direction regarding which option the Committee would like to move forward with, voter approval or super majority, so staff can put together the appropriate language for discussion and possible action at a future meeting.

Chair McMinn: \$15 million threshold, super majority
Member Gjede: \$15 million threshold, super majority
Member Hess: \$15 million threshold, super majority
Member Broggie: \$15 million threshold, super majority

Committee consensus to have the following structure for the charter language: all capital projects over \$15 million require a Study Session to kick off the 60-day public comment period, then at least one public hearing, if more than one public hearing is scheduled there would be at least 14-days in between. Will be on April 6 for discussion and possible action.

Article VIII - Contracts; Section 11 - Leases of City Property:

* New paragraph text provides the opportunity for more public input and requires a super majority Council vote for approval of high-value leases of city-owned property similar to the provisions for sale and lease/purchase of high-value city-owned property

Chair McMinn commented on adding in a comparative market analysis and an appraisal. It isn't always done, but it should be. She asked if there would be another section under this article to address if the city is leasing property as a tenant.

Ms. Moore asked for clarification on whether they want to replace Section 11 as it is now, or add in this information as a new Section; and if the value threshold is for the cost of the lease or the value of the property itself.

Member Hess stated that this proposal would add a new Section to the article and the value threshold is for property value, ie. properties over \$4 million. He echoed Chair McMinn's comments about an additional section that could mirror this language to apply when the city is the tenant and not the lessee.

Committee discussion regarding having something in code or the Charter regarding the city being a tenant.

Ms. Moore stated that the Charter gives the city authority to lease property, but there isn't anything as specific as these provisions.

Committee consensus to have that discussion next time as well, Chair McMinn will look into options.

Staff will also address language regarding "any lease or extension of an existing lease". Ms. Moore further asked for confirmation of the meetings in the same manner as the previous revision, ie: a Study Session to kick off a 60-day public comment period, then at least one public hearing, if more than one public hearing is scheduled there would be at least 14-days in between.

Committee consensus to follow this formula, and to have staff ensure that qualifying what defines the super majority for all of this language.

Committee and staff discussion to keep the proposed meeting schedule as is, with the caveat that some meetings may be canceled depending upon what the group decides to move forward to the Council and when.

Committee consensus to have these three Sections discussed as discussion and possible action items for the April 6 Meeting, as well as the Development Agreement Item that City Attorney Joseph Young was looking into.

This item was for discussion only, no formal action was taken.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chair McMinn adjourned the meeting at 3:46 p.m.


BONNIE MCMINN, Chair

ATTEST:


SARAH M. THORNHILL, City Clerk

