

Meeting Minutes

City Council Work Session

October 24, 2022 | 4:30 p.m.
Council Chambers Conference Room
88 E. Chicago St., Chandler, AZ



Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Kevin Hartke at 4:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Council Attendance

Mayor Kevin Hartke
Vice Mayor Terry Roe
Councilmember OD Harris
Councilmember Mark Stewart
Councilmember René Lopez
Councilmember Christine Ellis
Councilmember Matt Orlando

Appointee Attendance

Josh Wright, City Manager
Kelly Schwab, City Attorney
Dana DeLong, City Clerk

Staff in Attendance

Tadd Wille, Assistant City Manager
Andy Bass, Deputy City Manager
Dawn Lang, Deputy City Manager / Chief Financial Officer
Matt Burdick, Communications and Public Affairs Director
Ryan Peters, Strategic Initiatives Director
Rae Lynn Nielsen, Human Resources Director
Niki Tapia, DEI Program Manager
Tawn Kao, Assistant City Attorney

Discussion

1. Presentation, Discussion, and Plan for Implementation of DEI Assessment Results and Recommendations

MAYOR HARTKE called for a staff presentation.

JOSHUA WRIGHT, City Manager, introduced the discussion item and said this was discussed last month. He said they heard great feedback about the DEI assessment that has been underway for a year. Tonight's presentation will answer a few questions asked at that last meeting. Mr. Wright thanked Niki Tapia and congratulated her for being nominated for Arizona Diversity Leader of the Year by the Arizona Diversity Leadership Alliance.

NIKI TAPIA, DEI Program Manager, presented the following presentation.

- City of Chandler Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion October 24, 2022
- Agenda
 - Overview of DEI Assessment
 - Timeline of Events
 - External & Internal Target Goals
 - Progress & Next Steps
 - Non-Discrimination Ordinance
 - Key Elements
 - Exemptions
 - Violations
 - Complaint process
 - Penalty Process
- DEI Assessment Overview
- Timeline of Events
 - Mayor proclamation, diversity survey with Human Relations Commission & presentation of results to Council July – December 2020
 - Strategic Framework - commitment to diversity, equity and inclusivity through an update to Chandler's Brand Statement May 2021
 - City Council approves contract with CPS HR for DEI Assessment October 2021
 - City-wide DEI Assessment (focus groups, survey and evaluations) December 2021 – June 2022
 - CPS HR Assessment Final Report to HRC and City Council September 2022
- Roadmap to Reaching Goals
 - Phase I: Establish Targeted DEI Goals
 - Phase II: Reassess and Prioritize
 - Phase III: Consider New or Additional Goals

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if other cities have gone through this assessment.

MS. TAPIA answered that other cities have not gone through this assessment. Other cities are interested in doing a DEI assessment, but none have completed one.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said Chandler will be the leading edge on this.

MS. TAPIA continued the presentation.

- Phase I TARGET GOALS
 - External
 - Outreach to all groups beyond social media; use flyers, in person opportunities.
 - Communicate transparently, maintain group connections to continue progression.
 - Educate proactively, understanding of differences before it becomes problematic.
 - Develop actionable/visible response to identified needs - take feedback seriously.
 - Partner with non-profits and community agencies to connect resources, assist in enhancing their services.
 - Provide official City stance and status of discussion for Non-Discrimination Ordinance.
 - Internal
 - Create and communicate a sustainable vision for City's DEI Program.
 - Find opportunities to improve recruitment and hiring of diverse candidates.
 - Enhance DEI training, leadership development, and cultural awareness.
 - Streamline information sharing for DEI initiatives and expand awareness.
 - Promote DEI discussions in the workplace.
- Progress & Next Steps
 - External:
 - Work with Human Relations Commission to develop 2-5 actionable objectives for each targeted goal.
 - Finalize objectives by Spring 2023 in conjunction with City Council.
 - Internal:
 - Work with City Manager's Office, Human Resources, and employee stakeholders to develop 2-5 actionable objectives for each targeted goal.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked what the timeline would be to accomplish the internal goals.

MS. TAPIA said the goal would be Spring 2023, in conjunction with the external goals and Council's actions.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked what communication for the internal goals would look like.

MS. TAPIA said they will work with the Human Relations Commission for external goals, City Manager and Human Resources for internal goals, and bring all information together for the strategic plan in 2023 to keep Mayor and Council updated. We have all the information; we must bring it together to create a document to guide the DEI Department.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART summarized that after Phases I, II, and III are completed, we will have enough information to create a vision and mission plan for the overarching goal. Councilmember Stewart asked to clarify the overall goal with the DEI Department.

MS. TAPIA said that the DEI Department has existed in some capacity for 20 years, they connect with the community externally through activities and events and support cultural groups.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked for more information.

MS. TAPIA answered that this process is what is being decided. The DEI assessment is providing direction to the department.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked if the assessment has some of the goals included.

MS. TAPIA answered that the assessment does have some of the goals derived from the data. The Human Relations Commission takes the last step laying out the external goals and streamlining the plan based off those recommendations received from the assessment.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked to advertise the Human Relations Commission meeting where this would be discussed to allow for visibility and public comment. The public can participate in shaping this process.

MS. TAPIA said that she will share the opportunities that the public has participated up until this point. All the data collected is public comment.

MAYOR HARTKE asked about the Council role, as the policy leaders of the city, related to these goals.

MS. TAPIA said the City Manager's office is very active in the discussions and will advise when these opportunities arise.

MAYOR HARTKE said that any information should be shared to Council before it comes as policy to the city.

MS. TAPIA added that City Manager staff would be included in the process.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked if we are still in progress on Phase I.

MS. TAPIA answered that we are still in Phase I.

RAE LYNN NIELSEN, Human Resources Director, continued the presentation.

- Progress & Next Steps (cont.)

- Current Internal Initiatives
 - Expanded Bilingual Program to include 5 additional languages.
 - Offer several DEI related courses city-wide facilitated by diverse external presenters including:
 - Required DEI Workshop for all new employees (recently updated)
 - The Human Library Experience (Co-hosted with DEI and HR Team)
 - Juneteenth guest speaker
 - DEI Workplace Certification through University of South Florida
 - Eleven on-line DEI courses from May-August through computer-based learning
 - City-wide mentoring program with pairings focused on diversity in departments, job positions, generations, ethnicity, gender, personalities, learning styles, etc.
 - Communicate all position openings through the DEI office to Community Cultural Partners and utilize external websites to post positions as appropriate.
 - Facilitate diverse interview panels and provide recruitment training to panel members, currently expanding to include unconscious bias training.
 - External marketing campaign to kick-off in October to showcase Chandler careers and community with outreach to markets not utilized in the past.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked if these initiatives were originated from the assessment or if they were already in the works.

MS. NIELSEN said that these initiatives were already in practice, they will be enhanced by the findings of the assessment.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked what was being added to the internal side because of the assessment that were not developed beforehand.

MS. NIELSEN said that the unconscious bias training of recruitment panel members is new. We will be working closely on the internal goals to see what else we can do.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked if there was anything else in progress.

MS. NIELSEN said not at this time.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS expressed concern with the results of the survey with staff not satisfied with DEI initiatives. If there are not systems or policies in place to reinforce or reinvigorate, it may fall through. How can we further our initiatives to ensure that the 13% of employees dissatisfied with DEI initiatives are satisfied. Adding a process would codify the DEI initiatives. We should enforce what we have.

MS. NIELSEN said we do have policies and processes in place. It is good data to have to compare to when internal changes are made in the future.

MAYOR HARTKE wondered about the 13% in the survey, there is always a number of the population that misses the communication. To elevate the conversation, we elevate awareness and opportunity to express their voice.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS brought up we do have processes and enforcement. If something happens, Human Resources has a pathway to resolve issues that does not necessarily involve council. Councilmember Ellis asked if Human Resources is going to include enforcement for these initiatives.

MS. NIELSEN confirmed that Human Resources is going to include enforcement.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked what the goal for the number of employees dissatisfied with DEI initiatives in future surveys would be.

MS. NIELSEN said that was still an unknown at this point. Targets will be compiled later.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ asked for a definition on what enforcement would be.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS said that enforcement would be a process to reconcile. Human Resources would execute the process. There are different outcomes of enforcement.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said that Human Resources already has processes in place for managing employee enforcement. They deal with grievances at all levels.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how we effectively share this information with employees who work night shifts or swing shifts.

MS. NIELSEN shared that they are utilizing computer-based learning to work with these schedules, and Human Resources staff will also offer trainings and other resources at these off times. Communication is always an issue between the variety of employees. We try to use all different avenues.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if there is special supervisor training.

MS. NIELSEN answered that there is special supervisor training in progress currently. It is called HR 101 and will cover all aspects of recruitment, to DEI, to talking with employees.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said that the swing shift will likely miss communication from the normal working hours. It is something to consider if part of the 13% resulted from this.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked if the culture in the City of Chandler has created the 13% in feeling uncomfortable to talk about DEI. Sometimes culture can create an unwritten policy on how we go about things.

MS. NIELSEN said that has not been a pervasive problem across the organization. We have done a good job at providing many different avenues for problem solving. We evaluate any complaints. We do not get formal complaints often.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ added that the questions were open to interpretation. In his experience, those not in a minority demographic felt most uncomfortable answering questions or talking about DEI. Different perspectives all have different feelings and may feel uncomfortable discussing DEI. It is impractical to speculate on the reasoning of the 13% answering the survey question.

MS. TAPIA continued the presentation.

- Progress & Next Steps (cont.)
 - Internal Objective Examples
 - Targeted Goal: Create and communicate a sustainable vision for City's DEI Program.
 - Objective 1: Create strategic plan document and track progress.
 - Objective 2: Develop and promote DEI Division Vision Statement.
 - Targeted Goal: Enhance DEI training, leadership development, and cultural awareness.
 - Objective 1: Expand opportunities for employees to join national diversity membership organizations and hold quarterly meetings and discussions.
 - Objective 2: Continue to offer, begin tracking, and expand employee DEI related trainings.
- Progress & Next Steps (cont.)
 - DEI Strategic Plan Document
 - Share with City Council finalized document by Spring 2023 (to include internal and external targeted goals and actionable objectives).
 - Provide regular progress updates to City Council.

KELLY SCHWAB, City Attorney, continued the presentation.

- Non-discrimination Ordinance (NDO)
- Other Arizona Cities

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked if any of the other cities who have implemented a non-discrimination ordinance had any issues.

MS. SCHWAB said the only city that had had any enforcement issues was Phoenix, having a specific case go through the Arizona Supreme Court. Most have had inquiries but no complaints through the process.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked about the difference between enforcement and complaints.

MS. SCHWAB said that enforcement meant a complaint case that has gone through the whole process. There is not any other enforcement action other than the Phoenix case.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked how many complaints have been filed at other cities.

MS. SCHWAB said that information is not out there, it is just anecdotal through communication with other city staff.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked if there is any record of any complaints filed at other cities.

MS. SCHWAB said there was no record of any complaints filed at other cities. Most get removed due to being ineligible to be considered at the city level and are referred to other organizations or agencies.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked for more information on the Phoenix non-discrimination case.

MS. SCHWAB explained that the Phoenix case was an enforcement action that Phoenix took with a printer of wedding invitations. A same-sex couple seeking wedding invitations, and the company denied based on their religion. City of Phoenix found they were in violation of the non-discrimination ordinance, which was challenged by the company. It went to the Arizona Supreme Court, where it was ruled that there must be accommodations for people's religious views in the ordinances. The printer was found to not be in violation. This was an Arizona Supreme Court case, not a federal question.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS questioned why Councilmember Stewart wanted to engage in that line of questioning. He said we have had three meetings about that same thing and that question has been brought up three different times. He thought to insinuate that there is no record of it does not mean that it is not happening. He wanted to be clear on what was being said, and with the question being asked was he insinuating that no discrimination is happening. He said Councilmember Stewart had been debriefed about it three times.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART said he was not following the line of questioning from Councilmember Harris. He said that he had not been debriefed on the process that had happened in the Arizona Supreme Court case. Councilmember Stewart said he was asking the City Attorney specifically on the times that it had been brought up, how it went through so he

could understand the process. He said if we were to implement something here he wanted to better understand how the process will work here. Councilmember Stewart said he did not question Councilmember Harris on the questions he asked or his motives, and Councilmember Harris was welcome to ask him anything he liked.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS thought he was asking a question that they already talked about as a Council several times

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART said they had not talked about the processes in other cities, they had asked about their ordinances but not if anyone has ever filed any complaints.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ did not think that the process was something that was discussed in a public meeting.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said they talked about this on the dias. He wanted to call out that they had been debriefed on this several times.

MAYOR HARTKE disagreed and said they had not received the information.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS wanted to remind him that those questions were asked, and the answers were delivered.

MS. SCHWAB continued the presentation.

- Non-discrimination Ordinance
 - Prohibits discrimination, harassment, and retaliation based on actual or perceived race, color, religion, sex, ethnicity, national origin, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, disability, marital status, or familial status.
 - Areas covered:
 - Equity by City contractors, vendors and consultants in city services, programs, activities, and contracting
 - Equity in employment and places of public accommodation
 - Requires referral to another authority if they have jurisdiction (i.e., EEOC, Attorney General's Office)

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ asked if these protections are already covered with the City's internal policy.

MS. SCHWAB said most of these protections are already in the personnel rules.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ asked if these protections already extend to City contractors and vendors.

MS. SCHWAB said in most instances, they do not. There are certain cases with grants or federal funds where there are these specific requirements.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if something was covered in a different organization or agency with these protections if it would find that existing pathway. Internally, if there was a case covered with federal or attorney general protections, it would then be referred to these outside sources.

MS. SCHWAB said that was correct, most cases get referred to these outside sources. Most non-discrimination ordinances in other cities have this pathway.

- Exemptions
 - Non-profit private clubs
 - US Government, American Indian Tribes, State of Arizona which includes all departments, agencies, or political subdivisions
 - Religious organizations and persons holding bona fide religious views
 - City of Chandler—City has its own rules
 - Small Businesses (5 or less employees)
 - Places of public accommodation may afford beneficial pricing or policies to senior citizens, students, veterans, or individuals with disabilities
 - Employers may apply different standards of compensation or different terms, conditions, or privileges of employment pursuant to a bona fide seniority system, merit system, or any other system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production

MAYOR HARTKE asked about a hypothetical case in which a younger person asked for a senior discount at a business—the business would be justified in denying a senior discount as they may afford beneficial pricing to a certain demographic.

MS. SCHWAB said that was correct.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ asked why small businesses were classified as five or less employees.

MS. SCHWAB explained that these were common findings among other cities and were available as options for council to decide on. Larger corporations may have the infrastructure to deal with complaints, but small businesses may not be equipped to deal with complaints. There were concerns with enforcement. It is at the digression of the council.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ asked about the small business exemption.

MS. SCHWAB said the number five was not common, as no other cities were found to have small business exemptions in their non-discrimination ordinances.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked what number of employees other agencies use as the basis for defining a small business.

Staff communicated that 500 employees constituted a small business.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART suggested adjusting the number of 5 to 500.

MAYOR HARTKE said he suggested this small business exemption; it might be that a small company is not equipped to address these concerns.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART recommended defining small business as 500 employees in line with other usage.

MS. SCHWAB said direction from council would be sought later.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said at discussions of the ad hoc subcommittee, there was no discussion of the five-employee limit. The DEI discussions brought up five in varying channels of discussion. Expanding upon that, we must decide whether to expand the number or remove a small business exemption completely.

MS. SCHWAB continued the presentation.

- Violations
 - Complaint Process
 - Initial screening, referral to another agency if appropriate
 - Respondent notified of complaint and afforded opportunity to respond to allegations
 - Investigation
 - Voluntary mediation
 - Finding of a violation or dismissal for unsubstantiated charge or insufficient evidence
- Violations

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked who does the initial screening of a complaint.

MS. SCHWAB said that the City Attorney's office would screen complaints. They would be able to refer the complaint to wherever it needed to go externally.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked if someone was being discriminatory, we can choose to not do business with them.

MS. SCHWAB said depending on the procurement process, we could. Any time a city chooses to not do business with a contractor anymore, there needs to be reasoning behind it. There is a

debarment process, due process where contractors can appeal to the city. This would be separate from the non-discrimination ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART said this potentially would enforce not doing business with a contractor due to discriminatory practices. If the non-discrimination ordinance was in place, it would effectively let contractors know our practices and policy.

MS. SCHWAB said that was true, if a non-discrimination ordinance is passed, it would be added to the code and would be enforceable that way.

MAYOR HARTKE asked about debarment—would they have access to outside resources that are able to work with both sides on an appeal.

MS. SCHWAB answered that the process would allow both sides to share their perspectives, the city manager assigns someone to oversee that process. A neutral party would make the decision on debarment. If the non-discrimination ordinance is adopted, the contractor would have to go through debarment twice.

MAYOR HARTKE shared mixed feelings about the two-step debarment.

MS. SCHWAB added that the city must treat companies applying to do business with the city equally. If we are not going to do business with a company for a justified reason, there should be a process in place.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS commented that the debarment was a strong stance that was necessary. It is an uncomfortable question but is important to have a process in place. Providing a fair opportunity to contractors is important, but so is protecting taxpayer dollars.

MAYOR HARTKE asked about diverting complaint cases from contractors.

MS. SCHWAB was not sure what other entity those cases would be diverted to.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if other cities go through a debarment process.

MS. SCHWAB answered that there are other ordinances that preclude a contractor found in violation with doing business with a city.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO mentioned an example of debarring a contractor in the past. Councilmember Orlando said the bottom line is that the procurement process should be as equal as process. If there was a company acting discriminatory, it sends a message to other companies applying for Chandler.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said every time we talk about this, we have a process.

MS. SCHWAB continued the presentation.

- Violations (cont.)
 - Penalty Process
 - Public censure, educational training, and/or suspension or debarment for City contracts under section 3-17 of the City Code
 - Voluntary mediation can take place at any point in the process
- Discussion
- Discussion
 - Exemptions
 - Violations
 - Process
 - Penalties

MAYOR HARTKE asked if council is okay with calling this a non-discrimination ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ said he is okay with referring to it as that as the chapter location.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART asked if this would be associated with any state statute.

MS. SCHWAB said this is city law, unrelated to federal or state statutes.

MAYOR HARTKE said if the state decides to incorporate non-discriminatory laws, would that be something we would need to change on our end to change the content of the chapter.

MS. SCHWAB said that Chandler would have to revise the contents of the chapter in response to any state changes.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ asked about an override of the contents from the county.

MS. SCHWAB said there are few subjects that the county can override, and this is not one of them.

MAYOR HARTKE asked about naming the ordinance.

MS. SCHWAB shared that the ordinance does not have to have a name. If it is unnamed, they will revert to calling it a non-discrimination ordinance. An idea shared previously was "Chandler Embracing Diversity".

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS liked the Chandler Embracing Diversity name.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked about adding equity and inclusion to the title.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS said that equity and inclusion are included in the contents.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said there is no reason to name it.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS said that the Chandler name should be in the title.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said our brand has been DEI. Either way it works. To be consistent with previous messaging about DEI, that could be included.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART said the ordinance will be called whatever we call it. It is about balancing the connotation of the language used. Non-discrimination ordinance sounds punitive. He said this could be something amazing that celebrates our community and everything about it. He would like to see it as Chandler Embracing Diversity.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS he was okay with spelling it all out and said we are getting into the details of this.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART did not want to title it DEI.

VICE MAYOR ROE agreed with the title Chandler Embracing Diversity.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ agreed.

MAYOR HARTKE agreed.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said when the new Council comes on they would change it. He had asked for Chandler Embracing DEI.

MAYOR HARTKE asked about exemptions.

VICE MAYOR ROE asked about what was considered a small business in COVID regulations.

MS. NIELSEN said that 50 employees were required for benefits and federal monies.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS agreed with including five for small businesses. There is a lack of resources at a company of that size, not equipped to deal with challenges resulting from enforcing this ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER LOPEZ said it should be a larger number.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said the number should be zero, no one should be discriminated against.

MAYOR HARTKE reminded council that needs to be worked on now, it is a disservice if we were to wait. The goal is to create something that a majority could agree on, and that future councils would also agree with.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said that the non-discrimination ordinance was brought up as an issue multiple times during the most recent election. It is difficult to pick apart an ordinance that has been in the works for so long. Councilmember Orlando suggested that the subcommittee draft be reviewed. If there are issues, we can review and give more recommendations.

VICE MAYOR ROE said 50 employees is an arbitrary number. A lot of small businesses could be negatively impacted by the consequences of something like this.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS shared that she felt she cannot wait on moving forward on the ordinance. The number of five employees was accepted at the subcommittee level. The effects of the non-discrimination ordinance have gone to the highest state court without rendering punitive effects upon companies. Education is the best solution, when people know better, they do better. This ordinance should be something that council is proud of, without needing change later.

There was a consensus on allowing five employees to define a small business for a small business exemption in the non-discrimination ordinance.

MS. SCHWAB asked if council was comfortable with the violations process as outlined.

There was a consensus on the violations process.

MS. SCHWAB asked if council was comfortable with the penalties outlined.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS emphasized education, no public censure, debarment with city contractors in violation of the ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said he did not like the five, and that they are allowing for discrimination to exist. He asked council to review the draft that originated in the subcommittee.

MAYOR HARTKE said that the council subcommittee discussed many different ideas that may not be at a consensus with the whole council.

There was a consensus on the penalties outlined: education, and debarment with city contractors, mediation, appeals.

MAYOR HARTKE asked the city attorney to review the council direction and have an informed opportunity to vote on this. Further conversations to get the non-discrimination ordinance through need to happen.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO thanked mayor and staff for working through this for the past two years. It is time to review the draft and then move forward.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS shared his passion for moving this forward. It is important to share honest opinions with all in an open discussion.

COUNCILMEMBER STEWART said he was not part of the subcommittee, this meeting did not take the path of reviewing the draft. He said it took the path of a presentation. Councilmember Stewart said he has a list of questions on how it will be implemented, how it works in other cities, who makes the decisions and all those things. He thought the empathy was mutual.

MAYOR HARTKE adjourned the meeting.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

Mayor

Approval Date of Minutes: November 7, 2022

Certification

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Work Session of the City Council of Chandler, Arizona, held on the 24th day of October 2022. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this _____ day of November, 2022.

City Clerk