

Meeting Minutes

City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission Special Joint Meeting

February 6, 2025 | 3:00 p.m.
ASU Innovation Center
249 E. Chicago St., Chandler, AZ



Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Kevin Hartke at 3:01 p.m.

Roll Call

Council Attendance

Mayor Kevin Hartke
Vice Mayor Christine Ellis
Councilmember Angel Encinas
Councilmember Jane Poston
Councilmember Matt Orlando
Councilmember OD Harris, attended virtually
Councilmember Jennifer Hawkins

Commission Attendance

Chair Rick Heumann
Vice Chair Sherri Koshiol
*Commissioner Mike Quinn
Commissioner Kyle Barichello
*Commissioner Charlotte Golla
Commissioner Ryan Schwarzer

Appointee Attendance

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

Staff in Attendance

Tadd Wille, Assistant City Manager
Dawn Lang, Deputy City Manager / CFO
Andy Bass, Deputy City Manager
Kevin Snyder, Development Services Director
Lauren Schumann, Principal Planner
Kevin Mayo, Planning Administrator
Alisa Petterson, Senior Planner
Megan Moore, Logan Simpson Consultant
Terri Hogan, Logan Simpson Consultant
Bruce Meighen, Logan Simpson Consultant
Rick Merritt, Elliott Pollack Consultant

*Commissioner Quinn and Commissioner Golla departed at 5:00 p.m.

Introductory Remarks – Mayor and Commission Chair

MAYOR HARTKE introduced the discussion. He commented that the General Plan is the shared vision for the future, referred to for any planning and development in Chandler. It is an opportunity for collaboration for residents to provide input in our city. The process will involve ensuring Chandler is a vibrant inclusive place of innovation for people to call home. Mayor Hartke said City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission will have the chance to give input into this process.

CHAIR HEUMANN said this is an exciting opportunity for Councilmembers and Commissioners to learn about the future development of Chandler. There are challenges as Chandler is approaching buildout and pivoting to infill. This presentation will ensure all members are on the same page regarding future development and zoning.

Discussion

1. Presentation and Discussion regarding the Downtown Area Plan Update

ALISA PETTERSON, Senior Planner, presented the following presentation.

- Downtown Region Area Plan Update
- Presentation Outline
 - Existing Related Plans
 - Timelines & Community Outreach
 - Proposed Area Plan Map
 - New Recommendations
 - Allow Adaptive Reuse
 - Establish Commerce Routes
 - Allow Mixed-Uses at Industrial
 - Allow Alley Activation
 - Recognize Downtown Gateways
 - Develop Character Area Guidelines
- Existing Related Plans
 - 1995 Chandler Redevelopment Element (replace)
 - 2006 South AZ Ave Entry Corridor Study (replace)
 - 2010 South AZ Ave Design Guidelines (replace)
 - 2016 Chandler General Plan
 - 2019 Chandler Transportation Plan
 - Chandler Water, Wastewater & Reclaimed Water Master Plan Update
 - 2023-2025 Chandler Strategic Framework
 - Chandler Economic Development Strategic Plan
 - 2023 Infill Incentive Plan
 - 2023-2024 Southside Village Studies: Urban Land

- Institute and Washington Street Alignment
- Timelines & Community Outreach
 - 15 Month Timeline
 - COMMUNITY OUTREACH:
 - Website / social media / email notification
 - Educational Meetings
 - Stakeholder Interviews
 - Public & Virtual Workshops
 - Visioning: Aug 17 & 19
 - Scenarios: Sept 9 & 10
 - Immersion: Nov 15 & 16
- Proposed Area Plan Map
 - Describes subject area:
 - Ray Rd to 202 & McQueen to Alma School Rd
 - 5 separate districts:
 - Northern, San Marcos, Downtown, Eastern & Southern
 - Replace & combine existing area plans:
 - Chandler Redevelopment Element (blue)
 - South AZ Ave Corridor Area Plan (yellow)
 - Expand area map to add “gateway” areas:
 - San Marcos District
 - Arizona Ave north of Chandler Blvd
 - Chandler Blvd east of Arizona Ave
 - AZ Ave from 202 north to Pecos Rd
- New Recommendations
 - The new Downtown Region Area Plan will:
 - Guide all future development decisions within the region
 - Provide 50,000 feet view of how the future built environment within the region should look
 - Set policies that define types of developments that can be considered
- Recommendation: Adaptive Reuse
 - Add policy guidance to allow adaptive reuse along with new & redevelopment projects.
 - Why:
 - Planning initiative: development patterns are different than expected 20 years ago
 - Less land consolidation & big developments
 - Current zoning – difficult for smaller projects
 - Benefits:
 - Preserve & enhance Chandler’s unique historic character
 - Expand revitalization across more of the downtown area
 - Create a more vibrant & culturally rich community environment

CHAIR HEUMANN asked if the recommendation was to encourage smaller segments.

MS. PETTERSON said over the past couple of years, there have been challenges with smaller projects. This recommendation is intended to be more inclusive of new development patterns.

CHAIR HEUMANN shared that the development philosophy should be to find the best use for the parcel, instead of taking the first project proposal. This is due to Chandler reaching high rates of build-out.

MS. PETTERSON agreed and said the focus is on high-quality adaptive reuse projects in the downtown area.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if the Washington Street area is a part of the adaptive reuse project.

MS. PETTERSON said the Washington Street realignment project has not been a project of the Planning Division, but it will be moving forward and documented in the area plan. Housing in that area would be under consideration, looking at the highest and best use with consideration to any community input.

MR. WRIGHT added there will be some future presentations on the Washington Street alignment project, pending more community input. There may be opportunities to add improvements for transportation and quality of life.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO spoke about the possibility of historic overlays for this neighborhood for a creative solution.

MR. WRIGHT agreed and said public outreach is ongoing.

MAYOR HARTKE asked for information about public outreach.

MR. WRIGHT said information will be shared at a future presentation.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked how this recommendation would be encouraged with developers.

MS. PETTERSON said this would open an option for developers who may not have been able to go through with adaptive reuse in the past due to more restrictive area plans. This option would be added to be considered across the downtown area. Each proposal would still be weighed against what the city is looking for.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS said he is focused on the downtown region.

MAYOR HARTKE said further information on this subject will be brought back to Council.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO said there is a historic preservation overlay on the downtown district which has some specific restrictions due to that.

CHAIR HEUMANN added that eminent domain should be avoided, if possible, the city should encourage new development and independent businesses without that mechanism.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS asked about possible incentives to encourage smaller developments.

MS. PETTERSON said this is an area being studied currently.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS said incentives will encourage wanted developments in the downtown area.

CHAIR HEUMANN suggested that nonmonetary incentives such as expedited review could also be offered.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS spoke about incorporating the Historic Preservation Commission in potential adaptive reuse projects downtown. He also highlighted that it is important to make sure the downtown area is not crowded to enhance connectivity. Councilmember Harris emphasized enhancements such as utility boxes, lighting, and alleyway improvements.

MS. PETTERSON continued the presentation.

- Recommendation: Commerce Route
 - Establish commerce route policy to reroute commercial truck traffic in the downtown region
 - Why:
 - Planning initiative: approved development on Frye Rd (protected bike lane, Grayhawk Residences) will challenge the current capacity
 - More people expected downtown - more traffic, pedestrian & bike safety concerns
 - Better downtown environment & enhanced resident satisfaction
 - Benefits:
 - Safer streets for cars, bikes & pedestrians
 - Protection of built infrastructure (curbs, gutters & sidewalks)

CHAIR HEUMANN requested to explain the need for commerce routes.

MS. PETTERSON said there are large existing industrial users along Frye Road. There have been some instances of semi-trucks queueing along Frye Road in the morning, or attempting to turn

right on Frye Road, which is not suited for semi-truck traffic. Traffic would also come up against the Frye Road protected bike lanes plan, and the plan would be to encourage pedestrian and bike traffic safely.

CHAIR HEUMANN said Arizona Avenue is still State Route 87 which will have high traffic. Chair Heumann added that incorporating calming measures into downtown roadways is another way of encouraging safe travel.

MAYOR HARTKE commented that large trucks turning east on Frye are hazardous.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked how this new commerce route will be encouraged.

MS. PETTERSON said it will be a process of working with the users. Once the route is established in the area plan it should allow users to continue successfully operating and relieve potential conflicts between residents in new residential developments and existing industrial users.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked if this requires coordination with CIP if other measures are planned such as roadway widening.

MS. PETTERSON said this will be a coordinated effort. These conversations occur early with related departments once policies are set in place. These ideas could develop into projects.

MAYOR HARTKE asked where the construction would start for the Frye Road bike lane.

MR. WRIGHT said information would be provided.

MAYOR HARTKE said as construction reaches Arizona Avenue, that would be a great opportunity to facilitate messaging about the proposed commerce route.

MS. PETTERSON said outreach has begun.

MS. PETTERSON continued the presentation.

- Recommendation: Mixed-Uses
 - Add policies to allow mixed-use developments with residential & commercial uses at existing industrial uses east of railroad
 - Why:
 - Planning initiative: changing development trends
 - More efficient land use planning long-term
 - Provide policy to allow new uses now before a potential loss of existing industrial uses
 - Benefits:

- Live/work/play uses & development scale - a better fit for the downtown environment
- More available housing
- More vibrant, walkable & sustainable community

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how this would be depicted in the General Plan.

MS. PETTERSON said that this would include flexibility for rezoning the property. This may require an update to the existing zoning ordinance to be in alignment with policy recommendations.

CHAIR HEUMANN spoke about the allowable uses in industrial zoning that could be proposed for mixed-use that are congruent with existing placements.

MS. PETTERSON continued the presentation.

- Recommendation: Alley Activation
 - Establish a vision & policy guidance for alley activation as pedestrian areas in the downtown
 - Why:
 - Community input: create a more vibrant local identity with art & public gathering spaces
 - Community input: provide additional landscaping & neighborhood beautification
 - Address water & sewer infrastructure issues
 - Benefits:
 - More pedestrian space for community events
 - Increase unique community character
 - Greater flexibility for infill development

MAYOR HARTKE asked if water and sewer infrastructure is included in this recommendation.

MS. PETTERSON said that the preservation and enhancement of existing infrastructure have been discussed with the relevant departments.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO asked how the alley activation policy would be funded.

MS. PETTERSON said that after setting the policy, sourcing funding mechanisms would be the next step in the process.

MS. PETTERSON continued the presentation.

- Recommendation: Downtown Gateways
 - Create policy to identify enhancement opportunities for gateways into Downtown Chandler

- Why:
 - Community input: add more landscape, visual beautification & protected multi-modal paths
 - Similar to Chandler Airpark gateway areas
 - Consistent with “Downtown South” improvements
- Benefits:
 - Roadway beautification with new landscaping at medians & ROWs (similar to Chandler Blvd)
 - A downtown core that is connected to adjacent neighborhoods
 - A sense of place & arrival to the downtown core
- Recommendation: Character Area Guidelines
 - Develop character area guidelines for established neighborhoods & future development areas
 - Why:
 - Community input: provide unique landscaping, lighting & signage within neighborhoods
 - Benefits:
 - Enhance existing neighborhoods by creating a sense of place
 - Create better pedestrian connection to the downtown core
 - Honor the unique historic characteristic of established neighborhoods
 - Balance improvements across the region
 - Create more housing & supportive commercial uses

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how the parameters for the character areas were created and how were the areas determined.

MS. PETTERSON said the existing regions are geographically named, but proposed character areas incorporate neighborhoods such as the Silk-Stocking district. It is more about creating the policy for these types of character areas to be created. It may originate first from historic overlays.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if names have been developed and how that process would occur.

MS. PETTERSON said character area names would be specific and relevant to the individual neighborhood and would represent the special unique character of these areas. Names have not yet been proposed. This proposal would set a policy to allow these character areas to develop organically.

CHAIR HEUMANN asked if neighborhoods would be defined by types of residential housing available. He recommended achieving better pedestrian connection downtown and continuing to investigate different solutions.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if the intention was to create an identity in these neighborhoods.

MS. PETTERSON said this was based on feedback received from residents in the downtown area that creating unique places will add to the vibrant vitality of downtown which will spur development.

MS. PETTERSON continued the presentation.

- Please Share Your Thoughts

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZER asked if there have been any feasibility studies conducted or any proposed alley locations for the alley activation recommendation.

MS. PETTERSON said at this time, this would provide the pathway to seek those types of improvements. Further study is required in line with the policy approval.

COMMISSIONER GOLLA asked what Chandler can do to address adaptive reuse for proposed multifamily developments.

MS. PETTERSON said there is some guidance from the state that would supersede anything at the local level.

COMMISSIONER GOLLA clarified that this would be a guiding policy from Chandler to open new opportunities.

MS. PETTERSON said once the policy is in place, it can be used for enforcement.

MAYOR HARTKE added that involving neighborhoods' wants and needs must cohere with what works for Chandler.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said this sets forth a great vision for Chandler and the General Plan is approved by residents to be the vision for the community.

MAYOR HARTKE said local context for zoning and development is essential and this message is shared with state and federal leaders.

Recessed at 4:02 p.m.

Reconvened at 4:15 p.m.

2. Presentation and Discussion regarding the 2026 General Plan Update

LAUREN SCHUMANN, Principal Planner, presented the following presentation.

- 2026 General Plan Update

- General Plan Update Overview
 - General Plan Requirements
 - Comprehensive Housing Plan Update
 - Update Process
 - Innovative Public Participation
 - Changes since 2016
 - Joint Meeting Focus Group
- General Plan Requirements
 - 17 Elements required by state law
 - Land use
 - Circulation
 - Bicycling
 - Growth areas
 - Neighborhood planning
 - Housing
 - Conservation, rehabilitation, and redevelopment
 - Public services & facilities
 - Cost of development
 - Recreation
 - Open space
 - Energy
 - Conservation
 - Environmental planning
 - Water resources
 - Public buildings
 - Safety
- Comprehensive Housing Plan
 - Comprehensive Housing Plan (CHP)
 - Analyze current housing stock, affordability, & future needs
 - Community Engagement- online surveys, focus group meetings with interested stakeholders, & public workshops
 - Develop strategy approach
 - Final report to City Council anticipated Summer 2025
- General Plan Process and Timeline
- Innovative Public Participation
 - Public Participation Plan
 - Website Live!
 - Online Questionnaires- Q1 Posted
 - ChandlerTalk- Host experts to discuss hot topics items
 - Immersive 360 experience
 - Resident Advisory Committee
 - Social Media

- Planning lab- open houses to discuss different topics
- Provide booth at community events
- Input from grade school students
- Interview interested stakeholders

MAYOR HARTKE asked if this election is required to go on the ballot in November.

DANA DELONG, City Clerk, said that it could be on the August ballot, the only election required to go in November is the bond election.

- How has Chandler changed since 2016?
 - Where and how we work
 - How we interact
 - How we get around
 - Housing costs increase
 - E-commerce
 - Brick and mortar demand
 - Where our dollars go
- Changes since 2016
- Changes since 2016
 - Approximately 70% remaining land planned for non-residential uses
 - Housing
 - Aug. 2016- Jan. 2025 12,048 units built
 - 40% single-family
 - 60% multi-family
 - Finite water resources; plan accordingly

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if the map includes county owned property.

MS. SCHUMANN said some of the properties on the map are county-owned with minimal improvements on them with some opportunity for growth and development.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation.

- How will the General Plan affect and be affected by other plans?
 - Change in land uses could affect:
 - Area plans
 - Chandler Airpark Area Plan (2021)
 - Southeast Chandler Area Plan (1999)
 - Downtown Regional Area Plan (2025)
 - Transportation Master Plan (2019)
 - Water Master Plan (2018)
 - Parks Strategic Master Plan (2021)

- Airport Master Plan (2021)
- Infill Incentive Plan (2023)

CHAIR HEUMANN asked if the General Plan overrides other area plans.

MS. SCHUMANN said the General Plan does override the area plan, but it gives broad uses in comparison to the area plans with more specific types of uses.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation.

- Joint Meeting Discussion Focus Areas
 - 17 Elements Required by state law
 - Land use
 - Circulation
 - Housing
 - Conservation, rehabilitation, and redevelopment
 - Water resources
- Starter Questions
 - How should the City balance protecting employment corridors (e.g. Price Corridor) with the demand for increased housing supply and mixed-use projects (e.g. employment campuses featuring jobs, housing, and amenities)?
 - What types of housing make sense for Chandler with the limited amount of land available?
 - Development height: In what areas of the city do tall, high-density developments make sense? Should the City require minimum heights in certain areas?

MEGAN MOORE, Logan Simpson Consultant, introduced the starter questions.

MAYOR HARTKE spoke about encouraging transparency and communication with the community. He commented that it is beneficial to reassess the community needs currently in conjunction with the General Plan project.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS asked how City Council can facilitate community involvement.

CHAIR HEUMANN said that community involvement is important and spoke about balancing input from residents with concrete legislative actions.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO requested to see more input from investors, developers, and the business community in the plan development.

MAYOR HARTKE added that working with the Chamber of Commerce could facilitate those conversations.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO shared that he would like to see a balance between priorities, readability, and functionality of the General Plan document. This plan should be clear and readable from a business owner's perspective. These specific area plans allow for more specific details in line with the General Plan.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked if there have been any amendments to the plan in the last ten years.

MS. SCHUMANN said that since the last General Plan approval, there have been no amendments.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL asked if other developers or landowners were interested in proposing an amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN said that one example was a large home builder who had wanted to amend an area in an area plan for more residential development, but no action was taken.

MR. MAYO said the 2016 General Plan was a great tool for use in directing development opportunities. The 2016 Plan was intentionally strategic and goal based.

CHAIR HEUMANN asked if this lack of amendments was due to build-out.

MS. SCHUMANN answered that there are broad categories; there are only four land use designations that leave the interpretation of use and density to the city.

MAYOR HARTKE spoke about using the General Plan as a guiding tool for development.

MS. MOORE summarized that public involvement is paramount, providing different avenues to collect information and getting out into the community on a smaller scale will both be pursued. Council is encouraged to get the word out by communicating with constituents. She summarized that Councilmembers and Commissioners had commented that they wanted a concise plan with some flexibility to ensure ease of interpretation and a transparent process.

MAYOR HARTKE commented that Councilmembers and Commissioners can share suggestions of interest groups who would want to participate in this process.

CHAIR HEUMANN spoke about Question 1: employment corridors should be protected as they are currently. Employment zones provide a solid tax base for the city. The long-range vision for planning must be kept in mind.

MR. WRIGHT asked about the attitude towards mixed development: industrial with residential and commercial. This idea has been making headway recently, when in 2016 it was not yet under consideration.

CHAIR HEUMANN commented that there are a lot of components to zoning in that case, such as land cost. Price Corridor has changed from a single user to multiple users in the area.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how much acreage is left in Price Corridor.

MS. SCHUMANN said several properties along Price Corridor may be considered residential employment areas.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said there have been comments from users in the area about what amenities are offered along the corridor.

MS. SCHUMANN summarized that the attitude was to protect Price Corridor as an employment corridor.

MAYOR HARTKE said the city should consider proposals by developers for the area along Price Corridor.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO said there should be some guidance that staff can provide to interested users.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked how county island and tribal lands are considered in the General Plan.

MS. SCHUMANN said through this process, staff is working to engage as many residents as possible.

MAYOR HARTKE asked to engage with county island residents and neighboring tribal lands.

MS. SCHUMANN said outreach will be conducted to neighboring communities.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked if this outreach is being currently conducted or if this is part of the plan.

MS. SCHUMANN said staff will be reaching out to residents in neighboring tribal lands.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON said that any new users should be approached with an abundance of caution and should be conducted from a business mindset.

MS. MOORE suggested investigating metrics to provide in case of a development like this.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO provided an example of a past case of a use that could have created jobs but does not serve the public.

CHAIR HEUMANN said providing careful wording in development plans will help guide smart development.

MAYOR HARTKE said it is important to cultivate a balance between caution and welcoming new ideas.

MS. MOORE directed the conversation to Question 2 and asked about specific housing types in any regions of Chandler.

MAYOR HARTKE said he supports home ownership and promoting starter homes.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO added that cul-de-sac developments with less asphalt and more houses are popular in Chandler.

CHAIR HEUMANN said it can be challenging to encourage home ownership with existing homeowners who may not want to see new developments. Smaller lots and square footage are appealing to many.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO provided an example of the Mariposa development, where infill and single-family homes were in one development.

MAYOR HARTKE said there is not a solid solution for redevelopment infill but encouraged redevelopment to provide housing solutions.

CHAIR HEUMANN addressed Question 3: minimum heights do not always make sense for development areas.

VICE CHAIR KOSHIOL said variety provides opportunities for residents and community. It is challenging to balance the potential highest and best use and neighbor concerns. Well thought out density that offers amenities and infrastructure is a valuable part of the community.

- Starter Questions
 - What are the most important elements of an effective redevelopment and infill strategy? What must we maintain and what are we willing to change (e.g. traffic and neighborhood character vs. demand for high-turnover uses)?
 - What should be the City's role in promoting sustainability through development, such as combatting the urban heat island effect (e.g. more shade trees in developments and on streets, alternative paving materials, etc.)?

MS. MOORE introduced Question 4 and asked where smart infill can take place within the existing framework.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO said when investigating an infill site, it is important to consider any alternatives and suggest solutions to developers.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if it is more valuable to have multifamily or individual developments.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO said it depends, as developers have different business strategies. Density is needed to support the land values in those built-up areas. There is not always a variety of product available.

CHAIR HEUMANN spoke about Question 5, suggesting the heat island effect guidelines have been mitigated by current City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission action. The General Plan should include some guidelines in promoting sustainability.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO suggested less concrete and more trees and vegetation aid in promoting sustainability. Commissioner Barichello recommended flow back development guidelines to aid low impact development.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZER emphasized balancing vegetation with smart water usage.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said he looks forward to working to make Chandler a thriving city through community outreach in this General Plan project. He thanked staff, Council, and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS thanked staff for the presentation and asked for information regarding the website and survey, and if there is a baseline number of responses expected.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS said he looks forward to this General Plan and spoke about holding to the Chandler tradition and including residents' input for this plan.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZER said he is excited to see this plan move forward.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON said this is an exciting opportunity to reach goals of being a vibrant city attracting young professionals through a multitude of opportunities. Redevelopment is a big part of providing interesting product.

COMMISSIONER BARICHELLO said there has been many great creative actions taken that could be taken a step further across the city. Housing diversity is critical.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO thanked the Planning and Zoning Commissioners for their collaboration. Finding infill developers will be helpful in considering viable projects.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS thanked staff for their support in this endeavor. The collaboration for this vision has been comprised of hard decisions, the city must move forward with innovation in mind. The residents of Chandler know what they want and should be provided a detailed and smart document.

MAYOR HARTKE thanked staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission and looked forward to seeing the outcome of this plan.

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 pm.

Approval Date of Minutes: March 24, 2025

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Special Meeting of the City Council of Chandler, Arizona, held on the 6th day of February, 2025. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

City Clerk