

Meeting Minutes

City Council Work Session

April 10, 2025 | 4:00 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 4:00 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
Councilmember Jennifer Hawkins

Appointee Attendance

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

*Vice Mayor Christine Ellis and Councilmember Jane Poston attended virtually.

Staff in Attendance

Tadd Wille, Assistant City Manager
Dawn Lang, Deputy City Manager / Chief Financial Officer
Ryan Peters, Strategic Initiatives Director
Jennifer Ekblad, Deputy City Clerk
Rae Lynn Nielsen, Human Resources Director
Tawn Kao, Deputy City Attorney
Matt Dunbar, Budget & Policy Director
Zach Sakas, Bond Counsel, Greenberg Traurig, LLP
Alexis Apodaca, Mayor & Council Public Affairs Senior Manager
Matt Burdick, Communications & Public Affairs Director

Discussion

1. Presentation and Discussion Regarding the Proposed 2025 Chandler Bond Election and City Charter Amendments

MAYOR HARTKE called for a staff presentation.

JOSHUA WRIGHT, City Manager, introduced the discussion item.

DAWN LANG, Deputy City Manager / Chief Financial Officer, presented the following presentation.

- Bond Election & Charter Amendments Discussion City Council Work Session
- Committee Timeline
- Public Communication
 - Staff presented public information options in October to the Steering Committee
 - Input gathered helped to create a public information campaign regarding the work of the Resident Bond Exploratory Committee.
 - Bond election website created as the central source for resident information
 - Social posts and articles released
- Public Education
 - Bond Exploratory Committee can advocate for bond election once City Council calls for election
 - Staff will begin education to public through various platforms and organizations
 - Easy to distribute pamphlet created for both pre and post call for election

MAYOR HARTKE asked if there is a similar timeline for the General Plan Resident Advisory Committee, so that the committee may advocate for the General Plan election once the committee is sunset.

MS. LANG said yes.

MAYOR HARTKE asked what Council can do as elected officials in terms of providing education and advocacy for the bond election.

MS. LANG said information from the Law Department will be forthcoming. She also introduced Zach Sakas, Bond Counsel, Greenberg Traurig, LLP who has been engaged in the bond election process.

ZACH SAKAS, Bond Counsel, Greenberg Traurig, LLP explained that there are three pitfalls cities experience in promoting bond elections: do not deploy city resources in an advocacy manner, do not use city assets to advocate for the election, and do not hold special meetings to advocate for the bond election. If constituents are interested in being educated, it would be wise to meet outside of City Hall. If a neutral and impartial education is provided, that is acceptable. In your free

time as private citizens, you may exercise your rights, but city resources cannot be used for advocacy.

MAYOR HARTKE clarified that the city can provide education of the subject of the bonds but cannot steer a yes or no vote. Councilmembers can exercise their rights as private citizens on their own time.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if information from the sunsetted Bond Exploratory Committee could be used for advocating for the bonds.

MR. SAKAS explained that there is a balance as Bond Exploratory Committee members, after the committee has sunset, are no longer active members of the city committee. Advocacy cannot happen at City Hall.

MAYOR HARTKE said a campaign finance committee may be started by individuals who previously served on the Bond Exploratory Committee which would be separate. He encouraged councilmembers to share information and education about how the city intends to support parks, streets, police, and fire.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Chandler Bond History

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO requested to see the chart on this slide in today's dollars, so it is comparable across time.

MS. LANG said that information will be shared.

MAYOR HARTKE asked about cities that have had differences in bond authority amount requested and bond authority amount approved.

MATT DUNBAR, Budget & Policy Director, said some cities had elections where some bond questions passed but some failed.

MR. WRIGHT agreed.

MR. SAKAS added that voters had a pattern of not approving bond elections in Scottsdale particularly.

MS. LANG mentioned that the data in the slide for the City of Glendale was only since 2007, information before 2007 was not made available.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Steering Committee Recommendations
 - Over a period of five months, the Resident Bond Exploratory Steering Committee reviewed and evaluated 37 possible bond projects with an estimated total cost of \$728,095,600
 - Prioritized fiscal conservancy by focusing on the highest-need projects
 - Final recommendation of 24 projects with a \$475,000,000 bond need in the areas of Fire, Police, Streets, and Parks and Recreation for approval in the November 2025 bond election
 - If approved, this \$475 million recommendation to City Council would NOT increase primary or secondary property tax rates using current projections.
- Financial Management of Capital Plan
 - Bonds fund 73.9% of proposed 10-year CIP
 - The secondary tax levy funds GO bond debt, with additional capacity created by either increasing revenue or paying down debt leaving the tax rate flat
 - Arizona law limits GO bond debt to 20% of secondary assessed value for most projects and 6% for special purpose bonds, with the city well below these limits
 - Maintaining a stable tax rate requires balancing assessed values and tax rates, with state law capping assessed value growth at 6.2% for five years, then 1.22% annually
 - Committees recommendation caps growth at 4.5%

MAYOR HARTKE asked what the percentage delta is between 2021 and today's dollars and how inflation rates have affected this.

MS. LANG said this analysis included rates from the Mortenson Construction Index or the average US inflation rate to calculate the value of construction material in these prior years. In today's inflationary environment, when a project such as the Tumbleweed Recreation Center expansion is underway, the inflation rates due to the costs and amounts of steel and concrete used may be between 30% to 50%.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said equating this to current rates is important to understand. The proposed \$475,000,000 recommendation from the steering committee is not much higher in relative terms from previous bonds and is lower than the 2007 bond election which was the largest at the time.

MS. LANG confirmed that the 2007 bond election adjusted for inflation was the largest bond authorization at the time.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO commented that the chart on this slide of the existing debt service, additional debt service, and secondary tax levy shows a dip in 2028-29, and commented that an option to address this would be to not sell any new bonds.

MS. LANG said that Chandler is in the lifecycle of paying itself back for impact fee loans. If there is a year where the amortization or the principal and interest on the loans exceeds the assessed value, then Chandler can supplement secondary tax levy with loan paybacks in the secondary or in the debt service fund. There are two funding sources to help manage the rates at 87 cents which has helped keep the tax rate low.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if the payback could be used to fund some of these projects instead of selling bonds.

MS. LANG said there is a limit on how much the impact fees are owed back to the debt service fund, and until they are collected there is a limit on how much is collected through permitting.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Parks and Recreation Subcommittee
 - Maintain existing parks was the top priority
 - Community and recreation center repairs and improvements
 - Higher priority for AJ Park renovation
 - Folley Pool prioritized as high impact project for the surrounding neighborhood
 - include Phase 2 of Mesquite Groves Regional Park due to increased cost since the 2021 bond election
 - Park improvements to impact all areas of Chandler
 - Tumbleweed Ranch, Multi-Gen expansion, and Mesquite Groves Phase 3 pushed out to future bond election
- Proposed Ballot Question
 - QUESTION 1
 - ENHANCE CHANDLER'S PARKS AND RECREATION AMENITIES TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE COMMUNITY
 - Shall the City of Chandler, Arizona, be authorized to issue and sell general obligation bonds of the city in the principal amount not exceeding \$158,000,000 to provide funding for community, neighborhood and regional parks, aquatic centers, arts and cultural centers, recreational facilities, buildings and improvements? Projects may include, but are not limited to those intended to:
 - Renovate and improve existing neighborhood and community parks, recreational facilities and buildings,
 - Design and construct new city parks and recreational facilities, buildings and improvements,
 - Construct or improve multi-use fields, playgrounds and other facilities at city parks, which may include Snedigar Sports Complex, Desert Breeze Park, Mesquite Groves Park, and Dr. A.J. Chandler Park, and
 - Renovate and improve existing pools and aquatic centers, which may include Folley Pool.

- Generated funds will be used to pay for all necessary design, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, renovation, equipment and installation and associated costs including the acquisition of land or interests therein necessary for such. These bonds will be issued as general obligation bonds and the issuance of these bonds will result in a property tax increase sufficient to pay the annual debt service on bonds, unless the governing body provides for payment from other sources.

MAYOR HARTKE said there have been shifts in priorities in the past, it is beneficial to leave some flexibility in the plan for future councils.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked about the last sentence of the proposed ballot language reading “These bonds will be issued as general obligation bonds and the issuance of these bonds will result in a property tax increase sufficient to pay the annual debt service on bonds, unless the governing body provides for payment from other sources.”

MR. SAKAS explained that this language is required due to Arizona Revised Statutes Title 35 which states that the ballot language must include this, even though the reality may be that Chandler’s tax rates are being managed to not increase property taxes.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if this is required.

MR. SAKAS said yes.

MS. LANG said this language has been included in Chandler’s other bond election questions. In the election publicity pamphlet, there can be further explanations separate from the election questions about what this would result in.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO surmised that this is required language, but Chandler will not increase property tax rates.

MR. SAKAS said what voters will learn is that the bond question is not intended to increase the property tax rates based on the financial projections.

MR. DUNBAR added that one of the reasons this is included in the language is in the case of if a bond was not approved, debts could not be issued, and the debt service amount would need to be reduced. Without these projects the property tax rate would have to decrease.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked about the bullet point “Renovate and improve existing pools and aquatic centers, which may include Folley Pool” and asked if park renovations for Folley Park are included in current CIP projects.

MS. LANG said this budget includes the pool and the surrounding park areas.

MR. WRIGHT added that the northern segment on the park was redone substantially in 2016, so upcoming improvements would be for the pool and southern end of the park.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked what improvements were moved up in CIP last year.

MR. WRIGHT said a study or conceptual evaluation was moved up in the CIP.

MS. LANG asked if Council was okay with the ballot language.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked if the language of “provide funding for community, neighborhood and regional parks, aquatic centers, arts and cultural centers, recreational facilities, buildings and improvements” had a strategic order these were listed in.

MS. LANG said this may have just been listed without a specific order. This was expanded to include arts and cultural centers.

MAYOR HARTKE suggested ordering the sentence due to resident wants may be helpful for readers. MAYOR HARTKE suggested that the budget survey may be a good source to see resident areas of interest, so that the ballot language may be ordered to reflect high priority items

MS. LANG said the parks and pool questions could be listed first.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Public Safety – Fire Subcommittee
 - Prioritized facilities to meet the changing needs of Chandler
 - Rebuild Fire Station #284
 - Construction of new Fire Station #2812
 - Fire emergency vehicle replacements
 - Remodel of Public Safety Training Building A was moved to be paid by General Fund
- Proposed Ballot Question
 - QUESTION 2
 - ENHANCE CHANDLER FIRE DEPARTMENT SERVICES AND RESPONSE THROUGH IMPROVED FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
 - Shall the City of Chandler, Arizona, be authorized to issue and sell general obligation bonds of the city in the principal amount not exceeding \$88,000,000 to provide funding for public safety and fire facilities and improvements, related equipment, vehicles, technology and communication systems? Projects may include, but are not limited to, those intended to:
 - Construct a new city fire station and related public safety facilities,

- Repair and renovate existing city fire stations and related public safety facilities, and
- Acquire emergency vehicles which may include fire engines and ladder trucks.
- Generated funds will be used to pay for all necessary design, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, renovation, equipment and installation and associated costs including the acquisition of land or interests therein necessary for such purposes.
- These bonds will be issued as general obligation bonds and the issuance of these bonds will result in a property tax increase sufficient to pay the annual debt service on bonds, unless the governing body provides for payment from other sources.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if there were any questions or comments on this language.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked what the reason was behind not listing any specific fire stations in the ballot language.

MS. LANG said discussion around that with bond counsel, it was decided not to be that specific about the fire stations in the ballot question. In the publicity pamphlet, it will detail the actual specific proposed projects.

MR. SAKAS added that voters may be uninterested if they see a fire station that is not in their neighborhood, and if a specific fire station is outlined in a ballot question, what would happen if plans changed. The bond authorization must have some flexibility in the years to come to adapt to changing fiscal realities.

MAYOR HARTKE said the sentence "Projects may include, but are not limited to, those intended to" should give some flexibility to projects listed in the ballot question.

MR. SAKAS said it does have some flexibility and protection in that language.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked when the publicity pamphlet is mailed to voters.

MS. LANG said the publicity pamphlet is mailed to voters before the election.

DANA DELONG, City Clerk, said the publicity pamphlet will be mailed to voters September 23, 2025 before early voting begins.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if the language should be enhanced to make stronger and clearer statements.

MR. SAKAS said the heading is to attract the voter's attention, it is not part of the required language.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO suggested adding more specific language such as “improve Chandler Fire Department services and response times through enhanced facilities and equipment” which could capture the attention of readers.

MS. LANG explained that the steering committee had discussed including response times in the language but reasoned that the phrase response time could be left out to be concise.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS agreed with the sentiment.

MAYOR HARTKE said if the bond authorization is approved and a new station is built but it takes a couple of years to go into effect, this may not match the language of response times as listed in the ballot question.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Public Safety – Police Subcommittee
 - Prioritized facilities to meet the changing needs of Chandler
 - Police Main Station renovations
 - Radio communications equipment
 - Police emergency vehicle replacements
- Proposed Ballot Question
 - QUESTION 3
 - ENHANCE CHANDLER POLICE DEPARTMENT SERVICES AND RESPONSE THROUGH IMPROVED FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
 - Shall the City of Chandler, Arizona, be authorized to issue and sell general obligation bonds of the city in the principal amount not exceeding \$46,000,000 to provide funding for public safety and police facilities and improvements, related equipment, vehicles, technology and communication systems? Projects may include, but are not limited to, those intended to:
 - Renovate and improve the city Police main station,
 - Acquire technology and radio communication equipment to enhance police responsiveness, and
 - Acquire emergency vehicles.
 - Generated funds will be used to pay for all necessary design, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, renovation, equipment and installation and associated costs including the acquisition of land or interests therein necessary for such purposes.
 - These bonds will be issued as general obligation bonds and the issuance of these bonds will result in a property tax increase sufficient to pay the annual debt service on bonds, unless the governing body provides for payment from other sources.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if the reason behind renovation and improvements in the city Police main station could be included in this language.

MS. LANG said it comes down to flexibility in what is listed. The main station renovations are due to the proposed forensic facility and use of space. Too much detail in the examples could limit flexibility.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS noted this ballot question does not include language about the proposed forensic facility.

MS. LANG said the forensic facility has bond authorization from the 2021 bond election. This would be for the repurposing the main station after the forensic facility is in use.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said including more specific language such as “improving the utilization or capacity of the city police main station” could better explain the proposed improvements.

MAYOR HARTKE said he liked the description of utilization better.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO suggested that this is a better description for voters of what action is being done for the police main station.

MS. LANG said that language can be added to the ballot question.

MAYOR HARTKE asked what kinds of emergency vehicles would be acquired.

MS. LANG said including this level of specificity was discussed in the Resident Bond Subcommittee. She said staff will investigate adding more specificity to this example.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Public Works Subcommittee
 - Maintain existing infrastructure through repaving and collector street improvements
 - Placed higher priority on upcoming needed street and intersection improvements
 - Kyrene Road, Arizona Avenue and Warner Road Intersection, McQueen Road
 - Additional phases for McQueen Road and Warner Road moved to a future bond election
 - Ocotillo Shared Use Path moved to future bond election
 - Washington Street improvements moved to be paid by General Fund
- Proposed Ballot Question
 - QUESTION 4
 - KEEP CHANDLER STREETS SAFE AND IMPROVE TRAFFIC FOR CHANDLER RESIDENTS

- Shall the City of Chandler, Arizona, be authorized to issue and sell general obligation bonds of the city in the principal amount not exceeding \$183,000,000 to provide funding for streets, avenues, alleys, highways, transportation and shared use path improvements, related equipment, technology and communication systems, and traffic signals, signal control systems and signage to keep streets safe and improve traffic flows for city residents? Projects may include, but are not limited to, those intended to:
 - Repave and repair existing streets and intersections in the city,
 - Improve and repair traffic signals and signal control systems,
 - Improve city streets, which may include improvements to McQueen and Kyrene Roads,
 - Improve city intersections, which may include the Arizona Ave./Warner Road intersection and Kyrene Road/Chandler Blvd. intersection, and
 - Design and construct shared use paths.
- Generated funds will be used to pay for all necessary design, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, renovation, equipment and installation and associated costs including the acquisition of land or interests therein necessary for such purposes.
- These bonds will be issued as general obligation bonds and the issuance of these bonds will result in a property tax increase sufficient to pay the annual debt service on bonds, unless the governing body provides for payment from other sources

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if it is descriptive to describe the ballot question as “improve traffic flow.”

MAYOR HARTKE said there were two statements in Proposition 479, reducing commuter time and a similar description.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO agreed, and commented the language should be descriptive enough for the voter to see what specific improvements will be made to benefit them.

MAYOR HARTKE said incorporating language used for Proposition 479 could be beneficial.

RYAN PETERS, Strategic Initiatives Director, noted that the phrase traffic flow is in the ballot question itself.

MS. LANG said staff can research the language used in Proposition 479.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said using descriptive language for the voter will be helpful.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS commented that ballot questions should be as simple as possible. Councilmembers can share additional information and context with voters directly. If everything is included in one question, it may not give councilmembers the chance to engage with residents.

MAYOR HARTKE said the goal of what is being done is to reduce accidents and commuter time to make the streets safer for commuters.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said Council has examined previous bond ballot questions at this granular level before.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS commented that the ballot questions should be clear and concise.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS requested some additional examples.

MAYOR HARTKE commented that the statement of reducing accidents and time on the road is included.

MS. LANG suggested “improve traffic flow and reduce commuter times for Chandler residents” as a title.

MS. LANG continued the presentation.

- Next Steps

MR. PETERS presented the following slides.

- Charter Amendments Recommendation
- Potential Amendments for Consideration
 - Section 2.13 Publication and adoption of leases
 - Section 2.15 Publication and adoption of ordinances
 - Section 9.03 Residency requirements for city manager and all department heads
- Section 2.15 Ordinances
 - Current Charter requirements for publication and adoption of ordinances (effective 1965)
 - Introduction of ordinance at Council meeting
 - After tentative approval, distribution and publication* of the notice of consideration consisting of the ordinance by title only along with notice of time and date of final consideration
 - Final adoption by Council
 - Publication* in full at least two times with minimum of 6 days between publications
 - *Publication occurs in a newspaper of general circulation
- Requirements of Other Valley Charter Cities
 - City of Scottsdale
 - Ordinance is posted or read in full 24 hours before meeting

- One publication in full within 15 days after adoption
- City of Tempe
 - Notice of consideration published at least 7 days before action
 - One publication in full as soon as practicable after adoption
- City of Mesa
 - Notice of consideration published at least 6 days before action
 - One publication in full within 2 weeks after adoption
- City of Glendale
 - Ordinance is posted or read in full 72 hours before meeting
 - One publication in full
- Proposed Amendment
 - Consideration and action at one Council meeting for zoning and leasing ordinances
 - And
 - Publication one time after adoption
 - Ordinances amending City Code would continue current practice of two readings (e.g. new laws)

MAYOR HARTKE asked about the business community's input regarding this proposed amendment.

MR. PETERS said the business community has expressed frustration with the current process. Some cities have extra steps and processes in this process, and opinions from the League of Cities and Towns and the business community have been interested in removing these barriers to catch up with the speed of the market.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if financing and the market rates play a role in this.

MR. PETERS said that is correct, sometimes there is financing associated with these zoning and leasing ordinances.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if this proposed amendment is just for planning and zoning issues.

MR. PETERS said that is correct.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said an example is the urban camping ordinance, where after an introduction, residents may provide feedback to Council. The reason for the second reading is to get a response after the first reading.

MR. PETERS said in recent years, Council has not changed a vote in between a first and second reading, it is something that just adds time. As it relates to the laws, it is understood that the public may have interest in seeing an ordinance read twice. In the urban camping example, if a change

was needed after the introduction, a new ordinance would be introduced before its final adoption. Relating to zoning decisions that come before Council, this has not occurred.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked what would happen in a situation of a single reading of an ordinance was then approved, then after approval a mistake was found.

MS. SCHWAB explained that if there is a minor error, it may be corrected through a scrivener's error if the intention was clear. But if a larger correction was needed, a new ordinance would be needed. Under current practice, if a correction was needed, the city would have to go back to do the introduction of the ordinance again.

MAYOR HARTKE confirmed this is about speed to market. He said if an ordinance needs corrections after adoption, it will be corrected appropriately. He said the proposed amendment is about the speed to market for planning and zoning related ordinances.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked about the estimated costs of ordinance publication.

MS. DELONG said the costs of publication with the two readings and notice of consideration are less than it used to be, publication currently costs around \$5,000 to \$7,000 per year.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if there are any examples of business delays or missed opportunities due to this current process.

MR. PETERS shared some examples of zoning cases that were affected by the ordinance reading timing. Ultimately, all decisions were approved, the only thing impacted was the timing.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS commented that bringing this recommendation forward to increase the speed to market is beneficial, and the city has improved its communication with residents through social media. The engagement process with residents is different now due to different media strategies. Residents have an easier time staying engaged.

MR. PETERS emphasized that state law posting requirements for land use cases are still tightly followed. Outside timing of posting requirements for agendas remain as well.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said this zoning case timing is one area for improvement in the speed of business.

MR. WRIGHT added that the zoning code procedures are very robust even compared to other municipalities. Chandler goes above and beyond state law for zoning case requirements as far as the minimum notification radius, including HOAs, and requiring social media notification. Technology has shifted from the original charter as it was adopted in 1965.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if the example of Ordinance 5024 had run into difficulties due to the condensed Council meeting schedule.

MR. WRIGHT said this was a development wanting to have bar liquor license privileges and needed a minor rezoning. The two-week delay listed on the slide may mean it was held in the first part of the calendar year when there is only a two-week break between Council meetings.

MAYOR HARTKE said in cases with multiple municipalities adopting similar ordinances, it comes down to who is required to have two readings of an ordinance. Chandler may be delayed in a final adoption of an ordinance setting it into law due to the two readings.

MR. PETERS said the verbiage of an introduction and tentative adoption of an ordinance is sometimes confusing to residents.

MAYOR HARTKE said Council can always delay actions to push something back if Council is not ready to approve an ordinance. These options are still a part of Council actions.

MR. PETERS continued the presentation.

- Section 2.13 Action Requiring an Ordinance
 - In addition to other acts required by law or by specific provisions of this Charter to be done by ordinance, those acts of the city council shall be by ordinance which:
 - (a) Adopt or amend a city code or establish, alter or abolish any city department, office or agency.
 - (b) Provide for a fine or penalty or establish a rule or regulation for violation of which a fine or other penalty is imposed.
 - (c) Create taxes.
 - (d) Grant, renew or extend a franchise.
 - (e) Regulate the rates and fees charged for its services by a public utility.
 - (f) Authorize the borrowing of money.
 - ~~(g) Lease city lands and property for a period of three (3) years or more, or to convey same or to authorize leases for a period of three (3) years or more, or the conveyance of any lands or property of the city.~~
 - ~~(h) Reserved.~~
 - ~~(i)~~ (g) Amend or repeal any ordinance previously adopted, except as otherwise provided in Article VIII of this Charter, with respect to repeal of ordinances reconsidered under the referendum power.
 - ~~(j)~~ (h) Provide for the levy of assessments, the collection thereof, or enforcement of liens on real property within the city.
 - ~~(k)~~ (j) Provide for the appropriation or expenditure of any public money in excess of the sum of one-tenth of one per
 - cent of the then annual budget, unless the amount has been appropriated in the adopted budget.

- (k) Provide for establishing or changing fire limits.
- Section 2.15 Ordinances in General
 - (b) Procedure. ALL PROPOSED ORDINANCES SHALL EITHER BE READ IN FULL OR POSTED IN A PUBLIC PLACE AT LEAST TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOURS PRIOR TO THEIR ADOPTION, PROVIDED THAT IF ANY AMENDMENTS ARE PROPOSED TO A POSTED ORDINANCE SUCH AMENDMENTS SHALL BE PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED DURING THE PUBLIC MEETING PRIOR TO THEIR ADOPTION. ~~An ordinance may be introduced by any member at any regular or special meeting of the Council.~~
 - ~~(1) Upon introduction of any proposed ordinance, the city clerk shall distribute a copy to each Council member and to the manager. After tentative approval by the City Council, the city clerk shall file a reasonable number of copies in his office and such other public places as the Council may designate and shall publish it at least one time, by ordinance title only, together with a notice setting out the time and place for its consideration by the Council.~~
 - ~~(2) Consideration by the Council shall follow the publication within thirty (30) days. It may be held separately or in connection with a regular or special Council meeting and may be adjourned from time to time. All persons interested shall have an opportunity to be heard.~~
 - ~~(3) After consideration the Council may adopt, alter, or reject the ordinance. If it is altered, the Council may not adopt it until the ordinance or its amended sections have been subjected to all the procedures hereinbefore required in the case of a newly introduced ordinance.~~
 - ~~(4) As soon as practicable after adoption of any ordinance, the city clerk shall have it published in full at least two times, with the second publication to follow the first by at least six days.~~
 - (d) Publication of ordinances and resolutions. All ordinances and resolutions having the effect of law shall be published,
 - as required by state law or ordinance, once within fifteen (15) days of their passage.
 - (d) (e) "Publish" Defined. As used in this charter, the term "publish" means to print, at least one time, in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the city. The posting of an ordinance in one or more public places shall never be required in order to make it effective.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if this would be specific to only zoning.

MS. SCHWAB said the way this proposal is written is that it would apply to all ordinances. Council has two options: leave in the charter that ordinances changing Chandler code would go through the two-read process or Council could adopt an ordinance and put it into the code. The challenge is that it is a difficult process to amend a charter compared to city code. To allow for some flexibility, the recommendation is to proceed with this charter amendment and allow additional requirements for an ordinance that amends city code.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO clarified that the way the process is written here would apply to all ordinances.

MS. SCHWAB explained that the way it is written here would apply to all ordinances; depending on Council direction it can be changed.

MR. WRIGHT said the intention would be for this update to only apply to business related ordinances not code changing ordinances and clarity can be added through corrections before coming to Council.

MAYOR HARTKE commented that he was fine with this update for planning and zoning related ordinances and asked about the rest of Council.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked about the timing of the charter amendment going to voters at the same time as the bond authorization. There has been a significant amount of time invested in investigated bond authorization for this upcoming election. In the past, Council has put together a charter committee comprised of residents to do their due diligence in investigating proposed charter amendments. He suggested taking a step back and put the bond election as the priority.

MAYOR HARTKE said prior Council direction was to proceed without a charter review committee.

MR. WRIGHT said that there was a longer list of proposed charter amendments shared with Council and feedback received at that time was to narrow the list and provide an update to Council on how to proceed. A staff internal review was conducted through the charter of ideas that could make business processes more efficient. If the current Council direction is to take more time to study these proposed charter amendments, that can be done alongside some other identified proposed charter amendments.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said there is only one time to get the bond authorization approval correct for voters. He emphasized the importance of not diluting the subject of bond authorization approval on the ballot. He suggested forming a charter amendment review to move forward in a more logical approach to conduct proper due diligence on these amendments.

MAYOR HARTKE said there have been some stand-alone issues mandated by the legislature; some charter changes have been straight forward. He asked if there have been any other charter amendments elections that have been due to state mandates.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO mentioned the election date change to bring Chandler into alignment with state legislation was one example. Past examples may have been the franchise election with the charter amendments on the same ballot.

MS. SCHWAB said she recalls the charter election was conducted to conform with state law during a special election.

MS. DELONG said the Southwest Gas election was a franchise election held in November.

MR. PETERS mentioned that the 2026 ballot will include an APS franchise election. The charter amendments discussed here are some identified charter cleanup that echoes sentiment heard at the capital regarding housing and zoning. There is a more robust list of items that have been identified as potential charter amendments to clean up the charter that may do well in a more robust charter amendment committee.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO added that stakeholders have shared that it is not just the speed of approval of the ordinance, but the speed of business getting items to an ordinance. There are some work arounds available for individuals who have special business needs such as calling a special Council meeting for approval. He emphasized the importance of voter trust and transparency.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS said previous discussions were conducted where the timing is right to have bond and charter questions on one ballot. The work has been done to explore unobtrusive charter amendments that could go forward at the same time as bond authorization. Chandler has historically sought stakeholder input on its operations when appropriate. She encouraged moving forward with this process.

MAYOR HARTKE said the decision lies with Council to proceed with the process of charter amendments on the ballot, or to form a charter revision committee and look at a broader view of these amendments.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS requested seeing a healthy revision of charter amendments all at once with staff presentation or a charter committee. He did not want to add charter amendments to this proposed ballot.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS wanted to see charter amendments at a broader level before bringing it to the voters.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON requested holding off on charter amendments until a robust review is conducted, this is not the time to move forward on this.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS mentioned that one of the proposed charter amendments for residency requirements was due to hiring practices and losing out on a qualified candidate for a director role. He remembered having conversations about staying competitive in the job market based off this requirement.

MAYOR HARTKE noted that Council consensus is to have the upcoming election as a bond election only, without including charter amendment questions.

VICE MAYOR ELLIS asked when charter amendments would go on a ballot.

MAYOR HARTKE said charter amendments would not go forward on the November 2025 ballot.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

Mayor

Approval Date of Minutes: April 24, 2025

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 10th day of April 2025. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this _____ day of April, 2025.

City Clerk