

Meeting Minutes

City Charter Amendment

Resident Advisory Committee

Regular Meeting

November 17, 2025 | 4:30 p.m.
Council Chambers Conference Room
88 E. Chicago St., Chandler, AZ



Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lopez at 4:32 p.m.

Roll Call

Commission Attendance

Chair René Lopez
Committee Member Heather Anguiano
Committee Member Sherida McMullan
Committee Member Lisa Askey
Committee Member Jim Jurnak
Committee Member Jennifer Pawlik
Committee Member Allison Stewart

Staff Attendance

Ryan Peters, Deputy City Manager
Jen Winkler, Assistant City Attorney
Jennifer Ekblad, Deputy City Clerk

Absent

Committee Member Ursula Gordwin
Committee Member Brad Davis

Consent Agenda and Discussion

1. October 2025 City Charter Amendment Resident Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Move City Charter Amendment Resident Advisory Committee approve the meeting minutes of the October 15, 2025, Regular Meeting.

Consent Agenda Motion and Vote

Committee Member Pawlik moved to approve the Consent Agenda of the November 17, 2025, City Charter Amendment Resident Advisory Committee Meeting; Seconded by Committee Member Anguiano.

Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Discussion & Possible Action

2. Review of Proposed Revisions to Chandler City Charter - Discussion and Possible Action

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK recommended that the Charter amendments presented to Council are clear, concise, and consistent. He asked how the committee would plan on presenting these items to Council so it could cleanly transition to the ballot. He identified some additional grammar updates are needed in the proposed revisions for consistency in capitalization.

CHAIR LOPEZ said after the committee has approved the proposed revisions, then he and staff will draft a presentation to Council with the committee's recommendations. The committee is limited to recommendations to Council. The next step for the committee is to approve the revisions they would like to move forward with.

RYAN PETERS, Deputy City Manager, presented the following presentation.

- City Charter Amendment Resident Advisory Committee
- 3 Categories of Amendments
- Non-Substantive Changes
- Time to Vote

Committee Member Pawlik moved to recommend to Council the proposed non-substantive revisions to Sections 2.01, 2.03, 2.04, 2.07, 2.09, 2.10, 2.11, 2.14, 2.15, 2.17, 2.18, Articles III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII addressing gender neutrality, grammar and punctuation, elimination of technical legal language or wordiness, and consistency of capitalization; seconded by Committee Member Jurnak.

Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

MR. PETERS continued the presentation.

- Non-Substantive and Clarifying
- Time to Vote

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK asked about the differences among the categories presented: non-substantive, clarifying, and substantive changes.

JEN WINKLER, Assistant City Attorney, explained that the summary document with the color coding was staff's best efforts to categorize the information in an efficient way to be voted on. It does not have an impact on the presentation or vote of the information by the committee. The purpose is not for a legal category, but for categorization for ease of process by the committee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK asked about the edited language in section 2.02, "no ordinance increasing such salary shall become effective until after the next Council election following the adoption of the ordinance."

MR. PETERS explained that the language was included due to discussion held at a previous meeting, to ensure that no sitting Council can vote on their own compensation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK gave an example where a councilmember could vote on a compensation increase in July, be reelected in August, and then begin their second term in January with the increase in effect. He shared that the change could be perceived negatively by the public.

CHAIR LOPEZ asked what the purpose behind this revision was.

MR. PETERS explained that this was suggested for the ease of the agenda process.

CHAIR LOPEZ asked if other municipalities have a similar rule.

MR. PETERS said Tucson's rule is an increase is only effective upon the approval of voters, Tempe's rule is an increase is effective after the next election, Mesa's rule is after the next election, Phoenix's rule is by approval by a commission and voters, and Glendale's rule is that an increase goes to the voters. Chandler was the only one with a time limit.

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 1.03; seconded by Committee Member Pawlik.

Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 2.02; seconded by Committee Member Askey.

Motion passed by majority (6-1), Committee Member Jurnak dissenting.

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 2.12; seconded by Committee Member McMullan.

Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 2.16; seconded by Committee Member Anguiano.

Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Article X; seconded by Committee Member Pawlik.

Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

MR. PETERS continued the presentation.

- Substantive Changes

[discussion begins 32:57]

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK made comments on sections 2.05 - Prohibitions and 2.06 - Vacancies; forfeiture of office; filling of vacancies. He explained that councilmembers running for other political offices are not considered in 2.05a. He suggested this be broadened to include other offices such as local, county, state, or federal elected positions then they should resign from their position on City Council upon filing the nomination papers for that office. Then Council shall fill the vacancy created by the resignation in accordance with section 6.02(a). He said the proposed language is not clear regarding the requirements of when a councilmember must resign to run for political office.

CHAIR LOPEZ asked what the specific concern with Section 2.05 was.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK explained the existing language is muddled and does not reflect the requirement that a councilmember must resign to run for any political office, not just mayor.

CHAIR LOPEZ read the section and commented that it does not need to mention specific political offices, as it says "except where authorized by law, no councilmember shall hold any other elected public office or City of Chandler employment during the term for which they were elected to the council."

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK suggested adding simpler language to cover all elected public offices in both sections. He suggested the following change to Section 2.05a.1, "if a Council member including a mayor, with more than one year remaining in their term files to run for another office, elective office, city, county state or federal, they shall have resign upon filing the nomination papers for that office. The City Council shall fill the vacancy created in accordance with section 2.06. He then suggested the following change to Section 2.05.a.2: no former mayor or councilmen shall hold any compensated city, appointed city office or employment until two years after the expiration of their elected or appointed term." He remarked that the language reading

“or until they cease to occupy the office of councilmember or mayor, whichever comes later” is confusing and is not necessary.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ASKEY asked about a situation where there is less than one year remaining in someone’s term.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK said if there was less than a year remaining on someone’s term, it would not apply.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ASKEY noted a previous Chandler councilmember had resigned from Council when they had less than a year left on their term. She asked if the resignation of a councilmember had happened in the past as a courtesy when running for other offices or due to the Charter requirement.

CHAIR LOPEZ noted that one past example is that a councilmember resigned the day before filing nomination petitions for other office and that resignation is required by Arizona Revised Statutes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK clarified that his suggestion is to simplify the requirement of members of Council resigning to run for elected office. The issue is does a councilmember have to resign to run for other office. It depends on where they are in their term. If someone has less than a year on their term, the answer is no. If someone has more than a year on their term, then they must resign as required by state law.

CHAIR LOPEZ asked for more information on the state statute and how it applies to other elected office submitting nomination petitions.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PAWLIK asked about the difference between submitting a candidate statement of interest and submitting nomination petitions.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ASKEY noted that nomination forms and petitions, depending on the office, are typically available well before the nomination period for that office.

CHAIR LOPEZ asked if the suggestion was that someone should resign when they submit a candidate statement of interest to gather signatures, or when someone submit nomination petitions.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK said he meant when someone submits nomination petitions. He wanted to make the language clear in the Charter regarding the mayor and councilmembers.

COMMITTEE MEMBER PAWLIK said the committee previously discussed changing part of Section 2.05.a.1 to change the requirement from resigning at the time of taking out nomination papers or 105 days before the primary election to be resigning at the time of filing nomination papers.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK said the language is in conflict with language in Section 2.06.

COMMITTEE MEMBER STEWART asked if an existing councilmember were to run for the office of mayor in 2026, would they have to resign.

CHAIR LOPEZ explained that it depended on how long they had left in their term. Someone who was just elected in 2024 would have to resign, but someone who was elected in 2022 would not, as they would have less than one year remaining in their term in 2026.

MR. PETERS said the substantive change identified by staff in Section 2.05 was the change from resigning at the time of taking out nomination papers or 105 days before the primary election to be resigning at the time of filing nomination papers.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK said the other sections in 2.06 do not address the case of a councilmember vacancy if they resigned to pursue other elected office.

CHAIR LOPEZ said it depends on how much time remains until the next election. The committee previously suggested the change to Section 2.06.c that the Council has 45 days to appoint someone to a vacancy, and if they do not appoint someone to the vacancy there must be a special election.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK pointed out an inconsistency in Section 2.05.a.1 that determined that a vacancy created by a councilmember resigning to run for other elected office should be appointed by Council, and if no appointment is made, then the seat shall remain vacant until the next regular election.

CHAIR LOPEZ noted that the state statute language regarding this issue does not have a time limit on it, only that someone must resign from their current existing office when filing nomination petitions for another elected office.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK emphasized using clear language to clearly define the term requirement.

MR. PETERS recommended if the committee directs staff to work on developing the language in these sections, new language would be provided at a future meeting for consideration.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK said the Charter addresses prohibitions and holding office for mayor and councilmembers.

CHAIR LOPEZ noted that the Charter could not govern outside of Chandler elected offices.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ASKEY commented that the option other than councilmembers running for mayor is a mayor wanting to run for office of councilmember.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK said it should apply to anyone, mayor or councilmember, who wants to run for any other elected office.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MCMULLAN asked if a reference to the statute can be included in the Charter.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK emphasized the importance of presenting a Charter amendment that is clear to Council and voters.

MS. WINKLER said staff will follow up on state statute requirements for cities. She recommended staff would revise the proposed amendments to present to the committee at a future meeting, where a vote would be taken.

Committee Member Anguiano moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 2.08; seconded by Chair Lopez.

Motion passed by majority (5-2), Committee Member Journak and Committee Member Pawlik dissenting.

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 2.13; seconded by Committee Member Askey.

Motion passes by majority (5-2), Committee Member Journak and Committee Member Pawlik dissenting.

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 9.02; seconded by Committee Member McMullan.

Motion passed unanimously (7-0).

COMMITTEE MEMBER JURNAK made a suggestion for Section 9.03, commenting that appointive officers and department directors need not be residents of the city at the time of their appointment, but must become a resident within six months. He suggested that Council may waive the requirement for residency for up to six months. The residency requirement shall be waived for a city employee with at least two years of continuous service who is promoted from within to a department head or manager position directly reporting to the city manager. All other city employees must reside within a reasonable distance of the city as defined by the Council.

CHAIR LOPEZ commented that the reasonable distance for employees is the determination of managers, department directors, HR, and City Manager.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANGUIANO commented that she appreciated the inclusion of “may” in the Section 9.03 language “and the City Council may require any other position appointed by the City Council to establish residency in the city”.

Chair Lopez moved to recommend to Council the proposed revisions to Section 9.03; seconded by Committee Member McMullan.

Motion passed by majority (5-2), Committee Member Journak and Committee Member Pawlik dissenting.

3. Discussion and Consideration of Potential Charter Revisions Proposed by Individual Committee Members

This item was not discussed.

Calendar

4. The next Regular Meeting date, time, and location will be determined at the meeting.

Committee consensus was to meet on Monday, December 1 at 4:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers Conference Room, pending location availability.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

Ryan Peters, Staff Liaison

René Lopez, Chair