

Meeting Minutes

City Council Work Session

December 11, 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, attended virtually
Councilmember Angel Encinas
Councilmember Jane Poston
Councilmember Matt Orlando
Councilmember OD Harris, arrived at 4:29 pm
Councilmember Jennifer Hawkins

Appointee Attendance

John Pombier, City Manager
Kelly Schwab, City Attorney
Dana DeLong, City Clerk

Staff in Attendance

Tadd Wille, Assistant City Manager
Dawn Lang, Deputy City Manager / Chief Financial Officer
Ryan Peters, Deputy City Manager
Leah Powell, Deputy City Manager
John Sefton, Community Services Director
Matt Dunbar, Budget & Policy Director
Kim Moyers, Cultural Development Director
Jeremy Abbott, Public Works & Utilities Director
Alexis Apodaca, Mayor & Council Public Affairs Senior Manager
Jennifer Ekblad, Deputy City Clerk
Hermelinda Llamas, Special Events Senior Program Manager
Chris Perez, Assistant Police Chief

Discussion

1. Proposed Citywide Fee Adjustments
 - a. Overview
 - b. Department Fee Adjustments
 - c. Timeline for Implementation

MAYOR HARTKE called for a staff presentation.

JOHN POMBIER, City Manager, introduced the discussion item.

MATT DUNBAR, Budget & Policy Director, presented the following presentation.

- Annual Fee Adjustment Council Work Session
- Citywide Fee Study and Purpose
 - Will add clarity of methodology for setting category/type or rate for consistency year to year.
 - Scope will include a review of our fees to surrounding cities to understand where Chandler is in the market and a methodology recommendation for each category/type (i.e., cost recovery, % of market, lower fixed fee for societal/safety benefit).
 - Will coordinate with studies in process (i.e. Park and Recreation master plan, Airport Strategic Plan)
 - Outcome will provide a document that clarifies the purpose of fees to our city, a recommendation on methodology and policies for setting fees by category/type, a recommended cadence of fee adjustments and a calculation methodology for fee updates.
- Fees vs. Taxes
- Overview – Fees as a Component of Total Revenue
- Overview – Fee Characteristics
 - Fees assessed for use of facilities or services benefiting specific groups
 - Ensures fees are charged to those removing public space from availability to the public for private use
 - Fees provide full or partial recovery of cost of certain services, which offsets the subsidization from the General Fund
 - Authority to charge a fee must exist in City Code (fee amounts/specifics are set by resolution for the Citywide Fee Schedule)
- Departments Proposing Fee Updates
 - Cultural Development
 - Police
 - Public Works & Utilities
 - Community Services
- Cultural Development

- Cultural Development: Special Events (Cost Recovery/Encourage Compliance)
 - Would add Temporary Sales & Promotional Events (TSPE) Application Expedited Fees:
 - Maintains zero cost for applications filed 60 days or more in advance
 - \$50 for applications submitted 46-59 days before proposed event day
 - \$100 for applications submitted 31-45 days before proposed event day
 - \$200 for applications submitted 20-30 days before proposed event day

MAYOR HARTKE asked who applications are sent to.

KIM MOYERS, Cultural Development Director, said applications are received by either herself or Hermelinda Llamas, Special Events Senior Program Manager.

MAYOR HARTKE asked how the city should handle event requests submitted within the final 20 days and what the current policy is.

MS. MOYERS clarified that the discussion concerns Temporary Sales & Promotional Events (TSPE) on private property, not on public property.

HERMELINDA LLAMAS, Special Events Senior Program Manager, explained that they attempt to accommodate late requests, but approval depends on the event's scope and regulatory requirements, particularly when alcohol is involved. In response to a request for an example, she described bars submitting last-minute requests to extend their premises, which require expedited multi-department and state review and are not always approved in time.

MAYOR HARTKE asked for an example.

MS. LLAMAS explained that a bar has put in a request for temporary extension of premises, and then Tax and License, Special Events, and Police must review their application, get it approved in time, then send it to the state for them to approve it.

MAYOR HARTKE asked whether the updated fee and policies are intended to be educational.

MS. LLAMAS confirmed that it is intended to be educational. Since Cultural Development assumed oversight of TSPE fees, staff have emphasized the 60-day submission guideline. Late applications are still accepted but may not be approved.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked whether the guidelines apply only to private property.

MS. LLAMAS confirmed the processes are different, explaining that public property events have separate and more stringent requirements.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked how many applications are submitted within shorter timeframes.

MS. LLAMAS reported that in FY 2024/25, 73 applications were received, with 35.6% submitted at least 60 days in advance and 64.3% submitted within 60 days. Of the total applications, 23 were received between 49-59 days, 12 were received between 31-45 days, 10 were received between 20-30 days, and 2 received under 20 days.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether these permits apply only to extensions of premise.

MS. LLAMAS stated that while extension of premise is the most common, permits are also used for seasonal pumpkin and tree lots and fireworks stands, retail celebrations, grand openings, and parking lot or storefront events.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON clarified that these are public events on private property, not private events.

MS. LLAMAS agreed.

MS. MOYERS added that while staff prioritize education, last-minute applications are challenging due to staffing and scheduling constraints, so they strongly encourage submission 60 days in advance.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if all special events require city approval.

MS. LLAMAS explained that many types of events require approval when they deviate from normal property use and impact parking, access, or safety. She confirmed that private residential events, such as a large gathering at a home, do not require city approval.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether a strict cutoff deadline had been considered.

MS. LLAMAS stated that while it has been discussed, the city prioritizes being business-friendly and encouraging compliance rather than issuing automatic denials.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON noted that if the expedited fee was implemented, it would be informative to see whether applicants would change their behavior or accept the added cost.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Police
- Police (Cost Recovery)
 - Would change Video Recording Copies - per report from \$25 to \$46 for up to 1st hour and \$46 prorated per hour per copy

- Would change Audio Recording Copies - per report from \$10 to \$15
- Would change Digital Photographs - per report from \$5 to \$10
- Would change Report Copies - first 35 pages from \$5 to \$10
- Would add Public Records Requests (other) of \$25
- Would add Letters of Clearance fee of \$10

MAYOR HARTKE asked if these fees recover costs rather than discourage applications.

MR. DUNBAR said these fees are intended to recover costs from staff time spent on these requests. The highest cost is the time spent on redaction and review to ensure these documents are able to be released.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if these public record requests are freedom of information requests.

MR. DUNBAR said some of them are.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked what category most of these Freedom of Information requests the department most often receives. He asked if a resident could request crime records for themselves.

CAROLE SPERANZA, Police Operations and Records Senior Manager, explained that victims of crimes receive records free of charge, regardless of the type of request.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO confirmed that these requests are free.

MS. SPERANZA said yes. She further explained that residents can request crime records, who are not victims, and they would be charged the fee.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether the press would be charged these fees.

MS. SPERANZA replied that media requests are charged, and the press is directed to submit requests via the department website and pay the associated fee.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether the fees and policies align with other communities.

MS. SPERANZA explained that the fees align with comparable municipalities. She noted that a fee for a letter of clearance was added because it had previously been the only service without a fee. She noted that other requests, such as for department emails, training records, or general correspondence not part of police or personnel records; do not currently incur a fee, though significant staff time is required to gather these documents.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether these policies had changed over the past 14 years.

MS. SPERANZA responded that they have not changed in her 14-year tenure with the city, the fees have not changed in 28 years.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether the FOIA fee is a flat rate regardless of the number of emails requested.

MS. SPERANZA explained that requesters are asked to narrow their search to specific topics, incidents, or date ranges. IT then compiles the emails, and the department or legal team redacts sensitive information. A request carries a one-time \$25 fee, regardless of volume.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how this differs from other public records requests citywide.

KELLY SCHWAB, City Attorney, responded that the city currently lacks a mechanism to charge for non-fee public records requests but is evaluating software to implement and standardize fees in the future.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether the Police Department already has the software.

MS. SCHWAB confirmed they do, while the rest of the city does not.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON questioned why the software cannot be shared citywide if feasible.

MS. SCHWAB explained that the current software used by the Police Department for records requests is so police-centric that it would not work for the rest of the city. The city is evaluating public records software that could be implemented.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked why the fee for audio recordings is increasing from \$10 to \$15.

MS. SPERANZA explained the fee had not changed in 28 years and the increase is meant to help recoup staff time.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON noted that the fees align with state public records policies and most other cities.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO added that only a few surrounding cities have comparable fees listed on the chart referenced, while Phoenix and others do not. He requested a thorough comparison of fees from other cities.

MS. SPERANZA replied that she had prepared a graph for internal reference.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if a copy could be provided.

DAWN LANG, Deputy City Manager/Chief Financial Officer, confirmed that it would be added.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if the proposed fee increase for reports is for a copy or a certified copy.

MS. SPERANZA clarified that there is no additional cost for certified copies.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked about the typical turnaround time for police reports and whether the fee changes would affect it.

MS. SPERANZA explained that completed reports are returned within 7–10 business days. Requests involving body-worn camera footage take around 12 weeks due to extensive review.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Public Works & Utilities
- Public Works & Utilities: Solid Waste Enterprise (Cost Recovery)
 - Would increase the monthly solid waste disposal fee from \$20 to \$21.05 and the additional monthly disposal fee for alley solid waste customers from \$1.61 to \$1.71, to reflect the 6% increase discussed as part of the utility increases
 - Would change the cost of Solid Waste Containers from \$148 to \$150
 - Would change the Special Collection Fee:
 - One-time special curbside refuse container pick-up from \$18.50 to \$23.50
 - One-time special alley refuse container pick-up from \$35 to \$41.50
 - Bulk material pick-up from \$35 to \$43

MAYOR HARTKE asked whether the last item would be in addition to the free request.

MR. DUNBAR said that is in addition to the four free bulk pickup and/or visits to the Recycling-Solid Waste Collection Center.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked what percentage of residents use more than four service visits.

TABITHA SAUER, Solid Waste Manager, said she will follow up with that information.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked how many residents request a missed collection be picked up.

MS. SAUER said she will follow up with that information.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Public Works & Utilities: Solid Waste Enterprise (Cost Recovery)
 - Would change the Residential use of the Recycling Solid Waste Collection Center Fee from \$50 to \$70 per ton prorated in 20 lb. increments
 - Would change City Services per ton fee from \$50 to \$70
 - Would change the Recycling Solid Waste Collection per-visit fee for the first 400lbs of material from \$10 to \$14 (after all free visits used)

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how other cities cover the cost of solid waste containers.

MR. DUNBAR explained that other cities typically spread those costs among all utility ratepayers, Chandler charges the actual cost to individuals who require additional or replacement containers.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said that Chandler may be the only city addressing this fee in this way. He said the percentages of use of the population would be important to review in the use case.

MS. SAUER added that the referenced fee applies to the initial containers provided to new construction homes and is typically included in construction permit fees. Usually, the construction company is the one paying for a brand new trash and recycling can.

MAYOR HARTKE asked how normal wear and tear is handled.

MR. DUNBAR stated that standard wear and tear is built into the solid waste fee, while damage caused by misuse results in a replacement charge.

MAYOR HARTKE asked for other examples of damage compared to normal wear and tear.

MS. SAUER explained that the \$75 fee also applies when residents request an additional or replacement container for personal preference, like a new container when moving into an existing home. Older refurbished cans are recycled for distribution for worn containers.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Community Services
- Community Services: Overview
 - Fees not being adjusted: camps, facility entrance fees, swimming fees, library use, and non-exclusive use of facilities.
- Community Services: Library (Cost Recovery)
 - Would change black and white copy fee from \$0.10 per page to \$0.15
 - Would change color copy fee from \$0.25 per page to \$0.50

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS expressed concern about increasing fees for residents who already subsidize services and suggested a lower rate for residents and a higher rate for non-residents.

MR. DUNBAR explained that the intent of the fee is to avoid residents subsidizing individual printing costs, while still offering copies at a discounted rate. He said from a policy standpoint, if Council wants to adjust how this is handled, they have the ability to do so. The intent was to cover general costs associated with printing.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS expressed concern about fee increases for residents and suggested revisiting the issue to explore alternative cost and staffing approaches.

MAYOR HARTKE stated that he supports the approach and emphasized that the intent is to avoid having taxpayers subsidize individual uses, individuals should pay for services they personally request.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO stated that extensive copying can tie up library machines and delay other users and noted that even with the fees, the city's rates remain lower than comparable municipalities.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how the Library Board had previously lowered fees and why the issue is now returning to Council.

JOHN SEFTON, Community Services Director, explained that Council delegated fee authority to the Library Board, which lowered fees in 2022 after securing a more affordable contract. He noted the item is returning to Council for transparency and inclusion in the fee schedule. The proposed increase reflects higher costs and significant staff time required for large print jobs.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked why, if the Library Board previously lowered the fees, the issue is now being considered by Council rather than returned to the Library Board.

MR. SEFTON explained that this item did return to the Library Board, these fees are their recommendation.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS stated that he does not want commissions making policy decisions on fees or pricing and asked the City Manager to review the process.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Community Services: Sport Facilities (Exclusive Use)
 - New Archery Range Tournament Fee (Semi-Private)
 - Resident: \$20/hr. min. 4 hrs.
 - Non-resident: \$27/hr. min. 4 hrs.
 - Commercial: \$30/hr. min. 4 hrs.
 - New Pickleball Tournament Fee (Semi-Private)
 - Resident: \$10/hr. per court

- Non-resident: \$14/hr. per court
- Commercial: \$15/hr. per court

MAYOR HARTKE asked if this would apply to any pickleball court across the city.

MR. DUNBAR responded that it would apply to any court that someone would apply for exclusive use during a specific hour.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked how the proposed fees compare with those of professional pickleball facilities and whether the city would be competing with or undercutting them.

MR. SEFTON said the city isn't competing with private facilities and aims to accommodate exclusive requests with a cost contribution per policy. The city will not rent entire complexes unless it is for city programs. Upcoming fee and master plan studies will offer market analysis. Current prices are fair.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked which courts would be included and whether courts should be specifically designated for tournaments.

MR. SEFTON explained that the city has single pickleball courts: six courts at Arrowhead, and 18 courts at Tumbleweed, with tournaments primarily focused at Arrowhead and Tumbleweed. Additional indoor courts, school partnerships, and other facilities help meet demand, and participation continues to grow.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS expressed concern about oversight, permitting, and defining what constitutes a tournament.

MR. SEFTON explained that tournaments would be coordinated through the Recreation team using reservation software and permits, similar to room or ramada reservations, with QR code verification where applicable. He emphasized that entire complexes would not be rented to outside groups and that the goal is to respond to community demand for organized tournaments.

MAYOR HARTKE asked how court clearing and enforcement would work for extended reservations.

MR. SEFTON stated that the fee is intended for organized tournaments, not casual play, and that staff presence would generally be limited to larger events to ensure readiness, rather than active enforcement for every reservation.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked why there was no minimum time requirement for pickleball reservations, unlike archery, and suggested that a minimum might reduce one-hour reservations.

MR. SEFTON stated that the issue would be addressed.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Community Services: Recreation (Cost Recovery)
 - Community Recreation Program and Specialized Fitness Classes Formula Modification –the formula establishes the fee to participate in classes such as; arts/crafts, pom & cheer, dance, Spanish, photography, martial arts, ceramics, Zumba, racquetball, yoga, spin, tai chi, etc.
 - Community Programming: (Class Length + Prep Time) x # of days x 3.75 (was 2.75) Factor Rate (includes wages) + \$Program Supply Cost pp + \$5 Admin (was \$3) = participant cost
 - Specialized Fitness: (Class Length + Prep Time) x # of days x 5.5 (was 4.5) Factor Rate (includes wages) + \$5 Admin (was \$3) = participant cost

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether participation is tracked and whether higher costs could discourage participation.

MR. SEFTON responded that participation is closely tracked. Participation in classes remains strong.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO requested participation data for the past ten years, broken down by program type, with particular attention to youth programs.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked whether the data distinguishes between resident and non-resident fees.

MR. SEFTON confirmed that it does.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Community Services: Recreation (Cost Recovery)
 - Would change the Education Exploration costs as follows:
 - Up to 30 students: Resident fee from \$65 to \$78, Non-resident from \$88 to \$106
 - Up to 31-60 students : Resident fee from \$169 to \$203, Non-resident from \$229 to \$275
 - Up to 61-90 students : Resident fee from \$283 to \$340, Non-resident from \$383 to \$460

MAYOR HARTKE asked for an example of the proposed fee change.

MR. SEFTON explained that the Education Exploration Program at the Nature Center where trained staff is leading activities for youth groups like scouts, homeschoolers, and schools. He

noted a 20% fee increase, the first since 2008, to cover rising costs. The program is popular; there were 50 experiences scheduled for 2024–2025.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON questioned the significant fee increase between groups of 30 and 31 participants and suggested a flatter, per-participant fee structure.

MR. SEFTON responded that the increase is due to the need for an additional staff member for more than 30 participants.

MR. DUNBAR continued the presentation.

- Community Services: Recreation (Cost Recovery)
 - Would change the Birthday Party Packages (1 to 10 children) costs:
 - Birthday Party Package: Resident fee from \$80 to \$96, Non-resident from \$108 to \$130
 - Nature Options Birthday Party Package: Resident fee from \$100 to \$120, Non-resident from \$130 to \$156
 - Sportacular Fun Options Birthday Party Package: Resident fee from \$130 to \$156, Non-resident from \$176 to \$211
 - Creative Delight, Outdoor Bounce, Main Event and Theme Option Birthday Party Package: Resident fee from \$155 to \$186, Non-resident from \$210 to \$252
 - Would remove the Birthday Party Add-Ons Fee (i.e. cake, pizza, drinks, etc. Cost of Goods + 50% markup = Retail Price
- Timeline
- Questions?

2. New Parking Lot Program Update

This item was not presented at this meeting.

3. Streets Pavement Maintenance Program Update

JEREMY ABBOTT, Public Works & Utilities Director, presented the following presentation.

- Streets Pavement Maintenance Program
- The Big Picture
 - Chandler maintains ≈ 2,090 lane miles (LM) of streets
 - Current overall Pavement Quality Index (PQI) = 65.8 (out of 100)
 - Aspirational goal = 70 Baseline = 65
 - Higher funding is needed to hold the line and/or improve

CHARLIE SERNA, Streets Maintenance & Operations Superintendent, presented the following slides.

- How We Measure Pavement Condition
 - Rating system is Pavement Quality Index (PQI)
 - PQI Scale 1–100 (100 = best)
 - PQI calculation criteria:
 - Surface Distress Index (SDI) → PCI* equivalent
 - Ride Comfort Index (RCI)
 - Structural Adequacy Index (SAI)
 - Measured every 4-5 years by consultant
 - Most recent survey completed Nov. 2023 for FY 2024-25
 - *PQI is stricter than the common Pavement Condition Index (PCI) scale used by most cities

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked for clarification on whether the discussion included surface distress in addition to other calculation criteria, and on how important surface distress is compared to other factors.

MR. SERNA responded that surface condition is important, but structural integrity is critical. He explained that PCI evaluates only visible conditions, while structural conditions exist beneath the pavement.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how the structural adequacy index is measured.

MR. SERNA explained that it refers to the subgrade and native materials below the pavement surface.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked what other cities that do not use this approach are doing in the calculation of PQI criteria.

MR. ABBOTT explained that PCI and SDI focus primarily on surface appearance, whereas the city's broader pavement-quality approach evaluates both the surface and the underlying structure. He noted that PCI scores may appear higher because they ignore subsurface deterioration, which can allow moisture intrusion and accelerate structural failure.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether the city's approach differs from other cities in how underground conditions are handled.

MR. ABBOTT stated that the difference lies not in construction practices but in evaluation over the pavement's life cycle with holistic criteria.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether this approach increases costs.

MR. ABBOTT replied that there can be a higher cost in addressing the structure of the pavement, but ignoring structural issues leads to higher long-term costs due to deterioration.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how lifecycle costs are measured when only surface treatments are applied.

MR. ABBOTT explained that treating only the surface results in faster degradation, eventually requiring more extensive repairs. He added that the city uses different treatment strategies that address subsurface and structural conditions to extend pavement life.

MAYOR HARTKE summarized the concept by comparing it to repeatedly applying slurry seal to improve PCI appearance without addressing deeper structural needs.

MR. ABBOTT confirmed that was correct, surface treatment does not compare to structural improvements.

MR. SERNA continued the presentation.

- Where Chandler Stands Today (2025)
- Chandler vs. Neighboring Cities

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked how maintaining a pavement quality index (PQI) of 65, rather than the ideal 70, affects roadway longevity, durability, and cost-effectiveness.

MR. ABBOTT responded that the presentation outlines how different treatment applications influence PQI and noted that the 65.8 figure represents a citywide average, as individual roadways are evaluated separately.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked how long the city could expect to remain at a PQI of 65.

MR. ABBOTT stated that without maintenance, PQI would decline by approximately three to five points per year. He explained that ongoing maintenance is required just to maintain the current average and that doing nothing would result in rapid deterioration.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked whether increasing the PQI to 70 would extend roadway lifespan.

MR. ABBOTT responded that it would, noting that increased and timely maintenance generally results in longer pavement life.

MR. SERNA continued the presentation.

- Typical Lifestyle of Chandler Roadway Sections
 - The untreated life expectancy of a roadway is 20-25 years

- Can be impacted by construction quality, traffic loads, weather, oxidation & sun
- Year 0 → New construction or full repave (+ ADA upgrades)
- Year 1-3 → Rejuvenator coat
- Year 3-7 → 1st Seal coat
- Year 8-14 → Slurry seals (every 5-7 years)
- Year 15-25+ → Continued preservation or major repave again
- Goal → Intervene early and often to avoid expensive reconstruction
- Treatment Toolbox & Triggers

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how detailed the location of the pavement data is.

MR. SERNA explained that every street in Chandler receives its own rating, broken down by street sections rather than long segments. He noted that a road such as McQueen Boulevard is divided into multiple sections, allowing evaluations at varying lengths depending on conditions.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether treatments are limited to only the specific areas identified as needing work.

MR. SERNA responded that while data may flag a small segment, staff conduct field evaluations of the entire area to ensure treatments are applied logically and cost-effectively. He emphasized that decisions consider structural condition, ride quality, and surface condition together to determine the appropriate scope of work.

MR. SERNA continued the presentation.

- What Drives the Highest Costs
 - ADA - Mandated curb ramp & sidewalk upgrades are required on every Mill & Overlay project
 - ADA now consumes ~ 1/3 of the repaving budget
 - Typical split (FY 2023-24 actuals):
- Annual Preservation Treatments

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether crack sealing increases the pavement quality index (PQI).

MR. SERNA responded that crack sealing provides minimal improvement to PQI, but it does help maintain the pavement structure by reducing moisture and contaminants entering the subgrade which prevents further deterioration.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if the condition does not worsen as a result.

MR. SERNA clarified that crack sealing maintains the current condition but does not significantly improve the PQI. It also prevents plants from growing in cracks.

MR. SERNA continued the presentation.

- The Inflation Challenge

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked whether the city maintains a prioritized list of roadway areas identified for future work and how soon issues are addressed once identified.

MR. SERNA explained that staff develops programs based on roadway needs, incorporating one-to two-year plans to ensure emerging issues are addressed. He noted that ADA improvements are typically scheduled six to twelve months in advance due to notification requirements and coordination with private property owners. For arterial roadways, planning typically occurs 1 to 2 years in advance, reflecting the complexity of the process.

MAYOR HARTKE asked how the city coordinates with utility providers to prevent newly repaved roads from being cut shortly after completion.

MR. SERNA responded that staff coordinate with utility companies through the GIS team and provide advance notice of planned work. He explained that mill-and-overlay projects carry a two-year cut restriction that prohibits utility cuts, while other surface treatments currently do not have cut restrictions.

MR. SERNA continued the presentation.

- Recent Progress
 - PQI Trend (3-year rolling average)
 - 2016 → 59 (low point)
 - 2019 → 69.5 (peak)
 - 2023 → 61.0
 - 2024 → 64.5
 - 2025 → 65.8 ↑
 - \$30M in one-time General Fund additions
 - (FY 2023–2026) has moved the needle
- Path Forward
 - To maintain or enhance current PQI (65.8):
 - → Need approximately \$5M/year General Fund support on top of existing Bonds and HURF in CIP
 - To reach and hold aspirational PQI 70:
 - → Requires sustained higher investment (HURF + Bonds + General Fund)
 - 2025 Voter Approved Street Bond program = \$12.1 M per/year — a strong start

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO clarified that staff were requesting an additional \$5 million on top of the existing \$12.1 million, for a total of \$17.1 million.

MR. SERNA confirmed this amount.

DAWN LANG, Deputy City Manager / Chief Financial Officer, clarified that the funding consists of \$12.1 million in bond funding, \$5 million from the General Fund, and existing Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) funding, totaling approximately \$20.7 million to maintain or enhance the roadway program.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if other cities are spending similar amounts on roadway maintenance.

MR. ABBOTT stated that contractual per-lane-mile costs across the comparable municipalities are similar.

MR. SERNA added that Chandler often uses cooperative use contacts that outside organizations have with contractors, resulting in comparable pricing and costs across the region.

MAYOR HARTKE summarized that while funding levels may vary, costs are comparable because the same contractors are used.

MR. SERNA continued the presentation.

- In Summary
 - Chandler’s roads are fair (PQI 65.8) but will decline without more funding
 - Early preservation is 5–10× cheaper than reconstruction
 - ADA requirements and inflation have significantly raised costs
 - Recent funding increases are helping — continued investment is critical
- Thank you! Questions?

Public Comment

None.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

Mayor

Approval Date of Minutes: January 22, 2026

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 11th day of December 2025. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this _____ day of January, 2026.

City Clerk