

Meeting Minutes

City Council Work Session

April 9, 2026 | 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 Angel Encinas
Councilmember Christine Ellis
Councilmember Jane Poston
Councilmember Matt Orlando
*Councilmember OD Harris
Councilmember Jennifer Hawkins

Appointee Attendance

John Pombier, City Manager
Tawn Kao, Deputy City Attorney
Jennifer Ekblad, City Clerk

*Councilmember Harris attended virtually.

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
Marge Zylla, Strategic Initiatives Director
Jason Sieczkowski, Assistant Police Chief
Tera Scherer, Executive Coordinator
Riann Balch, Neighborhood Resources Director
Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager
Dawn Gingerich, Assistant City Attorney
Matt Burdick, Communications & Public Affairs Director
John Sefton, Community Services Director
Bryan Chapman, Police Chief

Discussion

1. Discussion and Presentation of Possible Amendments to the Chandler Municipal Code Related to Bird Feeding and E-Bikes

MAYOR HARTKE called for a staff presentation.

JOHN POMBIER, City Manager, introduced the discussion item.

TADD WILLE, Assistant City Manager, presented the following presentation.

- E-Bike Policy Work Session
- Where we are | Context Recap
- Today's Decisions – at a Glance

MAYOR HARTKE commented that the seven decisions up for consideration were developed through discussion in the Council subcommittee.

MR. WILLE agreed and added that consideration was given to best practices seen across other Arizona municipalities and nationwide.

MR. WILLE continued the presentation.

- Decision 1 of 7 | Helmet Requirements (Riders under 18)

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS asked if helmets are required for regular bicycle riders under 18 years old.

JASON CRAMPTON, Transportation Planning Manager, said no.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said he would prefer to be consistent with other cities. He asked whether the city would work with schools and bicycle shops to share information.

MR. WILLE said yes, once regulations are in place, education will be a focus.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said he is in favor of requiring helmets for all e-bike riders under 18 years old.

MAYOR HARTKE said even though potential decisions would not be in place by the Annual Family Bike Ride, it is a good place to share messaging about bike helmet safety.

Council was in consensus on requiring helmets for all e-bike riders under 18 years old.

MR. CRAMPTON continued the presentation.

- Decision 2 of 7 | Age Restriction – Class 3 e-bikes (28 mph)

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked if this applied to riding e-bikes in the bike lane on the road or on sidewalks.

MR. CRAMPTON shared that it was a separate consideration before Council tonight and would be shared later in the presentation. This question would restrict the age range for each e-bike classification, not where they can ride.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how a Class 3 e-bike is recognized in an enforcement scenario.

MR. CRAMPTON said it could be based on the bike's speed, and some locally sold e-bikes have a sticker or indicator to show the class.

JASON SIECZKOWSKI, Assistant Police Chief, added that it would be up to the officer performing the stop to either observe the sticker on the e-bike, check the e-bike's speed, or ask the rider if they know what class the e-bike is.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS expressed concerns about officers' ability to identify e-bike classes and asked what that looks like in practice.

MR. POMBIER said the main priority will be education about new potential enforcement through bike shops, schools, and other resources. Enforcement will be considered down the line; the goal is education and voluntary compliance. E-bike enforcement will present enforcement risks; the goal will be to get regulations in place, then begin education. The city will work with neighboring jurisdictions to get input on what has been effective in enforcement.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked if there was communication between Chandler and the school districts located within the city.

MAYOR HARTKE said communication between Chandler and school districts has not yet occurred on this issue because there is no ordinance yet in place. Mayor Hartke asked if Councilmember Harris meant that school districts provided input on this topic.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS clarified he meant school district input and buy-in and emphasized collaboration with various stakeholders on this topic.

MR. POMBIER said the city has had preliminary conversations with the school district, but the district is seeking direction from the city. He added that all these school districts have schools in multiple cities, and the more consistent Chandler can be with neighboring jurisdictions, the more consistent the school districts can be in providing messaging to students and families. The goal of

the decision points presented today is to get direction from Council on how the city can move forward, and then share that document with City Council, school districts, and the public to gather their input.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said he would like to see a follow-up with school districts and education partners around Chandler and other municipalities.

MAYOR HARTKE noted that the city would seek collaboration and input from school districts and other stakeholders on the remaining seven decisions.

Council was in consensus on requiring a minimum age of 16 to ride Class 3 e-bikes.

MR. CRAMPTON continued the presentation.

- Decision 3 of 7 | Age Restriction – Class 1 & 2 e-bikes

MAYOR HARTKE commented that he sees widespread e-bike use among middle and high schoolers in the community and supported this decision.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON shared concerns about the enforcement of this requirement.

BRYAN CHAPMAN, Police Chief, said it can be difficult to determine children's ages; officers may focus more on rider behavior and safety than on observable age, and then provide education.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if the age restriction would be helpful in enforcement.

CHIEF CHAPMAN emphasized that this is a Council policy decision; officers would provide education and enforcement in accordance with whatever the Council supported.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked why age 12 was picked as the minimum age to ride Class 1 & 2 e-bikes independently.

MR. WILLE said 12 was chosen to allow e-bike use for middle and high school students.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS commented that he was focused on the Class 3 e-bikes and helmet use.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked for more information on what a no change – no age restriction would look like.

MR. WILLE said anyone of any age could ride an electric bicycle that could go up to 20 mph.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO noted that other municipalities have age restrictions, such as 14 or 16 years old.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if there is an age restriction for electric scooters.

MR. CRAMPTON said there is no age limit for personally owned electric scooters, but there may be an age restriction on scooter rental apps that participate in Chandler.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how fast electric scooters go.

MR. CRAMPTON said electric scooters can travel up to 15 mph.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO noted that electric bikes are harder to stop than regular bicycles, which may be difficult for children and teenagers to manage. He said he was in favor of a minimum age.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS said an aspect of this is parental preference and education.

Council was in consensus to not require a minimum age to ride Class 1 & 2 e-bikes independently.

MR. WILLE continued the presentation.

- Decision 4 of 7 | Sidewalk Access – Class 3 e-bikes (28 mph)

MAYOR HARTKE asked whether enforcement would focus on observable issues, such as Class 3 e-bikes riding at 28 mph on sidewalks, rather than Class 3 e-bikes riding at a controlled speed.

CHIEF CHAPMAN said enforcement would depend on rider behavior, including safety risks to pedestrians.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS commented about the enforcement of sidewalk access and any related enforcement costs, noting he would like to see Class 3 allowed on sidewalks.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS said she would prefer to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes on sidewalks.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS said she would prefer to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes on sidewalks.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON said she would like to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes from sidewalks.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS said he would like to see Class 3 allowed on sidewalks, as sometimes the bike lane can be hazardous on the road.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said he would like to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes on sidewalks.

MAYOR HARTKE said he would like to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes on sidewalks.

Council was in consensus to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes from riding on Chandler sidewalks.

MR. WILLE continued the presentation.

- Decision 5 of 7 | Sidewalk Access – class 1 & 2 e-bikes

MAYOR HARTKE asked the Council which option they would prefer, noting consensus from each councilmember.

Council was in consensus to allow Class & 2 e-bikes on Chandler sidewalks.

MR. WILLE continued the presentation.

- Decision 6 of 7 | Speed Limits on Sidewalks

MAYOR HARTKE shared that he had experienced fast speeds from an e-bike while a pedestrian and was in favor of a speed limit.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether the speed limit would be posted physically.

MR. POMBIER said it would most likely not be physically posted; it would be a tool for parents to share information on the restrictions with their children.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked how this information would be posted and communicated to riders.

MR. POMBIER noted that there would likely be few speed limit stops due to this restriction, but it would improve pedestrian and bicyclist interactions.

MAYOR HARTKE added that speed limits could be posted around schools in common areas where bikes are ridden.

MR. POMBIER said any posted bike speed limit signs would need to be posted in areas where it would not conflict with road speed limit signs.

Council was in consensus to set a speed limit for Class 1 & 2 e-bikes on sidewalks.

MR. CRAMPTON continued the presentation.

- Decision 7 of 7 | E-bikes in City Parks

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if trails are considered under this decision as well.

MR. CRAMPTON explained that most of the trails that are not along canals are within city parks. This could apply to city-owned trails as well. It would not apply to SRP canals, as SRP-owned canal trails prohibit e-bikes.

MAYOR HARTKE noted that speed limits for e-bikes could not be posted on SRP canal trails as e-bikes are prohibited.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON said she wanted the most consistent option that aligns with the earlier consensus on the sidewalk and speed limit.

Council was in consensus to allow Class 1 & 2 e-bikes in Chandler city parks with a speed limit, and to prohibit Class 3 e-bikes.

MR. CRAMPTON continued the presentation.

- Included in Ordinance | Night Safety Equipment
- Decision Summary | Council Direction Record

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO commented that with the consistent speed limit on sidewalks, city parks, and trails, the e-bike speed limit could be posted in parks.

MR. CRAMPTON continued the presentation.

- Education, Outreach & Signage

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS emphasized the importance of outreach before it comes back as an ordinance.

MAYOR HARTKE said schools would be allowed to provide input on this topic.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS stressed the importance of collecting input from schools and community members on this topic before an ordinance comes back to Council for a vote.

MAYOR HARTKE agreed and said more information can be shared when this item returns to Council.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked for the time frame for approval of the ordinance.

MR. POMBIER said the goal would be to complete the ordinance before the end of the school year so that the city can work with schools on education.

MAYOR HARTKE suggested this could come back at one of the May Council meetings.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON suggested using digital advertising to get the word out.

MAYOR HARTKE asked how law enforcement would respond to individuals who do not comply with the e-bike restrictions.

ASSISTANT CHIEF SIECZKOWSKI said the intention would be to communicate with the parents or family and connect with other resources, such as a school's School Resource Officer, to curb unsafe behaviors.

- E-Bike Policy Work session

MR. WILLE presented the following presentation.

- Bird Feeding Policy
- Background

RIANN BALCH, Neighborhood Resources Director, continued the presentation.

- Decision 1 Should Chandler add a specific bird-feeding ordinance?

MAYOR HARTKE asked how the current infestation ordinance would apply to code complaints regarding pigeons.

MS. BALCH said the current ordinance does not cover bird feeding. Some other municipalities have specific ordinances related to bird feeding. The existing Chandler city code addresses nuisances caused by birds.

MAYOR HARTKE asked how a new provision for bird feeding would have clear enforcement thresholds.

MS. BALCH said evidence of an infestation or nuisance would require inspection by a code officer who would observe the issue.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked how code enforcement would inspect a complaint.

TAWN KAO, Deputy City Attorney, began explaining that a complaint from a resident may include pictures or witness testimony that could allow a code enforcement officer to open a case and begin an investigation.

MR. POMBIER explained that part of this process involved reviewing enforcement tactics and ensuring the city is following current law. In a situation where there's clear evidence, a resident is willing to testify, and they have video, that will be enough for the city to proceed without a code enforcement officer viewing it themselves. If that is not enough, it gives enough to start an investigation. If a code enforcement officer is standing on a public sidewalk and they can see a violation, or if they're invited in by a resident and they can see it, that is allowable and does not violate the law. Officers cannot enter someone's backyard without consent.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS requested more information on how evidence would be obtained in a case related to this topic and the city's legal standing.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO noted that this is a normal procedure for code enforcement violation investigations.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how a clear enforcement pathway could be established when determining which neighbor is the source of the nuisance or infestation.

MS. BALCH said it is challenging. The language on the slide is an example; staff can go back and refine it to make it less ambiguous.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO agreed and would like to see more specific language.

Council was in consensus about adding a specific bird-feeding ordinance.

MS. BALCH continued the presentation.

- Decision 2 Go further – restrict pigeon feeding specifically?

MAYOR HARTKE asked Council how they would like to proceed.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS supported Option C, to prohibit feeding pigeons specifically.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS said she would prefer Option C, to prohibit feeding pigeons.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked about the difference between the options presented.

MS. BALCH explained that the first option prohibits all wild bird feeding that is a nuisance. The second option says pigeons cannot be fed, but other wild birds can be fed in a way that is not a nuisance. The second option specifically prohibits the feeding of pigeons.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if nuisance feeding would be enforced under both options.

MS. BALCH said yes. Both options allow enforcement for nuisance feeding.

MR. WILLE said Option C, to prohibit feeding pigeons, would be an additional restriction in addition to nuisance feeding in the code.

MAYOR HARTKE asked what other cities prohibit feeding pigeons.

MS. BALCH said Phoenix and Mesa specifically prohibit feeding pigeons, and Tempe prohibits feeding all birds in a way that causes a nuisance.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO supported Option B, keeping the suggestion from the previous slide.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS agreed and said she would prefer Option B for no pigeon-specific restriction.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS asked how pigeons would be prevented from feeding from other bird-feed sources.

MS. BALCH said the suggested language to prevent pigeons would mirror what other cities have, including devices that prevent pigeons and ground bird feeding.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON supported Option B.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS preferred Option B.

MAYOR HARTKE noted he would prefer Option C, but the majority of Council was for Option B – no pigeon-specific restriction.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked whether the option to apply the same rules to all non-domesticated birds, without a pigeon-specific restriction, would give code officers sufficient enforcement tools.

MS. BALCH said yes, the suggested language gives code officers sufficient enforcement tools.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked for more information about how industrial bird feeders would be considered under this potential ordinance.

MS. BALCH said large industrial feeders might be something that could attract a nuisance in a residential area. If that is causing an attraction and creating a nuisance, that could potentially be covered. Responsible bird feeding spreads seed in a way that does not create attraction.

Council was in consensus to pursue Option B – keep the new provision as written, applying to all non-domesticated birds equally, with no pigeon-specific restriction.

MS. BALCH continued the presentation.

- Education, Outreach and Enforcement
- Questions & Discussion

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS asked for more information in the future on what implementing a bike-permitting process would look like. He commented that removing speed regulators from e-bikes should be prohibited and that this should be included in educational materials.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether the police department still conducts registration events to prevent bicycle theft; this permit proposal could be tied to those events.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if this service would be provided at the Annual Family Bike Ride.

MR. CRAMPTON said the service was offered at the last couple of Family Bike Rides but was unsure how effective it was.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON said voluntary registration could help deter theft and provide education to e-bicyclists.

Public Comment

BROOK BEALL, Chandler, asked about how the different categories of e-bikes are determined when policing, and the difference between a sidewalk and a multi-use path. He stated that e-bikes are a privilege, not a right for children. He asked what the next step would be after education for repeat violators of e-bike restrictions. He stated that the proposed bird feeding terminology is ambiguous and would not address situations of bird feeding on US government properties, such as the SRP canal.

DUANE LIDMAN, Chandler, commented that pigeon infestations could be caused by untrimmed palm trees, which is discussed in the city code. Pigeon infestations could be addressed by code enforcement through this mechanism.

CRAIG LOFGREN, Chandler, spoke about the importance of informing parents and consumers of the difference between a Class 3 e-bike and a motorcycle.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

Mayor

Approval Date of Minutes: April 24, 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 9th day of April 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this _____ day of April, 2026.

City Clerk