Meeting Minutes
City Council Work Session

September 17, 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 4:39 p.m.

Roll Call

Council Attendance

Mayor Kevin Hartke
Vice Mayor Angel Encinas
Councilmember Jane Poston
Councilmember Christine Ellis
Councilmember Matt Orlando
Councilmember Jennifer Hawkins

Appointee Attendance

John Pombier, City Manager
Deryck R. Lavelle, City Attorney
Jennifer Ekblad, City Clerk

Absent

Councilmember OD Harris – excused

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
Emilia Krajewski, Assistant to the City Manager
Micah Miranda, Economic Development Director
Steven Turner, Development Services Assistant Director
Dawn Gingerich, Assistant City Attorney
Matthew Burdick, Communications & Public Affairs Director
Stephanie Romero, Public Information Officer
Marge Zylla, Strategic Initiatives Director

Discussion

1. Presentation on findings from the Airport Community Impact Study and discussion on next steps associated with airport development.

MAYOR HARTKE called for a staff presentation.

JOHN POMBIER, City Manager, introduced the discussion item.

RYAN REEVES, Airport Manager, presented the following presentation.

- Presentation on findings from the Airport Community Impact Study and discussion on next steps associated with airport development.
- Tonight: direction on the future of the airport
    - What we are asking for
        - Direction on one of two paths for the proposed 680-foot runway extension
            - Keep Ordinance 3888 as written and move to a bond election
            - Amend Ordinance 3888 to remove the bond-election requirement, keeping the protections residents value
    - Not being decided tonight
        - Construction approval
        - Grant acceptance or funding awards
        - Design or construction contracts
        - Repeal of Ordinance 3888
- The bottom line
    - 680 ft – Added length
        - Runway 4R/22L goes from 4,870 to 5,550 feet — about 14 percent longer
    - 0 acres – No new land
        - All work stays inside existing airport property. The perimeter does not move.
    - 30,000lb – Same aircraft
        - Pavement strength does not change, so the weight limit does not change.
    - 90%+ – Federal share
        - Typical FAA share of eligible costs at reliever airports like CHD.
    - Ord. 3888 – The only barrier
        - A City ordinance — not the FAA and not state law — requires a bond election first.
- Defining our terms: what jet means in Chandler
    - Jet = Business Aircraft
    - Propeller Aircraft
- What the Community Impact Study did
    - Why Council ordered it
        - The Airport Strategic Business Plan named runway length the airport's main weakness

        - Of the plan's 5 goals — one was to revisit the extension
        - Council funded the study: community impact of a potential runway extension.
    - Four phases
        - Establish – Preliminary research, project definition, study programming
        - Prepare – Conceptual design, economic analysis, outreach materials
        - Engage – Community engagement, information sharing, feedback loop
        - Sustain – Ongoing community partnership and implementation support
    - What it produced
        - Economic impact & property value analysis
        - Conceptual extension design & noise analysis examination
        - Videos & "show not tell" exhibits to directly answer big questions
        - STEM tie-ins on physics of flight, runway design & impacts of heat
        - Record-breaking Airport Day
        - First-ever time @ Innovation Fair
        - Public web page and FAQs
        - A standing Steering Committee
        - Two years of resident feedback
        - Master Plan follow-through
- How we reached the community
    - 15,000 Airport Day attendees
    - 8,000 Innovation Fair attendees
    - 87 airport tours completed
    - 52K+ social media reach
    - The Steering Committee – four meetings, Nov. 2025 – Aug. 2026
        - Two earlier bond attempts had failed, so this study started by listening instead of presenting a finished plan. Residents, businesses, and airport users were brought in before any study structuring or material was final.
        - Meetings moved from background and outreach approach, to concerns and learning stations, to findings and feedback, to the FAA process and paths forward.
    - About the Committee
        - 25 members of the Steering Committee
        - Representing Chandler's residents (all quadrants), HOAs, education, business, nonprofits, government, development, and aviation communities.
        - Selected via collaborative process among Airport, City Manager's Office, Communications & Public Affairs, and consultant team.
- What event attendees told us: resident edition
    - "Based on what you learned today, what are your thoughts on a potential runway extension (adding approximately 680 feet of runway pavement within the airport's existing property)?"
    - How to read this
        - 307 resident responses: 74% support, 4% oppose, 21% want more information

            - Respondents were event attendees who had just visited the learning stations
            - This is informed opinion, not a statistically valid community-wide survey
            - Support rose the more people learned
    - "More Info" respondents wanted more on
        - Funding and taxpayer impacts
        - Noise and community effects
        - Purpose and need
        - Long-term benefits and tradeoffs
- Seven questions residents keep asking
    - From two years of feedback, the Master Plans, and prior surveys – not only this study
    - Is the extension really needed?
        - Section 2 – heat, not growth, is the constraint
    - Does this mean bigger planes?
        - Section 2 – pavement and weight limits do not change
    - Will it be louder?
        - Section 3 – contours stay south of Germann Road
    - Will there be more flights?
        - Section 3 – it changes when jets can leave, not how many fly
    - What does it cost me?
        - Section 4 – federal and airport funds, not property taxes
    - How does the airport benefit me?
        - Section 4 – jobs, wages, and local output
    - What does a general aviation airport do, and where do residents fit?
        - Section 4 – relieves Sky Harbor and welcomes Chandler via tours, STEM, and special programming
    - Steering Committee Common Theme
        - Our process does not align with the national standard.
            - Members understand the City's dual role as airport sponsor. They recognize the complexity of that role and this issue.
            - Their concern is that Chandler is lagging rather than leading and losing opportunities while the process stalls.
- What is proposed: 680 feet, inside the existing fence
    - 4,870 ft – Existing runway, 75 ft wide
    - +680 ft – Proposed extension
    - 5,550 ft – New total length
    - 5,700 ft – Cap already in Ordinance 3888
    - For scale
        - Chandler 4R/22L proposed: 5,550 ft x 75 ft
        - Sky Harbor Runway 8/26: 11,489 ft x 150 ft
- Why 680 feet: Arizona heat, not growth
    - Hot air is thinner

        - Engines make less power and wings make less lift, so aircraft need more runway to take off.
    - Today's users are already limited
        - On the hottest days, aircraft that already use CHD must cut fuel or passengers, reposition, or not fly at all
    - About four months a year
        - Business aircraft already based at or visiting CHD avoid it through the summer
- What the extension does — and does not — do
    - It does
        - Allows aircraft that already use CHD operate safely year-round
        - Adds a takeoff safety margin on hot days
        - Keeps based businesses and tenants competitive
        - Shifts the Runway 22L protection zone slightly; it stays on airport property
    - It does not
        - Bring airline service; no terminal, no Part 139 certification, no heavy-duty pavement
        - Allow heavier aircraft: pavement stays rated at 30,000 lb. single-wheel
        - Require land or displace homes or businesses
        - Add flight paths or shift traffic over new neighborhoods
        - Change the airport's role, its mission, or control tower hours
- This is not the same proposal as 2000 or 2007
    - 2000 Ballot – 6,800 ft
        - +1,930 ft over the existing runway
        - Nearly three times the length now proposed
        - Rejected: 6,914 no, 6,409 yes
    - 2007 Ballot – 5,700 ft
        - +850 ft over the existing runway
        - Still longer than today's proposal
        - Rejected: 6,194 no, 5,297 yes
    - 2026 proposal – 5,550 ft
        - +680 ft over the existing runway
        - Sized so aircraft already at CHD can operate year-round
        - Before Council tonight
    - What changed: the earlier proposals were long enough to raise fair questions about a different kind of airport. This one is sized to a single purpose – letting the aircraft already based and operating at CHD fly in summer heat. It does not change which aircraft can use the runway.
- Noise today: what the hotline actually receives
    - How noise is managed today
        - Noise Compatibility Program
        - Noise Hotline, answered and logged
        - Coordination with air traffic control

        - Voluntary noise-abatement procedures
        - Public outreach and airport tours
    - Every one of these programs stays in place with or without the extension. None of them depends on tonight's decision.
- Where the noise comes from
    - Training aircraft
        - Repeated takeoffs and landings in the traffic pattern
        - Lower altitude, over the same neighborhoods
        - Many passes an hour, throughout the day
        - Not affected by the extension
    - Business jets and turboprops
        - Repeated takeoffs and landings in the traffic pattern
        - Lower altitude, over the same neighborhoods
        - Many passes an hour, throughout the day
        - The aircraft the extension is designed to serve
    - Most of what the noise hotline hears about is pattern training – not the business aircraft this project serves.
- When does the noise occur?

MAYOR HARTKE asked about the max noise related to flight schools.

MR. REEVES answered that this varies based on the time of year, but for this month the maximum noise is usually in the early morning before 8 a.m. He shared that this is a low time of year for complaints because residents' air conditioning units are on and the white noise covers noise from the airport.

MAYOR HARTKE clarified that he is asking about the noise comparison from the touch-and-go's from training aircraft that generate most of the noise as opposed to jet traffic and how that relates to hour of the day.

MR. REEVES said that the touch-and-go's from training aircraft occur throughout the day from dawn to dusk. He said there are occasionally complaints late at night but that is typically connected to police or aeromedical flight operations.

MAYOR HARTKE asked for clarification on the Operations per Hour graphic on slide 14 "When does the noise occur?".

MR. REEVES explained that the graphic shows operational counts per hour and not noise.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if the city has mapped airport noise complaints.

MR. REEVES confirmed that the airport noise complaints have been mapped and provided Council

a handout that maps each household and the type of noise report that the airport received in the past year.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked for clarification on whether there were noise complaints from jets.

MR. REEVES confirmed that there are no jet complaints listed on the handout because there were no jet-related noise complaints. He explained that jets enter and exit the airspace much more quickly, resulting in fewer noise complaints.

MR. REEVES continued the presentation.

- Noise contours stay south of Germann Road
    - No residential neighborhood is expected inside the FAA's 65 DNL contour – with or without the extension.
    - What is DNL?
        - Day-Night Average Sound Level: noise averaged over 24 hours, with a 10-decibel penalty applied to flights between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. The FAA uses 65 DNL as its threshold for significant noise impact on homes.
- Flight volume: what changes, and what does not
    - ~251,000 operation a year today
    - 17th busiest general aviation airport in the U.S.
    - 8% of all controlled air traffic in Arizona
    - What the extension changes
        - It changes when business aircraft that already serve Chandler can depart — it will not change the type of aircraft. Total operations are largely driven by flight training and are forecast to grow on the same curve either way.
- What it costs, and who pays
    - The FAA process will take no less than 4 years and is dependent on securing federal grant funding.
    - Design and engineering - $637,000
    - Environmental review - $506,000
    - Construction: runway, taxiway, lighting, navigational aids - $5,605,000
    - Contingency - $395,000
    - Total - $7,143,000
    - 95% - FAA share (91.06%) & ADOT (4.47%), through the Airport Improvement Program — funded by aviation user taxes and fees, not by local taxpayers.
    - ~4.47% - Local share, typically paid from airport revenues such as fuel sales and hangar leases — not property taxes. ADOT may cover part of it.
    - On the 2023 runway rehabilitation, the FAA covered 95% and ADOT and the City split the rest.
    - FAA funding is not guaranteed: it requires environmental review, an approved Airport Layout Plan, and a competitive grant award.

- What the airport contributes today
    - Today – Current Annual Operational Impacts
        - 569 jobs
        - $150.2M economic output
        - $40.9M wages
        - $1.97M state and local tax revenue
        - Direct, indirect, and induced impacts combined. Full tables are in the appendix.
    - Potential – On-Airport Business Attraction
        - 977 jobs
        - $221.5M economic output
        - $76.4M wages
        - $3.54M tax revenue ($181,000 to the City)
        - A growth scenario, not a forecast. Not all of it depends on the extension. Totals, not additive.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked Mr. Reeves to elaborate about jobs at the airport.

MR. REEVES responded that the jobs are reflective of further development at the airport. He said that the first question operators and developers typically ask when they want to work with the airport is whether the runway will be extended. He said that developers and operators want to come to Chandler Municipal Airport but need the additional runway margin so that year-round use is possible. The job projections in this presentation assume that the runway extension is present and makes Chandler more appealing to developers.

MR. REEVES continued the presentation.

- What waiting costs
    - Summer stability
        - Fuel sales for business aircraft reliably decline each June, July, & August
        - Additional revenue
    - Based businesses
        - Annually, 10+ operators contact the Airport as they consider relocation. The first question for site selection is about runway length
        - Economic growth
    - Construction escalation
        - For non-residential infrastructure, the 30-year average is 3.6% a year, or about $213,000 for every year of delay
        - Cost containment
- What the airport does, how residents fit
    - CHD is a GA “reliever airport” set by FAA
        - A reliever airport is a busy general aviation (GA) airport near a major hub that shifts business, training, and recreational flights away from congested

commercial airports.
        - Chandler Municipal serves as a reliever airport for Phoenix Sky Harbor per FAA.
        - By shifting training, business, and recreational flights from PHX to CHD, Sky Harbor's runways are freed-up to focus on airline operations, it's primary job.
    - A smoother flight out of PHX
        - Chandler's Airport helps ensure that regional and national airspace operates safely and efficiently, simplifying air traffic control, improving queue predictability, and reducing delays for travelers at PHX.
        - CHD's role of reliever benefits everyone, including Chandler residents on a business trip, taking a vacation, or visiting family via a commercial flight from Sky Harbor.
    - Welcoming neighbors
        - Tours, education, & community programming
        - 25,000 recent Airport Day attendees
        - 87 airport tours completed
- Chandler grew up around its airport
    - The airport has been on this site since 1948. The rules Council is being asked about were written as the city grew out to meet it
- Every proposal has been shorter than the last
    - 1982 – Master Plan proposes new parallel runway of 6,900 ft max
    - 1989 – Voters approve a jet ban (Prop. 200); it conflicts with FAA grant obligation and is revised as Ordinance 2122
    - 1999 – Ordinance 2978 caps the runway at 6,800 ft and requires voter-approved bonds
    - 2000 – Bond election for runway extension and 133-acre land acquisition fails
    - 2007 – Ordinance 3888 lowers the cap to 5,700 ft; a second bond election fails
    - 2021 – Master Plan proposes a 680-ft extension to 5,550 ft
    - 2025-26 – Community Impact Study and community engagement
- Ordinance 3888: what it protects, and what it blocks
    - Adopted in 2007, building on Ordinance 2122 (1990) and Ordinance 2978 (1999).
    - Protections residents value
        - Any runway extension at CHD requires public input
        - Caps Runway 4R/22L at 5,700 feet
        - Sets maximum aircraft weight (75,000-lbs) and wingspan (79-feet)
        - Both options keep all three
    - The requirements in the way
        - Any runway extension requires voter-approved bonds that specify the purpose
        - It applies even when federal and airport funds would cover the eligible costs
        - No bond authorization means no project — regardless of FAA support
        - This is the only provision tonight's decision touches.

- How other airports approve runway projects
    - Approval by the city council or the airport's governing body
    - Coordination with the FAA on funding and approvals
    - FAA environmental review with a formal public comment period
    - Local election: not required
- What each path costs, and when it could start
    - Same project, same federal process. The difference is what the City spends to authorize it, and how long that takes
    - Option 1 – Bond election
        - Election cost - $500,000 in county election costs, plus an informational pamphlet mailed to every household with a registered voter
        - City Construction Costs - $330,000 from the added delay
        - Total additional City cost - $630,000
        - Earliest authorization – May 18, July 20, or Nov. 2, 2027
    - Option 2 – Council action
        - Election cost – none
        - City Construction Costs – Baseline
        - Total additional City cost - $319,000
        - Earliest authorization- Seek federal funding immediately after Council action
    - Arizona law requires an informational pamphlet mailed to every household with a registered voter, and limits how City resources may be used once an election is called. Staff can share facts; it cannot advocate.
- The two options side by side
    - Option 1 – Keep Ordinance 3888 as written; move to a bond election
        - How it works
            - Voters decide whether to authorize bonds for the extension
        - Protections
            - Every current ordinance limit stays in place
        - Public Input
            - A ballot measure, plus the federal public process the follows
    - Option 2 – Amend Ordinance 3888 to remove the bond requirement
        - How it works
            - Council amends the ordinance; the standard FAA process follows
        - Protections
            - Length cap, footprint limit, and aircraft limits all kept
        - Public Input
            - Four to five years of federal review with formal comment periods (next slide)
- If Council amends: guardrails that could be written in
    - Under Option 2 the protection residents value stay in the ordinance — and can be strengthened. For discussion; all subject to review by the Law Department and the FAA

- Length cap
    - Limit Runway 4R/22L to 5,550 feet — 150 below today's cap
- Accredited Public Engagement
    - Goes above and beyond the FAA process, ensuring transparency and accountability
- Current footprint
    - No airport growth beyond existing property
- Aircraft limits
    - Keep weight and wingspan limits, if consistent with FAA grant obligations
- Public process
    - Public hearing and noise analysis before any future runway change as federally mandated
- Accountability
    - Annual noise report to Council, plus implementation of the Council-approved Airport Master Plan
- Lesson from 1989: a voter-approved jet ban conflicted with FAA grant obligations and had to be revised. Guardrails only hold if they work inside federal requirements.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked about the public engagement and what the decision-making process looks like if the majority of the public is against the runway extension.

MR. REEVES responded and provided a current example related to airspace redesign. In this case the FAA received public pushback to airspace regulation changes and the FAA pushed back these changes as a result. Mr. Reeves noted that this shows the FAA does listen to and respond to public input. He explained that if there are concerns related to the runway extension, they would be listened to.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked why Chandler would not gather the public approval upfront via bond election. He asked if the results of a bond election could be taken to the FAA to create a better argument for continuing the process.

MR. REEVES agreed that the bond election option was worth exploring and confirmed that Chandler Municipal Airport is looking for Council direction for next steps.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS asked Mr. Reeves to elaborate on what the FAA's public process looks like if the city proceeds with option 2.

MR. REEVES presented the following slide that describes the FAA's public process.

- Either way, federal review takes four to five years
    - Removing the election requirement does not remove the public from the process. Federal review is longer, and more detailed, than a ballot measure.
    - Public input built into the federal process

        - Environmental review publishes findings and opens a formal comment period
        - Noise analysis is required and open to public review
        - Council actions on design, grants, and construction contracts are public meetings
        - Any future runway change would go through all of this again
    - What the City adds
        - Report back to the Steering Committee
        - Keep the Community Impact Study page current
        - Airport Day 2027, Innovation Fair, ongoing tours
        - This Study's established Community Engagement Process

MAYOR HARTKE reiterated Councilmember Orlando's earlier question and asked if it is helpful to the FAA's process to have a precedent of voter approval from an election. He asked if the results of a bond election would be considered in the FAA's public engagement process.

MR. REEVES said that the FAA recognizes that Chandler's situation is unique, since no other airport requires the bond election process. He stated that Chandler's process is unlikely to impact the process for securing FAA grant funding.

MAYOR HARTKE asked if the results of a bond election would have any impact on the FAA's public engagement process.

MR. REEVES indicated that bond election results have no impact on the FAA's process.

MAYOR HARTKE summarized that the bond election process is unusual for the FAA's collaboration with cities but not necessarily a negative.

MR. REEVES confirmed Mayor Hartke's statement was accurate.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS noted that with either the ordinance or bond election option, Chandler still needs to go through the FAA public engagement process. She highlighted that bond elections are expensive to run and that this election cost is unnecessary if Council amends the ordinance.

MR. REEVES confirmed Councilmember Ellis' statement.

VICE MAYOR ENCINCAS asked if the outcome of an election would change anything for the FAA. He also inquired whether the FAA had any opinions about Chandler's unusual process.

MR. REEVES said that opinions vary. Some members of the FAA have a negative opinion of Chandler's process, and others recognize that this process is part of Chandler's self-determination. He stated that overall, the FAA is hopeful that Chandler proceeds with the runway extension since the need for this extension has been identified in the Airport Master Plan for many years.

MR. REEVES continued with the presentation.

- Council direction requested
    - Both paths keep every protection in Ordinance 3888. The question is how the extension gets authorized.
    - Option 1 – Keep the ordinance as written
        - Move to a bond election
    - Option 2 – Enhance the ordinance
        - Remove the bond-election requirement and keep the protections residents value
    - Questions and discussion

MR. POMBIER noted that as air traffic in the area increases the volume at Chandler Municipal Airport will also increase. He asked Mr. Reeves which types of flights would increase in the airport if the runway extension went to a bond election and was turned down.

MR. REEVES confirmed the volume of flights at Chandler Municipal Airport is expected to increase. Without the runway extension, this increase in volume will come from small single-engine propeller aircraft and helicopters because the shorter runway is ideal for flight training. He highlighted that the runway extension would not cause Chandler Municipal Airport to receive larger aircraft than it currently receives, rather it would allow the aircraft already based out of Chandler to operate year-round.

MAYOR HARTKE asked Council for a consensus on how they would like to proceed and clarified that option 2 would authorize the City Attorney to draft an ordinance that Council would vote on in the future.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked whether a bond election is necessary regardless of the existing ordinance in order to fund the runway extension. She also asked how much the extension would cost the city.

MR. REEVES noted that the extension could be paid for without a bond. He said that this would be funded like other grants that are brought to Council for approval. Chandler would be awarded the grant, and the city match would be funded through the capital program. He elaborated that this is the only capital project at the airport that has the bond requirement.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO spoke about the history of Chandler Municipal Airport and the airport bond elections. He commended Mr. Reeves for the presentation but emphasized the importance of public trust. Councilmember Orlando spoke in favor of option 1. He argued that the ordinances were based on the vote of the people, and he thinks this question should go on a ballot. He also expressed that having the approval of the public from an election could be helpful to reference if there were concerns that arose during the FAA's public approval process.

MAYOR HARTKE spoke in favor of option 2, noting that the public has entrusted Council to make and amend ordinances.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS shared the history of the airport. She expressed that the Council is trusted as elected officials to elevate the city. She highlighted Chandler's focus on innovation and said that improving infrastructure is necessary to support innovation. Councilmember Ellis said she supports option 2, to amend the existing ordinance, as this will position Chandler to continue to grow.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS said that she prefers option 2. She said that the airport has already conducted extensive public outreach, so she feels comfortable continuing with this option. She said the time and cost savings from avoiding a bond election and the net benefit to airport noise make this her preferred option.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS shared that he supports the airport as an economic driver in Chandler. He acknowledged that Chandler has changed since the ordinance was put in place, but the underlying trust has not changed. He said he feels additional public buy-in is necessary and for that reason he supports option 1, continuing with the existing ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON shared her experience as a member of the airport bond committee. She commended Mr. Reeves for an excellent presentation but expressed concerns that the public opinions shared in the presentation were gathered at airport events and may have a positive bias for the airport. She said while she supports the airport, she does not feel comfortable with the Council making a unilateral decision and for this reason she supports option 1.

MAYOR HARTKE said that because there is no consensus on either option, the existing ordinance will remain.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS expressed concern about Councilmember Harris's absence and commented regarding his opinion on the options presented.

MAYOR HARTKE responded that since Councilmember Harris was absent his opinion could not be considered.

DERYCK LAVELLE, City Attorney, explained that under Arizona Open Meeting Law and parliamentary procedure, decisions are made based on the councilmembers who are currently present as long as there is a quorum.

MAYOR HARTKE explained that as of right there is no consensus for either option, but this does not prohibit the issue from being brought forward again in the future.

Public Comment

MAYOR HARTKE read the comment card received regarding this item (attached).

ANDREW SHAFER, Phoenix, AZ, owner of Chandler Aviation, and partner of an aviation business in Scottsdale, Deer Valley, and Sky Harbor, spoke about the costs he pays at other airports, and the increased demand other airports are experiencing. He encouraged Council to consider the private money that would come into Chandler Municipal Airport if the runway was expanded.

CICIO MILLER, Tempe, AZ, General Manager of Chandler Air Service, shared that every summer he needs to let go of employees and then rehire in August. He shared his company's operations and flight school and how these operations are conducted at other airports because Chandler's shorter runway is not safe enough. He encouraged Council to choose option 2.

SKY MCCORKLE, Chandler, AZ, shared that he supports the findings of the Airport Impact Study and supports moving forward with option 2. He said that the ordinance can be changed and if a member of the public has a concern, they have a large amount of time to object during the FAA public engagement process. He said this change could be positive for the city overall.

Discussion Continued

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked about what the next steps are based on this meeting and if the matter is moving to a bond election per option 1.

MAYOR HARTKE stated that the Council is at an impasse as there is not a consensus on either option.

MR. LAVELLE confirmed that as of now, Ordinance No. 3888 remains in place.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if there were any issues with considering a bond election.

MR. LAVELLE confirmed that the city can provide options regarding a bond election.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if options for a bond election could be brought before Council in 60-90 days. He said he would like to look at this issue being put to the voters in an election even if it is not necessarily a bond election.

MAYOR HARTKE shared that under the current ordinance this issue would need a bond election specifically if the city intends to use bonds to fund a runway extension.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO clarified that he would rather discuss that requirement and have staff look at if there are election dates coming up that Council could look at for putting this issue to the voters.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS asked the City Clerk what the cost of a stand-alone election would be if it is not possible to couple an election on the runway extension with an existing election.

JENNIFER EKBLAD, City Clerk, answered that in an odd year when there is a special election that is just for the city, elections are very expensive, upwards of $500,000. It is unknown what ballot measures other jurisdictions may have that would result in decreased costs to Chandler due to cost sharing. She noted that special elections are done entirely by mail which also increases the cost per voter for Chandler.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS spoke about how Chandler just had a bond election recently and it is premature to go back out to voters with another bond. He asked if there is a way to separate this topic from a bond election.

MS. EKBLAD explained that the options for an odd year election would be May, July, or November 2027, since the deadline for the March 2027 election has already passed.

MR. LAVELLE offered that staff could look at options for when a bond election could occur and the costs involved and present these options to Council later.

MAYOR HARTKE requested that staff put this information together and that Council would come back to look at this issue later.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

ATTEST: _____ _____

City Clerk Mayor

Approval Date of Minutes: October 12, 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 17th day of September 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this _____ day of October, 2026.

_____

City Clerk

CHANDLER arizona

Work Session

COMMENT CARD

If you wish to submit written comments to the City Council at a City Council Work Session, please complete this form and submit to the City Clerk. Comments relating to a posted agenda item will be included as part of the Public Record.

Date: 9-17-26

☒ Support presentation on Airport Community ☐ Oppose presentation on _____

Comments: I Totally support the Impact Study, Please ~~and~~ Take the next steps to rectify a Past City Ordinance that Tied the hands of and restricted growth at Chandler Municipal airport.

Name: Schuyler McCorkle

City/Town: Chandler

***Phone No.:** ~~48~~ 480 250-3643 **Email Address (optional)** _____

**Contact information is included as part of the Public Record.*