

Meeting Minutes

Village of Downers Grove - Council Meeting

Betty Cheever Council Chambers

July 15, 2025

07:00 PM

1. Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

2. Roll Call

Council Attendance (Present): Mayor Barnett, Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt, Commissioner Gilmartin, Commissioner Tully, Commissioner Davenport, Commissioner Sarver, Commissioner Roe

Council Attendance (Not Present): None.

Non-Voting: Village Manager Dave Fieldman, Village Attorney Enza Petrarca, and Village Clerk Rosa Berardi

3. Minutes of Council Meetings

MIN 2024-10527 A. Minutes: Village Council Meeting Minutes - July 8, 2025

MOTION: To Adopt Village Council Meeting Minutes of July 8, 2025, as presented.

RESULT: Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE: Commissioner Tully

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt

AYES: Commissioners Tully, Sadowski-Fugitt, Gilmartin, Davenport, Sarver, Roe, and Mayor Barnett

4. Public Comments

An unnamed resident expressed concerns about ICE not revealing professional identity to the public.

5. Consent Agenda

COR 2025-10831 A. Claims Ordinance: No. 6611, Payroll - June 27, 2025

BIL 2025-10832 B. Bills Payable: No. 6884 - July 15, 2025

RES 2025-10826 C. Resolution: Approve an Agreement with Brown Equipment Company of McHenry, Illinois, for Vehicle Upfitting Services

RESOLUTION 2025-56

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE AND BROWN EQUIPMENT COMPANY

RES 2025-10827 D. Resolution: Approve an Agreement with Force America, Inc. of Shorewood, Illinois, for the Upfitting of Snow Plows and Utility Vehicles

RESOLUTION 2025-57

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT AND ADDENDUM BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE AND FORCE AMERICA, INC.

MOT 2025-10825 E. Motion: Approve a Contract with A Lamp Concrete Contractors of Schaumburg, Illinois, for the 2025 Water Main Improvements Contract B Project

MOT 2025-10858 F. Motion: Approve a Contract with Landmark Contractors of Huntley, Illinois, for the 2025 DBD Crosswalk Accessibility Upgrades

MOTION: To Adopt the Consent Agenda of the July 15, 2025 Village Council Meeting, as presented.

RESULT: Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE: Commissioner Tully

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt

AYES: Commissioners Tully, Sadowski-Fugitt, Roe, Sarver, Davenport, Gilmartin and Mayor Barnett

6. First Reading

ORD 2025-10823 A. Ordinance: Increasing the Number of R-3 and REC-1 Liquor Licenses

Village Manager Fieldman presented this item and explained this ordinance simply creates one additional license in each of the two categories.

Village Council Comments

Commissioner Gilmartin asked, with a limit on both categories, if the typical process is to add licenses when they are requested. Attorney Petrarca confirmed this is usually the case, noting that more may be added for popular categories, and R1 licenses are standard restaurant licenses that are not restricted.

Mayor Barnett emphasized that Liquor Licensing is intended to align with the Village Comprehensive Plan, zoning, and other Village procedures. He explained that as new categories are added, they often come with set limits, which can be adjusted as needed. He said he does not believe license limits have deterred businesses from coming to Downers Grove, even when they may request a new business license type and it is denied.

Commissioner Tully agreed, saying limits are reasonable and do not hinder business development.

Commissioner Gilmartin mentioned he had prior involvement with adding the Boutique Liquor License category in the past. He thanked the Mayor, Commissioner Tully, and Staff for their input.

ORD 2025-10830 B. Ordinance: Updating the Village's Comprehensive Plan

Planning Manager Jason Zawila presented this item via PowerPoint. He reviewed the deliverables, Village engagements and the changes requested by the Village Council page by page. He noted the West Ogden focus area and the plan for Grant Street to be joined from east to west and reviewed Staff's implementation plan, including 10 items. Mr. Zawila thanked Houseal Lavigne, particularly Josh Koonce, and Community Development Director Stan Popovich for their work on the Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Barnett expressed the Council's gratitude to Mr. Popovich.

Public Comments

Janet Winningham, a resident, requested some changes be made to the language in the about plan,

Village Council Comments

Commissioner Davenport commended the Implementation Matrix and said it would be helpful when working through the Long Range Planning process. He said he prefers keeping Grant Street as is, citing personal experience that a connection would reduce bike and pedestrian friendliness. He shared he is open to feedback, but believes the current language of the plan is appropriate. He questioned why the Future Land Use Map date did not match up with the August 5 date change for the Comprehensive Plan in Section 1.12 of the Ordinance. Attorney Petrarca clarified this was holdover language that should have been removed when the previous Comprehensive Plan was adopted, as the Future Land Use Map is now a part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Gilmartin agreed with Commissioner Davenport on both the Grant Street issue and in keeping the Plan's language unchanged. He was also impressed with the implementation matrix/table but expressed concern these items may be interpreted as the Council's Priority Action Items, clarifying that the items in the matrix were identified by the public and the Council. The Council would need to work through them.

Commissioner Roe expressed interest in the Grant Street connection but wanted input from neighbors. He believes opening the street could add value to the area. He supported keeping the current language in the plan.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt agreed with Commissioner Roe, noting that Grant Street is currently marked as a sharrow route in the Active Transportation Plan. She said she also wants neighbor feedback and supports the existing language in the Plan. She praised the Implementation Matrix, highlighting her interest in the Attainable Housing Study #6.

Commissioner Sarver thanked Staff for the easy to read packet and presentation materials. She asked about the ownership of a vacant lot on Grant Street. Staff confirmed the property has been purchased. Manager Fieldman provided some information about the different possibilities of developing the land, further explaining that the connection needed will depend on the type of development that is proposed.

Commissioner Gilmartin received clarification by Manager Fieldman and Mr. Zawila, that there is one lot fronting Grant Street with eight lots behind it and reiterated his stance that a street connection should only happen if requested by a developer.

Commissioner Tully said he believes the Grant Street connection should be pursued privately, and opined that neighborhood input is essential. He suggested private funds be used for the development. He emphasized the importance of regular Comprehensive Plan updates, about every 5–7 years. He said he appreciated the hyperlinks on the website for this Plan and supported using “should” language for accessory dwelling units, but only on a trial basis in the Fairview area before implementing in the rest of the community.

Mayor Barnett opposed including the Grant Street connection in the Comprehensive Plan, preferring to wait until it is specifically requested. He shared his opinion that a possibility existed for a Belmont to Lee expressway and said that he did not want to discount public input. He strongly supported keeping the word “should” and not changing them to “could” in the Plan’s language, so as not to undermine the Plan’s direction.

Commissioner Davenport agreed with the Mayor on keeping the language as is and explained that #1 says to “consider” allowing ADUs in Single Family Attached districts, clarifying the plan does not say this has to be done.

Commissioner Gilmartin added that the plan was developed collaboratively with residents, consultants, and Staff, not just the Village Council.

Manager Fieldman said that Village staff would make the changes to the West Ogden Focus area to reflect input from the community and make it a proposal based decision. He said it would be back on the agenda for approval on August 5, 2025.

7. Attorney's Report

Pursuant to Section 2.5 of the Downers Grove Municipal Code, Village Attorney Enza Petrarca presented the following for Village Council consideration:

1. An ordinance increasing the number of R-3 and REC-1 Liquor Licenses.
2. An ordinance updating the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

8. Manager's Report

Mayor Barnett explained the Governance discussion would happen at the back of the Chambers in a dinner style setting. He called a five minute break at 7:41 p.m.

INF 2025-10861 A. Information: Council Governance Discussion

Mayor Barnett explained that Governance meetings generally happen every two years. He explained the Council operates as a body, within a set of agreed to criteria/boundaries on how they are going to interact with each other, Staff, and the public. He explained this can change from Council to Council, based on the makeup of the individuals sitting on the Council. He stressed the importance of the Council reaching consensus through these discussions. He referenced the Village Governance Manager's Memo, in the agenda packet, and explained the Council's discussion would include working through the Memo.

Mayor Barnett clarified that while Council Rules are outlined in the Municipal Code, they can be adjusted by the current Council's preferences. He opened the floor for discussion.

Council Meetings

Commissioner Tully shared past practices of holding four monthly meetings - the meetings involved alternating workshops and voting sessions. He opined that the current format of three meetings per month, though longer, works well. Commissioner Roe agreed the structure is efficient but noted the meetings have become excessively long and may need review. Commissioner Sarver echoed those concerns, saying late meetings lead to emotional fatigue.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt pointed out that most municipalities hold only two meetings per month. She attributed recent long meetings to the heavy workload from the Guiding DG projects and suggested setting an end time moving forward. She also shared that she is not interested in adding an additional monthly meeting.

Mayor Barnett acknowledged that meetings ending at 10:00-11:00 p.m. are not typical. He shared that in the past, some items were postponed to manage time. He also noted that the old four-meeting schedule placed a heavier burden on Staff.

Commissioner Davenport expressed support for the current meeting structure, noting that time constraints can create efficiency. He said that though he is not interested in adding a fourth meeting, having an optional fourth Tuesday provides flexibility when needed. He also referenced his School Board experience where regular discussions and decisions continued as long as a quorum was present and shared that he wanted to discuss the notion that all seven Council members need to be present to discuss important issues.

Commissioner Gilmartin agreed that three meetings per month are sufficient and prefers working longer meetings to adding more meetings. He pointed out that the Council took on the role of the Comprehensive Plan committee this time, unlike in the past, and he shared he sees no need to change the structure. He said he is open to starting meetings at 6:00 p.m. and invited feedback from other Council members.

Mayor Barnett acknowledged the Council's added workload over the past 18 months due to the Comprehensive Plan update and noted that Staff has historically worked to accommodate member absences when possible, as long as essential business is not delayed.

Manager Fieldman explained that for certain conversations, such as key land use decisions, Long Range Planning, and Governance, Staff prefers having all seven Council members present. Commissioner Gilmartin suggested adding Council Member New Business Items to this list. Manager Fieldman agreed it could be added with Council direction. Commissioner Gilmartin also emphasized that there should not be a policy written for this, rather the Council should be publicly agreeing to work this way. Mayor Barnett supported the discussion, noting the importance of balancing individual autonomy with the responsibilities of a unified Council. Commissioner Tully reflected on the past 18 months, where Council operations adapted due to members handling additional duties. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt asked about super-majority vote items, and Manager Fieldman confirmed these are also included in the list requiring full Council presence.

Commissioner Davenport appreciated the reminder that they have been doing "double duty" and acknowledged the demands of the Priority Action List. Mayor Barnett said it would be odd for a Council member to not want to be a part of this process.

Commissioner Tully suggested rotating the responsibility of making motions and seconds among Council members in an effort to encourage broader participation - noting that the same two people have been doing it for the past two years. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt supported the idea. Commissioner Gilmartin explained the current informal tradition with motions being made by the Mayor Pro Tem and seconds made by the longest-serving member, is a nice nod to those who have served longer and expressed concern about changing it. Mayor Barnett and several Commissioners Davenport, Sarver and Roe expressed neutrality. Since Commissioners Tully and Sadowski-Fugitt supported the change and no one opposed it, Mayor Barnett said the Council should try the rotation. He instructed Manager Fieldman to note the change. Manager Fieldman acknowledged the change.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt expressed her support for the current New Business Item process, complimenting Staff for making it smooth and efficient. However, she noted that when meetings run late, it becomes difficult to submit a new business item by the current Wednesday at 9:00 a.m. deadline and suggested moving the deadline to noon instead. Commissioner Gilmartin agreed that the current 9:00 a.m. cutoff is too early and proposed extending it to 3:00 p.m. Manager Fieldman explained that Staff meets for agenda planning at 9:00 am on Wednesdays, hence the cut off day and time. Manager Fieldman emphasized that Staff needs sufficient time to prepare the write-up, and noted that as long as he is notified of the type of New Business Item by 9:00 a.m. – so that a placeholder can be placed on the agenda - the details can follow later in the day, if necessary. Both Manager Fieldman and Attorney Petrarca stressed the importance of notifying Staff about new business items by 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, even if the item's details follow later.

Mayor Barnett commented that he has no strong preference about the deadline change but cautioned that new business items should not be reactionary.

Commissioner Davenport then raised an issue regarding Council Member Reports and Rule 36, pointing out that the Manager's Memo omitted a reference to "events sponsored by organizations other than the Village or other civic organizations".

Commissioner Tully and Mayor Barnett responded that this language is not found in the official Municipal Code. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt recalled that this reference may have been removed during the last Governance discussion. Mayor Barnett agreed and said he believed it was removed during the last clean-up of the Municipal Code.

Manager Fieldman and Attorney Petrarca agreed to review the Municipal Code and report back. Manager Fieldman also asked whether the Council believes they should retain the ability to report on community events, to which the Council unanimously agreed.

Commissioner Gilmartin stated that he has no objection to Point A regarding electioneering but took issue with Point B. He expressed concern that the language, written in the negative with "shall not" could be overly broad. He noted that public comment is not restricted. He emphasized that Council Member Reports should not be limited and argued that this section should be entirely removed, noting that it has never been enforced.

Mayor Barnett explained that the foundation of the discussion is about setting expectations among Council members rather than strict enforcement. He affirmed the importance of residents' freedom of speech but noted that Council discussions, in their official capacity, should center on Village business. Commissioner Gilmartin reiterated that his concern specifically relates to restrictions on Council Member Reports.

Mayor Barnett compared the Village's practices to other municipalities, mentioning some extreme cases, but maintained that even if the rule is not enforced, it should still exist in writing.

He spoke to proclamations, emphasizing that they are Mayoral proclamations and that he has declined many in the past that he thought the Council might not be in full agreement on.

Commissioner Sarver suggested the rule's original intent may have been to limit the length and scope of Council Member Reports at the end of meetings. Commissioner Gilmartin disagreed, stating he wants fewer restrictions and no time limits, viewing such limitations as an infringement on free speech.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt proposed a more positive framing of the rule, suggesting that instead of focusing on what Council members should not do, the guidelines should encourage reports to focus on community engagement and related activities.

Commissioner Tully added that Council members are generally aware of what is appropriate and that the report segment should not be used for lengthy speeches. He said if members continue current practices, there should be no issues.

Commissioner Gilmartin expressed concerns with freedom of speech being a problem with this Council and described the current rule as antiquated. He argued that the Council should have greater trust in one another and that the rule reflects an unnecessary restriction. Mayor Barnett clarified that the purpose of the rule is to prevent Council members from veering off-topic late in meetings, but Commissioner Gilmartin remained firm in stating that such a rule is no longer needed.

Commissioner Davenport asked whether the rule being discussed was part of an adopted ordinance. Attorney Petrarca confirmed that it is included in the Village Code. Commissioner Gilmartin expressed concern that having this rule on the books creates challenges for Council members when attempting to justify open discussion. Commissioner Davenport agreed, saying that he believes the rule should be removed. He suggested the Council revisit the matter in two years if issues arise with inappropriate reporting by Council members.

Commissioner Tully requested that Village Staff look into the matter and provide a report. Staff responded that they would conduct a review.

Commissioner Tully spoke about public comments, asking whether the Mayor can directly answer questions posed by the public during the comment period. Mayor Barnett responded by explaining that the public comment segment is not designed to be a debate or a Q&A session; rather, it is intended to be a time to simply receive comments. Commissioners Davenport and Sadowski-Fugitt suggested that the Mayor should be able to answer questions when a straightforward response is available.

Commissioner Davenport noted that, in some cases, there could be up to three hours that lapse between a question being asked during public comment and an answer being given in the Mayor's Report.

Commissioner Gilmartin thanked the Mayor for his efforts, during Public Comment, in limiting negative or accusatory comments directed at the Council. He advised that it is better for the Mayor not to respond to questions during meetings, even if he believes he knows the answer, in order to avoid complications and maintain consistency.

Commissioner Gilmartin asked about the section referring to Monday Phone Calls and Friday Mayor Meetings. He specifically wanted clarification on the purpose and structure of the Friday meetings between the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem and the Village Manager - particularly regarding how the agenda is handled and what the phrase "agenda item order" means. Mayor Barnett acknowledged that much of the language in that section was written under previous Village leadership and may not fully reflect current practices. He explained that the Friday meetings are similar in nature to the Monday calls with Commissioners, except they occur earlier with the Mayor. The Mayor noted that during these meetings, he might suggest changes to the order of the agenda items.

Commissioner Gilmartin expressed concern about the discrepancy between what is written in the Governance document and what is actually occurring, saying that he has had questions about what happens during Friday meetings. He expressed concern that the description in the document seems to differ from practice.

Manager Fieldman clarified that creating the agenda is his responsibility and that it is typically finalized before Friday. He added that he had included language in the Council Rules to reflect his ability to adjust the order of agenda items, especially if something needs to be removed from the agenda. He emphasized that any Council member can suggest such changes. He noted that the placement of Public Comment had also been moved on the agenda in the past.

Commissioner Tully added that he has made suggestions to shift items from the Consent Agenda to First Read when he knows a fellow Commissioner intends to raise discussion. Mayor Barnett supported this, noting that such logistical changes, like moving the Mayor's Report on the agenda, have also occurred in these meetings.

Commissioner Gilmartin reiterated that the phrasing "placement and order" in the document is confusing and gives the impression that these Friday meetings are different from the Monday calls. Manager Fieldman agreed to revise the language to more accurately reflect the actual function and process of the meetings.

Commissioner Tully provided an example of how Public Comment has been moved to the beginning of a Council meeting, especially during particularly contentious or high-interest topics, instead of leaving it at the end. Commissioner Gilmartin said he believes such decisions should be made by the Village Manager rather than individual Council members.

Commissioner Tully explained that Council members tend to receive more direct public input than the Village Manager does, suggesting they are well-positioned to make such recommendations.

Commissioner Gilmartin expressed concern that the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem appear to have more influence over the agenda than the rest of the Council.

Mayor Barnett suggested that Manager Fieldman revise the current language to provide better clarity. Manager Fieldman explained that during Monday calls, he often hears from Council members who want to adjust the order of agenda items. He then discusses these suggestions with the Mayor, who may decide to make changes during the Council meeting itself.

Mayor Barnett added that conversations between him and the Village Manager from Friday through Tuesday can influence the final agenda or its order by the time of the meeting.

Commissioner Davenport emphasized that any Council member is free to raise concerns about agenda items with the Village Manager. Commissioner Gilmartin clarified that he wants it to be clear that even after the agenda is published on Friday, he has the right to call the Manager by Monday to request changes.

Manager Fieldman explained as Village Manager, he works with staff to set the agenda and has not asked the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem for input on the agenda content. The conversation with the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem revolves around meeting management.

Mayor Barnett called a short recess at 9:08.

The meeting reconvened at 9:12 p.m.

Commissioner Gilmartin expressed concern about receiving Council Questions too late in the day, often around 4:00 to 4:30 p.m. on the day of the Council meeting. He requested that Staff provide them earlier to the Council to allow them more time for review.

Commissioner Davenport commented that he is not particularly fond of the rEmarks platform, stating that it may give the public the impression that Council members will read submissions before the meeting, which he is not always able to do. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt clarified that the primary purpose of rEmarks is to allow residents to have their comments included in the official written record.

Mayor Barnett addressed concerns about timing by reminding the Council that any member can make a motion to table a matter if they feel unprepared, however, that motion needs to receive a second and a majority vote. He noted that very few issues must be resolved on the night of the meeting.

Commissioner Gilmartin acknowledged he had not realized the purpose of rEmarks was primarily for recordkeeping.

The Mayor then moved on to review upcoming agenda items, and no further comments were made.

Mayor Barnett addressed public comment procedures and invited feedback from the Council.

Commissioner Davenport suggested shortening the five-minute speaking limit during crowded meetings to allow more residents to participate. Commissioner Gilmartin proposed the placement of a clock, visible to the public, during public comment. Mayor Barnett disagreed, stating that such a measure could discourage participation and that he already tracks the time and reminds speakers of their time limit. Commissioner Davenport clarified that his intent was to ensure fairness when many wish to speak.

Mayor Barnett asked for any feedback regarding the Manager's Report. There were no comments.

No Surprises Rule

Commissioner Gilmartin questioned its effectiveness in practice, prompting Commissioner Tully to explain that he views it as a way to maintain functional meetings by informing others of significant concerns beforehand. Commissioner Gilmartin inquired whether Commissioner Tully was primarily focused on voting matters. Commissioner Tully responded that one-on-one discussions could help resolve disagreements in advance.

Commissioner Sarver said she defines a "surprise" as an action that undermines the efforts of others for personal gain.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt expressed a desire for more transparency and equal access to information, citing the appointment of the Mayor Pro Tem as an example. Mayor Barnett responded that the situation was unique, but Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt emphasized the importance of all Council members receiving the same information at the same time. She also asked whether or not the research she provides is being relayed to others by Staff, and several Council members confirmed they receive it during their Monday calls.

Commissioner Davenport explained that he thought the "no surprises" rule applied to not surprising Village Staff. He said he tries to communicate his questions and positions on agenda items ahead of time, so Staff can relay that information to the rest of the Council. While he prefers to share his views during meetings rather than in private discussions, he acknowledged that it may be helpful to speak with colleagues in advance if a topic is particularly controversial, especially under New Business.

Commissioner Roe agreed, saying he believes the rule is meant to protect Staff by ensuring they are informed first, though he also sees value in Council members reaching out to one another about New Business Items.

Mayor Barnett referenced a statement written in the meeting materials that he felt captured the essence of the rule, creating shared expectations and making sure all seven members are ultimately comfortable with decisions.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt brought up the cannabis discussions as an example, where certain conversations appeared to have intent behind them.

Commissioner Gilmartin aligned with the general interpretation of the rule but expressed concern about unequal access to information, particularly regarding Friday meetings with the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem. He said that information that is shared to them on Fridays is shared later to the remaining Council members during their Monday calls. He criticized what he sees as selective and premature information being shared among some Council members and possibly the public, suggesting it may be intentional and inappropriate.

Mayor Barnett noted that while equal timing of information sharing is ideal, it's not always realistically possible for everyone to receive information simultaneously.

Commissioner Gilmartin raised concerns about information sharing, specifically referencing a past incident involving traffic data near the area of Prairie and Forest Avenues. He criticized a Council member for using that data to influence others. He opined that it is unfair for the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem to receive meeting information on Friday, before the rest of the Council. Mayor Barnett disagreed, stating that this timing difference does not violate the "No Surprises" policy, since everyone receives the information before the Village Council meeting. Commissioner Gilmartin maintained his disagreement.

Commissioner Tully emphasized that he prefers Council discussions to happen publicly at the dais, especially when there's disagreement. This is to ensure open, thoughtful dialogue. Commissioner Gilmartin asked why, to which Commissioner Tully responded that public discussions lead to more mindful and constructive conversations.

The Mayor said he thinks that they are talking about two different things. He said his take on "No Surprises" is that everyone gets the same information within the same range of time. Commissioner Tully said if he attends a meeting and knows there are a number of Council members that oppose agenda items, he may want to table an item. Commissioner Gilmartin asked if he would like a personal phone call from his fellow Council members, to which Commissioner Tully said was not necessary, as a heads up from Staff would be substantial.

Other Government/Agency Meetings

Commissioner Davenport suggested including Downers Grove Township. Manager Fieldman reminded the Council that the Village includes four townships.

Commissioner Tully raised the idea of reinstating liaisons to outside organizations. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt supported this, especially for the EDC and DMC because the

Village funds them. She said she also thinks there should be a liaison to the Library to have a closer connection.

Mayor Barnett noted past issues with liaisons, while Commissioner Gilmartin emphasized that since the Council funds the EDC and DMC, it should also approve their liaisons. He suggested having the organizations provide regular updates to the Council. Commissioner Tully noted that Staff often communicates with these groups, but elected officials do not.

The conversation shifted to whether appointments should be made by the Mayor or Council, with some questioning the effectiveness of Mayoral appointments. Attorney Petrarca said she had shared the bylaws and Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt asked for assistance with helping the Council to better understand them. The Council agreed to start by inviting other government bodies to speak at Council meetings and to explore future collaboration opportunities.

Coffee with the Council

Mayor Barnett asked for feedback on ways to improve the event. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt suggested incorporating a theme or focus topic at least every other month to increase public participation. Commissioner Davenport agreed that themes could be helpful and noted that themes should not prevent residents from bringing up other topics or issues.

Mayor Barnett supported having a focus while ensuring attendees still feel welcome to discuss any topic. Commissioner Davenport added that themes can encourage those less engaged to participate. Commissioner Gilmartin supported this idea. Commissioner Davenport also proposed partnering with other government bodies.

Mayor Barnett noted past efforts to hold meetings in various locations. Commissioner Davenport shared his preference for more public venues. The Council concurred.

Commissioner Gilmartin requested more detailed event postings beyond just a link or standard agenda. Manager Fieldman said he would review options with the Legal and Communications staff. Commissioner Sarver opposed adding anything beyond the formal agenda, while Mayor Barnett suggested adding brief descriptions to clarify agenda items. Manager Fieldman agreed to explore the idea with Staff.

Communicating with the Public

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt suggested utilizing Instagram more. Commissioner Tully spoke about people who want to access the agenda without going online and suggested using AI tools that can turn the agenda into audio that people can hear when they call in. He spoke further about accessibility. Commissioner Gilmartin said he thinks that is a great idea.

Responding to Inquiries from the Press

Commissioner Gilmartin said he thinks the Village does a great job with this.

Responding to Resident Inquiries and Requests for Service

The Council agreed with the current description for this.

Neighborhood Meetings

No Council comments.

Council Directed Work By Staff

No Council comments.

Commissioner Gilmartin said he would like to discuss the following subjects at a future meeting: reopening topics at meetings – including the Council’s interaction in those situations, Council education on processes that do not frequently occur, the performance reviews of Village Manager and Village Attorney - the process and expectations of those, and the idea of a “no-fly zone” - Village policy that says the Council does not appoint to boards and commissions or discuss controversial topics during the time that petitions are filed and elections are held.

9. Council Member Reports

A. New Business

REP 2025-10859 1. Report: Discussion Regarding an Amendment to Section 2.17 of the Municipal Code Pertaining to the Appointment of the Mayor Pro Tem

MOTION: To Direct Staff to Amend Section 2.17 of the Municipal Code to Reflect the Changes as Presented by Commissioner Gilmartin.

RESULT: Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE: Commissioner Gilmartin

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt

AYES: Commissioners Gilmartin, Sadowski-Fugitt, Tully Davenport, Sarver, Roe, and Mayor Barnett

Commissioner Gilmartin proposed an amendment to Section 2.17 of the Municipal Code to ensure a Mayor Pro Tem is always seated, aligning it with the Village’s Emergency Succession Ordinance.

Commissioner Gilmartin made the motion to instruct Staff to draft language that revises Municipal Code 2.17, to reflect the changes as proposed.

Commission Sadowski-Fugitt seconded the motion.

Commissioner Tully raised concerns about timing, process, and potential precedent. He suggested the issue be addressed during the governance discussions, rather than as a New Business Item.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt noted the need for the New Business Item, as change would not take effect for a couple of years and that Staff would not act on it without direction. Commissioner Gilmartin emphasized the need to resolve the issue.

Commissioner Roe shared he sees value in having Staff gather more information. Commissioner Tully suggested having Staff gather information by using the four-hour rule, but Commissioner Gilmartin opposed that, saying it would only delay the process further.

Commissioner Davenport expressed concern about voting to draft a change without proper discussion, especially when there are options like the 4-hour rule. He too shared that he expected the issue to be addressed during governance discussions.

Mayor Barnett emphasized that there is a high degree of deference to New Business Items as a general principal. He also shared his opinion that the Mayor Pro Tem issue should ideally be addressed during governance discussions..

Commissioner Davenport questioned the urgency, to which Commissioner Gilmartin noted that the Mayor Pro Tem role has not been part of past governance discussions and needs to be filled promptly. Commissioner Davenport asked if the matter will proceed as a First Reading item. Staff confirmed it would.

Commissioner Tully brought up Commissioner Gilmartin's suggestion that the EDC and DMC appointments should no longer be Mayoral appointments. He noted that the same issue could arise with these appointments as it did with the Mayor Pro Tem appointment. Commissioner Gilmartin agreed.

Mayor Barnett noted that this is historically the only time this has happened. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt clarified that this is not about changing the Village Code, but rather, it is about adding a fallback in case it happens again.

Mayor Barnett said the expectation has always been that the Mayor Pro Tem is a Mayoral appointment. Commissioner Gilmartin asked why the Council-approval was a piece of the process then.

Mayor Barnett emphasized that this discussion is especially important because the current Council is unlike any other. Commissioner Gilmartin responded by pointing out that many other communities follow the same process. Mayor Barnett then characterized addressing the issue under new business as an impulsive reaction by the Commissioner and suggested postponing the discussion to a later date. Commissioner Gilmartin disagreed and expressed his dissatisfaction with the Mayor's characterization.

Roll Call was taken on the motion made by Commissioner Gilmartin. The Motion was carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt shared that the Grove Foundation's Golf Outing is live.

10. Mayor's Report

There was no Mayor's Report.

11. Adjournment

Mayor Barnett asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION: To Adjourn the July 15, 2025 Village Council Meeting.

RESULT: Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE: Commissioner Tully

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt

AYES: Commissioners Tully, Sadowski-Fugitt, Gilmartin, Davenport, Sarver, Roe, Mayor Barnett

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosa Berardi
Village Clerk