

Meeting Minutes

Village of Downers Grove - Council Meeting

Betty Cheever Council Chambers

August 12, 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. Proclamations

A. Illinois Library Association's Librarian of the Year - Julie Milavec

After reading the proclamation, Mayor Barnett presented it to Ms. Milavec.

B. Illinois Library Association's Young Adult Library Professional of the Year - Jade Parks

Mayor Barnett read the proclamation in honor of Jade Parks, who was unable to attend the meeting.

4. Public Hearing

PUB 2025-10875 A. Public Hearing: Midwestern University Bond Issuance

Mayor Barnett called the Public Hearing to order at 7:09 p.m. and provided an explanation of the Public Hearing and its procedures.

Chris Walrath spoke on behalf of Midwestern University.

Village Council Comments and Public Comment

Commissioner Tully thanked Midwestern University for their continued investment in the community.

Commissioner Davenport added it was a privilege to say yes to this.

The Mayor thanked Midwestern University for their partnership.

Scott Richards, a resident, asked what projects this is for.

A representative of Midwestern University said this is for the University's new College of Veterinary Medicine. It will help with the cost to construct an academic building on the main academic campus and two animal clinics - the companion animal clinic will be built on Finley Road and the location of the large animal clinic is yet to be determined.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt noted that the University already owns the property on Finley Road.

Commissioner Sarver asked how big the animals will be.

The representative of Midwestern said that the vet students must be able to train both small and large animals, anything from cats to horses.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

5. Minutes of Council Meetings

MIN 2024-10529 A. Minutes: Village Council Meeting Minutes - August 5, 2025

MOTION: To **Adopt Village Council Meeting Minutes of August 5, 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, Roe, Sarver, Davenport, Gilmartin and Mayor Barnett

6. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

7. Consent Agenda

BIL 2025-10835 A. Bills Payable: No. 6888 - August 12, 2025

RES 2025-10876 B. Resolution: Approve the Issuance of Revenue Bonds, Midwestern University, by the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Glendale, Arizona

RESOLUTION 2025-60

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ISSUANCE BY THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GLENDALE, ARIZONA OF ITS REVENUE BONDS, MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY, IN ONE OR MORE SERIES AND, IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$150,000,000 WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES OF MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS; AND APPROVING CERTAIN RELATED MATTERS

MOT 2025-10885 C. Motion: Approve a Contract with Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. (CBBEL) of Rosemont, Illinois, for Consulting Services for the Summit Street Water Tower Rehabilitation Project

RES 2025-10874 D. Resolution: Approve an Agreement with Sentinel Technologies, Inc., for the Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) Phone System Upgrade

RESOLUTION 2025-61

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE AND SENTINEL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

MOTION: To Adopt the Consent Agenda of the August 12, 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, Tully, Gilmartin and Mayor Barnett

8. First Reading

ORD 2025-10879 A. Ordinance: Establishing Regulations for Micromobility Devices

Village Manager Dave Fieldman introduced Transportation Manager Emily Ericson. Ms. Ericson presented via PowerPoint. She provided the background information on this item and provided an overview of the draft ordinance that mirrors the Illinois Vehicle Code.

Public Comments

Laura Temple, a resident, asked if personal assistance devices were prohibited for use on the sidewalk.

Attorney Petrarca responded that they are not prohibited from use on the sidewalk.

Scott Richards returned to the podium and expressed his frustration with children wearing all black riding bicycles with no lights on the street and sidewalks. He explained it made it difficult to see them in the dark. He said he wants regulations in place and enforced.

Village Council Comments

Mayor Barnett opened the conversation about Section 6.5a of the new draft ordinance - regarding equipment related to bicycles, low-speed electric bicycles, low-speed scooters, and personal mobility devices.

Commissioner Davenport emphasized that concerns go beyond just children. He noted that the local ordinance aligns with existing State law, which applies regardless of local adoption. He stressed the importance of education and supported allowing Class 1 and 2 e-bikes on shared use paths, but opposed their use on sidewalks. He also expressed agreement with the matrix included in the agenda packet.

Commissioner Sarver appreciated the detail in the draft ordinance, particularly its provisions for addressing the nighttime use of bikes and devices. She opposed allowing any devices to be used on sidewalks, including scooters, with the exception of personal assistance devices.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt highlighted that e-scooters would only be allowed for individuals aged 18 and over, per the draft ordinance. She acknowledged enforcement challenges with age restrictions for Class 1 and 2 e-bikes, but suggested that a strong education campaign could serve as a deterrent. She also expressed that the age restriction would alleviate her concerns about e-bike use on shared paths and even potentially sidewalks, due to connectivity issues. She supported the matrix and was open to allowing Class 1 and 2 e-bikes on sidewalks, with signage listing allowable devices and age restrictions and max speed limits. She noted that she favored banning all other devices from both sidewalks and streets.

Commissioner Roe expressed agreement with Commissioner Davenport, supporting the allowance of Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes on shared-use paths, particularly due to the minimum age restriction. He noted that sidewalks on main roads, such as Ogden Avenue, differ from those on side streets because of the higher traffic volume. He also shared that he owns an e-scooter capable of reaching 18 miles per hour and questioned whether such a device would be permitted under the ordinance.

Attorney Petrarca clarified that the ordinance applies only to low-speed e-scooters with a maximum speed of 10 miles per hour. She explained that Commissioner Roe's scooter, which exceeds that limit, falls under the Illinois Vehicle Code (IVC) and is classified differently; it must be operated on the street and requires the operator to be licensed and insured, with the vehicle registered.

Commissioner Gilmartin clarified that the determining factor in regulation is the type of device rather than just its speed. He supported allowing Class 1 and Class 2 pedal-assist e-bikes on both shared-use paths and sidewalks, noting that the age restriction of 18 is higher than the legal driving age, even though automobiles pose greater risks. He emphasized that adult cyclists, including himself, sometimes use sidewalks depending on traffic and road conditions. He also pointed out that these regulations do not apply to the downtown area, where different rules are in place, and voiced concern about the 18-year age restriction for scooters.

Attorney Petrarca responded that the ordinance reflects State law, which sets the age at 18. Commissioner Gilmartin argued that because Downers Grove has Home Rule authority, the Village should be able to lower the age to 16.

Commissioner Tully clarified that while Home Rule authority allows municipalities to be more restrictive than State law, it does not allow them to be less restrictive. Attorney Petrarca confirmed that reducing the minimum age to 16 would indeed make the ordinance less restrictive than State law, but shared that she would look into it.

Commissioner Tully expressed support for the ordinance as written, stating he is open to future adjustments, if needed.

Mayor Barnett reviewed the draft ordinance's definition of a bicycle and suggested a slight revision. He asked about the classification of on-street bike paths—lanes marked on the side of the street—which Attorney Petrarca confirmed are considered part of the street, even if marked. Mayor Barnett noted that he can personally reach speeds of up to 20 mph on a traditional bicycle and stated that, despite concerns, he believes e-bikes should be permitted on sidewalks to encourage riders to travel throughout the Village while remaining protected from traffic and road conditions. He added that the current proposal may not fully address public feedback and emphasized the importance of promoting non-vehicular travel options.

Commissioner Gilmartin asked whether reconsideration could be given to allowing e-bikes on shared use paths. Manager Fieldman noted that a majority, Commissioners Davenport, Roe, Sadowski-Fugitt, Gilmartin, and Mayor Barnett, expressed support in allowing staff to explore the idea of allowing Class 1 and 2 e-bikes on shared use paths.

Attorney Petrarca cautioned that, from an enforcement standpoint, it could be difficult to distinguish between a Class 1 and a Class 3 e-bike. Manager Fieldman indicated that staff would further analyze the issue before the next meeting. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt referenced Senate Bill 285 as a potential resource for incorporating e-bikes into the Village's definitions. Mayor Barnett noted that enforcement would primarily serve as a tool to correct bad behavior. Manager Fieldman reiterated that staff would take a deeper look at the matter and bring it back for a vote, with further discussion about classification and enforcement issues at that time.

Commissioner Davenport shared that even though he feels comfortable with bicycles on the sidewalk, he understands that many pedestrians may not feel safe. He cited McCullom Park during COVID as an example of where bike restrictions made sense due to high pedestrian traffic, but reiterated that sidewalks are primarily intended for walking. He admitted this ordinance is not exactly what he would have drafted, but sees it as a solid starting point and asked Staff to look into Class 1 & 2 e-bikes on shared use paths.

Mayor Barnett pointed out that McCullom Park is a denser, higher-volume environment than the Park District may regulate at its discretion. He added that people walking and riding across town encounter a different environment than that of McCullom Park.

Commissioner Sarver raised concerns about young teens riding their bikes on sidewalks and posing risks to pedestrians. Commissioner Gilmartin said, as a father of a 13-year-old, kids often prefer riding on the street and questioned whether resident complaints are truly about pedal-assist bikes. He suggested reviewing fines for dirt bike offenders. Attorney Petrarca said those violations fall under State law. Police Chief DeVries added that current charges could include the operation of a vehicle without a license, operation without insurance, and potentially reckless driving. Chief DeVries said those are significant charges that could affect the graduated driver's license of a minor. He added that the ordinance also allows for the impoundment of those vehicles, in addition to the possible citation of the parent. He said that a parent allowing an unlicensed person to drive these vehicles could still be subject to a State violation. Chief DeVries also explained that there has been enough public education on this, so the Village would continue to use the State violations when it comes to dirt bikes.

Commissioner Davenport suggested a 10 mph speed limit on sidewalks to be enforced by radar guns, but Chief DeVries explained that enforcing speed limits, especially by radar, would not be possible and he reminded the Council that State law prohibits e-bikes on sidewalks.

Mayor Barnett and Chief DeVries agreed that monitoring speeds on sidewalks is not practical, especially since most bikes and scooters do not have speedometers.

Commissioner Davenport asked whether the Village could override State law to allow e-bikes on sidewalks. Commissioner Gilmartin pointed out that Glen Ellyn allows them. Attorney Petrarca said she would look into it and noted Glen Ellyn made that decision with legal risk.

Mayor Barnett asked that School Districts 58 and 99 be included in the education efforts. Manager Fieldman confirmed this would be possible and shared that Staff would do some additional research and bring updates to the September 2, 2025, Village Council meeting.

ORD 2025-10888 B. Ordinance: Amending the Provisions of Mayor Pro Tem

Manager Fieldman introduced the item and offered Staff support for any questions.

Commissioner Gilmartin explained he brought the ordinance forward due to a breakdown in the appointment process for Mayor Pro Tem, something the Council had never experienced before. He explained that under the current ordinance, the Mayor is not required to nominate a second candidate if the first is rejected by the Council. Commissioner Gilmartin said the changes would require the Mayor to present a new nominee within 21 days of the rejection of the first nominee. If a second nominee is not brought forth, then the position would default to the longest-serving Council member, preventing a vacancy. He likened this to past code clean ups/updates and noted that the draft ordinance mirrors the Village's Emergency Succession Policy. Commissioner Gilmartin explained that, if this is adopted, Staff advised the change would take effect in two years, with the next election. He explained this is due to the current ordinance's 60 day deadline for the Mayor to nominate another candidate. Commissioner Gilmartin noted that the adoption of this ordinance should reset the timeline and therefore require immediate action by the Mayor.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt supported the proposal, saying it provides a clear fallback and does not favor any specific Council member. She clarified that contrary to earlier assumptions, the ordinance could take effect sooner based on Staff responses. She agreed it aligns with the Village's Emergency Succession Policy and would help the Council move forward efficiently.

Commissioner Davenport referenced his past comments and expressed a desire to put the issue behind them. He called the matter a distraction and opined that the process should have included a Mayoral appointment without the need for Council approval. He shared hopes for a quick resolution.

Commissioner Tully expressed disappointment with the proposed ordinance change, stating that while it was supported initially as a New Business Item, he believes it stems from a misunderstanding. He emphasized that the Mayor Pro Tem role is a Mayoral appointment requiring Council confirmation. He said it is not a Council appointment and argued that unless there were clear reasons to reject the Mayor's nominee, the appointment should have proceeded. He warned that the proposed changes make the process resemble the appointments to the Library Board of Trustees, which are Council decisions, and said he does not support altering a process that was not broken. He cautioned that this could create problems for future Village Councils and does not represent good governance.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt agreed with some of Commissioner Tully's points, but shared that her intent in supporting the change is to encourage more open conversation and collaboration early in the process, ideally preventing the need to invoke fallback mechanisms.

Mayor Barnett strongly criticized the effort, stating that it was rooted in disagreement with his nominee rather than any flaw in the Village Code. He likened the move to partisan behavior seen nationally and claimed it was driven by personal issues among Council members, not governance concerns. He emphasized that his nominee was qualified and no valid reasons were given for rejecting the appointment. He warned that this change could set a harmful

precedent for other board and commission appointments, making appointments more difficult moving forward. He expressed his intention to submit another nomination.

Commissioner Sarver said, as a new Council member, she found the situation appalling and was angered by it. Commissioner Roe also expressed a desire to move past the issue and find a resolution.

Commissioner Gilmartin said the Mayor could have resolved the issue by putting forth a second nominee. He emphasized this was not about changing policy or about politics, but rather about the Mayor not listening to past concerns raised by him and Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt. Commissioner Gilmartin agreed with Commissioner Sarver and said he is ready to move on. He clarified that without bringing this issue forward, there would be no Mayor Pro Tem. He reiterated that this was not a political move, it was about the Mayor fulfilling his responsibilities. He stated that the discussion was not about personal dislike but about maintaining the integrity of the process.

Mayor Barnett responded that he had nominated someone, Commissioner Tully, who he believed was the most experienced Council member. He said he could put forward Commissioner Roe as an option, but Commissioner Roe declined, saying he did not feel experienced enough as a new member.

Commissioner Gilmartin compared the situation to the Village's Emergency Succession Plan, but Mayor Barnett disagreed, stating the Mayor Pro Tem role is not tied to succession and that there is a clear order in the Succession Plan process.

Commissioner Gilmartin stressed the need to fix the broken process and avoid similar problems in the future. Mayor Barnett defended the structure of the organization and his role as the elected leader. He argued that for 20 years there has been an elected Mayor, and this undermines that leadership structure and removes authority from the Mayoral role. He cited past Council discussions to support his position.

Commissioner Gilmartin argued that the Mayor had not properly communicated his nominee to the Council. Mayor Barnett responded that Commissioner Gilmartin had informed him prior to the meeting that there would be four votes cast against the nomination of Commissioner Tully, making confirmation unlikely. Commissioner Gilmartin denied providing this information.

Commissioner Gilmartin revisited the previous Council Governance discussion on agenda planning, noting discrepancies between the Village Code and the actual process. He also stated he must have confidence in whoever the Mayor nominates as Mayor Pro Tem, emphasizing that the role ultimately goes to the person who earns four or more votes.

Mayor Barnett responded that Commissioner Gilmartin's interpretation differs from the process followed by the County and by 80% of the population. The Mayor noted that the current

procedure—or defaulting to State law—represents the standard approach. He said that if something were to happen to him, a process is already in place to address the situation.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt countered that examples from other municipalities, included in the agenda materials, support the new ordinance approach. She acknowledged her differences with the Mayor, but emphasized her professionalism, integrity, and responsibility to the residents. She explained her reasons for voting against Commissioner Tully and said she believes the Village Code should be designed to stand strong for decades to come, preventing future Village Councils from facing similar issues.

Mayor Barnett agreed that no one wanted to be in this situation and expressed concern about others assuming responsibilities he believes belong to the Mayor. He stated that the role carries unique responsibilities and that he must have confidence in the person he appoints. He emphasized that selecting a Mayor Pro Tem should remain the Mayor's responsibility and reiterated that a succession plan is already in place.

Commissioner Davenport emphasized that the Mayor is elected as the leader of the Council, and stated his view that the Mayor Pro Tem should be appointed by the Mayor - without Council approval. He added that if he were to change the current ordinance, it would be to remove the Council approval requirement. He clarified that the proposed changes concern whether the Mayor or the Village Council selects the Mayor Pro Tem. The Commissioner concluded by stating he was ready to move on from the discussion.

Manager Fieldman asked for Council feedback regarding the ordinance's effective date. Commissioner Gilmartin said it should take effect upon passage; Commissioner Davenport said it did not matter to him because he is not voting in favor of the change.

Commissioner Gilmartin emphasized that all Council members are elected and the process is not about forcing a choice on the Mayor, and if two nominees are rejected, the position defaults to the most tenured member. Commissioner Davenport and Mayor Barnett disagreed.

Commissioner Sarver expressed her opinion that the meeting and further discussions should not proceed due to the tone of the meeting. Mayor Barnett noted the substantial workload ahead for the Council and the need to continue the meeting. Attorney Petrarca addressed Manager Fieldman's question about the effective date. Commissioners Roe, Gilmartin, and Sadowski-Fugitt wanted it effective immediately, while Commissioners Tully, Davenport and Mayor Barnett wanted it to go into effect later. She said she would leave the ordinance as drafted.

The Mayor urged the residents to look beyond the Mayor Pro Tem issue and emphasized the Council's shared commitment. He reminded all about the Council's collaboration during the Guiding DG process. He asked the public not to judge the Council or the Village negatively based on this debate.

9. 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 establishing regulations for micromobility devices.
2. An ordinance amending the provisions of Mayor Pro Tem.

Mayor Barnett called for a recess at 9:11 pm. The meeting reconvened at 9:23 pm

10. Manager's Report

INF 2025-10861 A. Information: Council Governance Discussion

The Council reconvened at 9:23 p.m. for an informal, dinner-style discussion at the back of the Betty Cheever Council Chambers. Due to the nature and length of the meeting, the Mayor proposed an end time of 10:00 p.m., and the Council agreed.

Mayor Barnett noted that the Governance materials included in the packet were redlined by Staff to reflect the Council's last discussion. He opened the discussion to the Council.

Commissioner Gilmartin suggested removing the section on Council Report Rules, which the Council supported. He had no other redline suggestions but noted that, regarding additional Governance topics, members should remain alert to the potential need to discuss rules for reopening previous Council decisions. He also mentioned adding rules for new processes, citing the Joint Ad Hoc Committee and a lengthy Priority Action Item list that needed to be condensed in the past. Commissioner Gilmartin emphasized reviewing rarely used practices to ensure they remain appropriate and efficient, particularly given the relative inexperience of many current members. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt added that expectations may have evolved.

Commissioner Gilmartin transitioned the topic to Council activity during election cycles. Commissioner Tully explained that the current policy originated in the early 2000s to avoid influencing elections with policy decisions, though he shared never seeing this happen. He encouraged the authenticity of the Council during election seasons. Commissioner Davenport noted the importance of being aware of the potential impact. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt argued that with elections every two years, too much time is lost if work slows down, and Council should continue with needed tasks regardless. Commissioner Tully agreed with her in principle but said it is more about using judgment, Staff can manage the workload, and such activity should not be banned, just approached with caution.

Commissioner Sarver noted that use of the word "controversy" in the packet was too strong a word and recommended striking it.

Commissioner Gilmartin interpreted Commissioner Tully's earlier remarks as suggesting Staff should decide what work gets done. Commissioner Tully clarified that he meant Staff should be trusted when the Council directs them and this should not be a formal rule.

Manager Fieldman noted the nature of the last Priority Action Item list and the intensity in which Staff tackled it. He shared that Staff was able to proceed as they did because there was clear Council direction to continue working. Commissioner Gilmartin said if the balance of the Council is in agreement this is a rule they do not want, then he is good with removing it. Mayor Barnett pointed out that avoiding major initiatives during elections ineffectively removes six months of work from the year. Both Commissioner Tully and Mayor Barnett agreed that this has been more a matter of perception and tradition, and they have not seen any issues. Commissioner Davenport admitted he had not followed that informal rule in the past.

Commissioner Gilmartin then noted his concerns about the Village Manager and Attorney Performance Review Process section. He explained the process includes a Village Council executive session meeting, without Staff, to perform a collective review of both the Village Manager and Attorney. He explained that after the executive session meeting, the process includes the Mayor Pro Tem summarizing the Council's feedback into a formal write-up. He expressed concern that the Mayor had shared individual feedback, specifically Commissioner Gilmartin's, with the Village Manager and Attorney after the meeting. He said it was something he himself wanted to share with Manager Fieldman and Attorney Petrarca, since it was not the consensus of the Council. Mayor Barnett responded, sharing that he has only had brief conversations with the two after the executive session meetings, since the formal write-up is not delivered until weeks later.

Commissioner Gilmartin explained his concern was about timing, and he did not want to give his feedback to the Manager and Attorney until he could do so constructively, and he felt the Mayor lacked the full context when conveying his feedback.

Commissioner Tully emphasized the importance of preserving the consensus process. Commissioner Gilmartin responded that if there is no consensus, the Mayor should not relay anything at all to the Manager and Attorney. He said that the individual Council members should have their own conversations with them. Mayor Barnett agreed.

Commissioner Tully added that Council members should share their feedback with the Village Manager and Attorney throughout the year, not just during performance reviews.

Mayor Barnett then spoke about a few inter-related topics including the Publication of Council Meeting Agenda Materials, Monday Phone Calls and Friday Mayor Meetings, and Three Council Meetings Per Month. He shared he has no issue with aligning the timing of the distribution of agenda materials to the Council Members and the Mayor. However, he made the Council aware that he needs more than one day to prepare for the meetings, as for him, it is not just about the content of the meeting materials, but also about the management of the meeting itself. He explained if the Council wanted to move to align the timing of the distribution of materials to

Fridays and the conversations with Manager Fieldman to Mondays, then he recommended having the Village Council Meetings every other Tuesday, with a start time of 6 p.m. He explained this would allow Staff extra time to distribute agenda materials on the Tuesday before the meetings, and would allow the Council members extra time to review the agenda materials. It would also give the Mayor and Manager Fieldman the extra time needed for proper meeting management.

Commissioner Davenport opposed changing the Village Council meeting schedule, saying it would confuse the public and reduce predictability.

Commissioner Tully noted that the meeting structure has changed multiple times over the years.

Commissioner Gilmartin asked why the Mayor feels receiving the materials on Friday is not enough time to prepare. Mayor Barnett responded that he needs more time not just to review materials, but to strategize with Manager Fieldman on managing the meeting effeciently.

Commissioner Gilmartin said he is fine with a 6:00 p.m. start time but wants to keep the current schedule for Village Council meetings - the first three Tuesdays of the month. Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt agreed that an earlier start time might work for heavy agendas, but opposed making it standard, citing public accessibility concerns.

Mayor Barnett pointed out that switching to every-other-week meetings would only reduce the total number of meetings slightly over the course of the year.

Commissioner Gilmartin raised concerns that an every-other-week meeting schedule, combined with vacations, could leave Council members disconnected for a full month.

Commissioner Davenport opposed reducing the number of meetings, saying the Council needs more, not less, time to meet and suggested that changing the start time would be a better approach. He also objected to any irregular meeting pattern.

Commissioner Roe said he would like to hear public feedback on a potential 6:00 p.m. start time and asked if changing the meeting schedule would make things more efficient for Staff to better prepare for meetings. Commissioner Tully was open to change and noted that meeting formats have been adjusted in the past. Commissioner Sarver expressed support as well.

Manager Fieldman said Staff had considered meeting twice monthly, on either the 1st and 3rd or 2nd and 4th Tuesdays, which would allow more prep time but could also result in longer meetings with fuller agendas. He said this was up to the discretion of the Council.

Mayor Barnett reflected on how meetings during the Guiding DG initiative were longer than usual, but said the effort was necessary and valuable. Commissioner Gilmartin agreed, noting that the Council essentially operated as two boards during that time.

Commissioner Davenport said he is open to holding meetings on either the 1st and 3rd or 2nd and 4th Tuesdays, but prefers not to reduce the total number of meetings. He supported making the meeting start time earlier, if needed.

Commissioner Tully suggested reconsidering the need for all members to be present at every meeting, noting that during Guiding DG it was necessary, but moving forward, meetings should proceed as long as there is a quorum.

Mayor Barnett agreed, noting that in past years, meetings often continued with 5–6 members present. Commissioner Davenport acknowledged he has come to better understand that not every meeting requires full attendance.

Manager Fieldman clarified that full participation is only needed for discussions on three topics: LRP financial strategies, LRP Priority Action Items, and Governance.

Commissioner Gilmartin said he prefers more frequent meetings for better discussion opportunities, rather than packing everything into two. He also noted that some meetings were canceled in 2023 and said he would rather have the flexibility to cancel if there's no content, than to permanently reduce the meeting frequency.

Commissioner Sadowski-Fugitt asked Staff to analyze past years of meeting lengths to gauge expectations moving forward. Commissioner Davenport suggested looking specifically at the two years prior to the pandemic. The Council agreed.

Mayor Barnett suggested wrapping up the meeting due to the time and explained that the discussion on Boards and Commissions would be deferred to the next Village Council meeting.

INF 2025-10892 B. Information: Boards and Commissions Discussion

The discussion was deferred to the September 2, 2025, Village Council Meeting.

11. Council Member Reports

There were no Council Member Reports.

12. Mayor's Report

There was no Mayor's Report.

13. Adjournment

Mayor Barnett asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION: To Adjourn the August 12, 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, Roe, Sarver, Davenport, Tully, Gilmartin and Mayor Barnett

The meeting adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosa Berardi
Village Clerk