

APRIL 5th, 2023 – CITY COUNCIL MEETING

SPEAKER SIGNUP, WRITTEN COMMENTS & POSITION STATEMENTS

PUBLIC FORUM

1. Dianne McGuire (Naperville)
2. Nancy Turner (Naperville)
3. Barbara O’Meara - Building permits
4. Basim Esmail (Naperville) – Brixmor and the Elections
5. Romel Bryant (Illinois) - Propose an opportunity to create 100 Jobs.

COMMENT ONLY

1. Asim Gaff (Naperville) - Political Signs- As a civics teacher, I am proud of the competitive political campaigns we have in Naperville. I do wish for a higher turn out rate, but I understand local politics requires a lot more time and connections to be knowledgeable of the significance and the candidates platform. If it wasn't for the ICN forum I wouldn't have gotten to know all the candidates. I hope the city can create more politically neutral social media campaigns of awareness of what each elected office does- that might increase turnout. I am also concerned about the increased number of political signs this election and question their efficacy. Who actually votes for a person because of a sign? Private property support makes sense and some signage is good, but what about public land? What branding or name recognition is created when every candidate is heavily covering our city with signs? NPR reports there MIGHT be a 1-2% vote benefit, but that was a survey not for municipal elections which typically has more motivated voters and very low turnout. There used to be heavy enforcement of where campaigns can place signs, I know because I used to volunteer for one, but now almost every other street corner, park and even forest preserve has signs. We had 2 storms that whipped up signs and turned them into waste into our water ways and parks. City staff can only do so much. Please consider mitigation efforts to protect our beautiful city from waste and excessive signage. The onus goes back to the campaigns and city expectations of them. I hope they continue to take the time to cleanup today what is still out there and I hope we can find more effective ways to increase voter turnout.

L1. 415 JACKSON AVE (RIVERWALK PLACE)

QUESTIONS ONLY

1. Vince Rosanova (Naperville) – PETITIONER

L5. CONDUCT FIRST READING ORDINANCE REPEALING CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE

SPEAKERS

1. Susan Glover Craighead (Naperville) – League of women voters in Naperville
2. Tim Messer (Naperville)
3. Marilyn L Schweitzer (Naperville)
4. Lynn Gosselin (Naperville)

OPPOSE

1. Laura Cuber (Naperville)
2. Kay Akins (Naperville)
3. Alexandria Ridenour (Naperville)
4. Nancy Leary (Naperville)
5. Karen Whitsitt (Naperville)

COMMENT ONLY

1. Derek Miller (Naperville) -I would like to OPPOSE repealing the campaign disclosure ordinance. I do believe a lot of outside money has entered Naperville's local elections, but I don't believe that money is because of the ordinance. Almost every community of Naperville's size around the country has seen outside money funnel into local elections. With campaign finance laws as they are it is unlikely we can prevent this money from coming in, but we can make that money as transparent as possible. If the ordinance is unclear about when donations should be disclosed, we should modify the ordinance instead of repealing it. Maybe to make it easier to avoid missing disclosures, all donations should be sent through the city's lawyer to determine what should be disclosed at each meeting. More transparency should not be a bad thing and repealing this ordinance would certainly decrease transparency.

2. Kevin Coyne -All, I had hoped to appear at the next Council meeting to voice support for Mayor Chirico's desire to repeal the Campaign Disclosure but, unfortunately it appears that I have a conflict. I won't belabor prior concerns that I have voiced in the past as to this ordinance. Namely that the ordinance deters donations from our local small businesses and residents while doing nothing disclosure-wise to the larger political players (namely PACs, unions, political parties) whom will rarely - if ever - be on our agenda. In effect, the ordinance makes larger political voices even more influential than they already are.

I'd like to highlight how unworkable and gotch'ya-geared this ordinance will be as more and more councilmen (and mayor) receive qualifying donations. Gray area has been created by all the PACs and Party involvement. The Firemen union, for instance, gave out numerous qualifying donations this cycle. They ran Facebook ads and did mailers for candidates. They canvassed and walked in parade entries for certain candidates. In my view, and that of most, is that the Fire Department is now a group that raises disclosure responsibility for those that received their support. Now what? Every procurement, budget item, innocuous consent agenda item, or even matter of public safety, that involves the Fire Department arguably triggers this ordinance. All of those that received political support from the Fire Department will regularly have to deal with this ordinance and/or be asked why disclosures are not being made.

If the position is taken that the Fire union is a different entity than the Fire Department (which is a heck of a stretch in my opinion) then the ordinance is so narrowly drawn that it would virtually never apply (i.e. so why have it?). The real estate developers, whom were the apparent target of the ordinance, rarely donate from the usually empty shell entity that appears on the agenda and which is used to bring the development forward. In other words, the developer donations will rarely ever have to be disclosed either. The whole original point of the ordinance was developer donations!

Since the ordinance was past, donations from third parties have grown exponentially. The suggested policy items (namely transparency) that the ordinance was created for have gotten worse - not better. Worse this ordinance places you all in a legal gray area. This just happened at your last meeting - did it apply in Theresa's case or not? Honestly its not clear and is a matter that a good lawyer could argue either way in court.

This ordinance is not just unfair to you all, Its unfair to those that will soon be joining the council and whom are likely to run into these questions more often than has occurred to date. Please support our Mayor's last initiative and repeal this problemed ordinance.

Thank you all for your consideration and service to Naperville.

3. Karen V Peck (Naperville) Dear Naperville City Council and Mayor, I am writing regarding File # 23-0407 Version 1, the "Ordinance Repealing Campaign Disclosure Ordinance." I OPPOSE the striking of this ordinance from the Naperville Municipal Code. I cannot understand why anyone would want to repeal an ordinance to publicly disclose political contributions totaling more than \$750 dollars unless those elected officials have something they wish to hide. I can think of no other rationale for striking this. A review of ethical behavior is one of the key measures voters use when voting. Disclosure of who is funding a candidate/councilperson is ethical and transparent. Striking the ethics ordinance on campaign disclosure makes candidate's and elected official's funding opaque and is a way to hide funders. Given that candidates of late have been funded by billionaire donors at the local election level, it is imperative that voters know who the donors are and to whom candidates are beholden. The fact is that candidates and elected officials are sometimes in conflict with the goals of the governing body to which they belong. For example, if a candidate/elected official accepts large donations from developers, how can that civil servant be impartial when development projects come to council for approval? I OPPOSE the striking of the ordinance to be transparent about campaign contributions. Unethical behavior and conflicts of interest will slip under the radar if this ordinance is stricken. Sincerely, Karen V. Peck Lisle Township, Precinct 004

4. Rayna Beauchamp (Naperville) I support the ethics ordinance requiring disclosure of donations of \$750+ when the donor's matters are before council. I DO think the ordinance must be improved to capture the outside influences we saw in yesterday's election. Also the code of conduct for council members and board and commission appointees must be applied consistently. Candidates are supported by different PACs: firefighters, police, realtors, trades, etc. However every mailer, call, or text from those PACs was disclosed, amplified endorsed candidates, and did NOT smear named candidates. The Safe Suburbs USA PAC chair is a current library trustee, former councilman, and attorney. His letters to the editor and social media decried PAC Naperville Forward's mailers which did not name names but warned of consequences if extremists were elected. It was a heated discussion in these chambers as well. In January, Safe Suburbs posted a picture of park district candidate John Risvold on Facebook stating he was running to drum up personal injury business and accused him of seeking to "gain intel to harass local businesses and homeowners". Did I miss when the chair of Safe Suburbs and library trustee repudiated this post? Was this conduct acceptable for a city representative? Dark money. Billionaire Dick Uihlein lives in the north suburbs and has a business in Wisconsin. He is a mega donor to right wing state and national causes and made large donations to Dupage Policy Journal and Safe

Suburbs in the last year. Several hit pieces appeared in Dupage Policy Journal about LEGAL property tax breaks councilmen Holzhauer and White were eligible for as veterans with CERTIFIED disabilities. A reporter revealed that the story had been shopped by a former city councilman who was an attorney. This publication also smeared councilman White's spouse, a community contributor who has led a non-profit since prior to Mr. White joining council, and questioned his ethics on STAFF-VETTED project grants submitted as a package which passed 9-0. Coalition for Jobs Growth and Prosperity texted the hit pieces to voters and sent mailers packed with lies and laced with racism that attacked candidate White and praised mayor-elect Wehrli. This PAC has not filed documentation with the state election board and mayor-elect Wehrli has not reported in-kind donations nor repudiated any of the above - nobody previously upset over Naperville Forward's mailers expressed outrage over the attacks on a sitting councilman and his family. So we have swift boating a 22 year army vet, a reporter who said they heard the story from a former city councilman who was an attorney, an unregistered PAC doing dirty work that benefits one candidate, and a billionaire outsider funding various entities pushing smear campaigns against specific named candidates in non-partisan races. I call on council to CONSISTENTLY investigate and apply the code of conduct and improve the ethics ordinance to make it difficult for dark money and outsiders to influence our non-partisan races.

O1. Option A: CONCUR WITH THE PETITIONER AND DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE AN EXTENSION TO THE FIRE SUPPRESSION AGREEMENT. OPTION B: CONCUR WITH STAFF AND DENY THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION TO THE ESTABLISHED FIRE SUPPRESSION INSTALLATION AGREEMENT.

SPEAKER

1. Marilyn L Schweitzer (Naperville)

O2. CONSIDER 3 OPTIONS FOR PROVIDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO NAPERVILLE TORNADO RELIEF FUND

SPEAKERS

1. Kristy Kennedy (Naperville)- Naperville Tornado Relief

2. Selvei Rajkumar (Naperville) - Naperville Tornado Relief/ Muthusami Paravel Foundation
3. Katie Long Piper (Naperville) -Ranchview Tornado relief-Funding
4. Marilyn L Schweitzer (Naperville)