



and it was not fake news--busses of Antifa and Black Lives Matters were brought in and escorted by the police. She goes on and on and on and on. Let me just tell you something. There are a lot of Black Lives Matter supporters that go to JJC. To believe that you would even spread or talk about what your son-in-law, if that is the case, is a Capitol Police and you are talking about what a Capitol Police has seen in Washington, I don't know that anything would be secure with you as a Trustee and Board Member if you're that loose with information. It really concerns me. My daughter is a young, Latina woman. Those comments that you made are very concerning and very upsetting and I don't want you anywhere around any decisions that have to do with this school with that kind of attitude. Thank you."

A statement was read by Chairman Wunderlich, from CAALAC (Committee for African American and Latino American Concerns). CAALAC requested this be read during a meeting this morning with Chairman Wunderlich and President Mitchell.

"The Committee for African American and Latino American Concerns (CAALAC) are communicating its displeasure regarding the comments made by Trustee Broderick via social media in January. As a representative of the College, Trustee Broderick has a responsibility to respect, advocate, and vote unbiasedly for every constituent associated with the College and its diverse population. Historically, minority employees and students of the College have experienced systematic racial inequities. Within the last several months, it appeared as if we were on a path of healing with Kaleidoscope training, diversity, equity, and inclusion talk sessions, diversity-focused book club meetings, as well as the recent hires of minority executive-level staff. Comments like those conveyed by Trustee Broderick make employees feel as if we're not gaining any traction. Joliet Junior College is the nation's first community college. We were trailblazers in setting the standards for community college and we now have an opportunity to continue to be a trailblazer for equality for all."

Chairman Wunderlich clarified the purpose of the Electoral Board. The reason for the Electoral Board is to see if petitions and objections of the two candidates are valid. The other comments are comments that are made because it is a special board meeting and there are always public comments.

#### 4. Approval of Hearing Minutes

The Approval of Hearing Minutes was brought forward. Chairman Wunderlich called Betty Washington forward virtually to express concerns she had with the public comment section. Betty Washington requested that the following comment be added to the record related to the email from Public Comment.

Ms. Washington's statement was as follows:

"Under public comments, I would like to draw your attention to the comment by Delores Hermanson, which says that, 'I strenuously object to the consolidated election petitions of Maureen Broderick and Betty Washington as candidates for nomination to the office of Board Trustee for Joliet Junior College. Those that praise sedition have no place in our educational system. Please remove these

candidates from the ballot as they are traitors and not fit for public office.’ First I would just like to say that I take offense to Ms. Hermanson, who does not know me, to her comment. I am a lifetime member of the NAACP, a trusted resident of Joliet. I would not engage in such rhetoric. I was not involved. I think where the miscommunication is that my petitions were challenged because of some of the signatures. It has nothing to do with the comments from Ms. Broderick. So I do want that clarification made to the other Trustees, the Board, and the Administration of Joliet Junior College. Thank you.”

Motion to accept the minutes with this comment noted was moved by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. All approved.

5. Hearing  
for Case  
Number  
2021-EB-1

Those present for the Hearing for Case Number 2021-EB-1 were identified as Drew D. Duzinkas (objector), Maureen Broderick (candidate), and Ryan Morton (attorney for Ms. Broderick). Hearing Officer Harvey called for preliminary matters and there were none.

Mr. Duzinkas presented information on the objection, stating that the objection as written stands for itself. Election code requires uniformity between statement of candidacy and the petition, which was not met. There is a fatal inconsistency between the statement and petition and the election authority must not guess what the candidate is running for.

Attorney Morton, representing Ms. Broderick, requested confirmation of the response filed to the Electoral Board for Review. It was received by Hearing Officer Harvey and Mr. Duzinkas. This document was then shared with the electoral board members, who were provided time to review the document.

Chairman Wunderlich asked for confirmation on whether the Statement of Candidacy did not have a term of office on it. Attorney Morton confirmed that was accurate, but asked to present his argument that is seven to eight pages of response that he will summarize. He states that the objector has not met the bare minimum for relief. To award the petitioner relief, the objector must present facts and a legal basis must be provided. He has provided facts but has not included any citation to the election code. Attorney Morton stated that the arguments have no basis in the law.

Attorney Morton states that nowhere in the election code does it require a person to write the length of the term of office. Section 10-4 states that each petition must include the office, name and address. Section 10-5 states that the statement of candidacy must include the office, name and address. The contents of the form, including the term of office/duration of term, are not in the statute. The model form presented by the state board of elections is not a statutory form.

The objection mentions a lack of consistency (addressed in section B) between the Statement of Economic Interest and the petition. Attorney Morton states that Mr. Duzinkas gives no statutory basis for the need for consistency between the documents, so it should fail. Regarding the Statement of Economic Interest, there is no requirement in the act to list the term of service, just the office.

Therefore, Attorney Morton argued that this objection is irrelevant.

Attorney Morton addressed the objection regarding the statement of the term and consistency with the petition is not addressed in the statute, but is well taken. However, every petition indicates the unexpired term. This is cited to decisions in the brief (page 3) and Attorney Morton stated that the important thing is not strict compliance with the statements matching the petitions. Case law states that substantial compliance was enough because there was no doubt about what the candidate wanted. Attorney Morton cited the exhibit letter from Local Election Official, Dr. Tracy Morris. He stated that the letter stated that Ms. Broderick was running for the 6-year unexpired term, 4 years remaining and he stated that since the Local Official knew what the person was running for, that is why the consistency argument does not hold.

The last argument from Attorney Morton (section C in response) was about the specific mistake that Ms. Broderick allegedly made by not filling in the form. The form is voluntary and not required by statute. Ms. Broderick interpreted it to be a 6-year term that is unexpired. This language does not say how many years are remaining. Her interpretation was that the length was 6 years. Attorney Morton states that there was no confusion based on the wording. She did not leave it blank. Broderick made it known by putting the term on the petitions, which was proven to be known by the Local Election Official.

Attorney Morton summarized by asking the board to be objective. He acknowledged the comments in the community and in her service, but that is not what the Electoral Board should consider, it should be just about the objection papers submitted by both parties.

Mr. Duzinkas was permitted the opportunity to respond. He stated that on the Statement of Candidacy, the full language states that a full term is sought unless specified. That is an inaccuracy in their arguments. He stated that his understanding of the objection process is that the objector did not have to bring forward case law and that his objection stands in light of a well put together response. There is still remains a fatal inconsistency between the documents.

Proof and evidence was closed. The Board deliberated on the evidence. Trustee Morales stated that it does say clearly on the form that if not indicated, a full term is sought. The wording seems clear on the form. It says 6-year unexpired term, which is not consistent with Dr. Morris' letter. Letter states for the 6-year unexpired term-4 years remaining, so there is confusion. Chairman Wunderlich commented that on the form that if not indicated, a full term is sought. Ms. Broderick did put 6-year unexpired term on the form. It does not say how many years are remaining.

Hearing Officer Harvey clarified that there is no 4-year term. They are all 6 year terms. He clarified that it is the board's determination by majority to make the decision and to base the ruling on what parties brought forward to you. The court reporter will complete a transcript and either party can appeal the decision.

Motion to sustain the objection was made by Trustee Morales. Motion to overrule the objection was moved by Trustee Mahalik. Trustee Mahalik and Chairman Wunderlich voted to overrule the objection and Trustee Morales voted to sustain the objection. Objection was overruled and Ms. Broderick will remain on the ballot. Hearing Officer Harvey called for a five-minute recess to prepare the decision and provide copies to the parties.

6. Hearing for  
Case Number  
2021-EB-2

Those present for the Hearing for Case Number 2021-EB- 2 were identified as Betty Washington (candidate), and Bryan Kopman (attorney for Ms. Stacie Kreag-Gebar).

Hearing Officer Harvey called for preliminary matters. Attorney Bryan Kopman asked if Betty Washington made a comment during the public comment section of the open meeting. Chairman Wunderlich clarified that Ms. Washington made a comment on the minutes of the prior meeting, not the public comment. Attorney Kopman had no matter, as a result.

Attorney Kopman (representing the objector) presented information on the objection, which is related to specific signature objections. The documents were received by Hearing Officer Harvey then provided to the electoral board members. The information from the County Clerk's offices, which provided the following information on registered voters and provided information for each of the signatures objected to. The documents have been certified by the County Clerk's office. It was determined that the process would review each objection.

Attorney Kopman presented Exhibit 1, which is a copy of the rules of procedure for the Illinois State Board of Elections. This board has its own rules adopted at the last meeting. He stated that he doesn't offer the rules for how to hold a hearing. However, this document has appendices that offer guidance on how an electoral board should consider signature elections. Attorney Kopman requested to tender this to the board and Ms. Washington had no objection.

A summary of the objections was provided. The election guidelines state that a candidate must turn in a minimum of 50 valid signatures. The objector presents objections against 12 signatures. Ms. Washington turned in 59 signatures. If 10 are ruled out—she should not remain on the ballot. The general objections are that the identified people were not registered to vote at that address or at all, the signature is not genuine, and/or the address was missing or not complete.

Sheet 1, Line 5—Objection is that signer is not registered at the address. Provided specific details on the objection (E. Cole) and certification from the County Clerk. Ms. Washington was allowed to respond. She stated that she was at an open event and she had not gone through each signature with the County Clerk, so she has no objections to going through.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 2, Line 1—Objection is that signer is not registered at that address.

Provided specific details on the objection (S. Johnson) and certification from the County Clerk. Ms. Washington had no response.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 2, Line 2—Objection is that the signature not genuine. Attorney states that the Board needs to compare the petition with the signature on the card (L. Davis-Most). Ms. Washington had no response. Chairman Wunderlich stated that not everyone signs the same way and this signature should remain valid.

*Motion to overrule the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection overruled.*

Sheet 2, Line 3—Objection is three-fold—that signer (V. Thompson) is not registered at the address shown, signature is not valid, address is not complete. Ms. Washington had no response. Chairman Wunderlich stated that not everyone signs the same way but Trustee Morales noted address is incorrect.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 2, Line 4—Objection is that the signer is not registered at the address shown. The Clerk's Office ran a search. Printed voter's name (A. Edmon) is not at that address. Attorney clarified a question from Trustee Mahalik that if someone moves, they have to sign with the address where they are registered to vote—would not comment on legality of that. Ms. Washington had no response.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 4, Line 2—Objection is that the signer (N. Swartz) is not registered at the address shown and the address is missing or incomplete. The Clerk's Office ran a search and nobody is registered at that address. Ms. Washington had no response.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 4, Line 3—Objection is that the signer (S. Koziol) is not registered at that address. This is the same address as previous, with no voter at that address.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 4, Line 6—Objection is that the signer (R. Brown) is that the address missing or incomplete on the petition.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Sheet 5, Line 5—Objection is that the signer is not registered at address shown. Clerk's office shows signed as Michelle Crowder, but no Michelle Crowder is registered to vote. There are documents for a Michelle Frank Crowder who is registered to vote 1082 Cathy Drive in Joliet (same as petition). Ms. Washington noted that the signature in question is her daughter and that she is a registered voter at that address.

*Motion to overrule the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection overruled.*

Sheet 6, Line 1—Objection is that the signature is not genuine and address is not complete. The objection presents the petition sheet and the printed name is Nicole Lyles and the objection is that address is incomplete according to Clerk's Office. (520 Bellarmine Drive East—she entered 520 Bellarmine Drive). The objection also presents two copies of her signature (which include the last name Williams) and state that both are different/not close to the signature at the County Clerk. Ms. Washington stated that signatures may change and that the signatures were obtained outside or may not have a solid foundation to sign on, which could impact this. Attorney Kopman reiterated that the signature is nothing alike and that only the name Williams is on file-not Lyles. The objection is based on these of the incorrect name and signature. Objections were discussed regarding the name, signature, and address.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. Trustee Morales and Mahalik approved and Chairman Wunderlich dissented. Objection sustained.*

Page 6, Line 6—Objection is that the signer (J. Collins) is not registered at the address shown, which is a Grundy County address. Objecter's Exhibit #2 presented from Grundy County Clerk's Office. Ms. Washington had no response.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Page 6, Line 10— Objection is that the signer (M. Maldonado) is not registered at the address shown, as shown on the last page of Will County Clerk document.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. All approved. Objection sustained.*

At the end of the process, the Board returned to the first two objections to vote, as noted.

Attorney Kopman summarized that 10 objections were sustained and 2 were overruled. Therefore there are 49 signatures remaining on the petition. Request that objection is sustained to remove her from the ballot. Ms. Washington had no response or statement.

Discussion to sustain the objection to remove Betty Washington's name from the

ballot because she does not meet the 50 signature requirement. Hearing Officer Harvey stated that documentation will show each objection and that the number of signatures is mandatory and it appears that Mrs. Washington is one signature short and the Election Board is not able to waive that requirement. Ms. Washington will not be able to be placed on the ballot, but will have the ability to appeal.

*Motion to sustain the objection by Trustee Mahalik and seconded by Trustee Morales. All approved. Objection sustained.*

Hearing Officer Harvey called for a five-minute recess to prepare the decision and provide copies to the parties. The Hearing Officer will mail the decision as required by the election code.

7. Recess of Adjournment      Motion to adjourn at 4:14 p.m. was moved by Trustee Morales and seconded by Trustee Mahalik. All approved.

Minutes approved at the Board of Trustees meeting held February 17, 2021

