

BOOK 1 VOL. 1

WOODRIDGE FIRST-POLITICAL PARTY-Its Formation and Basic Precepts:

Woodridge First Party was organized on October 2nd, 1967 and consists of interested citizens from within the Village limits of Woodridge, Illinois. The party was founded with the basic intent of providing to the public a genuine voice in local government. In so doing, the Woodridge First Party dedicates all its resources toward the presentation of true facts, the real issues and when necessary, provide the voting public with a better choice in those affairs that affect the residents of the Village of Woodridge.

The Woodridge First Party is nonaligned and has no affiliation with any county, state or national political party or organization at all. Whether sponsored or endorsed by the Woodridge First Party, candidates must adhere to the same nonaffiliation requirement insofar as their candidacy for public office is concerned.

The Woodridge First Party presents to the residents of Woodridge, Illinois its basic precepts for action:

- 1) Bring about a fluid working relationship between all governing and taxing bodies affiliated with the Village of Woodridge.
- 2) Strive for Integrity in Village Government.
- 3) Stimulate Public Interest in Village affairs.

DECEMBER 9, 1968

4) Strive for a greater Woodridge by promoting controlled growth, based on a sound fiscal foundation.

Current Officers of the Woodridge First Party:

Chairman

Vice-Chairman Secretary

Treasurer

Rec. Secretary

Chas. E. Martin

A. Parlich

J. Case

W. Allison

FORMATION OF THE WOODRIDGE FIRST PARTY'S NEWSLETTER

"Minutemen News"

As we all know, the Village of Woodridge does not have a newspaper of its own, although four newspapers have assigned reporters to the village to cover the Village Board and local activities. It is a known fact that these four newspapers cannot, and do not, cover all the news and important issues of the village. Furthermore, all village residents do not subscribe to all four newspapers.

Publishers

Following one of the Party's Basic Precepts, "Stimulate Public Interest in Village Affairs", Woodridge First Party decided to publish the "Minutemen News". The "Minutemen News" will be published by the party on a bi-weekly basis and will be issued the week following each regular schedule Village Board Meeting.

Cont. on page 2, col. 1

Editor

The Party has named Charles E. Martin, 6323 Bradley Drive, Woodridge, Illinois-969-1970, as the editor of the newsletter.

Pledge

Woodridge First Party, through its newsletter, pledges to report to the residents of the Village of Woodridge the actual facts, as far as can be determined, behind the actions of the Village Government. This includes all phases and departments of the Village Government.

In reporting the facts as well as they can be determined, we shall also state the Party's position clearly without hesitation or doubt.

Where the fact cannot be determined, we shall publicly, and in print, ask any administration questions, which we believe should be answered by the administration.

MERGER OF GROUP OF INTERESTED CITIZENS WITH WOODRIDGE FIRST PARTY

The group of interested citizens who circulated the petition for a referendum on the question as to whether the Village should purchase the Woodridge Sewer & Water Company, were invited by the Woodridge First Party to attend a meeting of the Party. The Party and the group wanted to discuss each other's basic philosophy, ideals, and principles.

After a healthy and somewhat lengthy discussion, the entire group of interested citizens unanimously decided to merge with Woodridge First Party.

Please read the "Letter to the Residents of Woodridge" from the group of interested citizens which we are printing in this issue.

EDITORIAL

Many of you are my friends, and many of you remember me as the Unity Party's Chairman and Campaign Manager in the Mayoral Election of 1965.

I am sure that all of you are wondering why I have associated myself with a different and opposing political party. Since it is impossible to meet with each of you to discuss the basic reasons, I shall try to state the reasons clearly in this editorial. Each of you are welcomed to contact me if further clarification is needed.

Reason I: Some of us who worked so diligently and successfully in the Unity Party of 1965, desired to keep the Unity Party alive and vibrant! Immediately after Unity Party's Candidates for Mayor and Board of Trustees were elected, the Mayor and successful members of the Board of Trustees wanted no part of the continuation of the Unity Party. A comment was made at the time by a prominent member of the present administration to let the "cockroaches" crawl back into the woodwork until the next election.

Woodridge First Party has been established as a PERMANENT Village Party (see the article on front page - Formation and Precepts of Woodridge First Party). Basically, all thinking residents desire the same simple, yet so hard to attain, goal in any government. Honest Government, By The People and For The People.

So, the Unity Party of 1964-65 died after the election only to be resurrected by the Mayor to run two candidates for Trustee in 1967. By the way, the two candidates ran unopposed and were elected--naturally. Many of the loyal workers of the original Unity Party were not contacted at all to work with the hard core group under the name of UNITED PARTY.

Mr. Wm. Woody, the closest personal associate of the Mayor was named Chair-

Cont. on page 3 col. 1

LETTER TO WOODRIDGE RESIDENTS

"Yes" or No" for Purchase of Sewer and Waterworks?

While we, the citizens and taxpayers of the village, went about our daily routine activities, the Village Government passted Ordinance 68-22. "An Ordinance of the Village of Woodridge for the Acquisition, Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a Combined Waterworks and Sewerage System and For the Issuance of Refunding Bonds Payable From Revenue of the Combined Water and Sewerage System for Its Acquistion, Construction, Maintenance and Operation." This Ordinance was passed on 24 October 1968 and was published in pamphlet form by authority of the Corporation Authorities of the Village of Woodridge on 31 October 1968. A copy of this ordinance may be obtained from the Village Clerk at the Village Hall.

Section 5 of the Ordinance authorizes the Village Government to issue and sell Water and Sewerage Revenue Bonds in the amount of two million, five hundred thousand dollars, \$2,500.000.00. Section 7 of the Ordinance, in part, states that it no petion be filed with the Municipal Clerk of the Village within twenty one days (21) after the publication of the Ordinance, signed by 15% (fifteen) of the electors voting for Mayor at the last(1965) Mayoral election, asking that the question of acquiring the combined waterworks and sewerage system as provided in this Ordinance and the issuance of revenue bonds be submitted to the electors of the Village, the Ordinance shall be in full force and effect.

The writer became aware of this Ordinance on Thursday, November 14th, 1968. The Ordinance was to become effective on November 20th, 1968; without giving the citizens and taxpayer of Woodridge a chance to vote "YES" or "NO".

It is the writer's judgment that the taxpayers should always have the right to vote on any question regarding any increase in taxes, or the spending of large sums of money that must be paid by the taxpayers. With this Ordinance being passed, do the Mayor and Board of Trustees feel that they have the right to commit us, the taxpayers and voters, to two and one half million dollars without even consulting the taxpayers? There is much evidence that legally they should have, of their own will, put this question to the people. Did they?

Sunday, November 17th, the writer used the 'phone, and gathered together a group of interested citizens who believe that we, as taxpayers, have the right to know all the facts before this decision is made and that we should have the opportunity to vote "yes" or "no". We carried a petition to all sections of the Village for signatures and over 300 citizens-taxpayers signed the petition. This is more than enough legal signatures to force the Mayor and Board of Trustee to call a special election to enable us to vote on the issue.

The Petition For Referendum reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, electors of the Village of Woodridge, DuPage County, Illinois, numbering not less than 15% of the number of electors voting for Mayor of said Village at the last preceding general municipal election at which a May was elected, ask that the question of acquiring the existing combined waterworks and sewerage system of Woodridge Sewer & Water Company, and Illinois Corporation, as provided in Ordinance No. 68-22 of said Village

formerly adopted by the Mayor and Board of Trustees of said Village on October 24, 1968 and the issuance of \$2,500.000.00 of Water and Sewerage Revenue Bonds of the Village of Woodridge therefore, be submitted to the electors of said Village at a special election in the manner provided by law to vote upon that question."

The goupd of interested people who circulated the petition takes no stand as to whether the Village should or should not purchase the combined water and sewerage system. It is impossible for us, or anyone else, to make this judgment since very few of the facts are known or have been made public.

Why has the Mayor and Board of Trustees not published any concrete facts?

Why, has the Village Attorney been authorized to begin condemnation proceedings in Court without first determining the will of the citizens-tax-payers?

Why are Village funds being paid for legal fees which might not be necessary if the majority does not want to purchase?

Why, is the Mayor and Board of Trustees, desirous of floating a bond of \$2,500,000.00 when the Woodridge Sewer and Water corporation are reportedly asking \$4,100,000.00 as the sale price?

How is the difference to be made up? Additional bonds? Much higher sewer and water rates? We have the second highest water rates in the Chicagoland suburbs at the present time!!!

Is the Sewer and Water system making a profit (real profit) at the present time, or is it only a "book" profit or loss? WHAT, ARE THE TRUE FACTS?

The Ordinance specifically says that the bonds must be retired from the revenue of the system. If, it is a losing proposition, does this mean that our water rates will go up like taxes, and never down?

These, any many more questions, must be answered in full and in truth, before any of the citizen-taxpayers can make a clear judgment as to whether to vote "yes" or "no" on this question.

This interested group of citizens, as a consequence, having circulated the petition, were invited by the Woodridge First Party to attend one of their meetings. We did this; we found that their goal, ideals and principles were the same as ours. As a result, we merged.

You will find the full story of the Woodridge First Party in this newsletter listing the Office of the Party.

We urge all citizen who are interested in having HONEST VILLAGE GOVERNMENT, BY THE PEOPLE AND FOR THE PEOPLE OF WOODRIDGE, to contact one of the Officers of the Party to obtain more information and to attend a meeting as their guest.

Charles & Martin

continued from page 2

man. True to the comment and prediction, a few "cockroaches" came out of the woodwork, voted, and then went back. The United Party dies conveniently so that the Administration still had no one but themselves to answer to, because we residents and voters are too apathetic to care until it is too late.

Now that April of 1969, time for re-election, is just around the corner, the Mayor and Mr. Woody desired to reactivate the old Unity Party of 1964-65. The writer was contacted and, with a personal friend and associate of the Old Unity Party, went to meet and have a discussion about the reformation of the old party lines.

Two meetings were held. The net results were my refusal to back the present Mayor for re-election and to back the Unity Party officials in their proposal for a Village Complex to the tune of approximately \$500,000. One of the main issues before the voters in 1965 was a proposal of the then CAP Administration to build a Village Hall for \$180,000. The Unity Party was opposed to this issue in 1965. The voters overwhelmingly voted against the proposal and for the Unity Party. The village is only four years older --- in fact, the village will be celebrating their Tenth Anniversary in 1969. It is the Editor's opinion that the Village still cannot afford this kind of luxury, although the Village does need a larger Village Hall.

Reason II: Approximately three years ago, the present Mayor and Board of Trustees, in office at that time, held a public meeting in the Woodridge School Gym with the School Board to discuss ways and means of obtaining help from developers.

At that meeting, which many of you attended, the Mayor informed the School Board that the schools were the School Board's problem and that the School Board should negotiate with the developers on their own for help for the schools! This was not the problem of the Mayor and the Board of Tru-

stees. Their problem, was to obtain from developers park land and playground equipment!! The Mayor conveniently overlooked the fact that no School Board has any base to negotiate from with developers. Only the Mayor and Board of Trustees have this advantage in negotiating a "Pre-Annexation Agreement" with a developer.

I ask only one simple and direct question which, has never been answered--How can any resident of the village, elected official or just plain citizen, disregard the school problem of the village and say "it is only the School Board's problem"??

It was because of this pronouncement by the Mayor and absolutely no dissenting remarks by any of the Trustees present that I completely disassociated myself from the Mayor and Board of Trustees and decided that when the time came, I would work just as hard to "un-elect" them, as I did to elect them.

Another precept of Woodridge First Party is "Bring about a fluid working relation - ship between all governing and taxing bodies affiliated with the Village of Woodridge! This, in my opinion, and I'm sure yours, also means the School Board.

We will discuss these and other reasons in future issues of the "Minutemen News".

Charles E. Martin, Editor

VILLAGE BOARD MEETING HEADLINES

VILLAGE WILL HAVE REFERENDUM ON PURCHASE OF WATER COMPANY

BOARD CONCURRED IN PLAN COMMISSION'S REJECTION OF KPK PETITION

BOARD PROMISES OFFICIAL PROTEST TO COUNTY

MAYOR PROPOSES STREET LIGHTS

(see page 4)

VILLAGE BOARD MEETING OF DECEMBER 5, 1968

The Village Attorney, in the board meeting of December 5, 1968, advised the Mayor and Board of Trustees that the Petition for a Referendum on the question of the Village purchasing the Sewer & Water Company was legal and valid. He further advised, that an ordinance, calling for the referendum, must be passed by the Mayor and Board of Trustees. He said as he recalled, the ordinance must call for the vote no less than 15 days, and no later than 30 days, after the ordinance had been duly published.

The Village Attorney went on to say that this was probably the most important issue that the residents would be voting on for some years to come, and that the Mayor and Board of Trustees should fully inform the residents by what ever means available, of the facts regarding the issue. This would help the residents to make an intelligent decision on how they should vote.

Editors Note:

This is exactly what the group of interested citizens, who circulated the petition, desired. We felt that the residents should be fully informed before the Village Government went plunging ahead with negotations, condemnation proceedings, and hearings before the ICC Commission. We are happy to see that the Village Attorney now advises that the people be informed fully on the issue.

MAYOR AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES RECEIVE LETTER FROM THE PLAN COMMISSION ON KPK ANNEXATION PETITION

The Plan Commission rejected the KPK Annexation Petition officially by letter to the Mayor and Board of Trustees. The letter was read during the meeting

The Mayor recommended to the Board of Trustees that they also officially reject the Petition, although KPK officially withdrew their Petition on Friday morning,

prior to the Village Board Meeting. The Mayor promised that the Village would be in touch with KPK Corporation to see if they would revise their petition. He further promised if KPK goes to the County with the same petition, the Village Government would file an official protest with the County.

We are happy to see that when the residents get fully aroused, the Village Government will, at times, bow to the will of the voters.

STREET LIGHTS FOR UNITS 1, 2, and 3 SOUTH OF 75th STREET PROPOSED BY MAYOR

The Mayor advised that he had received numerous requests from the residents in Units 1, 2, and 3 south of 75th Street for the installation of street lights. As a result, he contacted Commonwealth Edison and asked them to make a survey on how many lights were needed and how much it would cost the Village. He reported that the street lights would be installed on existing wooden poles where available. The complete installation, along with maintenance, would be done by Commonwealth Edison for approximately \$2600 per year.

After some discussion by different members of the board, it was referred to the Finance Committee, although the Mayor urged the board to act immediately.

Trustee Stewart appeared to want the residents in the area to vote yes or no onwhether lights should be installed.

Trustee Alexander said that if the present ordinances had been on the books when the Village was incorporated, the residents would have no choice, therefore, why ask them now "Put the lights in".

Residents of the area, what do you want? You'd better speak up, or you will have street light whether you want them or not. Attend the next Board Meeting in mass on December 19, 1968, and let your desires be known!