

JOE AIELLO
SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK

SANGAMON COUNTY COMPLEX
200 SOUTH NINTH STREET – ROOM 101
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701
TELEPHONE: 217-753-6700/FACSIMILE: 217-535-3233
WEBSITE: www.sangamoncountyclerk.com



MINUTES

SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD

DECEMBER 14, 2010

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on December 14, 2010 in the County Board Chambers. Craig Hall called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Hall asked for a moment of silence in recognition of deceased Mayor Tim Davlin. Mr. Moore and Mr. Schweska gave the Invocation. They said a prayer for Mayor Davlin. Mr. Sullivan led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

NOMINATION AND APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Fulgenzi, to nominate and appoint Mr. Hall as Temporary Chairman. A voice vote was unanimous.

APPOINTMENT AND REPORT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Mr. Hall appointed the following members to the Credentials Committee to review the credentials of the newly elected County Board Members: Mr. O'Neill, Mrs. Turner, Mrs. Musgrave, Mr. Preckwinkle and Mr. Davsko. The Credentials Committee left the chambers to review the credentials. Upon returning, Mr. O'Neill reported that the credentials are all in order.

SWEARING IN OF NEWLY ELECTED COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS

County Clerk Joe Aiello administered the oath of office to the newly elected County Board Members.

ROLL CALL

Temporary Chairman Hall asked the Clerk to call the roll. There were 26 Present – 2 Absent. Mr. Montalbano and Mr. Stephens were excused.

NOMINATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

A motion was made by Mr. Tjelmeland, seconded by Mr. Krell, to nominate and appoint Andy VanMeter as the Chairman of the County Board. A voice vote was unanimous.

NOMINATION AND APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

A motion was made by Mrs. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to nominate and appoint Sam Montalbano as Vice-Chairman of the County Board. A voice vote was unanimous.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW COUNTY BOARD MEMBER

A motion was made by Chairman VanMeter for the appointment of Jason Ratts to fill the unexpired term of Rosemarie Long. A voice vote was unanimous. County Clerk Joe Aiello administered the oath of office to Mr. Ratts.

PRESENTATION BY THE FAITH COALITION FOR COMMON GOOD

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, to suspend the rules and allow a group to address the County Board.

T. Ray McJunkins, with the Faith Coalition for Common Good, addressed the Board. He gave his address as 641 Bent Tree Court in Springfield. He stated that he is a Pastor with Union Baptist Church as well as President of the Faith Coalition for Common Good. They presently have a membership of congregations, labor unions and non profit organizations. Since October of last year, they have been conducting listening campaigns. Through these campaigns, they have come up with four social justice issues. One issue is equality in services. In that area they are working hard to get voters registered for the spring election. The second issue is education; third issue is comprehensive immigration reform; the fourth is high speed rail. The high speed rail issue is the one they would like to address tonight. He explained that they have met with the County Board and shared a community benefits agreement they have put together. This agreement addresses some concerns from the community with regards to high speed rail.

LeRoy Jordan, residing at 2051 Randall Court in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated that he is a member of St. Katharine Drexel Parish and serves as Chairman of the Railroad Issue Task Force with the Faith Coalition for Common Good. They have been meeting over the past year and have hosted a People's Summit to listen to people who live along the 3rd, 10th and 19th Street corridors. They went door to door to encourage people to attend the People's Summit. As a result, they had approximately 100 people show up. There were representatives from the I-64 project, which is a transportation program in the St. Louis area, in attendance to share a transportation agreement. This agreement had been reached by approximately 30 to 40 different organizations in the St. Louis area. The coalition purposely asked people living along the railroad tracks to come and be a part of this summit. They asked them what their concerns would be if the high speed rail would come to this community. They developed elements of the community development agreement.

Those elements were: relocation assistance, jobs for local & low income people, training money, green space such as bike paths and walks, small business development opportunity, safety/noise issues, and a planning/monitoring committee made up of community members that want to participate. This would be the first rail community benefits agreement in the nation. They have also found out the Illinois Department of Transportation has all sorts of helpful materials for individuals and organizations to understand such things as quick take. Their organization has been meeting with community officials including Senator Durbin, Secretary Hannig and Ray LaHood to get them to agree to this community agreement. Once that is done and the planning committee is established, they will be assured of getting the citizens' input into the whole process.

Dr. Gordon Smith stated that yesterday they met with some officials and heard horror stories about eminent domain and how it works. The process is supposed to protect the citizens. They want some very specific contract language to protect the citizens and want it to be very clear. Right now they know there is no final decision of where the tracks are going to go, but they want the County to assign a person to sit at a table convened by I.D.O.T and the Faith Coalition for Common Good leaders to finalize plans for the railroad community benefits agreement. They need to do this to understand clearly how this will affect the citizens. They have also met with Union Pacific and plan to meet again. They would like the County to sign this final agreement. They are wondering what kind of plan they have to evacuate or what plan they have to take care of citizens if something occurs with the types of cargo that comes through Springfield. They need to sit down in advance of the final decision to talk through these things and insist they be done. He stated they would like to hear the County Board agree to this and put forth a resolution tonight. The direction of the agreement is the right direction to make certain the citizens get the best they can from this situation.

Chairman VanMeter asked Mr. Jordan to go over the basic points again that the Faith Coalition has put together. Mr. VanMeter first gave a little background on the Coalition. He explained that Reverend McJunkins and several other members of the committee met with him a couple months ago, and they have also been working on this project since almost the beginning of the railroad relocation issues. The committee has met with all of the powerful players in this process including the City and Senator Durbin. At some point the goal is to get each of the governmental bodies to sign onto this. When they met, he felt the principles seemed very sound. Senator Durbin's office indicated there may be some technical issues that need to be worked out. Mr. VanMeter stated he feels it probably would not be appropriate for him to sign until Senator Durbin's office has worked out those technical issues.

Mr. Jordan read over the goals of their committee. The goals and issues to address are: relocation assistance, training money for workforce development, green space, small business development opportunities, safety issues and noise abatement and a planning and monitoring committee. Chairman VanMeter stated that the goal is to get the City, County, and other major stakeholders to sign onto these principles, but he does not think they can sign on until the details are worked out. He asked for an informal show of hands from the County Board members of those who think the County should commit to this when the details are worked out. The majority of members raised their hands.

Mr. Stumpf asked if information is available on their web site regarding quick take and other information. Mr. Jordan stated that there is, or he can get that information to him personally. Chairman VanMeter stated that the County Engineer should also be able to provide some information on that.

Mr. Moore encouraged the Faith Coalition group to continue participating with the railroad study group and to keep in contact with the Regional Planning staff as they have been. The Regional Planning staff will continue to update the County Board on this information. Chairman VanMeter thanked them for sticking with this project and for producing what looks like a good direction for them to go on for this project.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, for approval of the Minutes of the November 9, 2010 meeting. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

A motion was made by Mrs. Turner, seconded by Mr. Goleman, to place correspondence on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous. There was no correspondence to file.

RESOLUTION 1

1. Resolution approving the low bids for aggregate for the annual maintenance of County highways.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Hall, to place Resolution 1 on the floor. Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote. Upon the roll call vote, there were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 2 – 4

2. Resolution appropriating motor fuel tax funds for IMRF expenses.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Hall, to place Resolution 2 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Preckwinkle, to consolidate Resolutions 2 – 4. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 3 and 4.

3. Resolution appropriating motor fuel tax funds for the County Engineer’s salary and expenses.

4. Resolution approving an agreement between Sangamon County and the Illinois Department of Transportation to transfer surface transportation program funds for State funds.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 2 – 4, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 5

5. 2010-38 – Pete Meeker, 2925 S. Holmes Ave., Springfield – Granting a Rezoning and denying a Variance. County Board Member – Jennifer Dillman, District #23.

A motion was made by Ms. Dillman, seconded by Mr. Davsko, to place Resolution 5 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report since no one present wishes to speak in favor of or against the petition. There were no objections. Mr. Moore explained that one of the conditions of the variance is that Mr. Meeker is to comply with the parking, parking stripes and paving as he agreed to at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. He stated that he will be instructing the professional staff to monitor this.

A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 5.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2010-44 – Ron Furman, 4229 & 4301 Peoria Road, Springfield – Granting a Rezoning and Variances. County Board Member – Jim Good, District #8.

A motion was made by Mr. Good, seconded by Mr. Krell, to place Resolution 6 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report since no one present wishes to speak for or against the petition. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 6.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mrs. Turner, to go out of the regular order of business and move Resolution 7 to follow Resolution 11 for the convenience of the audience. A voice vote was unanimous.

RESOLUTION 8

- 8. 2010-46 – Boesdorfer & Boesdorfer, Inc., 14273 Bab Road, Auburn – Granting a Rezoning and Conditional Permitted Use. County Board Member – Sam Snell, District #6.

A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Mr. O’Neill, to place Resolution 8 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff’s report since no one present wishes to speak for or against the petition. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 8.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

- 9. 2010-47 – Meyer Roofing, Inc., Carlyne Meyer, 3950 N. Dirksen Parkway, Springfield – Granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – Jim Good, District #8.

A motion was made by Mr. Good, seconded by Mr. O’Neill, to place Resolution 9 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff’s report since no one present wishes to speak for or against the petition. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 9.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 10

- 10. 2010-48 – Dennis M. McEvoy, 5751 Sweeney Drive, Rochester – Granting a Rezoning and Variance. County Board Member – Andy Goleman, District #4.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 10 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff’s report since no one present wishes to speak for or against the petition. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 10.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 11

- 11. 2010-49 – Wilma K. Dullanty, Trustee, 4042 & 4044 Thornbrook, Springfield – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Abe Forsyth, District #27.

A motion was made by Mr. Forsyth, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, to place Resolution 11 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report since no one present wishes to speak for or against the petition. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 11.

**MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED**

RESOLUTION 7

7. 2010-45 – Mark Gerdes, 1 Whippoorwill Road, Springfield – Granting a Variance – County Board Member – Harry “Tom” Fraase, District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Smith, to place Resolution 7 on the floor. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Molly Berns, professional staff, stated that the petitioner is requesting a variance of Section 17.44.010E to allow a split rail fence along the side property line adjoining a side street to be zero feet from the property line instead of the required 15 feet. The staff recommends approval of the requested variance. The standards for variation have been met. Due to the topography of the property, it is not possible to build the fence 15 feet off the side property line as required by the ordinance. The exposed steep slope and drainage ditch on this property directly off Meadowbrook Road pose an immediate public safety concern, and granting the variance is appropriate. The petitioner states that a split rail fence which is seen as low impact will be constructed, which would eliminate issues with traffic visibility. Cyndi Knowles, professional staff, stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff report and recommends approval.

Ron Gregoire, residing at 3809 West Bluffs Road in Springfield, addressed the Board. Many members of West Bluffs opposed this project initially for several reasons that were discussed at the Zoning meeting. One of the main concerns is the legal concern that the property owner has expressed his intentions to sue his neighbors for all costs related to this fencing. What started as a neighborhood beautification project has become an opportunity for this property owner to sue his neighbors. Regardless of this decision, this property owner will pursue legal action against his neighbors, and approval of the variance will only add to the cost of this case. He proposed that if there were a legal maneuver allowing him to build a fence and not sue his neighbors, he would abandon this project.

Robert Nelch, residing at 3909 West Bluffs Road in Springfield, addressed the Board. He has lived in this subdivision since 1986, and in the last three years he has been the one who has maintained the entrance to the subdivision. The present owner has basically never taken any concern to it because there is about 75 feet of forest that goes along his edging up to where the street comes in at the entrance of the subdivision. They did all the beautification, and the attempt to put in the rail fence would require the removal of existing landscaping that had been put in back when the prior owners approved it.

Mark Gerdes, residing at 1 Whippoorwill Road in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated that he had promised to take necessary legal action to recover costs for the split rail fence, but he has not. He hopes that the people responsible for causing damage to the property will come forward and offer to pay for the fence. He stated that if it were him he would have approached the person and offered to pay for the damage, but that has not occurred with his property. The right-of-way was only maintained by the people from Bluffs West neighborhood this year and the year before. Over the course of a 20 year period, there were two individuals who, one-at-a-time, maintained that area. It was not this mass neighborhood effort that they have been told. When he moved to this location 4 ½ years ago someone conveyed to him this was the Bluffs West Neighborhood Association property. He probably naively believed this and this is why he has not maintained it.

Mr. Mendenhall stated that Mr. Gerdes' testimony was somewhat different at the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing. Mr. Mendenhall explained that Mr. Gerdes said they had come and asked him if they could be on his property and he agreed to it. Mr. Gerdes stated that this is not correct because they did not ask him if they could do anything. Mr. Mendenhall stated if someone came onto his property he would go out and see what they are doing, especially if he gave them permission. Mr. Gerdes stated that he did not give them permission to come onto his property. This particular stretch of road they were working on is somewhat remotely located from his house, so it is difficult to see. It is about 150 feet from the house and there are trees and other vegetation. Mr. Mendenhall asked if he knew they were there in that three weeks time. Mr. Gerdes stated that he did know they were there, but they are from a different neighborhood. Mr. Mendenhall asked if he stopped them, inquired what they were doing, or had a police investigation. Mr. Gerdes stated that normally you would not expect people to enter your property and cut down trees and vegetation. Mr. Mendenhall stated that Mr. Gerdes also indicated at the Zoning Board of Appeals that they had cut down some trees that were five inches in diameter. He stated that he looked at the property and never found anything bigger than his thumb, and it is not five inches.

Mr. Forsyth asked what the purpose of the fence is. Mr. Gerdes stated that when the trees and vegetation were cut back it exposed a steep slope and a drainage ditch, which has about an eight to ten foot vertical drop. The fence would prevent children or anybody from falling down into the ditch. It is a safety issue as evidenced by the Planning Commission. Mr. Forsyth asked what kind of fence this is. Mr. Gerdes stated it is a split rail fence. Mr. Forsyth asked if you can see right through the fence. Mr. Gerdes stated that you can.

Mr. Gregoire gave his rebuttal. He stated that one of their neighbors has a similar fence on his property, and over the years children have played on it and it occasionally has been broken. These kinds of things lead him to wonder how many times this fence is going to be broken. Vegetation was removed on that first weekend of neighborhood planning activity, but since then it appears someone has gone in and cleaned a lot more out on the property.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they are talking about the petitioner wanting to put a fence up on his own property, and if they are objecting to him putting a fence up on his own property. Mr. Gregoire stated that he is, and they are objecting basically because of the legal issue involved. Their objection is not of the fence on the property, but of the variance.

Mr. Moore asked what the vote would have to be on this if they are going to vote contrary to the zoning Board of Appeals recommendation. Mr. Grohne stated that it would be a simple majority vote. Mr. Moore commented that “good fences make good neighbors.”

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the resolution. Upon the roll call vote, there were 7 Yeas – 19 Nays. Those voting yea were: Mr. Boyster, Mrs. Douglas-Williams, Mr. Fulgenzi, Mr. Moore, Mr. Preckwinkle, Mr. Smith and Mrs. Turner. Resolution 7 written to “grant a variance” was denied.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTION 12

12. 2010-50 – Brian J. Shirley, 2700 S. Spring, Springfield – Denying a Conditional Permitted Use and Variance. County Board Member – Clyde Bunch, District #21.

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Ratts, to place Resolution 12 on the floor. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Molly Berns, professional staff, stated that the petitioner is requesting a conditional permitted use to allow a drive-thru package liquor store and tavern with the sale of alcoholic beverages and packaged liquor sales, and a variance to allow a liquor store and tavern to be within 100 feet of a residential structure. The staff recommends approval of the conditional permitted use and variance. The subject property was rezoned to B-3 in 2008, and the County Board deemed it appropriate for heavy commercial uses at that time. Spring Street, which divides the subject property from residences, is narrow, thus reducing the amount of available space to separate the property line from the residential structure. There is some concern regarding noise that may result from a tavern and liquor store at this location; however, B-3 zoning permits other uses, such as pool halls, bowling alleys, ambulance services and restaurants including live entertainment, which may also result in increased noise and activity at this property. It is important to note that based on the proposed site plan, the drive-thru package liquor store will be located on the east side of the property, which is a significant distance from the nearest residential structure. The site plan also illustrates that the building with the pizza parlor or retail shops will be located on the west end of the property nearest the residential structures. The written petition states that this building will house a tavern with food services. The petitioner should provide detailed testimony at the hearing to explain the intended uses, including the hours of operation, number of employees, etc. Cyndi Knowles, professional staff, stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals does not concur with the staff report and recommends denial of the conditional permitted use and variance because the proposed liquor store and tavern would be within 100 feet of a residential structure. In the opinion of the Zoning Board of Appeals, this would result in an adverse impact of the area.

Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to convey to the Zoning Board of Appeals the County Board’s appreciation for this new reporting method, which is very helpful for them to understand their reasoning.

Joe Bart, residing at 418 S. Koke Mill in Springfield, addressed the Board. He explained that they are not looking to build a tavern at this location, but just a liquor store. In the future, they hope to possibly have a pizza parlor on the second half of this building. They initially discussed this with the Liquor Commission. There are two parcels on this property and they wanted to make sure they had a conditional permitted use to cover the entire two parcels of property. With that in mind, they went to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the conditional permitted use because they may want to serve beer or wine in the pizza parlor. They would consider that a small operation only for delivery and carry out and would not want to have more than 10 tables in the place. They may never get to that point, but they wanted to get this in case they need approval in advance. This is a small building and will be for liquor only, it will not be a tavern, and there would be no bands at all.

Mr. Stumpf asked if the drive-thru liquor store property corner line would be within 100 feet of a residential structure. Mr. Bart stated that is listed per code, but the facility would be as far as 200 feet away and a minimum of 175 feet away. Mr. Stumpf asked for verification from the professional staff of how close any corner of this property is to the nearest school and to any residences. Molly Berns, professional staff, stated that the nearest school is about 1 ½ blocks away. There are several residential properties across the street to the west on Spring Street and to the northwest. He was required to request the variance to be within 100 feet of a residential structure because the site plan submitted with the petition showed it to be less than 100 feet. Mr. Stumpf stated that he has the utmost confidence in Mr. Bart and his business capabilities, but he is not in favor of this particular building being there just because of the location. He feels they need to find something for that. He stated that he will vote no, but he would like to see about working with them on some kind of building opportunity. He just does not feel this is the right location for a drive-thru liquor store.

Mr. Bunch clarified that the school is just a block away. This is a dead end street, and there are now five bars in that area with a lot of music. He has been out there several times for meetings with the Sheriff. People in that neighborhood are up in arms because of the noise. The Sheriff's Deputies will go and have them turn the music down and they will just turn it back up as soon as they leave. With the railroad blocked off at Highland, the only way to get to the liquor store would be down by the school or to come up North Street off of Stanford or Highland. It is just not designed for that type of business. There is so much traffic out there now. He stated he is not opposed to people trying to make progress in this town, but this is just too much for the neighbors and it is going to get a little dangerous.

Rod Salefski, residing at 1907 Bates in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated that they own the three properties across the street from the proposed property. He agreed with the other objectors. This property is close to the east and there is no access to the railroad crossing. There is a school just a block away, and he counted 19 school buses there today. On Highland there are no sidewalks going west. He sees people walking, pushing strollers, riding bikes and skateboards all the time. The drive-thru would obviously promote traffic that would make this a dangerous area.

Carroll Sutton, Woodside Township Trustee at 460 North Street in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated that he is present on behalf of the Township Board of Woodside.

They have had delegations and individuals appear before their board objecting to this type of use for this particular property. He endorsed the earlier statements and arguments made. This will cause traffic. Since it is virtually unapproachable from the east or south, it could potentially cause a problem with law enforcement when they are needed because they cannot approach from those two areas.

Jeff Baker, with Sorling, Northrup Law Office, addressed the Board. He stated he is here on behalf of Charles Thomas Publisher. This would be too big a risk to public health and safety to put a package liquor store or even a restaurant serving alcohol given the proximity of the homes and schools in the neighborhood. This proposed use is out of character with the surrounding area.

Mr. Moore stated that he had asked for some assistance from the Sheriff's Office, and Captain Jack Campbell is present from that office. Mr. Moore asked Captain Campbell to tell them about the nature of that neighborhood with respect to the existing bars and what effect the drive-thru would have on that type of neighborhood. Mr. Campbell stated that there are four or five existing bars there. One of the fears is that people will go over to the package liquor store after drinking at one of the taverns and purchase more liquor for the drive home. They are already familiar with all the establishments down there and one more would probably stress their distribution of manpower. Mr. Moore asked what effect a drive-thru liquor store has on a neighborhood. Mr. Campbell explained that generally an establishment that sells liquor tends to be a problem for law enforcement, not just because of the products they sell, but also because they tend to be victims of crime such as burglaries. This is just one more place people can get involved with alcohol. This could become a DUI issue because people could leave there and drink while they are driving. Mr. Moore asked if they have the staff to support that kind of operation. Mr. Campbell stated that they do not. By the end of the year, they will be down 12 deputies, and they are already short staffed as it is.

Mr. Fraase asked what types of businesses could go in this location that would be suitable for the residents. Molly Berns, professional staff, stated that under B-3 general business district there could be storage units, pool halls, restaurants, dance halls and a number of other things. Mr. Fraase asked if there could also be gas stations. Cyndi Knowles, professional staff, stated there could be gas stations and garages.

Mr. Moore stated it is up to them as legislatures to meet with leaders and potential business owners in the area and try to figure out a business that works in this neighborhood.

Joe Bart explained that they did not build the road system over there, so he can't do anything about that. It is zoned properly, but it is obviously up to the Board to decide whether they want businesses to move forward. They cannot tell what will happen in the neighborhood unless they move forward. It is slightly hypocritical to say "we want new businesses and jobs and productivity, but we don't want you over there." He stated that he can't control what other people do, but can only control what he does. They are just asking to let them do what they do and let everyone else do what they do.

Mr. Bunch stated that it was not the County Board's fault that the railroad blocked off the road, but he does understand where they are coming from. It is a little complicated if you live out there, and is not if you don't live there. He has been out there many times with the Sheriff and met with people out there, and this just does not fit.

Mr. Schweska explained that one of the main problems with this is the word drive-thru. He stated that he lives right down the street from a drive-thru liquor store, and there used to be a fitness center and Periwinkles in the area. These types of businesses change hands more times than he changes his oil for the simple reason that no one wants to be there. It is not exactly the greatest thing in the world to hear thumping in your window at 1:00 a.m. in the morning when you are trying to sleep because somebody decided they wanted that last beer of the night.

Mrs. Turner echoed her colleagues' comments. She is all for business, but as they move forward, they need to get a good mix of business that is compatible with the neighborhoods. The neighborhoods are dying and they need to be resurrected. She also lives near a drive-thru and she spends many hours waiting at the stop sign at Wheeler and South Grand to make a turn because the traffic is backed up so badly due to people waiting in line at the drive-thru liquor store. She stated that she thinks they are all interested in keeping the integrity of their neighborhoods. A lot of times people will go for a package liquor store or tavern because it is perceived to be a quick money business with low labor intensity involved, but they just need to think differently if they want to move forward in this community.

Mr. Salefski stated that he is also a business owner, and he is all for businesses. This is a unique eclectic area of the County, and the business needs to be something that blends in this neighborhood. It is not right to see a business move ahead at the destruction of its surrounding neighbors.

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll. Upon the roll call vote there were 25 Yeas – 1 Nay. Mr. Smith voted nay. Resolution 12 written "to deny a conditional permitted use and variance" was adopted and the conditional permitted use and variance were denied.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 13 – 21

13. Resolution reallocating and waiving the County's recovery zone property volume cap for eligible costs for the City of Springfield Baseball Complex.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to place Resolution 13 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mrs. Turner, to consolidate Resolutions 13 – 21. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 14 – 21.

14. Resolution approving an intergovernmental agreement regarding the distribution of certain sales tax receipts.

15. Resolution approving tax levies for Fiscal Year from December 1, 2010 through November 30, 2011.
16. Resolution authorizing the issuance and sale by the County of its Economic Development Revenue Bonds-The Hope School Project.
17. Resolution approving a contract with Designed Roofing Systems, Inc.
18. Resolution setting the salary of the Chief Public Defender of Sangamon County.
19. Resolution amending Sangamon County's policy on accrued benefit time payouts for retirees.
20. Resolution approving a bid from Seico to complete the digital video recording project.
21. Resolution authorizing the issuance and sale by the County of its Economic Development Revenue Bonds-Sacred Heart-Griffin High School Project.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 13 – 21, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

Chairman VanMeter asked the County Administrator to invite the Public Defender to attend a future County Board meeting so that he can be introduced to everyone.

WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Goleman, to waive the ten-day filing period. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

RESOLUTION 22

22. Resolution approving repairs to the engine of the emergency building generator.

A motion was made by Mr. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, to place Resolution 22 on the floor. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 22.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 23

23. Resolution approving the renewal of the agreement with R.W. Troxell & Company for the County's self-insurance programs.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, to place Resolution 23 on the floor. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 23.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

OLD BUSINESS

A. Resolution 4 – Tabled 11/9/10
2010-40 – Illinois National Bank Land Trust #04-407, 13487 BAB Road, Auburn-
Granting a Rezoning and Variance. County Board Member – Sam Snell, District #6.

Resolution 4 remains Tabled.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions

B. Appointments

Appointment of Andy Goleman to the Sangamon County Board of Health for a term expiring November 30, 2011.

A motion was made by Mr. Preckwinkle, seconded by Mr. Hall, for approval of the appointment. A voice vote carried. Mr. Goleman voted Present.

Chairman VanMeter announced that the nominations for appointment at the January, 2011 meeting have been submitted.

MOTION CARRIED
APPOINTMENT ADOPTED

**REPORTS OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, SPECIAL COMMITTEES, STANDING
COMMITTEES & COMMITTEE REPORT ON CLAIMS**

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Bunch, that the Committee Report on Claims be filed with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
REPORT FILED

Newly elected member Chris Boyster invited everyone to a celebratory reception held at Andiamo that he had planned to celebrate his election to office. They were going to cancel the reception in light of what happened today, but his supporters encouraged him to have the reception to mourn the loss of the Mayor and to come together as a community, which the Mayor was good at doing.

RECESS

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Goleman, to recess the meeting to January 11, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MEETING RECESSED