

**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.co.sangamon.il.us](http://www.co.sangamon.il.us)

## **MINUTES**

### **SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD**

**JULY 13, 2010**

The Sangamon County Board met in Regular Statutory Session on July 13, 2010 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman VanMeter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Montalbano gave the Invocation and Mr. O'Neill led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **ROLL CALL**

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll. There were 25 Present – 4 Absent. Mr. Goleman, Mr. Preckwinkle, Mr. Tjelmeland and Mrs. Turner were all excused.

### **PROCLAMATIONS**

Mr. Stumpf presented a Proclamation to Vintage Tech Recyclers for their successful electronics collection, at no cost to the County, for the residents of Sangamon County, and for helping the County Board continue its long-standing commitment to recycling at a time when resources are scarce.

Mr. Stumpf stated that things have changed within the last few years. There has been a severe decline in recycling issues. The County was receiving a \$154,000 per year grant from the State that was cancelled. They had to dramatically reduce the money put towards recycling programs almost down to zero. Angela Harris, Sangamon County Recycling Coordinator, has been working extensively to get programs at low or no cost. She has worked with Vintage Tech on their project.

Vintage Tech Recyclers and Angela Harris, Sangamon County Recycling Coordinator, were present. Karrie Gibson with Vintage Tech Recyclers thanked the Board. She stated that they just try to do the best job they can and look forward to doing many more successful events in Sangamon County.

### **MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the minutes of June 8, 2010. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MINUTES ADOPTED

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

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

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to proceed out of the regular order of business to accommodate the school districts' presentation. A voice vote was unanimous.

### **PRESENTATION BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

Art Moore with the Board of Education for School District #186, addressed the Board. He stated that there is a handout being distributed to the Board Members. He introduced Anne Noble with Stifel Nicolaus, Mark Gebhards, Board Member with the Pleasant Plains school district, and Lisa Weitzel, Board Member with the Ball Chatham school district. He also recognized various board members, community members & administrators in the audience this evening that have come out to show their support for this presentation.

Mr. Moore explained that they are here this evening to ask the County Board to certify the sales tax question for the November ballot at their meeting in August, and they are here to provide the Board with the information regarding the sales tax, to answer any questions they may have, to present the proclamation resolutions and position statements the various Boards have passed, and to explain to them and the community what it is they seek to utilize the sales tax revenue for if it does pass.

Anne Noble, with Stifel Nicolaus, addressed the Board. She stated that her purpose here today is to explain the mechanics of the County School Facilities Sales Tax law and how it works. This is a philosophical shift in school districts that are funded in Illinois. For the first time there is a way to at least partially fund Illinois school districts through sales taxes as opposed to the current mechanism of property taxes. This funding is only for school facilities purposes. The law is based on a very similar law that exists in Iowa and a number of states all across the South. The General Assembly approved this law in the fall of 2007, and since that time there have been six counties who have passed the tax that encompassed 31 school districts.

The law is focused around the County serving as a conduit because school districts don't have the legal authority to collect a sales tax. The General Assembly made the County a pass through on this because they do have the authority to impose a sales tax.

There are six additional counties proposing to vote on the sales tax this November. The law is very clear that this is a school facilities tax and is not a school operating tax. The money can be used for any long term facility need of a school district, and can include new construction, additions, renovations, land purchases, roof repairs, and anything that would be a long-term improvement to a school facility. The money cannot be used for direct instructional costs, salaries, buses, or short-term assets like computers. There are two ways this is a benefit to the property taxpayer. The first is a direct reduction of property taxes, and this would be true in school districts that are going to use a portion of their sales tax revenue to abate or reduce property taxes and make payments on existing bonds they sold in the past for school facility improvements. If you have a district that built a new middle school in 2004, they can use sales tax revenue to make those bond payments instead of putting it on the property tax rolls where it currently sits. The sales tax can also be a property tax avoidance mechanism. A district with facility needs can use sales tax revenue to accomplish those projects instead of selling bonds that would go on the property tax rolls.

A lot of items were excluded from the tax. Generally, groceries including any unprepared food are excluded from the tax, and restaurant food is taxed. All types of drugs including over-the-counter and vitamins are all excluded from the tax. Anything related to farming is also excluded. They also excluded vehicles registered with the State. One reason for that is so people would not leave the County to purchase a new car. This is a retail sales tax and not a wholesale tax.

This does require voter approval. School districts that represent at least 51% of the resident student enrollment have to pass resolutions by their local school board requesting that the question be put on the ballot of their choosing. In this case it would be the November ballot. They would then come before the County Board because the County has to certify the question to put it on the ballot. The County Clerk would then put the question on the ballot. A simple majority of the voters is required to pass the tax. After the voters approve the tax, the County may impose the tax after that point. This would require additional Board action at that time.

The sales tax will be collected like all other sales tax. All sales tax collected at the retail level is sent to the Department of Revenue. They then allocate it amongst all the different sales taxing bodies, and re-distribute it back out to everybody according to the specifics of the law under which each tax was collected. When it is re-distributed back out on the school facilities sales tax, the money goes to the Regional Office of Education for their allocation to all the local school districts.

All of the school districts and the County's resolutions must be passed by August 16, 2010. The local districts are already done and are being submitted to the Board tonight. This would be before the voters in November, and the sales tax would not start being received by the districts until October 2011.

On page 12 of the presentation it shows the number of students each district has and the amount of revenues they would receive based on actual sales tax revenue from last year. Every student attending public schools in the County would have approximately \$667 attached to their head, and the school they are attending would receive that amount per pupil. The report also reflects the amount needed to be spent in qualifying expenditures in order for the sales tax to outweigh the benefits as opposed to a property tax increase.

Lisa Weitzel, Board Member with the Ball Chatham school district, addressed the Board. She presented copies of the resolutions passed by 14 school districts in support of this, as well as position statements from each of them explaining how they would use the funds. These districts represent 90% of the students in Sangamon County, and they are simply requesting that the Board add an item to their Agenda to certify the question on the ballot.

Mark Gebhards, Board Member with the Pleasant Plains school district, addressed the Board. He gave perspective on how his school district would utilize the money if this tax were to pass. Presently in Pleasant Plains they are faced with a challenge with respect to facilities at their high school. The original high school building was built in 1927 and is in dire need of repairs that cannot even be made in the kitchen and cafeteria facility. They are trying to serve over 400 students in a facility that is designed to feed about 200 to 220 students. They are at the point where they need to move forward just because of the deterioration of the building. If this were to pass it would allow them to not have to move forward with the property tax scenario and be able to use these funds for the purposes of that facility.

Art Moore stated that half of the districts that passed position statements have earmarked the money for some sort of property tax reduction. This includes District #186 who just passed a resolution to designate 10% or the equivalent of \$1,000,000 per year towards property tax abatement in Springfield. The districts are concerned about the property tax base and are interested in relieving some of that stress and obligations of property tax owners.

Anne Noble explained that Appendix A of the presentation shows a summary of the position statements from all the districts they have referred to.

Mr. Montalbano asked how the taxes would be distributed. Ms. Noble stated that it is the Regional Office of Education's responsibility to distribute the tax. They distribute the money to all the local districts based on their fall housing count of student enrollment within the County. Each district is required to put the money in a separate school facilities sales tax fund that has to be segregated from all other funds of the district.

Mrs. Fulgenzi asked if schools that took a neutral position are receiving benefits from these funds. Art Moore stated that they would still receive revenue from the sales tax if it does pass.

Mr. Moore asked if they have to do this because the law says they have to regardless of the merits. Ms. Noble stated that is correct. Mr. Moore asked if phase 2 would be to discuss the viability of the tax. Ms. Noble stated if approved it would be on the ballot at the full 1% and would then come back to County Board for imposition.

Mr. Moore stated that he would rather debate the merits of the tax at that point since they do not have a choice but to put the issue on the ballot. Chairman VanMeter stated that there is consensus amongst the members that they want to state clearly their position on this in advance of the public's vote. Mr. Moore asked if they may discuss the merits next month as well. Chairman VanMeter stated there is a possibility that they may want to.

Mr. Smith asked if money currently being used for facilities' costs would be freed up to go towards operational costs. Ms. Noble stated that it is possible, but it depends on what fund they are currently paying it from. Mr. Smith asked if it is possible that this money would not be abated or reduced from what the district has in its total funds, but is simply redistributed within their funds. Ms. Noble stated that it is possible. The vast majority of school districts repay facilities improvements from bonded debt that can only be used for school facility purposes, and there is a separate levy for that. It is very rare that you would have a district paying for bonds out of operating funds. Mr. Smith asked what percentages of districts have said they would directly abate property taxes in their area if this is passed. Ms. Noble stated that half of them have included abatement in their position statements.

Mrs. Long asked the State's Attorney for clarification if the County Board would be required to put this referendum on the ballot. Jim Grohne explained that if the appropriate documents come from the school districts that contain more than 51% of the students then it does have to be on the ballot.

Mr. Hall asked if the State of Illinois has cut the schools funding over the past year or two. Ms. Noble confirmed that they have. Mr. Hall asked if a school is able to opt out of the taxing. Ms. Noble explained that there is no ability to do that because the tax is imposed county-wide and those districts will receive the revenues. Mr. Hall asked what the wordage is going to be on the ballot. Ms. Noble stated that it is very generic and says "Shall the County of Sangamon, Illinois, be authorized to impose a retailers' occupation tax and a service occupation tax (commonly referred to as a "sales tax") at a rate of 1% to be used exclusively for school facility purposes." Ms. Noble explained that there is no legal authority to change it so that is all it can say.

Mr. Hall stated his concern is there are people who can travel more than ever before. People who will purchase here may change their habits. So if it's more expensive to purchase here in Sangamon County, they may go to another county. Ms. Noble stated that they do track sales tax revenues monthly from other counties, and they have seen absolutely no difference in the spending patterns than before the tax was imposed. In Sangamon County there is already approximately 20% in sales tax revenues coming from people who live outside the county.

Mrs. Musgrave asked what it would take to put this on the ballot again if it fails. Ms. Noble explained that it can go back on the ballot as often as the districts want and there is no mandatory waiting period.

Chairman VanMeter asked if the school districts are absolutely intent on placing this on the November ballot. Art Moore stated that this is their sentiment and the wishes of the committee.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they have a statement prepared that will explain to the voters why it would be good to pass this. Art Moore stated that they have a committee in place, which is Citizens for Sangamon County Schools, who are in the process of developing a web site to place the position statements on the site and are looking into running specific polls to figure out some data, and to nominate a chairman and spokesperson to speak on behalf of the question itself.

Mr. Smith asked if voted in favor by the populous of Sangamon County they could choose up to that amount or if it would tie them to a 1% sales tax. Ms. Noble stated that it would not and they could impose whatever they wish.

Mr. Moore asked Jim Grohne if there is any other entity that can put a question like this on the ballot through this measure. Mr. Grohne stated that he is unaware of any other entities that follow this particular procedure.

Chairman VanMeter asked Mr. Grohne if they must certify this for the ballot as long as the petitions are in order. Mr. Grohne stated this is correct, and the majority of the members must vote to put this on the ballot. If the County Board did not act to do so then the school districts could bring an action to force the matter to be put on the ballot. If the petitions are in order the matter must be submitted to the voters. Chairman VanMeter asked if he has ever seen a matter like this where they must vote a certain way. Mr. Grohne stated that he has not.

Mrs. Fulgenzi asked if this would still be placed on the ballot even if everyone voted against it. Chairman VanMeter stated that the school districts would be obligated to get an order to place the matter on the ballot.

Chairman VanMeter asked if the Board would have the discretion whether to actually impose the tax. Mr. Grohne stated that is correct. They can choose to impose the entire amount approved by the voters, part of it, quarter percent increments, or not impose it at all. Chairman VanMeter stated that at that point the Board may say "the voters approved this 1% sales tax, but doing that would raise the sales tax in this community to such a level that their position as a retail focal point would be challenged; therefore, it would be detrimental to the community to raise the sales tax to that level." Mr. Grohne explained that any reasonable governmental interest of the County Board would be sufficient for them to vote against it if they choose.

Chairman VanMeter expressed the broad consensus of the Board with respect to this question. They have had some preliminary conversations with the school board committee that has been working on this issue. The Board feels very strongly that a community that fails to invest in their children has no future. At the same time, a community that squanders its resources, that are not effective, cheats its children of their potential. This Board is really concerned to make sure taxpayer's money is spent as efficiently and effectively as it possibly can be, which I think is true of people who serve on the school boards in this community.

The steps the school districts have taken to outline the planned expenditures for the sales tax is a good first step in explaining to the community what they will do with those funds. There is a strong broad consensus by the Board that you could further measure the strength in your presentation to the community if you could state, in a positive way, the potential outcomes that could result from this for the children in your community. The Board is very anxious to work with the schools and would like to volunteer their acting and soon to be Regional Superintendent of Schools to assist in the effort to try and arrive at some kind of consensus where they can make that statement. They would like to meet with them sometime this week.

Mr. Gebhards stated that he makes an excellent point. All of them here this evening and many other members of school boards from around the County have a goal to improve the children's ability to learn and ultimately improve their success in that endeavor and make them as productive citizens as they possibly can. They are open to continuing dialogue with the Board regarding this. Mr. Gebhards encouraged members of the County Board to continue that dialogue within their respective districts. They are planning to invite the County Board to their next school board meeting this month to talk about this very issue. He encouraged the Board to also contact members of the school boards and do that very same thing. Chairman VanMeter stated that this sounds like a good first step.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to direct the County Clerk to review the documentation submitted by the school board committee, and ascertain its compliance with the legal requirements and prepare a resolution for the County Board to consider at its next meeting. A voice vote was unanimous.

### RESOLUTION 1

1. Resolution approving the annual agreement with the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Ms. Dillman, to place Resolution 1 on the floor. Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the adoption of Resolution 1. Upon a roll call vote, there were 24 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### RESOLUTIONS 2 – 3

2. Resolution establishing a County Fleet Maintenance Department.  
(See Resolutions 2 a., b. & c.)

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Stephens, to place Resolution 2 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Smith, to consolidate Resolutions 2 and 3. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolution 3.

3. Resolution approving a professional services contract for a building at the County Highway Department.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 2 -3, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 4**

- 4. 2010-24 – Neil L. Dodson, 324 S. Livingston, Springfield – Granting a Rezoning. County Board Member – Doris Turner, District #19.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to place Resolution 4 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. O’Neill, to table Resolution 4. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION TABLED

**RESOLUTION 5**

- 5. 2010-25 – Jay Shirley, 3020 Hoover Ave., (Rear parcel) 3024 Hoover Ave., and a parcel in the 3000 block of Hoover Ave., Springfield. Denying a Rezoning and Granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – Joel Tjelmeland, District #14.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Good, to place Resolution 5 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff’s report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 5.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 6**

- 6. 2010-26 – Southfork Land Trust, John Homeier Trustee, 2820 Young Road, Mechanicsburg – Denying a Conditional Permitted Use. County Board Member – David Mendenhall, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Moss, to place Resolution 6 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 an asphalt batch plant. The staff recommends approval of the conditional permitted for an asphalt batch plant. The subject property was rezoned to I-2 in 2006 to allow for a bio-diesel production plant, which is no longer in use.



Allowing an asphalt batch plant at this location seems appropriate. There is a sand and gravel operation to the east and an asphalt batch plant to the south. The public health safety and welfare will be protected as the property is located 1.5 miles outside of Buckhart and 5 miles outside Rochester and is not within the immediate distance of any church, schools or hospitals. There is a residential development about ¼ miles from the proposed location of the plant. Since the approval of the subdivision, the subject property has been rezoned to I-2. The subject property is located within the volunteer Rochester Fire Protection District. Although the property is in a flood plain, the petitioner has applied to FEMA to obtain a letter of map amendment to remove the proposed location which has higher elevations from flood plain designation. There will be no building permits issued until the letter of map amendment is received.

Cyndi Knowles, professional staff, stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals did not concur with the staff's recommendation. The motion to concur with the staff's report failed by a vote of 2 to 3, which resulted in denial of the petition.

David Mendenhall addressed the Board to represent the owners of Southfork Land Trust, John Homeier Trustee. He explained that they need a conditional permitted use to operate an asphalt plant. The petition was presented and recommended for denial by the Zoning Board of Appeals although it was recommended by staff. The Zoning Board of Appeals concerns were with increased truck traffic and potential problems for school buses that increased truck traffic could create. He spoke with the schools transportation director and he feels the additional traffic would not be a concern to the welfare of the school buses. In 2006 the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended approval for a bio-diesel plant that would have generated a large amount of trucks and a possible conflict with the school buses. It would have created many more trucks, but there was no concern then about the welfare of the school buses or the roads. Another objection was raised by the operating engineers concerning whether the asphalt plant would operate as a union or non-union shop. He stated that he does not see where that is relevant. The company they are currently in negotiations with is a union shop. The objections raised are no more than an attempt to eliminate any competition. This land is suitable for an asphalt plant.

Mr. Good stated it has been suggested that the gravel operation on Southfork Land Trust property is a hobby, and not getting a conditional permitted use would not matter much to the overall business. John Homeier, petitioner, stated that he has put over \$3,000,000 in that plant.

Patrick Joyce, at 205 S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 700 in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated that he is an attorney with Brown, Hay & Stephens and is representing Charles (Barney) Flatt. Barney and his family live in this area, and are concerned about heavy traffic. The testimony he presented at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting was a statistic he received from the Truman Flatt Company that shows a heavy truck traffic day would generate 506 truck trips from Buckhart Road up to the plant. This road would bear all of the traffic on less than a mile stretch of road. A gentleman from the Operating Engineers testified that they have their training operation for heavy equipment here, and on those days they have 60 more people with 60 trucks. There are school buses that also go up here.

Two trucks going together on this narrow road can barely pass each other. One requirement of a conditional permitted use is that it cannot be detrimental to the health and safety of people in the area. These people in this area would include truck drivers, operating engineers, school children and buses. The Zoning Board of Appeals recognized that these conditions were not met and recommended denial of the petition.

Mr. Moore asked the professional staff what the basis is for the Zoning Board of Appeals vote. Molly Berns explained that the Zoning Board of Appeal's primary concern was regarding school bus traffic. Mr. Moore asked for clarification if the staff report was to allow the conditional permitted use. Ms. Berns stated that is correct. The standards for variation and the findings of fact were met in their opinion. Mr. Moore asked for an explanation of this. Ms. Berns stated that when the staff makes a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for consideration there are certain standards that must be met in the ordinance.

The staff does the analysis and makes a recommendation whether or not it is their opinion these findings of fact were met. In this case, their opinion is that they were met which is why they recommended approval of the request for the conditional permitted use.

Mr. Hall stated that he thinks it is kind of strange they are complaining about an asphalt plant because it is a trade that is a trucking trade and this is an industrial area.

Mr. Joyce stated that he understands the question, but his client's position is that the additional traffic generated by this asphalt plant along with the traffic already there is going to be too heavy, and could endanger the safety of all the drivers. It is not strictly the fact there is an asphalt plant, but it's a question of how much is enough on this particular stretch of road. From a safety standpoint, the road just could not bear any additional traffic.

Mr. Good asked at what point this becomes a safety issue when there are already 506 trucks going up and down the road now. He asked if the road does currently meet the standards for two trucks. Mr. Joyce stated that he assumes it does since the township has not barred the traffic. They feel it has just about reached its saturation point right now and any further traffic would go beyond it.

Mr. Smith asked if his client raised the same objection on the bio-diesel permitted use. Mr. Joyce stated he did not represent him at that time, but apparently he did not.

Mr. Snell asked if truck traffic would be a consideration if they decided to do something else with the land. Ms. Berns stated that it would not. Some of the allowable uses under the existing I-2 zoning are: fertilizer manufacturing, a motor freight terminal, grain elevator, building materials sales with outside storage, and fertilizer sales & service. They would not need permission to come before the Board to market the property for those uses.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if this land was already zoned for the bio-diesel plant at the time it was approved. Ms. Berns stated that a use variance was granted for that land and because it was not utilized that way for a period of one year, the use variance automatically expired on the bio-diesel plant.

It is specified in Section 17.66.060 of the County Code that if the use variation is not utilized within one year from the date of the variation or if the use variation ceases to be utilized for a period of two years or if they don't comply with the conditions, the use variance does become void and the property owner is notified.

Mr. Mendenhall asked if this means Mr. Flatt would not be able to bid on other contracts to increase his business and his truck traffic because the road will not carry over 506 trucks.

Lawrence Sweat, CEO of Bi-Petro Inc, addressed the Board. He stated they are 100% of the operation of Sangchris Sand and Gravel. They feel what the staff recommended was accurate. Mr. Mendenhall has addressed the three primary concerns. Those concerns were the union issue, school buses, and the road safety concerns. They are always conscientious about safety. Some of their traffic would be reduced because they could just haul it right to this new plant; however, there could be increased traffic as they are making asphalt and hauling it out. They have trucks on the road 24 hours a day, seven days a week. They do understand that accidents do happen, and they are going to try and address those issues.

Mrs. Musgrave asked if they also talked to the road commissioner of Cooper Township about this. Mr. Mendenhall stated that they did.

Chairman VanMeter asked if the current business located there would cease if this is not approved. Mr. Sweat stated that they have no intention of shutting it down even if this is denied. It is a tough market out there and Mr. Homeier does not do anything for a hobby. It is a struggle to make money, and this would be an enhancement to continue their employment there. It obviously does impact them and reduces their trucking towards that direction.

Mr. Moss asked if it would be a possibility of the 500 or more trucks going into their operation instead of the one they are going into now. Mr. Sweat stated that they certainly compete with Mr. Flatt's sand and gravel company, but Sangchris Sand and Gravel does not compete in the asphalt business with people that would be coming there. They do like the idea that competition is good for all of them.

Mr. Joyce gave his rebuttal. He explained that he represents Barney Flatt and not the asphalt company. Two thousand tons a day would be a very heavy day. This area is saturated with heavy industrial businesses and adding this increased traffic would endanger the drivers on the road. He respectfully requested they follow the recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals and deny the conditional permitted use.

Mr. Good asked if this is a 12 month operation. Mr. Joyce stated that it is not because it is shut down in the winter. His knowledge is that they generally shut down in November and open back up in March. Mr. Good asked if a two thousand ton day is more of an exception. Mr. Joyce stated that it depends on the amount of work. At other times it may not be as busy.

Mr. Stephens asked if his client feels the current traffic is imposing a safety risk. Mr. Joyce stated that the gravel company and the asphalt company have worked with the township road commissioner to improve the road so they are doing their best to make it as safe as can be. They do stress to their drivers to drive safely and to be careful.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote for the adoption of Resolution 6. Upon the roll call vote, there were 11 Yeas – 12 Nays – 1 Present. Resolution 6 is adopted to deny the conditional permitted use. Jim Grohne explained that a majority of the members present and voting would have to vote no to approve the conditional permitted use, and a majority of those present tonight would be 13.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### RESOLUTION 7

7. 2010-29 – Rick Moushon, in the 500 block of S. John Wayne Road, Dawson - Granting a Variance. County Board Member – David Mendenhall, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Moore, to place Resolution 7 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 7.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### RESOLUTIONS 8 - 10

8. Resolution approving a contract for janitorial services for the County Courts Complex, Sheriff's Office, Public Health and Community Resources Offices.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Snell, to place Resolution 8 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Fraase, to consolidate Resolutions 8 – 10. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 9 and 10.

9. Resolution approving the name of the Public Health & Community Services facility.
10. Resolution declaring the new Public Health and Community Services campus to be smoke free.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Good, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 8 – 10, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

### WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

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

MOTION CARRIED  
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

### RESOLUTIONS 11 – 15

11. Resolution identifying acquisition contracts for the Public Health and Community Services purchase of lamps, chairs and tables.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to place Resolution 11 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Smith, to consolidate Resolutions 11 – 15. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 12 – 15.

12. Resolution identifying acquisition contracts for the Public Health and Community Services purchase of a security system.
13. Resolution identifying acquisition contracts for the Public Health and Community Services purchase of a wireless Internet system.
14. Resolution identifying acquisition contracts for the Public Health and Community Services purchase of baby changing stations.
15. Resolution identifying acquisition contracts for the Public Health and Community Services purchase of energy management engineering.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 11 – 15, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

### OLD BUSINESS

- A. Resolution 2- Tabled 6/8/10  
2009-64 – James Ley/Ley Metals Recycling, 3000 Peoria Road, Springfield –  
Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Jim Good, District #8.

Resolution 2 will remain tabled.

**NEW BUSINESS**

## A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

## B. Appointments

Appointment of Richard Weekly to the Buffalo Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2013.

Appointment of Larry Loits to the Loami Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2013.

Appointment of Elaine Funk to the Citizens Advisory Committee on Animal Control for a term expiring June, 2011.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the appointments. A voice vote was unanimous.

Mr. Bunch stated that he is not opposed to these appointments, but it would be nice for his party to receive a courtesy call regarding who they are appointing. They come to these meetings and know nothing about it until they get to the meeting. He stated that he will vote yes on these, but will vote no in the future if they do not know about them in advance. Chairman VanMeter explained that it has been a very clear policy that the political leadership of the local Democratic Party meets the approval of the Democratic floor leaders to bring appointments to the Board. They have been pretty consistent in carrying that message to the members.

MOTION CARRIED  
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

## C. Appointment of Election Judges (2010-2012 term)

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mrs. Long, for approval of the Election Judges. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

**COMMITTEE REPORT ON CLAIMS**

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to place the Committee Report on Claims on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
REPORT FILED

**RECESS**

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to recess the meeting to August 10, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MEETING RECESSED