

**DON GRAY****SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK**

200 SOUTH NINTH STREET – ROOM 101

SPRINGFIELD, IL 62701

PHONE: (217)753-6700/FAX: (217)535-3233

WEBSITE: [countyclerk.sangamonil.gov](http://countyclerk.sangamonil.gov)**MINUTES****SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD****APRIL 8, 2024**

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on April 8, 2024 at the BOS Center. Chairman Van Meter called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Schackmann gave the Invocation and Mr. Fraase led the County Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL**

Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to call the roll. There were 27 Present – 2 Absent. Mr. O’Neill and Mr. Stumpf were excused. Mr. Cahnman came in late at 7:20 p.m. and Ms. Small was present by phone. Chairman Van Meter stated Ms. Small is attending by phone and this is allowed pursuant to the Open Meetings Act. Ms. Small notified the Chair and the Clerk that she wishes to attend the meeting via telephone conference. This is allowed under the Open Meetings Act if a quorum of this body is present, which it is, and if a majority of the board, at least 15 members, vote to allow it. Ms. Small is prevented from physically attending the meeting for a cause recognized by the Open Meetings Act as one warranting participation via telephone conference. The Chair will now entertain a motion to allow Ms. Small to participate via telephone. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Ms. Scaife, to allow Ms. Small to attend the meeting via telephone. A voice vote was unanimous. The Chair asked the County Clerk to revise the roll call to reflect that Ms. Small is participating in the meeting via telephone conference as allowed by the Open Meetings Act and is considered present at this meeting for the purpose of determining a quorum and participating in all proceedings. Ms. Small acknowledged that she is present.

**PROCLAMATION**

Ms. Lathan presented a Proclamation showing opposition to the U.S. Post Office Springfield Processing and Distribution Center consolidation due to potential adverse effects on mail service, job loss, and other community impacts, and calls on the U.S. Postal Service to consider the concerns raised by Springfield postal workers, local officials, and community members.

Johnny Bishop, Local Union President of Local #239 in Springfield, addressed the County Board. He is a 35 year employee. They are opposing this and are doing everything they can by contacting the City and County. In July there will be some changes where mail for anyone in the County will be delayed automatically by a whole day in your small post office in your town. As it is right now, they do pick up in the evening but no longer will in July. They are trying to stop that as well. They are just trying to get the right information to the right people. One thing to remember is the Post Master General Louis DeJoy is the one doing this. He is trying to run the post office as if it is a business, and it is not a business. It was never made to make a profit. It is not my post office, even though I have been there that long (his dad and his wife also worked there). This is the people's post office. As long as we stick together and keep pushing it, we can try to stop this.

### **HEARTLAND HOUSED PRESENTATION**

Josh Sabo, Executive Director of Heartland Housed, addressed the County Board. He gave them an update on what they were able to accomplish in their first year of the Strategic Plan's implementation. With the support of Sangamon County, Capital Township, the City of Springfield, our local medical community, our local philanthropic partners United Way and the Community Foundation for the Land of Lincoln, our community was able to complete the first strategic plan to address homelessness our community's had since the early 2000's. We completed that at the end of 2022.

Throughout 2023, our organization and others have been working hard to meet the goals laid out in that plan. In the Strategic Plan, there are four key goals. The first strategy is about creating new supporting housing opportunities to help people end their homelessness. They created 142 new supportive housing opportunities (98 rapid rehousing and 44 permanent supportive housing). The second plan was to improve the effectiveness of our system in connecting people to the services and support they need. This board has heard a lot about the Helping Hands emergency shelter. That facility consolidated what was once Helping Hands and the overflow shelter in our community. This facility is a housing focused emergency shelter that works from the front door to connect people to housing opportunities. Other initiatives this year had to deal with developing community standards by helping their organizations know, as they create housing opportunities and provide emergency shelter, what the community expects of them in regards to best practices. Before the facility was created for Helping Hands, the community had been searching for a shelter solution like this for almost 20 years. The third strategy was to increase partnerships to improve access to healthcare, jobs, and to provide support through transitions from other systems (healthcare, public safety, foster care, etc.). They are doing a soft launch of a program called Medical Respite Care. One thing they recognize, and the strategic plan points to, is that the cost for our community to maintain people's homelessness is much more costly than helping a person in their homelessness. They can support an individual in a house with a case manager for \$15,000 to \$20, 000 per year. The amount the community spends on things such as police response, emergency room visits, ambulance visits, etc. is about \$40,000 to \$50,000 per person. When a person is ready to discharge from the hospital but the congregate emergency shelter is not an appropriate place for a discharge, they will spend weeks and months in the hospital instead of going to a more cost-effective solution. Helping Hands will be piloting this program later this month in partnership with the local medical community. They have

also developed a Youth Homelessness Task Group that integrates with foster care programs and other programs in our community. They also help to support the Sangamon County Re-entry Council which pulls together all kinds of different partners in our community working together to connect people, as they return to our community from the justice system, with work, housing opportunities, and other ways to build stability into their lives.

The fourth strategy was to develop local infrastructure to support growth and improvement in the homelessness system and to meet the goals of this plan. They did this by creating Heartland Housed, which is now a nonprofit in our community supported by Sangamon County, Capital Township, the City of Springfield, and grant funding. He highlighted some of the successes that came from this infrastructure in particular. From about 2010 to 2022, their community lost about a quarter million dollars a year that was coming to them from the federal government. The reason was because our community was performing poorly. HUD took funding from our community to give to other communities. Over the course of the last four years, we have gone from being almost 80 points below the highest continuum score in the country to this year being 3.5 points behind the highest scoring continuum in the country. HUD looks at our local data to see if it's improving and they use that to make funding decisions. The reason that is really important is it leads to an upper trajectory like this. Over the last four years, our funding from HUD has improved by around \$136,000. This is giving us the opportunity to grow funding coming into our community from the state and federal government. In 2023, funding for programs to address homelessness in our community went up around 225% from around \$650,000 to over \$2.1 million. A little of this was due to HUD funding and a lot was due to funding increased from the state budget and new grants.

As they move into year two of the Strategic Plan, they feel like the infrastructure has been created, the foundation is in place, and now they are focused on some of the most problematic parts of the system and continuing to grow those housing opportunities. Some things they have been working on over the first quarter of this year are the development of data dashboards. They have them created. As they get more data in them, they will begin to communicate that and share them more broadly. Right now there is basically one month of data in them that is not too informative for the community. They intend to use that as a community education tool to show how homelessness is either growing or shrinking month over month. They began a 100-day challenge in February that was focused on unsheltered homelessness. A lot of that has to do with increasing outreach collaboration and data sharing, connecting with people who are unsheltered to start them on a pathway to housing. This month they are launching the Heartland Housing Helpline to help create navigational support for the system. It also helps connect people to programs they are eligible for. There is also the Medical Respite Program that he mentioned. They have also applied for a new grant in hopes of getting around \$300,000 to support efforts to address youth homelessness. They are creating quarterly reports with all of this information and they are available for questions or concerns. They are excited about the progress that has been made, but they still have a way to go.

Chairman Van Meter asked where the people are actually going when they use the Medical Respite Program. Mr. Sabo explained they would go to Helping Hands where they have the reserve side with 10 beds devoted to this.

## PRESENTATION ON CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION

County Administrator Brian McFadden addressed the County Board and gave a summary of the Feasibility Study of the expansion of the BOS Center. Mr. McFadden reminded them that in 2023 the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation to give them the opportunity to create a Tourism Impact District. This would have a 20-year life and would allow us to borrow funds to do an expansion of the Bank of Springfield Center. That legislation passed and created a timeframe for them to act. In November, a group of local hotel managers and owners came to the County Board with a petition asking that a Tourism Impact District be created. That set in place a number of things including the County Board passing a resolution of an intent to do so. There was then a public hearing, and then in December the County Board did approve the Sangamon County Tourism Impact District, which is now in place. After that happened there was a working group put together that consisted of representatives from the County, the City, SMEAA, and several local hotel/motel managers, owners & operators. That group got together and started looking at the next steps. They agreed the next step should be a Feasibility Study on whether there are benefits to expanding the BOS Center. The group requested an RFP, and Molly's staff (Regional Planning) did a phenomenal job putting that RFP together. The RFP went out for a selection process to bring in a consultant that would help guide this analysis of whether there is a benefit to doing the expansion. He believes they had four companies submit interest. The group interviewed all of them and decided to go with CSL-Convention Sports & Leisure. The cost of the study is being paid for by SMEAA. Although the board approved that, they are being reimbursed by SMEAA for those costs of around \$100,000 to \$115,000. Everyone should have an executive summary of the Feasibility Study, so he will go over that.

The first question is what they were looking for in this study. The company was to tour the facility and have stakeholders meetings, which they had over 30. They conducted over 75 interviews and did an analysis of the current BOS Center and of the local market and industry trends. They are looking at what is going on in comparable markets. It is very important to the group to see how they stand compared to their comparable communities. This all worked into the completion of a cost benefit analysis. On Page 3, they start with the BOS analysis. You will read the word "subprime" several times about the current BOS Center and the local adjacent hotels and why they are considered by industry experts as subprime. One of the good things about the BOS Center is it has 40,000 square feet that is contiguous altogether and puts it on the higher end with the comparable markets, but it's kind of like a basketball arena, and that is not the industry standard. They have the contiguous space, but it is not in a usable manner that allows us to maximize our ability to attract the regional and state conventions they want to bring to town. There are 950 hotel rooms within a half mile of the BOS Center, which also puts us at the top end of our comparables; however, these hotel rooms are considered by industry as subprime. They are not considered industry leading facilities. They interviewed over 150 event planners and people who put together events for different groups, and these are the folks they are getting the feedback from. The BOS Center has made the best from the facility they have.

Page 4 is just a review of local and regional conditions. Occupancy rates have rebounded since the Pandemic but are not at pre-Pandemic levels yet. They have a 54% occupancy rate compared to 59% before COVID. The average daily rates have rebounded from \$107 pre-Covid to \$128 post-Covid. Springfield's hotel/motel tax burden is very comparable to our fellow communities in Illinois and in the Midwest. They looked at Indianapolis, Ft. Wayne, Missouri, Kentucky, and all over the Midwest to do the comparables. We are currently at 14% with the total hotel/motel tax and a few others. The Tourism Impact District legislation allows us to go up to a 5% assessment. The recommendation from the experts is not to do 5%, but to do 2%. Going into this study, the 2% is what the hotel/motel industry thought was warranted by looking at our comparable communities.

Page 5 talks about industry trends. The BOS Center has done well on keeping up with some industry trends. They have established outdoor space, which is important to attract conventions. Some of the other things are state-of-the art technology and unique food experiences. The industry experts see us falling between our peers on these things.

Page 6 talks about the comparable facilities in the market. They looked at 16 different facilities in the Midwest to draw the comps. They rated well because of their square footage and because there are hotels right across the street or connected to the BOS Center. Peoria has far more contiguous space but they do not have a hotel attached to the Convention Center, so we have an advantage over them for that. One of the strong messages throughout this report is they need to improve the facilities if they want to improve the number of conventions coming here.

Page 7 talks about the market demand and program. They went out and interviewed the event planners to look at places for conventions. They have a number of strengths here such as the Lincoln attractions, Route 66, and other things. The available parcel to expand onto includes the County parking lot that is available. Some limitations they have, that is keeping them from attracting different convention center business, are the design and use of the main hall upstairs. That is just not how main halls are designed now days. They want a nice big main hall with no columns and lots of glass where you can look out. The meeting rooms are also not set up like rooms are to meet industry standards.

Page 8 shows how they looked at a couple different scenarios. Scenario 1 being an expansion of just the BOS Center. Scenario 2 being an expansion along with a new 300-room top flight hotel adjacent to the Convention Center. Currently they have a little over 61,000 available square footage that can be programmed into the current BOS Center. What they are proposing for the BOS Center is around 126,000, double of what is now available. They recommend that the upstairs main hall would become just a sports facility and the other 40,000 square foot main hall would be built across the street on the County parking lot. Then they would have another 15,000 square feet in meeting space. They would also have 10,000 square feet in outdoor space. The target here is not national conventions but regional and state conventions. The goal here is not to host a 120,000 square-foot event but to be able to host two sixty thousand square-foot events.

Page 9 lays out the three options for three parcels. They think the most attractive parcel is the County parking lot. They think there is the potential for a hotel on that space as well. The least

desirous is the Horace Mann parking lot. There are design limitations there. Also, the block to the south of the County parking lot, which contains a popular restaurant and some office buildings, would be middle of the road to them and there would have to be certain situations for a builder to buy that property. Their focus is they have this parcel owned by the County available for development right across from the Convention Center and right by the headquarter hotels that are downtown.

On Page 10 you will see they brought in, as part of the study, an architectural firm called Populous who does a lot of convention center and hotel work across the country. They feel they can accommodate the expansion on just the County parking lot and they don't need those other two parcels to achieve what they are going to do with the 126,000 square foot facility. The cost estimate to do this, along with a hotel, would be \$129 million.

On Page 11 there is data showing what would happen with the number of events, event days, economic impact, and hotel room nights with the BOS Center expansion, and with the expansion of the BOS Center and the construction of a 300-room headquarter hotel. The experts/consultants are saying the Wyndham Hotel needs to come down and needs to be replaced with a new hotel. It is just not adaptable for what people are looking for today to stay in conjunction with conventions and events. They have figured out a way to build the hotel next to the Convention Center to achieve some cost efficiencies. They don't have to do the structural things with the BOS Center expansion that they would be building a hotel on top of it, which would have been at least a 20% increase in the cost. That is big to this project because they can do what they want to do without having to deal with the Wyndham.

Pages 12 & 13 summarizes what the BOS Center expansion would mean for the community. Bottom line is the expansion would generate \$1.1 million in new tax revenue for the City of Springfield and Sangamon County. The BOS Center expansion and a hotel would create \$1.5 million in new tax revenue. The cost benefit analysis clearly shows this would be the desirable thing to do. They have heard from the event planners who said "If you build this then we will bring events to your community and almost triple your hotel nights." There is a rating system that shows this would be one of the highest ratings they have seen based on the feedback they've received that the facility would be used and fully utilized. It is not being fully utilized now because of limitations on the design and adjacent hotels.

Page 14 gives you, as part of the cost/benefit analysis, one of the biggest concerns heard from hotel/motel owners in that they cannot market themselves from the situation and are not compatible with our comps including Peoria, Indianapolis, St. Louis, and other communities. The charts show the hotel/motel tax rate being charged in the State of Illinois is 14% with the high mark being in Chicago at 17.3%. They recommend that tax should not go more than 2%, and we should not go higher than Chicago. They also referenced the potential for a restaurant tax in Sangamon County. We do not have that tax now in Sangamon County. That is something the City of Springfield will need to debate. The County is a non-home rule unit of government and does not have authority to do a restaurant tax.

Mr. Hall asked how much money of the \$129 million is coming out of the County. Mr. McFadden stated they are looking at a number of different options. The summary shows different

incentives that can be used to attract development. This includes everything from a TIF district to an enterprise zone which brings along a property tax abatement, and restaurant tax abating tax revenue created by the project. There are a menu of options, none of which have been agreed to at all. All he is reporting today is what the consultants have brought to him. It will be up to the County Board, City Council, and SMEAA Board to do what they think is doable to make it work. The price estimate is \$129 million, but that is not the total cost of the project. The bulk of the hotel cost will be borne by private development and private funds. In all of these developments in other communities there has been government assistance from things such as TIF money, enterprise zone designation, abatement of taxes, rebate of sales taxes, and other taxes as well. Mr. Hall stated his concern is if they want to do this. He asked if SMEAA is coming before them as well. Chairman Van Meter explained that they are not approving anything tonight. This is just a summary. Mr. McFadden stated if this happens, it will take a long time. Everyone agreed, the first step was to do this feasibility study. If this doesn't make sense in the industry then it stops right there. Chairman Van Meter stated before any decision is made they would do their best to bring before you every person relevant to the discussion.

Chairman Van Meter stated he knows some people are skeptical but the goodwill and support around this project has been enormous. Figuring out how to get it work has appeared to be very daunting, but this afternoon he and Brian were part of a presentation by the consultants that gave them real hope, for the first time, that this project is doable. It will depend on some substantial support from the Governor. He thinks they are very fortunate in this community that the Governor of this state is very interested in doing things for the capital city. He is somewhat hopeful, if they make a presentation to the Governor that the community is really behind this project, that he will support it as well. That is probably the final critical piece to really make this possible. This issue will come back over the next couple months, so it is good to have all the background.

### **PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

Chairman Van Meter stated they have two public speakers who wish to speak regarding an issue before the County Board tonight. Chairman Van meter asked for unanimous consent that they go out of the regular order of business and allow them to speak. There were no objections.

Paul Brandon Brackney was signed up to speak but gave his time to speak to Chad Turner. Chad Turner, residing at 116 Regent Estate Road, Jacksonville, IL, addressed the County Board. He stated he is present representing the business The Cove. Their business name is Top Set Management. He is speaking regarding Resolution 12 before the County Board to limit or take away the 3:00 a.m. liquor licenses in the unincorporated areas of Sangamon County. He would have much preferred to have the opportunity to speak to each of them individually, "before the votes had been counted," so to speak. He first heard about the potential of this Resolution coming before the entire County Board two weeks ago today. In the unincorporated areas of Sangamon County, there are four licensees under the 3:00 a.m. classification. None of us were contacted, to his knowledge, that this was being considered by the Liquor Commission and was going to be brought to a proposal by this body. That is not to suggest they had to and not to suggest there was any violations to the Open Meetings Act or anything of that nature. We all should be able to agree that good public policy comes

out of vigorous debate. I was able to speak with many of you personally and he thanks everyone that he did speak to. Everyone did call him back that he tried to reach.

He had a good conversation with Mrs. Scaife, who is the chairman of the Liquor Commission, and he knows she is a proponent of this. That did not stop us from having a respectful good dialogue, and he appreciates that. We disagreed without being disagreeable. He does not believe he's had sufficient opportunity to state the case there is to be made that this is not necessarily good public policy. He certainly doesn't believe five minutes will change that. His first argument is he would like to have more opportunity for the County Board to see what the real information is here. The second argument is that the section of the Liquor Code 5.04.040 says the limitation upon number of licenses issued. The local Liquor Commissioner is authorized to set limits and to vary the limits established in this chapter on the number of licenses to sell alcohol at retail to be issued in each classification, such as 3AA. The restriction upon the number of licenses shall not limit the right of renewal for any existing license nor the issuance of a license to the purchaser of an established licensed business as an ongoing concern; but as licenses are revoked, expire without renewal, or for any other reason cease to exist, then the total number of licenses of each such classification shall be reduced until the total of each classification shall not exceed the number authorized by the local Liquor Commission. The counter argument is going to be "Well we are not doing that. We are getting rid of the classification altogether." With all due respect, that is the exact same thing. If you could get around this section simply by doing away with the entire classification, then this section is meaningless. He knows there are lawyers on this board, and that is not a good thing because everybody hates lawyers. They will tell you that the first rule of statutory construction is if there is language in there, it is meant to have effect. If you can do it just by getting rid of the licenses, that has no effect.

Mr. Turner continued by saying he was told the basis for this was the number of incidents that have occurred at 3:00 a.m. locations has been increasing in frequency and severity. One of the things he wanted was time to delve into that. Mr. McFadden was gracious enough to give him the statistics related to tavern incident reports, and they simply do not show that this increase has been happening in frequency or severity. He encourages them all to look at that going backwards to see if they have been getting worse. The 3:00 a.m. licenses have been going on for 25 years. There were three categories that were more severe. Assault and battery was the first one. There were 11 assault and battery complaints dating back to January 1, 2023. Five of them occurred after 1:00 a.m. One of those occurred at a 1:00 a.m. licensed establishment. You know they are open until 1:30 a.m., That means there were five assault and battery complaints left over a 15-month period. The next serious ones were shootings. There were four at 3:00 a.m. establishments, and one of them occurred at 1:13 a.m., at a time when 1:00 a.m. bars are still open. The comment by the Sheriff's deputies was there were claims found to be untrue. One of them they found no other evidence of a shooting, so that is two over a 15-month period. The third serious issue is stabbings. There were three complaints. One was at 10:00 p.m. at a 3:00 a.m. establishment, one was at 1:05 in the morning, when the establishment was still open, and the other was in an establishment that is open past 1:00 a.m. He does not believe the argument that there has been increased frequency or severity is accurate, and he would love to have more time to delve into those statistics and discuss them with the board. He promises you he has a lot more case to be made and this issue warrants further debate. Some establishments will close if you pass this tonight.



**MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the Minutes of March 12, 2024. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MINUTES ADOPTED

**CORRESPONDENCE**

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to place correspondence on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

**RESOLUTION 1**

1. Resolution approving a joint funding agreement with the Illinois Department of Transportation for a project on Oak Crest Road in Clear Lake Township.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Hall, to place Resolution 1 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to call the roll. Upon the roll call vote, there were 25 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 2**

2. Resolution allowing the County Engineer to submit an order for bulk rock salt to the State of Illinois Central Management Services Joint Purchasing Program.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 2 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Madonia that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolution 2. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 3**

3. 2024-004 – Todd Pankey, 12609 State Route 125, Pleasant Plains – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use and a Variance. County Board Member – Tom Fraase, Jr., District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 3 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 3.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 4**

4. 2024-005 – Josh & Kristina Waggoner, 533 Centerwood Drive, Springfield – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Tom Fraase, Jr., District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 4 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 4.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 5**

5. 2024-006 – Robert W. Britz, Jr., 951 Gaffney Road, Divernon – Denying a Rezoning and Granting a Use Variance with Conditions and a Variance. County Board Member – Tracy Sheppard, District #6.

A motion was made by Ms. Sheppard, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 5 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall 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. 2024-007 – Kevin Schultz, 8015 Village Center Road, Sherman – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Casey Constant, District #2.

A motion was made by Mr. Constant, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 6 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 6.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 7**

7. 2024-008 – RPIL Solar II, LLC, 3500-3600 Blocks of Shaler Road, Springfield – Granting a Siting Approval Permit. County Board Member – Paul Truax, District #10.

A motion was made by Mr. Truax, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 7 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall 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

**RESOLUTION 8**

8. 2024-009 – Pivot Energy IL 60 LLC, 3300-3400 Blocks of Mt. Pulaski Rd. & 18,500-18,600 Blocks of Borden Rd., Illiopolis – Granting a Siting Approval Permit. County Board Member – David Mendenhall, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 8 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to table Resolution 8 for 30 days until the current developer can meet with Illiopolis and the other lease holder to work through some potential changes and updates. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION TABLED

**RESOLUTIONS 9 - 11**

9. 2024-010 – Text Amendment to the Sangamon County Zoning Ordinance amending Chapter 17.70 and 17.76 of the Sangamon County Zoning Ordinance related to Fireworks.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Constant, to place Resolution 9 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to consolidate Resolutions 9 – 11. Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to read Resolutions 10 and 11.

10. Resolution amending Chapter 8.12 of the Sangamon County Code so that the terms are in harmony with both the Pyrotechnic Use Act and the Pyrotechnic Distributor and Operator Licensing Act.
11. Resolution amending the Sangamon County Code by amending Title 15-Buildings and Construction.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Madonia that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolutions 9 – 11, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

### RESOLUTION 12

12. Resolution approving amendments to the Sangamon County Liquor Code to eliminate alcohol being sold, given, or consumed between 1:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. under any Chapter 5 license issued by Sangamon County.

A motion was made by Ms. Scaife, seconded by Mr. Miller, to place Resolution 12 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. Krell, to table Resolution 12. Upon a roll call vote, there were 8 Yeas – 17 Nays. The motion to table Resolution 12 failed. Those voting Yea were: Mr. Ayers, Mr. Constant, Mr. Hall, Mr. Krell, Ms. Lathan, Mr. Madonia, Mr. McGuire, and Mr. Schackmann. Those voting Nay were: Mr. Bunch, Ms. Deaner, Mr. DelGiorno, Ms. Deppe, Ms. Douglas Williams, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Fraase, Mr. Fulgenzi, Mr. Mendenhall, Mr. Miller, Mr. Rader, Ms. Scaife, Ms. Sheppard, Ms. Small, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Tjelmeland, and Mr. Truax.

Mr. Madonia stated he thinks they are making a huge mistake and he does not understand the big rush. They have plenty of time, two months, before their liquor licenses expire. They should of had a public forum on this. They are talking about peoples livelihood's here. They could have one right here next month, open it up to all the bar owners, listen to evidence, and make their own opinions. He personally thinks they are doing a disservice to the public, and he will try again next month to sway some of his fellow board members to bring this off the table and try to get a public forum on this.

Ms. Scaife expressed they did study this in the Liquor Committee meetings wholeheartedly and they worked hard at it. It wasn't just an overnight thing. They have seen the reports and they have increased. They are out for public safety for their deputies as well as this community. It is very important. The 3:00 a.m. licenses are a privilege and the bar owners know the issues. They are pro-business as well, but they have now come to this point. She would appreciate a yes vote on this.

Mr. Krell stated they just had a nice presentation on the BOS Center. If you visited other cities you will see accompanied with these centers, they have a vibrant downtown area with a lot of activities from restaurants and bars. Visit Nashville, St. Louis and Chicago and you will see when there is anything to do with these conventions, people are coming to town not to just sit in their motel room. You are telling me if there is a convention and people come into town, they are limited to having an hour or two to go out on the town. That does not seem very good to him. In our comparable cities such as Peoria, Joliet, Champaign, and Rockford there are 4:00 a.m., 3:00 a.m., and 2:00 a.m. licenses. They have boats and other venues to go to. We have things like Abe Lincoln's Home, but you would go see that in the daytime.

They are talking about bringing this city back to the way it was and having conventions and to the sports park, but want to close down bars and restaurants that serve liquor until 3:00 a.m. He does not think that is the right thing to do and it is not sending the right message when their comparables don't do it. Some of these things that are going on are happening at different times and throughout the day. When he comes down 11<sup>th</sup> Street he smells more pot than booze. They have people driving under the influence all day long and that doesn't seem to be a problem with anybody. They have a few hiccups in a 3:00 a.m. license and people go nuts over it. They need to crack down on the people who are causing the issues. Those are the people who need to be punished, not the bar owners.

Mr. Schackmann stated he does find it a shame to come down on people who are productive in our society as opposed to people who are destructive. They have talked about the safety and crime and that has increased everywhere. He sees people blatantly running red lights and turn signals just to go straight through the red lights. He sees our parks being used as drug houses. He sees individuals having these pop-up parties in our parks, the Mall, Qik N EZ, and in the Walmart parking lots, yet they are not coming down on them. They are changing the rules for productive members of our society. They are the victims here in his opinion. It's those people causing these issues that they need to come down on. He appreciates every cop that they have, and they need to support them more. These rules have changed so that people can do these things and they just get away with it, and now businesses are going to hurt. He is not in favor of that and he does not want to vote in opposition to businesses because they produce things we need in this community. He knows this is only four businesses, but what is next? He does feel, in this instance, this is coming down on people that try to be productive.

Mr. Fraase stated he did talk to the owner of Mama Lees today, who is one of the four bars, and she does want to give up her 3:00 a.m. license because she doesn't want to have the liability after 1:00 a.m. He clarified that they are not losing their licenses but are just losing the ability to be open from 1:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. He personally thinks if this will kill a good bar owner's business then something else is wrong.

Mr. Hall stated he served on this committee and has been on this board for twenty plus years. He appreciates all the effort from the chairman of this committee. He thinks she did a good job. He went to a bar that had issues in the parking lot, sat there, bought a beer and talked to the owner. Years ago that is how they did things. He appreciates the effort of the committee but the idea of tabling this does make sense to him, but he is going to vote in favor of the 1:00 a.m. license.

Ms. Lathan stated she appreciates the work done by the committee and the chair who has reached out to her and they had several conversation. She made it a point to visit establishments and speak to residents in the County, the City, and residents throughout her district. Her district is one that is extremely impacted by these pop-up parties. In almost every conversation she's had in regard to this Resolution, the pop-up parties have been part of the conversation. One of her concerns is initially they had conversations about 2:00 a.m. licenses.

The other concern is that understanding the pop-up parties and not having a clear understanding of the data makes it clear there should be some type of security safety standards for the bars that accompany some type of repercussion. What they do know is if the data is accurate or somewhat accurate, these types of incidences also occur at 1:00 a.m. bars. From a public safety perspective from consumers as well as law enforcement, there is also the added work that needs to be done, and that is another need for this to be tabled. She thinks they have been able to have very healthy conversations on a number of occasions, but she also believes some conversations still need to move forward so they can make sure that whatever they do as a county is addressing all the needs. We all know from 1:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. there needs to be some changes, but there is also need to have some built in standards as well as repercussions that are a part of this entire process.

Mr. DelGiorno stated his question is probably more for legal counsel regarding issues raised by Mr. Turner concerning the number of licenses. He asked if that issue has been vetted by the State's Attorney so they feel comfortable with the board taking this action without opening us up to potential litigation or if it a risk this board needs to be willing to take. State's Attorney John Milhiser stated it is the opinion of Legal Counsel that the board has the authority to eliminate an entire classification of licenses, which it is doing here. Mr. DelGiorno asked if Mr. Turner's argument unfounded about the language of that one section and it doesn't keep a licensee from being able to renew just because they are eliminating a classification if they already have it. Mr. Milhiser stated it is the opinion of Legal Counsel that the board has the authority to eliminate all 3:00 a.m. licenses, and not just a couple of them.

Mr. Cahnman stated the Liquor Code does have a provision authorizing 2:00 a.m. licenses. When is the last time they had a 2:00 a.m. license? Professional staff Trustin Harrison stated he is unaware of any 2:00 a.m. licenses they had. That was designed for bowling alleys, and the last one was in Joel Tjelmeland's district, and it was a 3:00 a.m. when it closed. He is not sure how many there were with 2:00 a.m. licenses. That would go back about 20 years.

Mr. Thomas asked if a class is revoked, if it could be reinstated. Mr. Milhiser stated it could.

Ms. Douglas Williams stated her decision is because of the officers. They too would like to go home to their families. This is not just someone making money, but is also about someone living. It is not just about the individuals going to the taverns, but is also about the security they hire to protect people. In her heart she feels this is about safety and someone going home to their daughter, their mother, to their wife or anyone else.

Mr. Ayers stated this is a hard one for him. He voted to table this because he just found out about it himself. It sounds like some of the bar owners didn't even know about it. That is not fair for them, if that is true. They should have been in the committee meetings, but he doesn't know if they were. It doesn't sound like the process worked very well. He supports law enforcement unequivocally and will likely support the underlying ordinance before us, but this is a big decision that affects a lot of people. By passing this tonight, he is fearful some of these folks will be going to his colleague's districts with other pop-up parties, causing the problems there, and just relocating the issue for them, and making it worse. He would asked for more time, but that motion failed.

He is probably one of the younger folks here, and he remembers his 20's well. He had a lot of fun at these 3:00 a.m. bars, and didn't get into any trouble at all. In fact, it got him here. These places are places where folks that get off work at 11:00 p.m. or Midnight are going to go out, have fun, socialize, and hang out with friends. He also gets that there is a public safety concern. He asked his constituents how they felt, and they were overwhelmingly in support of the 1:00 a.m. licenses. That is what he is going to vote for, but he does not like the process. They should have been given more time to speak and say their peace.

Ms. Scaife explained they here at the County are a committee form of government so everything goes through the committee. They have all worked very hard on this, and went back and forth. They were blessed and had a captain from the Sheriff's Office who spoke to them and laid it all on the line. If you heard him, there would be no way you could vote against this. She asked for support for all of their deputies. As far as the bar owners knowing, they have called them in at different times. One is going to a 1:00 a.m. on their own and the other two were aware. She asks for a yes vote for the 1:00 a.m. licenses.

Mr. Krell stated he was under the impression when this was thrown out there that most people were on board with a 2:00 a.m. license. That was kind of a compromise, but now you are telling me there never was one. He asked why that was brought up in the first place as a compromise. Now that is off the table and they are back to a 1:00 a.m. license. It seems there was no compromise here. It was someone saying there was, but it didn't happen. He doesn't think that has been an open debate. Over the years, during the Fair and other events, they've allowed 1:00 a.m. licensees to stay open until 3:00 a.m. So now they are taking those all away as well. So if a big event comes to Springfield such as a big convention at the new Convention Center, you are saying they won't be able to extend a 2:00 a.m. license to them. That is not very attractive when you are trying to attract people to Springfield, Illinois.

Mr. Cahnman stated he is on the Liquor Committee and was at the March meeting. He made the inquiry and asked if the 3:00 a.m. license holders were informed that this was coming up at that meeting. He was told none of them were informed and none of them were there. If he had been here on time tonight, but wasn't due to traffic in Southern Illinois, he would have voted to put this off for another month to give people an opportunity to air their views on this. He doesn't think just because they are closing these bars at 1:00 a.m. that people are just going to go home and stop drinking. He thinks it does create, as Mr. Ayers alluded to, a greater risk of pop-up parties and perhaps more criminal activity than if these bars remained open. At least these people could be supervised in the bars they are drinking in. If they are out in an open lot at a pop-up party then all hell could break loose. The previous speaker alluded to a compromise of 2:00 a.m. A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to amend the ordinance to make the closing time 2:00 a.m. instead of 1:00 a.m. Mr. Krell stated he agrees with this and thinks they should also put in the amendment that they could give 3:00 a.m. or 2:00 a.m. permits when available and if needed. Chairman Van Meter explained that is not an issue here. The 3:00 a.m. special licenses are still allowed.

Ms. Fulgenzi stated she has a 23 year old daughter who has only been able to drink for a couple years and she has already called us scared because there was a shooting, so we had to go pick her up, although this was not in our county. These are popular bars. Another time, she was in a beer garden and there was a crash and someone drove past and tossed a gun into the beer garden. Ms. Fulgenzi stated she thinks times have changed and our society has changed a bit. It is good if we can cut back on some of the turmoil that is out there. She doesn't think that making all of their bars open until 1:00 a.m. is unreasonable.

Mr. Cahnman stated he thinks it makes sense to try 2:00 a.m. and see if that works. If it doesn't work and they still have the problems then they could always take another vote to eliminate the 2:00 a.m. time and go to 1:00 a.m. Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to amend the Resolution to make the closing time 2:00 a.m. instead of 1:00 a.m. Upon the roll call vote, there were 7 Yeas – 19 Nays. Those voting Yea were: Mr. Ayers, Mr. Cahnman, Mr. Krell, Ms. Lathan, Mr. Madonia, Mr. McGuire, and Mr. Schackmann. The motion to amend Resolution 12 failed. Those voting Nay were: Mr. Bunch, Mr. Constant, Ms. Deaner, Mr. DelGiorno, Ms. Deppe, Ms. Douglas Williams, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Fraase, Ms. Fulgenzi, Mr. Hall, Mr. Mendenhall, Mr. Miller, Mr. Rader, Ms. Scaife, Ms. Sheppard, Ms. Small, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Tjelmeland, and Mr. Truax.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on Resolution 12 as originally proposed. Upon the roll call vote, there were 21 Yeas – 5 Nays. Those voting Nay were: Mr. Cahnman, Mr. Krell, Ms. Lathan, Mr. Madonia, and Mr. Schackmann. Those voting Yea were: Ms. Ayers, Mr. Bunch, Mr. Constant, Ms. Deaner, Mr. DelGiorno, Ms. Deppe, Ms. Douglas Williams, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Fraase, Ms. Fulgenzi, Mr. Hall, Mr. McGuire, Mr. Mendenhall, Mr. Miller, Mr. Rader, Ms. Scaife, Ms. Sheppard, Ms. Small, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Tjelmeland, and Mr. Truax.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 13**

13. Resolution approving the final plat of the Mihalich Minor Subdivision.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to place Resolution 13 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Madonia that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolution 13. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 14**

14. Resolution approving a grant application for the Coroner's Office from the U.S. Department of Justice for strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System in the amount of \$100,000.



A motion was made by Mr. Tjelmeland, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to place Resolution 14 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Madonia that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolution 14. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD**

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

MOTION CARRIED  
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

**RESOLUTION 15**

- 15. Resolution approving the procurement of goods and/or services for the Auditor’s Office from Triune Health Group for the purpose of Worker’s Compensation Medical Nurse Case Management in the amount of \$62,740.

A motion was made by Mr. Krell, seconded by Ms. Sheppard, to place Resolution 15 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote so that Mr. Cahnman could be included in the vote, since he came in late. Upon a roll call vote, there were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays. Mr. Cahnman wanted to clarify that he is voting yes on Resolutions 13 and 14 as well.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

- B. Appointments

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the appointments. A voice vote was unanimous. There were no appointments. The nominations for appointment in May were submitted.

C. Procurement/Grant Notifications

There were no procurement/grant notifications.

D. Ratification of Highway Dept.-Laborers CBA

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Schackmann, to approve this contract as it was a good contract. Mr. Bunch stated the Union was happy and so were we. Chairman Van Meter stated it was his understanding this contract was arranged in record time, which is great news. The motion is to ratify the contract with the Laborers for the Highway Department. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
CONTRACT RATIFIED

E. Ratification of Deputies & Court Security-FOP CBA

No action was taken on this contract.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to place reports on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
REPORTS FILED

Chairman Van Meter announced that they do have a special Finance Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, April 10, 2024 at 5:30 p.m., but it is possible that meeting may be cancelled. It is to pursue the issue of the Convention Center. They will inform all the committee members if that meeting is not going forward, but as of now it is.

**RECESS**

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to recess the meeting to May 14, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MEETING RECESSED

***Don Gray***  
***Sangamon County Clerk***