

DON GRAY**SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK**200 SOUTH NINTH STREET – 1st FLOOR

SPRINGFIELD, IL 62701

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

WEBSITE: countyclerk.sangamonil.gov**MINUTES****SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD****JANUARY 13, 2025**

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on January 13, 2025 in the Sangamon South Auditorium. Chairman Van Meter called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Hall 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 – 1 Absent. Ms. Fulgenzi was excused.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Van Meter stated they would go out of the regular order of business to public comment to accommodate members of the public who signed up to speak tonight.

Calvin Christian, residing at 1701 S College in Springfield, addressed the County Board. He is here today, not only as a member of the Sonya Massey Commission, but also on behalf of the Commission. The Commission released the following statement on the recall “The Massey Commission was established as a citizen’s commission in response to the tragic killing of Sonya Massey by a former Sangamon County Deputy. The tragedy and response of the Sangamon County Sheriff’s Office highlighted a significant concern. The citizens of Sangamon County currently lack a mechanism to hold the Sheriff accountable mid-term. New accountability measures must be implemented for the Sangamon County Sheriff’s Office to ensure responsible leadership and public safety for all. The Commission believes it is in the best interest of the residents of Sangamon County for the County Board to take action that enables a proposition granting recall authority for the Office of the Sangamon County Sheriff.

While we acknowledge that there will be legal challenges along the way, ultimately it should be the people of Sangamon County that determine if that is an acceptable risk to ensure new accountability measures in Sangamon County.” That is the statement on behalf of the Sonya Massey Commission.

Mr. Christian continued by saying his statement is that he stands before them with a sense of urgency and responsibility to speak in favor of placing a referendum on the ballot that would allow citizens of this County to decide whether they should have the ability to recall their Sheriff. We are gathered today because of the tragic and preventable loss of Sonya Massey, whose family still feels the weight of this injustice. The actions of former Sangamon County Sheriff Sean Grayson, during that incident, has left an unforgettable mark on our community; however, this tragedy is only the most recent example of a larger issue. An issue of leadership, accountability, and the failure of the public to be adequately protected. When former Sheriff Jack Campbell chose not to resign in light of the situation, it became clear that leadership in this County must be held to a higher standard. In response to these failures, the County Board created the Sonya Massey Commission and asked us to evaluate whether the people of Sangamon County should have the ability to recall their Sheriff in cases where public trust has been broken. The Commission, after careful consideration, unanimously recommended that the County Board place this referendum on the ballot. They did this, not because of a single incident, but because of a broader need for accountability in our law enforcement leadership for the people of Sangamon County to have a voice when those in power fail them. It is crucial that we respect the trust placed in the Commission by the County Board. They were asked to make this decision and we did so thoughtfully and with the utmost care. He asks you to honor the work they have done and uphold our recommendation. To dismiss this recommendation would undermine, not only the work of the Commission, but also the faith that the citizens of Sangamon County have placed in both our Commission and the County Board.

If you feel unable to vote to place this referendum on the ballot, then at the very least he urges them to vote on the Resolution for Sangamon County State’s Attorney John Milhiser to seek an opinion from the Illinois Attorney General’s Office regarding the legal basis for this proposal. This step would ensure further clarity on the matter and demonstrate a commitment to exploring every option to uphold public trust and accountability. We cannot afford to disregard the voices of the people especially when public trust is at stake. We cannot afford to pretend that everything is fine when citizens of this County feel vulnerable. The recall provision is not about partisan politics nor is it about revenge. It is about giving the people a tool to ensure that their elected officials remain accountable, and when leadership fails, there is a recourse to hold them accountable. It is a safeguard and it is a necessary one.

He understands that some may express concerns over the potential for legal challenges. If this proposal is challenged in court then it is the responsibility of the Sangamon County State’s Attorney’s Office, our legal experts, to defend it. This is the role of our County’s legal team, and he has no doubt they are more than capable of ensuring that the people’s right to recall their Sheriff is defended. The fear of a challenge should not be a reason to abandon this proposal. It should be an opportunity for us to stand firm in our belief that the people of Sangamon County deserve a tool of accountability.

We must also remember the presence of Sonya Massey's family in this room today. Their loss serves as a painful reminder that we cannot afford to ignore the need for leadership that is surely accountable to the people. They have suffered because of failure in leadership, and they deserve to know that we are taking action to ensure that no family is forced to endure such a tragedy again. This is not a political issue; this is a moral issue. In closing, he urges you, members of the Sangamon County Board, to honor the work of the Sonya Massey Commission by placing the recall provision on the ballot as we have recommended. If you cannot take that step today, then I implore you to take action on the Resolution for the opinion from the Illinois Attorney General's Office. This is not just about passing measure, it is about standing up for justice; standing up for the citizens of Sangamon County and ensuring that leadership remains accountable to the people it serves. We have done our part and now I ask you to do yours.

Chairman Van Meter asked Mr. Christian to take a message back to the Massey Commission regarding some speculation that the County Board set its meeting this evening to, in some way, inconvenience the Massey Commission. They set this meeting back in November in order to create the maximum time for the Board to act on any potential issue that needed to be put on the April ballot. This was the last day they could act, so they set the meeting tonight specifically to try to be as responsive as possible. He asked Mr. Christian to pass that message on to the Massey Commission. Mr. Christian agreed to pass the message on.

Shawn Miller, Chairman of the Sangamon County Veteran's Assistance Commission, addressed the County Board. He is here on their behalf stating that this County has held back funds in reference to an act, by the Illinois General Assembly, has passed by unanimous decisions, that the military Veteran's Assistance Act be enacted in every county that has a VAC. We have the support from every military organization within this County. Why can't we get the Military Veteran's Act in plain site? He's got it from the Illinois General Assembly's Office that says we are correct. He has it from the attorney that wrote it for the Act and was forwarded to the General Assembly, and they approved it and said we were correct. We've got lawyers that say we are correct, and we have different commissions in different counties that are also enacting the Military Veteran's Assistance Act because they know it is right and it is by the law. It is simple.

He's done all the homework for you and has provided you with every piece of information you asked for. He has provided to the caucuses, has divided it to other people and leadership. What am I hearing? "We need a judge's opinion." This is wrong. He has done everything for you and was told, "It's ambiguous." He's not a lawyer and he understands it. This is wrong. Your ASA tells me every day, "That is not right and that is not correct." The Attorney General's Office and the Illinois General Assembly, who voted for it, says it is correct. He is looking for a resolution or for anything from you, the Board members, to say we need to enact the Military Veteran's Assistance Act in Sangamon County immediately. It could be a 30-day wait, give me the options. He will take every bit of it. He's a governing board, and if you want to meet his board, they meet on Wednesday at 7:00 p.m. at the V.F.W. 755. Come and see what they do. Their board is parallel to your board. Whatever our board says is law. Let's tell the attorneys at the County level they are wrong. Let's not take this to court because he guarantees you they will spend more than \$200,000 of your taxpayer's money.

Court takes time and every lawyer fee is \$300 to \$400 an hour. Guess what that is going to give us...a lot of money to be spent, and it will be spent from your money. If they can just say the Military Veteran's Assistance Act is correct. I am proud of who I am...please stop taking away from the Veterans. They have many Veterans that need help, and now have a back file of over 100 people. That's over 100 people they can't help because of this. Help us help them get this in play and let us have our right as the law.

Cynthia & Dan Cody, residing at 20 Wildwood Rd. in Springfield, addressed the County Board. Ms. Cody stated that many of them already know who they are and why they are there. They have lived in this community all their lives, raised their kids here, and dedicated their lives to this County. You, as a board, were elected to represent the citizens of the County. It has been four years since their son's death. Jamie is his name. Commit that to your memory because your officers, Bill Grigsby, Earl Grigsby, Scott Meyer and Kyle Meyer, killed our son. They were never punished or disciplined in any way shape or form when this happened. We came here right after and begged them to give us names and they refused. It seemed to take an attorney to find out who killed our son. His death was ruled a homicide. That means your officers killed him. Jack Campbell, at the time, had a hand in this too, and so did this county. The county that allowed Jack Campbell to encourage the use of force, no matter how excessive or how many deaths or permanent injuries it caused. As a Board, you allowed him to get away with this for years. You would think, after four years, we would know more about what happened to our son and why these officers killed him, but we don't. What we do know, according to the Illinois Police investigation, is the video that was released is missing seven minutes of your officers torturing and killing our son. They know they tased him five or more times while he was face down on the floor. We know three officers weighing every bit of at least 800 pounds were together on top of him for several minutes while officers were tasing him. Not only that, there were several looking on and they didn't stop it. Miraculously, she read through two of the officers depositions, they don't remember anything. How can you not remember killing someone? How can you not remember sitting on someone and they died? You killed them and you don't remember?

Jamie did have a rough start in his life, but he did have a bright future ahead of him. He was getting himself together, but your officers ripped that away from him. There is no question about liability. Sangamon County is liable for the death of our son, and a judge in this case agreed. They had a settlement in 2023, but you can never give us back our son, but you can compensate his children for his loss. We came here tonight to ask you to do the right thing, put this thing to rest, and give his children and family closure that they desperately need. If you fail the citizens of the County again by refusing then we will take this to trial, put it all on display and let a jury decide. Ms. Cody showed pictures of Jamie and his son (their grandson).

Maureen Bommarito, residing at 8 Fair Oaks in Springfield, addressed the County Board. She is here to ask the County Board to support the recall Resolution before you this evening. It's been before you several times, and she hopes this time they are brave enough to warrant the possibility of a lawsuit from moving forward when the community has been so desperately asking for this since the incident. You have the power and the ability to do something about it since this is what you have been asked to do by your citizens and constituents, and that is what she hopes they will do.

Don Hanrahan, residing at 4981 Smith Rd. in Pleasant Plains, addressed the County Board. He stated that Sheriff's wield tremendous power over investigations and policies that mean the difference between life and death. The ultra-conservative constitutional Sheriff's movement convinced nearly half the Sheriff's across the nation that within their counties they wield more power than state and federal governments. It's not true, but our own Sheriff Campbell decreed that state gun laws were unconstitutional and would not be enforced in Sangamon County. The history of deaths, injuries, lawsuits, and settlements caused by the Sheriff's Office in Sangamon County have been on blast and under public scrutiny and culminated in last summer's horrific murder of Sonya Massey by a Sangamon County Deputy. Aside from the devastating effects on her family and her friends, the people now face immense liability and a costly DOJ investigation. You established the Massey Commission to make recommendations and to take action that expand safe and equitable access to services by addressing systemic racism and mistrust in law enforcement. The immense power of the Sheriff requires equally immense accountability and responsiveness. One of the first recommendations of the Commission is to change the Sheriff's term of office from four years to one of four years subject to termination by recall in order to help achieve those goals. But, a committee of the County Board voted against that recommendation claiming it is not clearly constitutional. He has already stated to that committee in detail why they are wrong about that. He is not going to waste what little time he is granted here making legal arguments to a political body that lacks the ability to make determinations of what is constitutional and what is not. That's not your role.

The second argument that was advanced was that it would cost too much to defend a recall, and that is ludicrous. Sure, there is a difference of legal opinion between what he thinks and what others think, and what the lawyer that teaches trial out at U of I thought, but he can tell you there is more than just a colorable claim that changing a Sheriff's term of office to make it subject to recall is perfectly constitutional. As for the expense of defending it, he is with Mr. Christian. They have a State's Attorney's Office that is perfectly capable of taking care of that. The argument assumes you are going to pay \$1,250 bucks an hour to some silk stocking law firm from Chicago. We are not going to do that. You don't have to do it...it is not rocket science, just because you haul out the boogeyman of constitutionality. Unlike the Board's committee, he has every confidence that Mr. Milhiser and his staff are capable of defending the claims. Think about the liabilities we are trying to avoid that you have repeatedly had to pay because of Sheriff's that exceeded their authority. You established the commission to make the recommendations and to take action. He had early skepticism as to whether the County Board was serious or whether this commission was just a classic move to diffuse the legitimate anger of the people and to channel their demands for change into some safe harbor of endless minutia "do nothingism". He has followed their work and frankly, though a healthy skepticism remains, he has hope, especially with this recommendation that was made. It would please him to have the Board remove the rest of his skepticism. It would please me for you to show confidence in your own attorneys. It would speak volumes to the people of Sangamon County and to the Massey family so grievously injured for you to show your good faith to the commission you created and to pass this recommendation.

Mike Ingram, two-time County Board Member and former Recorder of Deeds for Champaign County, addressed the County Board. He is speaking regarding the idea of eliminating the office of Recorder of Deeds in Sangamon County. He was elected in the year 2020, and spent about a year campaigning on the idea of eliminating the office. He took office December 1st of 2020 and walked out the door unelected on December 30, 2021, so that is 13 months. He worked very hard during the campaign to get everybody up to speed on the elimination. He spent a long time, before he even ran this campaign, looking at other counties who had gotten rid of their Recorder of Deeds. It is often not something the Recorder of that county wanted, so he thought it would be an interesting thing to be the Recorder who said, "Get rid of my office." In every county, he saw that somewhere between one and two years seemed appropriate. As a County Board Member, he asked the County Board to immediately turn around and begin discussions on what it would be like to put it on the consolidated ballot in April. They consulted with the State's Attorney and talked to everybody they could from other counties and found that another county or two had already done so. It seemed like an appropriate time to try to do this as fast as possible.

They put it on the April ballot. There was discussion about when to end the term. He, as the office holder, had the opportunity, if he wanted to, to cut his term short. There is nothing that says you have to fill out a whole term. He went ahead and said, "Let's do this between one and two years." We thought the cleanest thing would be to do it at the end of the calendar year, which meant the salary would cut off at the same time. He declined all benefits while he was the Recorder because he thought if he is really serious about saving the county money, he should save as much as humanly possible. He made sure he watched out for possible pitfalls during the transition. In that year, they confirmed the voter's choice to eliminate the office. It was roughly 56 to 44, so they set it to end at the end of 2021. He worked really hard with the County Clerk's Office to make sure they had a smooth transition, and it worked seamlessly. He kept the deputy from a previous Recorder who he had beaten because he thought institutional knowledge was important when handing an office over to another department. There was also no staff change in the department. Everything worked out very well, he checked in on the office after he left, and is still in contact with several of his employees. He has heard of no complaints about lagging documents or anything like that. They had a seamless and wonderful transition.

He is here to say that it is an appropriate thing to do. Our Recorder of Deeds system is pretty outdated. He felt pretty good about doing it at the time and nothing ever convinced him, while he was in office, that they shouldn't do it. Nothing since has convinced him of that as well. He believes you are doing the right thing in adopting this Resolution. He kept getting messages from people that were saying, "Hey, I think the guy in Sangamon is doing a similar thing as you." I would assume he is very supportive of this timeline as well. If you run on wanting to save taxpayer's money then you should do this as expeditiously as possible. They did a lot in that one year in office that I was very proud of. He found being a public servant to be very rewarding. He had seen several Recorder of Deeds, around the state and in his own county, not do very much and not show up at the office very much. It is very outdated, and unfortunately it is something that just lingers in a few counties. He hopes that you, as a county, decide to recommend this Resolution and that you, as voters, choose to pass it.

Tericus Mackey was the next person signed up to speak but was not present.

Ken Pacha addressed the County Board. He supports everything Mike said about the Recorder position. Lesko ran on that and I think we should hold him to it. He thinks after what he did at City Council, where he interned one of our Alderman to take over as City Clerk without the knowledge of about half of the City Council, could be a telling sign about the kind of behavior we might see in the position if he does not follow the Resolution to try and remove the office, which is exactly what he ran on and was elected on. He does not support the idea that he would be allowed to stay in that position if that's what he ran on. You should hold yourself to the word of what you promised the voters.

He moved on to the next topic, which is the 708 Committee. He is really hoping they pass that tonight. From what he has heard from the Democratic members, you all seem pretty in line about that. It seems like an extremely reasonable question to put on a referendum for citizens to decide on. He doesn't think he needs to spend a lot of time on that considering there are quite a number of other counties that have already set up 708 Boards and have found great success with that with a .15% property tax off of that, that would be almost \$6 million a year off the previous year's \$39 million in property taxes you collected. Based off that, you would do pretty well to fund that effort. In doing so, you would create a deep well of reserve help for the law enforcement and other things, which would go a long way from preventing the outcomes they saw with Sonya Massey's murder by the Sangamon County Sheriff's Department. He strongly encourages you to pass that and give the voters a chance to make that choice.

He knows they will probably kill the recall effort. He thinks what frustrates him the most is you have no right to make that decision for any of us, and that is not personal. The only thing that has ever been said in relation, by actual courts in Illinois, to a recall effort relates to the 2016 recall effort to remove what many of us know to be a "terrible Mayor" Tiffany Henyard. The simple fact is they tried to recall her first and the 1st Appellate Court did issue an opinion on recalls. The reason they denied the recall effort that was put in place was because the City seemed to be in a rush and tried to put the question of a recall and the removal of the Mayor on the same ballot, which is "Putting the cart before the horse." However, they did make it very clear that the only group, especially in a non-home rule entity such as this, if we are looking into Dillon's rules, it's going to be the idea that it should be put to the referendum of the voter's choice. You need to give us the opportunity to tell you yes or no. It's not up to you; it's up to us if we want to recall our Sheriff.

Our previous Sheriff refused to enforce particular laws of this State. It's been made very clear by the Illinois Supreme Court that this is not an allowable choice. We should not have been forced to tolerate that and we shouldn't have to tolerate it in the future. Our current Sheriff Paula has not shown any indication about that, but then again, nobody has actually asked her about it either. It's a little bit frustrating to him that instead of giving the voters of this area the opportunity, given the past issues we've had with Sheriff's not including Campbell, but such dignitaries such as our two time DUI having Neil. That's the kind of thing where we tolerate that kind of behavior from our law enforcement and then we can't remove them for however many years. It's up to us as citizens to

make that choice. If we elected them, we have the right to remove them. It shouldn't be up to a board to do that for us.

He thinks it's very frustrating that the Sonya Massey Commission has been very clear about what they've asked from you and he was here from the start when you voted to enact it, fund it, and get it on its own and going. It was very clear that you said you would try to respect the work they were doing and follow through on the recommendations. All they recommended is that the voters of Sangamon County have the opportunity to have a choice as to whether or not we recall our Sheriff. He is asking you tonight to reconsider the choices you've made because quite frankly, previous Attorney Generals such as Lisa Madigan, who was Attorney General for 17 years, very clearly stated that she thinks recalls are a great idea. There's a current House bill in place right now to help recall all elected officials. The frustrating part for him is a lot of times they will see resistance from County Board members and City Council in enacting that because the number one group of people that are recalled by that statute, when put to voter's decision, are County Board members and City Council members. There may be legal questions and the courts have already spoken on it. The Associate State's Attorney has spoken on it, and Milhiser seems reluctant to even ask Raoul about it.

He thinks it's important to note again that the previous Attorney General for the last 17 years was very supportive of a recall effort even when asked in regard to her father Michael Madigan. He thinks it's very important to note those kinds of things because what we are talking about is giving the voters of Sangamon County the opportunity to have a choice in the people they elect beyond the election. If people are going to refuse to enforce laws and have the kind of behavior we saw in the Sangamon County Sheriff's Department...I will give you a heads up, he has been listening to the Massey Commission and their next recommendation is going to be in relation to staffing and hiring practices at the Sangamon County Sheriff's Department. If the new Sheriff refuses to enact those kinds of things, shouldn't we be given an escape for the idea that our Sheriff may not choose to enforce actual laws that have been enacted by our State? He thinks that is very frustrating for everybody to see that kind of behavior coming from chief law enforcement officials. We are forced to wait until what happens, the outright murder of one of our own citizens, to even get a discussion moving about removing the kind of Sheriff who refuses to enact and enforce our state's laws.

Donna Massey, mother of Sonya Massey, and Teresa Haley addressed the County Board. Ms. Massey stated she doesn't know why she is here because you won't get anything from her but a bunch of tears. Teresa Haley stated they are here on behalf of Sonya Massey's mother, father and the family to ask the County Board members to vote yes on the recall tonight. They were in court again today. Every month they show up in court waiting and waiting and waiting. If you vote to recall this, it will be approximately 30 days after their next court hearing. They are simply waiting for the Supreme Court to do the right thing on behalf of Sonya. We keep saying, "Say her name" but no one is listening. So, they are asking you to say her name...say her name. Please do the right thing County Board. This is not about politics. This is about people. This is about a human being. This is about Springfield Illinois, the home of Abraham Lincoln. The place where President Obama announced he was running for office. The home of the 1908 Race Riot that led to the oldest civil rights organization in the world. Ms. Donna is asking you all tonight to do the right thing to put this on the voting agenda for April. Thank you so much.

PROCLAMATIONS

Mr. Stumpf presented a Proclamation to Molly Berns, upon her retirement, recognizing her years of service with the Regional Planning Commission. Mr. Stumpf praised the work she has done. Ms. Berns thanked them for the recognition. When she joined the staff back in 2008, she intended to stay two years and 17 years later here I am. She thanked everyone for their belief in her and her abilities. She was blessed with a great sense of co-workers and staff that she worked with diligently. They are tireless and they are smart and innovated and care about the issues and the community. She thanked them all. After 17 years, 1,989 City and County zoning cases later, she is retired. She thanked them for their support through the years.

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 2024 & DECEMBER 18, 2024

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. DelGiorno, for approval of the Minutes of December 10, 2024 & December 18, 2024. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED

MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

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

RESOLUTION 1

1. Resolution appropriating Motor Fuel Tax funds for the 2025 annual maintenance of County highways.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Miller, 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 26 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 2 - 5

2. Resolution appropriating Motor Fuel Tax funds for the 2025 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. DelGiorno, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to consolidate Resolutions 2 – 5. Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to read Resolutions 3 – 5.

3. Resolution approving the purchase of an Etnyre Chipspreader from E.D. Etnyre & Co.
4. Resolution approving the FY2025 Township Motor Fuel Tax letting contracts.
5. Resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement between Sangamon County and Menard County for the purpose of constructing Phase 3 of the Sangamon Valley Trail.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. Chairman Van Meter asked if the Intergovernmental Agreement for Resolution 5 takes the trail into Athens or if Menard County would be responsible for taking it all the way into Athens. The professional staff explained that this resolution does not cover that. Menard County would be responsible for it.

A motion was made by Mr. DelGiorno that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolutions 2 – 5, as consolidated. A voice vote carried. Mr. Hall voted no on Resolution 5. Mr. Thomas voted Present on Resolution 5.

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2024-027 – Jennifer Mazeika, 501 N Dirksen Parkway, Unit A, Springfield – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Tom Madonia, Jr., District #9.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. DelGiorno, to place Resolution 6 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case. Trustin Harrison, professional staff, stated the petitioner is requesting, pursuant to Chapter 17.66, a variance of Section 17.58.080(D)(4) to allow a liquor store property line to be approximately four feet from a residence instead of the required 100 feet. Emily Prather, professional staff, stated the staff recommends approval of the requested variance. The subject property is bounded on all four sides by commercial zoning and fronts a commercial corridor where businesses of this nature are expected to be located. The proposed liquor store will be located within the existing convenience store with the entrance facing Dirksen Parkway. The standards for variation are met. The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends approval of the staff recommendation.

Jennifer Mazeika, petitioner, addressed the County Board. She resides at 803 N Osburn in Springfield. She is here as a first time business owner asking for your approval for package liquor for her convenience store. This business is more than a job. It is how she provides for her family and serves our very busy community. Right now, her store is missing what many customers are asking for and that is package liquor. Adding this option would let her meet their needs, help our economy, and also keep her doors open. Additionally, she would like to point out that another renter in the same building already holds a liquor license. This demonstrates that the building and the surrounding area are already familiar with and supportive of responsible alcohol sales. Approving her license would align with the existing practices in the building. The benefits of approving this license include

economic growth, keeping her doors open, creating jobs, and allowing her to offer more services to the community. There would also be convenience for residents. Customers would not need to travel for something they could get close by and save them time and money.

She understands that alcohol sales come with concerns, but she wants to assure them that safety and responsibility are her priorities. Her and her staff will follow all laws, check identification, and ensure alcohol is sold responsibly. This decision is about trust. Trust in her as a responsible business owner that wants to serve the community and support her family. She hopes they approve this license so she can keep growing her business and meeting the needs of their neighborhoods.

Mr. DelGiorno stated there were rumors going around that you would be pursuing a gaming license. Ms. Mazeika stated that is not true. The business two doors down already has a gaming parlor. They are the business that also holds the liquor license.

Ms. Lathan asked how long she has owned this business. Ms. Mazeika stated she has been there two months. Ms. Lathan asked what the business was before. Ms. Mazeika stated it was a convenience store before that had many previous owners and has been there for years.

Nicholas Welch, residing at 8300 Book Road in Williamsville, addressed the County Board. His mother's house is a neighbor to this business. This has been an ongoing situation for over 10 years. Ten years ago, they had a big fight about this. They had over 120 signatures, and it was shot down. Doris Turner was involved with it. The issue is that it is just too close. With package liquor, people will just be walking up and down the street with it. This is Carpenter Street where someone was just shot over road rage. It's a rough neighborhood. It's the east side, and used to be Carpenter and Dirksen Parkway, and used to be Route 66. The only thing going over there now are liquor stores and gambling joints. He has a letter that was signed when the existing gambling place went in there and they signed a letter saying they would not sell any alcohol there. His mom is 92 and has a bunch of grandkids. His dad was military and this house is all he left her.

Mr. Hall stated he hears a lot of people saying how the neighborhoods are going bad. Well, it is up to them to kind of pull the neighborhood back together and protect those neighbors. With a lot of these people, their homes are all they have. He would love for her to do good with her business, but others have promised they would only have alcohol and no gaming. Then months/years later they come back for gaming, so he is going to vote no.

Mr. Krell stated he reached out to someone who has a business and said he has no problem with this whatsoever.

Mr. Madonia stated this business is four feet from someone's house and five feet or so from other neighbors. A package liquor store does not need to be in a neighborhood like this. She has a right because it's zoned industrial, but he thinks common sense should prevail here and they should vote this down.

Ms. Mazeika thanked them for sharing their concerns. She completely understands their points of view. Her store hasn't always been a positive part of this community due to the previous owners, but she is changing that and plans to keep it a safe and responsible environment. This isn't about promoting alcohol but is about offering what is in demand in a responsible way. She also believes a strong thriving business like hers benefits the whole neighborhood and community. It creates jobs, builds connections, and helps the community stay strong. She values their neighborhood and the people in it and wants to see it remain safe and welcoming.

Mr. Welch gave his rebuttal. He stated he does trust her, but there are a lot of wild and crazy things going on in that neighborhood. They are letting some prisoners out and putting them in the hotels over there, so it's rough.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a voice vote on the question to adopt Resolution 6. The voice vote carried with the majority voting no. Resolution 6 was denied.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTION 7

7. Resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement between the County of Sangamon and Cantrall regarding enforcement of the International Building Code.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 7 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 7. 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. DelGiorno, to waive the ten-day filing period. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

RESOLUTION 8

8. Resolution requesting the submission of a binding question of public policy to the electors of Sangamon County regarding eliminating the office of the Recorder of Sangamon County.

A motion was made by Mr. DelGiorno, seconded by Mr. Cahnman, to place Resolution 8 on the floor.

Mr. DelGiorno explained that the Resolution in their packet is an exact copy and paste of the Champaign County Resolution adopted in 2021. They just changed the County to Sangamon and changed the dates accordingly. Over the course of the last year, Frank Lesko, our newly elected County Recorder, campaigned on a premise of "Hire me in order to fire me." He would like to help him keep his promise. Last week there was a Channel 20 piece where both Mr. Lesko and our County Auditor were interviewed. Mr. Goleman, our County Auditor, said, "He thinks it's an easy \$200,000 to start off with right off the bat if we eliminated the County Recorder's Office. The position of the County Recorder and Chief Deputy would be eliminated right off the bat." He also said, "I think it will absolutely save money and it should be done fairly soon." Now it seems "fairly soon" is in the eye of the beholder. What we heard tonight from Mr. Ingram, from Champaign County, is he did this exact same thing just four years ago. He was elected on the same campaign promise. Champaign County immediately put it on the ballot for the next election, which for us would be April 1st. They eliminated and merged the offices together by the end of 2021. What this Resolution would do is give a full year to April of 2026 to merge the offices together. He thinks Mr. Lesko's campaign promise should be upheld and they should allow him and voters of Sangamon County to have the final say, as soon as possible, to save the taxpayers money as Mr. Goleman and Mr. Lesko have both promised.

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mendenhall, to strike Resolution 8 and replace with the following Resolution.

WHEREAS, the Sangamon County Board places a high priority on reducing costs of county government and has a long record of reducing spending and eliminating wasteful spending in order to improve the efficiency of county government;

WHEREAS, the Sangamon County Board has consistently examined opportunities for consolidation, worked with industry professionals, and engaged in initiatives to educate voters; these efforts have led to significant cost-saving measures, saving taxpayers millions of dollars, including the merging of Animal Control, Elections, 911 Dispatch, and Public Health between Sangamon County and the City of Springfield, as well as the elimination of Township Collectors.

WHEREAS, closely related, overlapping administrative functions within local governments provide excellent opportunities for consolidation;

WHEREAS, the functions of the office of both Sangamon County Recorder of Deeds and the Office of the Sangamon County Clerk include maintaining official records;

WHEREAS, Article VII, Sections 4 (c) and 11 of the Illinois Constitution, provides that a County Board, by a resolution may authorize a referendum to eliminate a County office, including the office of the Recorder of Deeds;

WHEREAS, voters in other Illinois counties have recently elected to consolidate the powers and duties of the office of the Recorder of Deeds with existing County Clerk offices to save taxpayer funds, and only a few counties in the state still maintain a separate Recorder's office;

WHEREAS, the current Recorder pledged to voters to eliminate the office through a ballot question targeting a 2026 referendum, with the merger planned for 2028. This plan was actively presented to the public during his campaign, and countywide voters elected him with the understanding that this timeline would be pursued.

WHEREAS, in the interest of following the voters' wishes and continuing the Board's long tradition of eliminating wasteful spending, the Sangamon County Board must put this question before the voters to ensure the continued pursuit of efficient and effective government operations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Sangamon County Board calls on the Recorder and the County Clerk to engage MGT, a reputable firm specializing in government efficiency studies to conduct a comprehensive cost saving analysis. This analysis will evaluate the financial and operating impacts of consolidating the Recorder's functions with the County Clerk's office and will be used to inform both the Board and the public. The final report will be submitted to the County by December 1, 2025, providing ample time for thorough review and discussion before the proposed referendum; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Sangamon County Board, Sangamon County, Illinois, a unit of local government, that the following binding question shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the County of Sangamon on November 3, 2026:

SHALL THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF SANGAMON COUNTY BE ELIMINATED, AND ALL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS BE TRANSFERRED TO THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK OF SANGAMON COUNTY ON DECEMBER 1, 2028?

Mr. Cahnman stated this does not look like an amendment, this looks like a new Resolution. Mr. Madonia said, "He was moving to replace the motion that Mr. DelGiorno made with another motion." This motion was never distributed to us prior to the meeting, is not on the Agenda and is out of order. He asks that the Chair rule this new motion out of order.

Mr. DelGiorno stated he believes this new Resolution has a requirement to waste a little more taxpayer money to do a study when we already know however many counties in the State of Illinois have already eliminated the office of Recorder and merged with the Clerk's office. We know what the steps are to do this, and we know already what the savings will be. The only issue here is you're protecting Frank Lesko for four freaking years. I am moving that this is out of order under the Open Meetings Act because it's asking us to vote on the issue of hiring a consultant to review this whole Resolution. He is asking that the Chair be overruled. Mr. Cahnman seconded that. Mr. Cahnman stated in support of the motion, he would say this Resolution is not germane just like you ruled in August on my amendment to putting a binding referendum on the ballot. Chairman Van Meter ruled that the proposed amendment is in order.

This is not germane because it calls for the spending of money on a study. There is nothing in Mr. DelGiorno's Resolution that calls for the spending of any money or any study. He seconded Mr. DelGiorno's motion and asks that they vote on it. Chairman Van Meter explained the motion is to set aside the proposed amendment because it's not germane and it violates the Open Meetings Act. Upon a roll call vote, there were 8 Yeas – 17 – 1 Present. Those voting yes were Mr. Ayers, Mr. Cahnman, Mr. DelGiorno, Ms. Deppe, Ms. Douglas Williams, Ms. Lathan, Mr. McGuire, and Ms. Small. Ms. Sheppard voted Present. The motion to set aside the proposed amendment was denied.

Mr. Cahnman urged the Board members and fellow colleagues to vote no on this amendment. All this amendment does is commit the County to additional wasteful spending. The \$200,000 a year could be saved. Mr. Madonia's amendment wants to extend the term of the current Recorder for an additional three years, which would be a waste of \$600,000 of the taxpayer's money. In addition, his proposal would end the Recorder's office when Mr. Lesko's current term ends in 2028, so it would be violating his campaign pledge to hire me to fire me, since he would not be fired and would serve until the end of his term. Further, he spoke to Mr. Lesko prior to the meeting and asked him if he would support our Resolution and he said no because he wants to put it on the ballot in November 2026 to end the office in November 2027, which would be hiring him to fire him. This Resolution doesn't do what Mr. Lesko said he wanted to do because it ends his term in 2028 when it normally ends under his normal term. He would be violating his campaign promise and what he told me prior to the meeting. He is asking for a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. Ayers asked if Frank Lesko is here tonight. Mr. Lesko is not present. Mr. Ayers asked why he is not even here tonight. The former one is. So, they are going to hire him so they can study for a while and make some more money. This isn't that complicated. He appreciates that some Republicans voted yes. He doesn't understand what they are doing here. This was the easiest thing on the Agenda as he was keeping his promise to the taxpayers. He is stunned over this. Study it some more so we can vote no on it. He asked Mr. Madonia what they are studying on this. Who picked MGT? This is a joke. He is not even here. This is his job on the line and he is not even here.

The second to last paragraph says we will be submitting this for a vote in November 2026. He believes that vote will be ratified by December 2026, but your last paragraph says 2028. Was that a typo and meant to say 2026? Chairman Van Meter stated he does not think so.

A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman, seconded by Mr. Ayers, to amend the amendment to change December 1, 2028 to December 1, 2026. Chairman Van Meter explained Mr. Cahnman's motion is to amend the amendment so that the effective date of the closing of the office would be December 1, 2026.

Mr. Hall asked if this has gone through the Election Committee. Chairman Van Meter stated it has not. When Mr. DelGiorno filed the Resolution, there wasn't time to send it to through the Election Committee and still have the possibility of it being effective as Mr. DelGiorno originally envisioned. Mr. DelGiorno agreed that is correct.

Mr. Cahnman stated this would at least carry out Mr. Lesko's promise of hire me to fire me.

A voice vote carried on the amendment and the amendment passed.

Mr. Hall stated they are having a meeting tonight on this because they had to get this on the ballot. He believes in going through the Committee, and this did not go through the Committee. We can't have another Committee meeting this week. Chairman Van Meter explained this was the last day they could act in order for anything to go on the ballot. That is the reason they changed the meeting to tonight.

A voice vote carried on the motion to adopt Resolution 8 as amended.

Mr. Cahnman made another motion to put this question on the ballot on April 1, 2025, which was what Mr. DelGiorno originally proposed. Mr. DelGiorno seconded the motion. Mr. Madonia stated he would oppose this and stays with what he originally proposed.

Mr. Hall asked how much the study would cost. Chairman Van Meter stated that proposal will come separately and will be voted on by the Board.

Ms. Lathan asked for clarification on the date. Chairman Van Meter explained they would now be voting on Mr. Cahnman's amendment returns it be put on the ballot in the April election, which was Mr. DelGiorno's original proposal. The merger will occur December 1, 2026.

Mr. Krell asked if the company would still come in to do the study even if they move the date up. Mr. Cahnman's amendment doesn't change the outline of the policy to study the effect of the merger with respect to the Recorder's office and the County Clerk's office.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to change the date the question would be put on the ballot to April 1, 2025. Upon the roll call vote, there were 17 Yeas – 9 Nays. The motion passed. Those voting nay were Mr. Davsko, Ms. Deaner, Mr. Hall, Mr. Madonia, Mr. Mendenhall, Mr. Miller, Mr. Rader, Mr. Stumpf, and Mr. Truax.

Mr. DelGiorno stated he has a further amendment. He moves to amend the amended Resolution to strike the paragraph that begins *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Sangamon County Board calls on the Recorder and the County Clerk to engage MGT...etc.* Delete that entire paragraph. Mr. Cahnman seconded the motion.

Mr. Stumpf asked Mr. DelGiorno to clarify that since they moved the date to April 1, 2025 that there is not time for this. Mr. DelGiorno stated that is correct. There is not only no time, but they know exactly how other counties have done this. His recommendation would be the Recorder's office becomes a division within the Clerk's office and you are done. That is all it takes. There is no reason to be spending money for this.

A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to strike the third paragraph from the bottom from Mr. Madonia's amendment.

Ms. Scaife asked if the Committee could review the option of having the study if it goes through in April. Chairman Van Meter stated the Committees are not that involved in the management of the offices. Those offices would be working on that.

Mr. Thomas asked if there is a difference in our county from Champaign County with regards to township assessing. Don gray stated he can't answer the question because they should have a thorough analysis and study of our relationship to properly having a foundation and strategy of merging the Recorder's office with the County Clerk. We are all governed by statute of operation. The vast majority of his colleagues do serve as Recorders, but it does not negate that there could be small intricacies that could affect this merger and its effectiveness. He cautions doing this properly. There is no need to be rash but be professional and have a full understanding of the concepts and the things that need implemented, since it has been a long time that recording operations have been in the County Clerk's office. Analyzing, looking, and paying attention to the things that need to be done to the uniqueness of our systems is critical and it shouldn't be rushed. We are responsible for proper customer service. There will be cost savings and they could reap more additional cost savings by properly analyzing it and doing it effectively and correctly.

County Clerk Gray explained that they have a home grown built system here in Sangamon County of how we operate County Clerk operations. The manner in how we integrate recording as a division is important and should be properly analyzed to ensure that it is done properly. In the end, it is the services that matter. Recording will still need to be accomplished. The function is a critical one to the foundation of our land records and transaction of property. He cautions taking time to properly look at it, professionally analyze it, and make sure it is done properly so that is truly seamless in transition to the County Clerk's office, and we can maximize those cost savings by doing so.

Mr. Thomas stated it was his understanding that Don Gray's office does handle something different from the County Clerk's office in Champaign County in that they have something to do with townships that Champaign County does not do. His point is if he does more work than the Champaign County Clerk, giving him until December 2026 is warranted because he does have a different job than the Champaign County Clerk does. Mr. Gray agreed with Mr. Thomas. The Sangamon County Clerk shares a unique relationship to assessing property for Capital Township and does have a unique relationship to the recording process. The work is going to be done, but the question is how it will be done, and how they will integrated recording into the same office as assessments. It may not affect it all, but it could, and they should look at it.

Mr. Stumpf recommended that they go ahead and agree to not have the study, but in lieu of that, if the voters say with the binding referendum that they wish to do this, they would have time to do it after.

Ms. Douglas Williams stated Josh Langfelder is here and people have a lot of questions about what needs to be done. She doesn't know if they could ask him to help answer some of the questions. Chairman Van Meter stated they could not.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a vote on Mr. DelGiorno's motion to strike the commitment to the consultants with the understanding we might add them back later. A voice vote was unanimous on the amendment.

Chairman Van Meter clarified the next vote would be on the Resolution as amended. The first amendment strikes the plan to hire a consultant, the second one sets the date on which the office will close as December 1, 2026, and the third change changes the date on which election this would take place. Chairman Van Meter stated he thinks this is rushed and not advisable, and that is the point the County Clerk was trying to make. He would vote no on this as amended.

Upon a roll call vote, there were 24 Yeas – 2 Nays. Resolution 8 was adopted, as amended. Those voting no were Ms. Deaner and Mr. Mendenhall.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

9. Resolution approving a grant application to the State's Attorney from the Illinois Attorney General's Office for the Violent Crimes Victim Assistance Program in the amount of \$43,000.

A motion was made by Ms. Sheppard, seconded by Mr. Truax, to place Resolution 9 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 9. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 10

10. Resolution establishing a referendum to create a 708 Mental Health Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Schackmann, seconded by Mr. Tjelmeland, to place Resolution 10 on the floor.

Mr. Schackmann stated the Committee had a public hearing, there were several members of the community there, and our own State Senator weighed in on this. The Committee voted to pass this Resolution and he asked that everyone vote in favor of it.

Mr. Cahnman asked if this proposes to put the referendum on the ballot in March 2026. Chairman Van Meter stated that is correct. Mr. Schackmann told Mr. Cahnman this was at the request of the Senator at the meeting you were at. Mr. Cahnman asked legal counsel if they would have to pass another Resolution to get this on the ballot in March 2026. Joel Benoit stated he believes that is correct.

Mr. Ayers thanked the Chairman of the Committee Mr. Schackmann for all his help and leadership on getting this to where it's at. A lot of work went into this, and a lot of folks attended the Committee meetings. Public Health had a lot of personal reasons and stories why they wanted to see this done. Members of the public are going to benefit greatly from this board if approved by the voters.

Mr. Ayers also thanked the Massey Commission for recommending this to us as well. It just feels really good, after all the debate they just went through, to hopefully be united on something that is so good and so positive for our community.

Mr. Schackmann stated they like having something positive where they can all work together and speak kindly to each other. Gina made some good points on why we don't want to rush this thing. Several of their committee members, including Pam and Greg, also feel this is a positive thing to have a good resolution for this community.

Mr. Hall stated before he came here tonight he was going to vote no on this because they are just adding another slice of the pie. If this is passed they are going to spend \$50,000. He was against this by making another \$150,000 for a \$200,000 house, until Mr. Schackmann made a point. Mr. Schackmann stated other communities came to the committee meeting that said of every \$4 invested in the community on mental health issues, there is a potential savings of up to \$7 through law enforcement.

Ms. Lathan added that this was a great system for real improvement and change in terms of, not just behavioral health, but really being able to make sure those in most need for services are using those services, creating a healthier and safer community, and making sure we are doing the work for people dealing with mental health. It is making sure they are training our first responders as well as making sure we are not over utilizing incarceration and unnecessary force.

Mr. Krell clarified that this Resolution is just approving to get the people on the Board. Chairman Van Meter stated that is correct. This is just approving to create the Board to study it and does not set the Resolution for voting, as Mr. Cahnman asked earlier. This outlines the process, but there will be another vote later to put it on the ballot.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a vote on the question. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 10.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 11

11. Resolution approving the procurement of goods and/or services for the Election Office from various news publications for the purpose of publishing required election notices for the 2025 Consolidated Election in the amount of \$48,737.

A motion was made by Mr. Miller, seconded by Ms. Scaife, to place Resolution 11 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 11. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 12

12. Resolution authorizing that a referendum be submitted to the voters of Sangamon County at the Consolidated Election on April 1, 2025 asking "Shall the voters of the County of Sangamon provide for the power of recall on the Office of Sangamon County Sheriff."

A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman, seconded by Mr. DelGiorno, to place Resolution 12 on the floor.

Mr. Cahnman urged a yes vote on this Resolution. There are 39 states that have some type of recall. They have three local governments in Illinois that have adopted recall under the local government article of our state constitution. They are Buffalo Grove, Wheeling, and Arlington Heights. It is kind of like a safety valve that lets you turn off the term of office of an elected official that is not conducting the job properly in the eyes of the people. It is not easy to recall an elected official under this proposed legislation. It takes about 8% of the people that voted in the last Governor's election. That is about 8,000 signatures to collect. You would have to collect about 15 or 16 to get the right number. In Illinois, we adopted recall statewide for our Governor back in 2010. In Sangamon County, almost 70% (68.43%) of the people voted for that recall. Public opinion polls show that 80% of the people of our state support recall for the office of Mayor. He would think it would be similar for this. Among Republicans, it is actually 90%, and we have a majority of Republican Board. That should be more reason for carrying out the will of our constituents to pass this Resolution. The Massey Commission, that we formed to give us recommendations, unanimously endorsed this Resolution. Sonya Massey's mother was here tonight and urged us to enact this. All this does is put the question on the ballot for the voters to vote on April 1st. It would still be up to the voters even if we pass this Resolution.

He hasn't heard anybody object to this based on bad public policy. The only opposition he heard is the claim that they lack the authority under the Illinois Constitution to enact recall, even though these other three local governments have done so. In Assistant State's Attorney Joel Benoit's opinion, he conceded that there are Appellate Court decisions that disagree with them.

We were elected to carry out the will of the people. We are not judges. We are County Board members. The people of Sangamon County overwhelmingly want us to adopt recall. We have heard from citizens on numerous occasions and we have the public opinion polls. We should do what the Massey Commission recommended. We created the Massey Commission to give us recommendations and if they are reasonable, we should follow them. If we pass this and someone

wants to challenge the legality of it in court, they are free to do so. Then the real judges can decide the issue, not us County Board members who are not judges. He urges a yes vote on this Resolution.

Mr. Truax asked if this is the proper wording for the ballot. Assistant State's Attorney Benoit gave Mr. Truax a copy of the question.

Mr. Madonia stated they had a public hearing and brought in their own experts and the Massey Commission said we should take all legally authorized steps. In his opinion, he does not think they are legally authorized to do this. He knows the State Board of Elections is against this as they have talked to the supervisor there. He does not think this is the right situation for this. He thinks it is legally unattainable and should be thrown out. That is just his opinion.

Mr. Miller stated the Illinois Election Code does allow for a viable option through a public referendum for an advisory referendum that would give the voters a more organized way to vote and they wouldn't have any say on it.

Mr. Rader stated, from what he is understanding, the State Board of Elections says we don't have the authority to enforce this because we are a non-home rule county. He does concur with one of the speakers tonight that a Representative at the Capitol has brought forward a bill to push this through. If the Representatives pass this then they would have the means for the public to do what they have asked us to do.

Mr. Cahnman stated there has never been a vote by the State Board of Elections on anything regarding recall. What he believes Mr. Madonia is referring to is back in August, when he first proposed this to the Illinois Times reporter Dean Olsen who called up Matt Dietrich, who is the public relations person for the State Board of Elections, and he said he didn't think the non-home rule units have the power to ask for recall. He is now a lawyer and he spoke to him later and he said he regrets saying that and would like to take it back, but won't say anything further on it.

Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to address Mr. Cahnman's repeated comment that Appellate Court's opinion in the 1st District authorizes us to do this. Assistant State's Attorney Joel Benoit stated he doesn't have his opinion that he drafted up for the committee but Mr. Cahnman is incorrectly saying this. There were three different Appellate Court opinions. The first one said we definitely do not have this power. The second one, the one Mr. Cahnman likes, says they disagree with the first one. The third one wouldn't reach the issue, but said Illinois is obviously not a big recall state when you compare it to somewhere like California. He pointed out that Mr. Cahnman is incorrect when he says that one Illinois Appellate Court reversed the other. That is not how that works. It would have to be the Illinois Supreme Court that would reverse it.

Mr. Benoit continued by saying after going through the entire analysis, considering all the laws and public policies, and the fact that the only time they ever had a recall provision in the Constitution was 15 years ago related to Governor Blagojevich and they used the word recall multiple times, but that word is not anywhere else in the Constitution. On balance, after looking over everything, his opinion was Sangamon County does not have the power to do this.

Mr. Cahnman stated he does have Mr. Benoit's memorandum with him. He says in his Article 3 closing thoughts, "Interpreting the terms and phrases have issued conflicting opinions. For example, Illinois Appellate Court opinions from the 1st District agree and disagree with my interpretations." So they have an Appellate Court opinion from 2016 that disagrees with Mr. Benoit's interpretation. The later Appellate Court opinion, he refers to in 2020, did not make any ruling on the legality or recall. It just said they couldn't put those two questions on the same election ballot since it was improperly worded. Those are very good arguments that we do have the legal authority to do this. Mr. Benoit explained when he was researching this; he found that years ago there was a House Bill put forward to give this power of recall for local officials. Most recently, there is a new push for this, and he thinks Mr. Cahnman brought this up. You just have to ask yourself, "Why would they be submitting bills to get this power if it already existed?" Mr. Cahnman stated whether they have the power or not, the Legislature can introduce all sorts of crazy bills. Just because somebody introduces a bill to do something doesn't mean they don't already have the power to do it. He would put his faith in the Appellate Court decision over some crazy legislation that has been introduced by some members in the last General Assembly when there was like one day to go, so it was a useless bill anyway. Again, he asks for a yes vote on the Resolution.

Mr. Ayers stated all these lawyers here are confusing him once again. It is a great debate, and he will be the first to say he does not know what is going to happen in the courts. He doesn't think any of us actually know what is going to happen with this. The courts have said conflicting things. It's okay to say we don't know because he doesn't know. What he ultimately thinks on this is not really that important. He wants to know what his constituents want to do with recall. This is for them. This is for your constituents and is not about what you think. This is what they think, and he thinks that should matter. Based on the last Election, they might vote no, and it's done. This could be over with fairly quickly. Let's at least ask them what they think. He knows there is a lot of debate about the legality and the courts might intervene and say this is unconstitutional. County laws are challenged all the time. They can't do the work of the lawyers, but he thinks this is good public policy to let people vote on recall. It strikes him as interesting that we've had so many Constitutional lawyers speak out on this, and he loves the debate. Where were these lawyers when they had a former Sheriff who refused to enforce a law himself, which was the gun laws and the assault weapons ban? He refused to enforce that law. Of course, it went to court and the Supreme Court upheld it. Did anyone ask him to uphold the law after it was upheld? No they didn't. To him this is a wash. He wants to know what his constituents want. He encouraged a yes vote on this.

Mr. DelGiorno stated he is a lawyer and occasionally he has a client, much like they are the clients to the State's Attorney's Office, who will take his advice and say thank you but I'm going to do what I'm going to do anyway, and I know the risks. They do know the risks, and there might be a court challenge. The second point he would like to make is in response to why the Legislature would file a bill to create the authority of recall for non-home rule jurisdictions. They see legislative bodies, like the General Assembly and Congress, all the time will file bills to codify what is law. What does that mean? An example of this is Roe vs Wade. It was case law. Some states passed the law to codify it and make it the law of their state to protect their rights to choose. Other states did the opposite, and once that case was struck down then the right was gone. All he believes the Legislature may be doing in this case is codifying what the 2016 case says, which is we do have the authority.

Chairman Van Meter stated there is a risk. It is clear that it is unclear if this right to recall exists. It is Mr. DelGiorno's position that he would take that risk. That is a reasonable position that is reasonably calculated, but understand the nature of that risk could be we tell everybody this right exists and citizens go out and collect 8,000 signatures to create an election and we hold an election and then a court says, "You really couldn't do that." Personally, he doesn't think that is a responsible position to take. As Mr. DelGiorno says, "Reasonable people could differ on that position."

On the question to adopt Resolution 12, Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote. Upon the roll call vote, there were 7 Yeas – 19 Nays. Resolution 12 was denied. Those voting Yes were Mr. Ayers, Mr. Cahnman, Mr. DelGiorno, Ms. Douglas Williams, Ms. Lathan, Mr. McGuire, and Ms. Small.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTIONS 13 – 18

13. Resolution approving the procurement of goods and/or services for the County Board Office from various vendors for the purpose of 2025 County fleet vehicle purchases in the amount of \$575,000.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to place Resolution 13 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. DelGiorno, seconded by Mr. Madonia, to consolidate Resolutions 13 – 18. Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to read Resolutions 14 – 18.

14. Resolution approving the purchase of goods and/or services for County Board Administration from Verizon Wireless for the purpose of ETSD Wireless Services in the amount of \$152,400.
15. Resolution approving the purchase of goods and/or services for County Board Administration from various legal firms for the purpose of legal counsel in the amount of \$250,000.
16. Resolution approving the purchase of goods and/or services for the Auditor's Office from Kim's Autobody, LLC for the purpose of automobile repair in the amount of \$100,000.
17. Resolution approving the Sangamon County/SMART Title VI Program.
18. Resolution approving the annual salary of the Supervisor of Assessments of Sangamon County effective December 1, 2024 through November 30, 2025.

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 13 – 18, as consolidated.

A voice vote carried. Ms. Deaner voted Present on Resolution 18.

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 19

19. Resolution requesting that Sangamon County State's Attorney John Milhiser request an opinion from the Illinois Attorney General on the power and authority of the Sangamon County Board to enact Recall via a binding referendum.

A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman, seconded by Mr. DelGiorno, to place Resolution 19 on the floor.

Mr. Cahnman stated the Massey Commission passed a Resolution at their November meeting that the Sangamon County Board should evaluate the question of whether Sangamon County should authorize the referendum on the question of recall for the Office of Sangamon County Sheriff. He thinks to carry out the will of the Massey Commission we have doubts about the legality of doing this. The opinion of the Attorney General's office was established pursuant to the Attorney General Act to consult with and advice with several State's Attorneys to obtain written opinions from them on matters relating to their official duties when appropriate. One of the State's Attorney's official duties is to advise on the legality of various legislation. We have an opinion from Assistant State's Attorney Benoit that will be very helpful to us to carry out the will of the Massey Commission and to ask the Attorney General's opinion on this. Half of the Attorney General's opinions are in response to questions from State's Attorneys from around the state. For us, in good faith, to carry out the recommendation of the Massey Commission, the County Board should evaluate the Constitutional statutory requirement for Sangamon County and authorize a referendum on recall. It requires and necessitates the County and State's Attorney to request a second opinion from the Attorney General. He urges a yes vote on this Resolution.

Mr. Krell expressed his appreciation for the debate back and forth on this. He's been here 16 years and has seen two people leave office including Susan Boone, who stepped down with some pressure from Board members and Sangamon County officials. She did the right thing and stepped down and they got another Coroner. Then there was the horrible incidence with the Masseys. He hopes they never have to go through that again. When it was all said and done, Jack Campbell did the right thing and resigned. He will vote against this.

Mr. DelGiorno stated they just gave a middle finger to the Massey Commission on the vote for this last Resolution, so let's not do that with this one. He encouraged them to vote for this Resolution.

Mr. Truax asked why they are only doing one countywide office. Chairman VanMeter stated the thinks that is a rhetorical question.

Chairman Van Meter objected to Mr. DelGiorno's characterization of the Board's previous action. He thinks the County Board is very sensitive to the Massey Commission's recommendations, but very hesitant to engage the community in a presentation that we have the authority to do something where the community might go to a great deal of trouble and effort to find out we don't have that authority. The better course of action is to go to the State Legislature to make clear that we have that authority. With respect to this Resolution, he thinks this is the kind of micromanagement of the elected official's offices that this Board should thoroughly resist.

Mr. Ayers stated this motion is just asking for an opinion. Why are they doing this just for the Sheriff and why not all elected officials? If someone wanted to make that motion he would second it. He does not see how that is micromanaging. We are asking for one more opinion and that is it. He gets the opposition to the whole thing, but this is just one more opinion they are seeking. They might say we don't have the authority.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote. Upon the roll call vote, there were 7 Yeas – 19 Nays. Resolution 19 was denied. Those voting yes were Mr. Ayers, Mr. Cahnman, Mr. DelGiorno, Ms. Douglas Williams, Ms. Lathan, Mr. McGuire, and Ms. Small.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTION 20

20. Resolution approving a Construction and Maintenance Agreement between Sangamon County and the Norfolk Southern Railway Company for construction of the west-side portion of the Springfield-Sangamon County Transportation Center (The HUB).

A motion was made by Ms. Deppe, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to place Resolution 20 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 20. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

OLD BUSINESS

- A. Resolution 51 – Tabled 12/10/24
Resolution approving a grant application for Public Health from the Illinois Department of Human Services for the Reimagine Public Safety Act Violence Prevention Grant in the amount of \$639,500.

Resolution 51 remains Tabled.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

Appointment of Mike Emery to the Sangamon County Deputy Merit Commission for a term expiring January, 2031.

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. DelGiorno, for approval of the appointment. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED

APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

Chairman Van Meter announced they will be filling the District 21 seat of Clyde Bunch at the February 11, 2025 County Board meeting and they will serve until the November 2026 Election.

Mr. DelGiorno asked if they would be getting their committee assignments. Chairman Van Meter stated they would once Mr. Bunch's position is filled.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED

REPORTS FILED

RECESS

A motion was made by Mr. Madonia, seconded by Mr. DelGiorno, to recess the meeting to February 11, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED

MEETING RECESSED

Don Gray
Sangamon County Clerk