

JOE AIELLO
SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK



SANGAMON COUNTY COMPLEX
200 SOUTH NINTH STREET - ROOM 101
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701
TELEPHONE: 217-753-6700/FACSIMILE: 217-535-3233
WEBSITE: www.co.sangamon.il.us

MINUTES

SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD

JUNE 4, 2007

The Sangamon County Board met in Regular Statutory Session on June 4, 2007 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman VanMeter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Montalbano gave the Invocation and Mr. Aakash Raut led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll. There were 25 Present – 2 Absent. Mr. Bunch and Mr. Kamper were excused.

SWEARING IN OF NEW COUNTY BOARD MEMBER

Chairman VanMeter made a motion to nominate and appoint George Preckwinkle as the new Board Member for District #25. Upon a roll call vote, there were 21 Yeas – 0 Nays. The County Clerk swore in Mr. Preckwinkle as County Board Member for District #25.

PROCLAMATIONS

Mrs. Long presented a Proclamation to Irv Smith for his leadership, dedication, compassion and commitment to the citizens of Sangamon County. Mr. Smith accepted the Proclamation. He stated that he started out in politics on the County Board back in the 1970's and it was the most fun he ever had. He stated that he has enjoyed his life with them and thanked the Board for the honor.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mrs. Turner, for approval of the minutes of May 8, 2007. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Illinois Department of Transportation Motor Fuel Tax Allotment and Transactions for April, 2007.

A motion was made by Mrs. Turner, seconded by Mrs. Long, to place the Correspondence on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
CORRESPONDENCE FILED

RESOLUTION 1

- 1. Resolution approving a loan to CopperTree Outdoor Lifestyles as agreed in the Community Services Block Grant.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, for the adoption of Resolution 1. Upon a roll call vote, there were 21 Yeas – 0 Nays – 1 Abstained. Mr. Smith abstained from voting on Resolution 1.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 2

- 2. 2007-21 – Nipper Wildlife Sanctuary Trust, 9560 Withers Road, Loami – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use. County Board Member – Craig Hall, District #7.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Hall, for the adoption of Resolution 2. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Linda Wheeland stated that the petitioner is requesting a conditional permitted use for a wildlife sanctuary. Randy Armstrong stated that the sanctuary is located on Withers Road about 1 ½ miles south of Loami. The Nipper Trust is proposing some improvements on a five-acre portion of the 120 acre wildlife sanctuary.

Ms. Wheeland stated that the park will be used for passive nature activities and will be open only during daylight hours and there are a few residences in the area. Most public parks are adjacent to residential areas and they are considered an amenity, therefore, the staff recommends approval. Mr. Armstrong stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff report and recommends approval.

Dennis Stoll, residing in Chestnut, Illinois in Logan County, addressed the Board. He stated that he is employed by JP Morgan Chase Farm Management Department where he has been the Vice-President and Farm Manager for 28 years. He explained that JP Morgan Chase as Trustee has a responsibility to administer the Nipper Trust by the terms of the Will of the late Mr. and Mrs. Frank Nipper. The Nipper Trust is a self-financed trust and no tax revenues are needed. The Nipper Wildlife Sanctuary contains 120 acres of land and is made up of two separate real estate tax parcels. The larger portion is 80 acres and the second parcel is 40 acres and is located south of the 80 acres. For the past several years new trees have been planted to enhance wildlife development in laying the foundation for the upcoming sanctuary.

Mr. Stoll stated that the Springfield Landscaping Architectural Consultant Firm of Massey, Massey and Associates was secured by the Trust Department to provide their vision of what they thought the Nipper Wildlife Sanctuary could be. The first draft drawings of the proposed Nipper Sanctuary included proposed improvements and activities that did not necessarily meet the criteria of the terms of the trust. The trust documents are very specific with guidelines. The guidelines include no picnics, no hunting, no trapping, no motor vehicles except for educational purposes only, and strictly limited hours. Some of the proposal included festivals in a separate building for meetings and exhibits. The north and south sanctuary proposals were too expansive and covered too much of the acreage in the opinion of the trustee. The hours needed to be more restrictive in the undisturbed areas for the wildlife. The south 40 acres will probably see no public at all. They also need to talk to the Public Health Department regarding septic issues.

Mr. Moss asked if this would be a year round facility. Mr. Stoll stated that it will be seasonal from Spring to early Fall.

Jim Withers, residing at 9399 Withers Road in Loami, addressed the Board. He stated that nobody has ever approached him about what would take place with this sanctuary. He clarified that this is a wildlife sanctuary and not a park. The Will designated certain things they wanted to take place on this sanctuary. Some of the safety issues that need to be taken into consideration are that the road is very narrow and two school buses couldn't meet without one getting off the road. There is also an incline in the road and dip where it goes down. If there is school children out in that area and someone were driving fast they would not be able to see them in time to stop. The leaves and grass gets four or five feet tall and it is a hazard when they burn these in the Spring. It is a controlled fire setting, but when it is set it goes like you would not believe. He explained that he could stand outside of his house and feel the heat coming off the field when it is burning and his house is approximately 100 yards from the east boundary.

Mr. Goleman asked Mr. Withers for clarification that Mr. Nipper's Will specifically said there will be no picnics, no roads constructed, no mechanical vehicles of any type except for maintenance or emergencies, no harming, trapping, or disturbance of wildlife and if it was filed on February 8, 1989. Mr. Withers stated that is correct.

Mr. Moore asked if he is opposed to the wildlife sanctuary as it sits at this time. Mr. Withers stated that he is not.

John Wilker, residing at 19975 Trotter Lane in Petersburg, addressed the Board. He explained that he has worked for the Illinois Department of Natural Resources for the past 12 years. The issues raised on this project have already been addressed within their planning process or can be dealt with through consultation and cooperation with adjoining land owners. This project should not alter the land use significantly at this site. The planning for the site has always put the benefit of wildlife ahead of anything else. He stated they have enhanced the value of the sanctuary through many kinds of wildlife and is proud of his involvement in this project. The initiation of the potential new phase of the sanctuary will enhance the value of the sanctuary to the surrounding community while also maintaining a wildlife friendly emphasis. This project will provide a unique opportunity to share the sanctuary with the community as a whole and also provide schools the ability to learn about prairie and other habitats in a friendly and handicapped accessible environment.

Mr. Montalbano asked how many people they anticipate daily. Mr. Wilker stated it is hard to assess. Through planning of this process they have consulted various wildlife sanctuaries and nature centers throughout Central Illinois and each one covers a different type of clientele. The Nipper Wildlife Sanctuary is different from all of these so they can't really get a good estimate of what the number of visitors per day would be. Because of the limited facilities they will schedule groups and open the preserve on certain days and times to accommodate individual families and people to go out there and look, and they are not anticipating a huge number of crowds.

Mr. Montalbano asked how they would address the sewage issues there. Mr. Wilker explained that it was his understanding this is why they went to the Zoning Board for the planning process. Some of the documents that have been passed around are just preliminary. There has only been one submitted to the Zoning Board and to the Sangamon County Board.

Mr. Hall stated that he believes the issue they keep hearing is they are unsure and not certain. This makes it difficult for the Board to help them. He explained that they are still unsure of how it will look or what changes will be made. He asked if there will still be more changes after this. Mr. Stoll explained that when they came up with the first draft plan it showed porta-potties, other extra buildings, and festivals on the drawings and some of these things did not meet the terms of the Nipper Trust Will. They also need to meet with the Public Health Department to see if things such as porta-potties would meet the requirements of Sangamon County. After meeting with Zoning and the Planning

Commission they were told they would need to apply with some type of special or conditional permitted use other than agricultural and the category that fits is public park, although they were not looking to be a public park.

Mr. Stephens asked Mr. Wilker if they have contacted any of the adjacent land owners to work out some of their concerns. Mr. Wilker explained this whole process started last Fall when the caretaker that was living on site moved. When there was no longer a permanent resident there it opened up the other facets of the Will. They talked about needing to get with the neighbors about their concerns but wanted to think about things first. That is why they hired the consulting firm of Massey and Massey to create a plan to force them to think about these concerns and how they would address them. Through this process they would be able to discuss their visions with the neighbors and assess their needs. He explained that they would like to meet with the neighbors and discuss these issues. All of the issues raised can and will be addressed.

Mr. Withers stated that he has no idea of what they are planning to do with this and what the purpose of the visitor's center would be. He explained that he does not know who will be in charge of security and the Will does state that there should be no fences erected. How will people be kept out of there at night? He stated that they really need to take a good look at this and consider the safety issues. Also, the Fire Chief in that area is not even in favor of this.

A motion was made by Mr. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, to table Resolution 2 until next month because of all the confusion. Upon a roll call vote, there were 7 Yeas – 15 Nays. Those voting yea were: Mr. Fulgenzi, Mrs. Long, Mr. Mendenhall, Mr. Moss, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Preckwinkle, and Mr. Smith. The motion to table Resolution 2 was denied.

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll on the motion to adopt Resolution 2. Upon the roll call vote, there were 3 Yeas – 19 Nays. Those voting yea were: Mr. Fulgenzi, Mrs. Long, and Mr. Preckwinkle. Resolution 2 written to "grant a conditional permitted use" was denied.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTION 3

3. 2007-23 – Arthur & Diane Shulte, 912 N. Edmond, Springfield – Denying a Rezoning. County Board Member – Doris Turner, District #19.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Snell, for the adoption of Resolution 3. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Linda Wheeland stated that the petitioner is requesting a rezoning from R-2 to RM-4. Randy Armstrong stated that the owner is leasing the lot for a manufactured home. Ms. Wheeland stated there are several properties on the block that are zoned RM-4 and there are many mobile homes in the area, therefore, the staff recommends approval. Mr. Armstrong stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommends denial.

Jerry Stasukinas, residing at 44 Melody Lane in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated the he has photos to show them so they can understand the property in question. The first two pictures are of the property to be developed and the other two are adjoining neighbor properties. He explained that he bought these two properties zoned for mobile homes and they had dilapidated homes on them which he later destroyed. He said he received a phone call from Jim Henricks from the Public Health Department thanking him for doing so because he had been plagued with it for so long. He stated that the property in question was cleaned up and sold to Art Shulte and he has since placed two mobile homes on them with the intention of purchasing a third mobile home.

Arthur Shulte, residing at 112 Kings Point in Sherman, addressed the Board. He stated that he bought the property and wanted to get the one lot re-classified for a single-family mobile home. He explained that he does own the lots, but wants to sell the mobile homes and does not want to rent them out. He stated that he has been doing this all his life, has a lot of experience, and does currently have a couple mobile home parks which are doing very well.

Mr. Stephens asked if the homes would be on a permanent foundation. Mr. Shulte stated that they would not.

Mrs. Long asked if they are new mobile homes. Mr. Shulte stated that they are not new but are good mobile homes.

Mrs. Turner asked if he would be selling them contract for deed. Mr. Shulte stated that he would. One of them is already sold and the other is in the process of being sold. Mrs. Turner asked if he has other mobile homes in the area that he sold contract for deed. Mr. Shulte stated that he does not have any others in the area. Mrs. Turner asked why these particular homes would be sold contract for deed. Mr. Shulte explained that he does rent mobile homes out in his two parks but on the private lots he does not want to get involved in renting them out because of the responsibility and upkeep. Selling them on contracts would help the lower income people who cannot afford houses.

Barbara Pulliam, residing at 1003 N. Albany in Springfield, addressed the Board. She stated that she understands these lots will not be sold with the homes and the people will have to pay \$200 per month for the lot and then the payment on the home. She stated that they are just now trying to get a lot of drug people out of this area who have been in and out of these mobile homes. When they are empty the drug people would go into them. She explained that when her mother lived in the area they had to stay with her day and night because so many of these places were left empty. The people would just move out in the middle of the night. Also, they are just now getting the railroad property blocked off so people can't come in and dump things.

Bill Kerske, residing at 927 Edmond in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated the he was born and raised on Edmond Street and the people getting these trailers are nothing but drug heads with no respect for people's property.

He stated that he bought property there just to keep the drug heads away because he has money invested in other property in the area. He stated that they are working with the road commissioner to clean up this area and he does not want to lose money on his property.

Mr. Moore asked what they would want there instead of a mobile home. Mr. Kerske stated that a modular home with a foundation would bring in a better class of people. The petitioner does not even live there so he does not have to deal with this.

Mr. Stasukinas explained that Mr. Kerske lives directly across the street in a mobile home and he has had an opportunity to observe what they have done and have cleaned up. This is a good project. He stated that Ms. Pulliam's mother does not live in the area and has not for some time now.

Mr. Moss asked where they purchase the mobile homes. Mr. Shulte explained that the mobile homes on the lots came from his mobile home park and he was renting them out. He stated that he purchased the private lots and wanted to sell the mobile homes because they are in more demand when they are on private lots. Mr. Moss asked if they are old mobile homes that were purchased from people who were renting. Mr. Shulte explained that he rented them out for years and they are in the 1970's, but are good homes which are nice inside and out.

Mr. Smith asked if the people buying these by contract for deed would be purchasing the lot also. Mr. Shulte stated they would just be purchasing the mobile home and renting the lot from him.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if this would be considered a trailer park. Randy Armstrong from the Zoning Department explained that there would have to be three or more on an individual lot for it to be classified as a mobile home park.

Ms. Pulliam stated that her point was if these were going to be permanent homes then the lots should have been sold with them. She stated that she was with her mother everyday for 17 years to watch her while she lived there, and she has a very nice home there that she cannot rent or sell because nobody decent would want to live there. She explained how she had to maintain this area for 17 years even when a whole truckload of dead fish full of maggots was unloaded there. Also, a tree service that was making money cutting people's trees kept dumping all of the tree branches and logs where she was keeping it mowed. She added that she had paid people many times to haul things away that were dumped there.

Mrs. Turner stated that this is an area in the northeast part of her district which has been extremely troubled for a long time. This area does get dumped on a lot because people dump things they don't want from other areas. When the mobile homes are no

longer of use in the nice parks those would be the ones put there. He keeps the land for these and has people rotate in and out of the mobile homes.

People will move in and stay for a couple months and when they can no longer pay the rent they will get evicted and move out. It is an area the neighbors are working very hard to clean up and bring back to what it once was. She asked the Board to deny this rezoning so the people there will have a nice place to live. Even though there are other mobile homes in the area there is a distinct difference between owner occupied homes and others not on a permanent foundation with a recycling of people coming in and out.

Mr. Stumpf asked the State's Attorney how this may hold up in court if it's denied when there are all the other mobile homes in the area. Jim Grohne, Assistant State's Attorney, stated that he is concerned about giving percentage opinions on litigations in an open session of the County Board, but as a general proposition for a zoning law if a parcel is surrounded by similar zoning the general rule is if that is the trend in the area it is probably appropriate. That is not to say an area cannot change back and that similar zoning can be denied if there is a rational basis for doing so.

Mr. Moore asked if it would be a totally different project if the proponents came back at a time in the future proposing a modular home on a foundation and requested RM-4. Mr. Grohne confirmed that it would be a different situation.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if this is already zoned as a residential lot for a home. Randy Armstrong stated that it is. Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they would be down zoning. Mr. Armstrong stated that they would. This is a single lot where there would be one mobile home not on a permanent foundation. Mr. Fulgenzi stated that this happened before on Hoover Street and they were denied because it was not on a permanent foundation. Mr. Armstrong stated that it is not feasible to block up a mobile home around the edges. It could be blocked up and appear to be on a permanent foundation, but actually cannot set on the block.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 3. Upon the roll call vote, there were 22 Yeas – 0 Nays. The resolution written "to deny a rezoning" was adopted and the rezoning was denied.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 4

4. 2007-24 – Beth Morrison, 5757 Auburn Rd., Auburn – Granting Variances.
County Board Member – Sam Snell, District #6.

A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Mr. Tjelmeland, for the adoption of Resolution 4. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Linda Wheeland stated that the petitioner is requesting a variance to allow two parcels less than 40 acres, a variance to allow the lot width to be met greater than 60' from the public road for one parcel, and a variance to allow the lot depth to exceed 2 ½ times the width for 2 parcels. Randy Armstrong stated that the property is on Auburn Road on the north edge of the City of Auburn and the petitioner wants to divide off a parcel to sell.

Ms. Wheeland stated that the petitioner would like to divide off the existing home so one new building site would be created. It is felt the standards for variation are met and the staff recommends approval. Mr. Armstrong stated the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff report and recommends approval.

Elizabeth Morrison, residing at 5757 Auburn Road in Auburn, addressed the Board. She stated that the house was willed to her from her grandfather and she is only looking to keep four of the ten acres. She explained that the land is going to waste because she cannot manage all of it but it is very important to her to keep the residence because it was her grandfather's house. She stated that it will eventually be given to her children.

Chuck Davis, attorney with Brown, Hay & Stephens, addressed the Board. He stated that he represents the beneficiary of a trust that owns a neighboring property. They do empathize with Ms. Morrison because of the financial burden on her, but the law is clear with a variance that the issue is the land and not a particular land owner on the property. When you look at the elements for a variance it's that the property in question cannot be economically used or yield a reasonable return or that the plight of the owner is due to circumstances unique to the property. This property has been used for a long time before her for its size and use. There is a lot of case law that talks about how it is to the owner's advantage or convenience, but those are not acceptable reasons for a variance. A variance is saying that any owner who came into this property could not economically use it in its current state. Also, the property has not been kept in a good state. It is overgrown with broken down cars and does not help with the overall character of the neighboring properties and their intended uses and development.

Ms. Morrison agreed that he is right about the property. The weeds are terrible and the lawn mower is broke so the lawn could not be mowed. She explained that the cars are there due to accidents and she has been trying to salvage them out but they need to put in for lost titles to get rid of them. She stated that a smaller property would give her more time to maintain it.

Mr. Davis stated that she could sell the entire property because there are other owners who could maintain it and keep up with it financially and keep the general planned use of this area.

Mr. Wieland asked the professional staff if Sangamon County has an ordinance of any kind limiting the height of grass. Randy Armstrong stated that if there is it would be through the Public Health Department.

Jim Stone, Director of Public Health, explained that there is not an ordinance that deals with general vegetation. The only grasses they can require people to cut are noxious weeds.

Mr. Snell stated that he owns Auburn Hills which is a new subdivision south of the property and they are trying to build a nice addition to Auburn. All adjoining neighbors are opposed to this variance as requested and they feel these ten acres should stay as one property. The acreage has no access other than by foot to the north, which is about 3 ½ acres or so. The property has a history of too many non-operating vehicles and equipment, very little mowing, and tall weeds and brush. This property has not been kept in a manner that would entice a good neighbor. There is concern the variance would create a new problem to the west side of the property where water and septic would have to be provided. In addition, this property could have a problem complying with Auburn's comprehensive plan and the Auburn City Council has filed an objection with the County Board since the Zoning Board of Appeal's decision to allow the variance. The Auburn City Council feels the property should be left as one tract.

Mr. Snell submitted a letter, for the record, from the City of Auburn with the unanimous vote that this be denied. Mr. Snell encouraged the Board to deny the variances leaving the property as one parcel zoned A.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 4. Upon the roll call vote, there were 4 Yeas – 18 Nays. The resolution written "to grant variances" was denied. Those voting yea were: Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Fulgenzi, Mrs. Long, and Mr. Smith.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTION 5

5. 2007-25 – Edward & Elizabeth Ritter, 7666 N. State Route 29, Springfield – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Todd Smith, District #2.

A motion was made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Stumpf, for the adoption of Resolution 5. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 5.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2007-26 – Kay Anita Bedolli, 757 Stanton Airport Road, Riverton – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use. County Board Member – Dave Mendenhall, District #3.

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

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 7

7. 2007-27 – Steve Contri and James Mitchell, 6600 Block of Tolan Road, Pleasant Plains – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Tom Fraase, District #1.

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

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 8

8. 2007-28 – Kim Shirley, 400 North Street, Springfield – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use. County Board Member – Clyde Bunch, District #21.

A motion was made by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, for the adoption of Resolution 8. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 8.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

9. 2007-29 – Donald R. Poe, 287 E. Andrew Road, Springfield – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use and a Use Variance. County Board Member – Todd Smith, District #2.

A motion was made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Goleman, for the adoption of Resolution 9. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections.

A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 9.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 10 – 19

10. Resolution approving a loan to Certified Tank & Manufacturing, LLC as agreed in the Community Services Block Grant.

A motion was made by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Mr. Wieland, for the adoption of Resolution 10. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, to consolidate Resolutions 10 – 19. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 11 – 19.

11. Resolution approving the designation of the Lincoln-VanBuren Trail as a Sangamon County Historic Site.
12. Resolution approving amendments to the Sangamon County Floodplain Ordinance, Chapter 16.72 of the Sangamon County Code.
13. Resolution approving amendments to Sections 2.04.460 and 2.04.270 of Chapter 2.04 Title 2 of the Sangamon County Code regarding contract bidding requirements.
14. Resolution approving the purchase of a vehicle by the Community Resources Department for weatherization services.
15. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and UCP, Land of Lincoln.
16. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and the Springfield Community Federation.
17. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and the Capital Area Career Center.
18. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and the Lawrence Education Center.
19. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and the Springfield Urban League.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation of Resolutions 10 – 19. A motion was made by Mr. Moss, seconded by Mrs. Long, to amend Resolution 14. Mr. Moss stated that the word “sued” in the second paragraph should be changed to “used”. A voice vote was unanimous. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Hall, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions

10 – 19, as consolidated and amended. A voice vote carried. Mr. Hall voted nay on Resolution 17.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

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

MOTION CARRIED
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

RESOLUTIONS 20 - 26

20. Resolution approving the realignment of precincts.

A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Mr. Tjelmeland, for the adoption of Resolution 20. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, to consolidate Resolutions 20 – 26. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 21 – 26.

21. Resolution designating the intersection of Old Jacksonville Road and Farmingdale Road as the Deputy William D. Simmons Memorial Intersection.

22. Resolution approving Prevailing Wage Rates.

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

24. Resolution approving an engineering agreement with Fehr-Graham Associates, LLC for a bridge replacement in New Berlin Township.

25. Resolution approving a bridge petition from Loami Township for a drainage improvement.

26. Resolution approving the purchase of a new air system by the Public Building Commission for the Detention Center cooking hoods.

A voice vote carried on the motion to consolidate Resolutions 20 – 26. A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Mrs. Long, to separate Resolution 20 from the consolidated resolutions. A voice vote was unanimous. A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Mrs. Long, to table Resolution 20. A voice vote was unanimous.

A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolutions 21 – 26, as consolidated. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Long, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 21 – 26, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

Mr. Smith clarified that he abstained from voting on Resolution 1 but is in favor of the other resolutions where the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands for the vote on those resolutions.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 27

27. Resolution approving a contract for work on the new Public Health Facility.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman to withdraw Resolution 27. Without objection, Resolution 27 is withdrawn.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION WITHDRAWN

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

RESOLUTION 28

28. Resolution approving the appointment of E. Norman Simms, Jr. as Executive Director of the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Goleman, for the adoption of Resolution 28. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

B. Appointments

Reappointment of Don Butler to the Chatham Fire Protection District for a term expiring May 2010.

Reappointment of Ed Weigler to the Illiopolis Fire Protection District for a term expiring May 2010.

Reappointment of James Price to the Divernon Fire Protection District for a term expiring May 2010.

Appointment of Don Eastep to the Citizens Advisory Committee for a term expiring July 2008.

Appointment of Dale Molohon to the Board of Trustees of Loami for a term expiring July 2008.

Reappointment of Scott Morey to the Pleasant Plains Rural Fire Protection District for a term expiring May 2010.

Appointment of Doris Turner to the Insurance Board of Managers.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED**

COMMITTEE REPORT ON CLAIMS

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

**MOTION CARRIED
REPORT FILED**

ADJOURN

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mrs. Turner, to adjourn the meeting to June 12, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

**MOTION CARRIED
MEETING ADJOURNED**