

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

JANUARY 9, 2007

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on January 9, 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. Kamper led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll. There were 26 Present – 3 Absent. Mr. Buecker, Mr. Goleman and Mr. Wieland were all excused.

PROCLAMATIONS

Mr. Stumpf presented a Proclamation in support of Radon Action Month in Sangamon County. Steve Collins and Pat Daniels from IEMA and Jim Stone, Director of the Public Health Department were all present to accept the Proclamation.

Mr. Collins stated that this is an important health issue and there are some federal grant monies available to Sangamon County to help with this. There will also be free radon detectors available to every citizen. Mr. Daniels explained that they are very pleased to get Sangamon County to do this. Other counties are also doing this in conjunction with Sangamon County. He encouraged citizens of Sangamon County to contact them at 1-800-325-1245 or go to the Illinois Emergency Management Website to order a free radon test kit. The only way to know if your home has a risk for radon is to test your home. Mr. Stone stated that with this grant they will not require any additional staffing or hard cash out of their pockets.

Ms. Cimarossa presented a Proclamation to the Sacred Heart-Griffin High School Football Team, the SHG Cyclones, for winning the Class 5A State Football Championship. Coach Ken Leonard and some of the team members were present to accept the honor. Mr. Leonard stated that it has been a great honor to represent Springfield and Sangamon County. This year they had a remarkable record led by the Seniors of 43 and 0 and showed the Chicago Suburbs they can play a little football down South too.

Mr. Smith presented a Proclamation to the Calvary Academy Girls Seventh Grade Basketball Team for winning the IESA State Tournament and to Calvary Academy for its many accomplishments in academics and sports. Some team members and the coach were present to accept the honor. The coach thanked the Board for this recognition and stated that it was an honor to represent their school.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Ms. Cimarossa, for approval of the Minutes of December 12, 2006. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Illinois Department of Transportation Motor Fuel Tax Allotment and Transactions for November, 2006.

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 appropriating motor fuel tax funds for an agreement with the Illinois Department of Transportation for traffic signal upgrades.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Stephens, for the adoption of Resolution 1. Upon a roll call vote, there were 25 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 2

2. Resolution approving an engineering agreement for a bridge replacement on Gibson Road in Maxwell Township.

A motion was made by Ms. VanHoos, seconded by Mr. Hall, for the adoption of Resolution 2. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 3

3. Resolution approving an engineering agreement for a bridge replacement on County Highway 8 west of Berlin.

A motion was made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, for the adoption of Resolution 3. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 4

4. 2006-63 – David Barkus, 4825 Sage Road, Rochester – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Andy Goleman, District #4.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Ms. VanHoos, for the adoption of Resolution 4. 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 4.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 5

5. 2006-64 – Gemini Properties, LLC, Jim Johnson & Phil Zinn, 4132 and 4136 Peoria Road and 2400 Ardmore Ave., Springfield – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use. County Board Member – Dennis Wieland, District #8.

A motion was made by Mrs. Scaife, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, for the adoption of Resolution 5. Chairman VanMeter asked the Professional Staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Susan Poludniak, professional staff, stated that the petitioners are requesting a conditional permitted use to allow a private outdoor recreational facility. Randy

Armstrong, professional staff, stated that the property is at the southeast corner of Peoria Road and Ardmore Avenue and is a property known as the Black Dog Bar. The petitioner is requesting a conditional permitted use for private outdoor recreation to allow volleyball courts and wiffle ball fields.

Ms. Poludniak stated that the property is located adjacent to a residential area with one resident only a few feet from the east property line. The noise and activity associated with the proposed use would have a negative impact on the residential properties and the staff recommends denial.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommends approval because they felt the conditional permitted use was appropriate since much of the surrounding property is zoned for and is being used for commercial purposes. Also, the lot where the recreational area is proposed is zoned "B-3" and could be used for commercial uses with a similar effect on the neighborhood without the conditional permitted use.

Phil Zinn, petitioner, residing at 1315 Arlington Chase in Sherman, addressed the Board. He explained that they are trying to get a couple of outdoor sand volleyball and wiffle ball courts in an effort to boost recently lost revenue and keep the doors open. The area is zoned mostly "B-3" with a few residential houses.

Gary Budd, residing at 3212 Ridgewood Avenue in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated that he is the Supervisor of Springfield Township and was contacted by the people who live out there and are against this. There are 25 signatures from people who are against it. If you go out and take a look at this piece of property you will see there is no place to park. People will be parking down the road and will be throwing their trash on the road. Also, the lights would shine right in the neighbor's house. He asked that the Board either postpone their vote on this tonight or vote against it.

Mr. Stumpf stated that he counted 37 parking spots and has been by there before when they had this type of event and it did not seem too overcrowded. He asked Mr. Budd if he has seen the written parking arrangement. Mr. Budd stated that he has not. Mr. Stumpf explained that this parking arrangement was approved by the Board of Appeals. Mr. Budd stated that they would have to see this to understand it. Mr. Stumpf asked if they would not be allowed to park along the frontage road or on the side roads. Mr. Budd stated that is what the highway commissioner has said. People would be parking along side the ditches and would be littering soda and beer cans on the road.

Mr. Zinn stated that he has met with George Ruzic, Highway Commissioner, and one of the major concerns of the most adjacent resident was the traffic. At the last meeting they agreed to close access to Ardmore Avenue and Mr. Ruzic said he was going to do that so there would be no more through traffic going through the neighborhood. That should alleviate all through traffic on that road. He also stated that the parking outline is accurate according to what he was told.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Zinn to address the lighting issue regarding the direction of the lighting and how it would affect the layout of the proposed courts. Mr. Zinn explained that all lighting would be on a 25 foot tall pole and the taller you have the pole the more direct you can get the light on the court. There would also be an 8-foot privacy fence to further lower the amount of light off the property.

Mrs. Scaife asked if there would be restroom facilities. Mr. Zinn stated that they would determine that with building and zoning.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked what section of Ardmore would be closed off for through traffic. Mr. Zinn explained that there is a very small lane off of Ardmore that comes on the property. Ardmore used to go directly into Business 55 and they would take out the gravel and cut out a part to help with drainage in that area. Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they would then close it off completely or buy it from Springfield Township. Mr. Zinn stated that they would like to lease or buy the existing road for parking if the township would be willing to look at that option.

Mr. Bunch asked where people would park if they come to watch the games. Mr. Zinn stated that they would park in the parking lot provided. If all the courts were full there would be 24 volleyball players and 12 wiffle ball players and he is sure there would be people watching the games.

Mr. Griffin asked if the hours until 10:00 p.m. is part of the conditional permitted use or is it something he just suggested. Randy Armstrong, professional staff, stated that the petitioners did submit the hours with their petition and it probably should have been included with the resolution. Mr. Griffin stated that he would like the 10:00 p.m. lights out provision to be included with this petition if it is approved.

A motion was made by Mr. Griffin, seconded by Mr. Moore, to amend Resolution 5 to add a restriction to the conditional permitted use of the operating hours being from dusk to 10:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

Ms. Cimarossa asked if this also includes an 8-foot fence. Mr. Zinn stated that they would apply for that because zoning required them to do so. Mr. Armstrong confirmed that they would have to do that.

Mr. Stumpf stated that they have to understand the neighbors are dissatisfied with this and an official from Springfield Township is speaking against this. A lot of times with events going on people will park up and down the road. If this would go through they would be stuck with these proposed parking lots. There could be lots of problems every time someone parks there. He asked Mr. Zinn if they would stick to this parking lot once it is proposed. Mr. Zinn stated that they could add parking spots if the township would lease or sell the piece of ground which is virtually useless now.

Mr. Stumpf asked Mr. Zinn if he would be opposed to tabling this so they can work with the township and objectors in the neighborhood on this. Mr. Zinn stated that they would like to get a vote tonight.

Mr. Moore stated that Mr. Wieland, who represents this area but could not be here tonight, is in support of this.

Mr. Budd stated that if Mr. Zinn says 10:00 p.m. and the game is over they will not shut the lights off until the game is over. He promised that he would sit out there every night to make sure they do.

Mr. Budd stated that he is representing the people of Springfield Township and they are against this. There will be more than 37 people showing up for these games. There is no way 37 spots will be enough. He encouraged the Board to vote against this for the people of that area.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they have considered closing that section of Ardmore down and go in the other entrance on Peoria Road. Mr. Budd stated that he talked to Mr. Ruzic about it and he said he would probably close that off so they can't go onto Ardmore and go down the side street, but there is nothing saying they can't come along off of Business 55. Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they would lease it to the petitioners to provide additional parking. Mr. Budd stated that they could probably pick up another 10 or 15 spots in that area by doing that.

Mr. Montalbano asked if it would be possible to buy that piece of land from Springfield Township. Mr. Budd explained that he does not know at this time because they would have to take it before their Board to see if it's even possible.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Stumpf, to table Resolution 5 so that they can look into this. Upon a roll call vote, there were 12 Yeas – 13 Nays. The motion to table was denied. Those voting nay were: Ms. Cimarossa, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Mendenhall, Mr. Moore, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Musgrave, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Pace, Mr. Smith, Mr. Snell, Mr. Stephens, Mr. Tjelmeland, and Ms. VanHoos.

John Schmidt, State's Attorney, stated that the amended motion would prohibit activities during daylight hours. He clarified that it needs to read "use of the lights for activities on the field is limited in this conditional permitted use to the hours of dusk to 10:00 p.m. to control the light".

A motion was made by Mr. Griffin, seconded by Mr. Kamper, to strike the first amendment and adopt this amendment. A voice vote was unanimous.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 5, as amended. Upon the roll call vote, there were 11 Yeas – 14 Nays. The motion to adopt Resolution 5, as amended is denied. Those voting nay were: Mr. Bunch, Ms.

Cimarossa, Mr. Fraase, Mr. Fulgenzi, Mr. Hall, Mr. Kamper, Mrs. Long, Mr. Montalbano, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pace, Mrs. Scaife, Mr. Stumpf, Mrs. Turner, and Ms. VanHoos.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION DENIED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2006-65 – John C. Vandenberg, Kirk D. Vandenberg, Chandler M. Vandenberg, Terry J. Vandenberg, and David K. Vandenberg, 1020 North Oak Road, Rochester – Granting Variances. County Board Member – David Mendenahll, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Moore, 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. 2006-66 – Robert L. Hughs, III, 1648 McQueen Road, Pleasant Plains – Granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – Craig Hall, District #7.

A motion was made by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Forsyth, 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 carried on the motion to adopt Resolution 7. Mr. Smith voted nay.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 8

8. 2006-68 – Text amendment to the Sangamon County Zoning Ordinance regarding bio-diesel and ethanol plants and banquet halls.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Snell, for the adoption of Resolution 8.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Hall, to amend Resolution 8. Mr. Moore stated that the words “and banquet halls” should be stricken from the third paragraph of the first page because they felt these items should be handled separately

from the bio-diesel and ethanol plants to allow additional time for comments on the banquet halls. He explained that several banquet halls in the rural areas have had to put a business zoning classification on an entire acreage. A conditional permitted use would be a better fit for this. Even the process is identical between getting a conditional permitted use and a zoning change on the land; it was felt they should go ahead and make that text amendment.

However, since there was controversy over both these issues they felt it would be better to separate them and let the banquet hall issue stand on its own and be addressed at a later date.

Chairman VanMeter asked if proper notice was given, opportunity was given for the public to be heard, and the hearings were held in accordance with normal procedures for the banquet hall issue. Mr. Stumpf confirmed that there was and this is being done to give additional time for the public to comment.

A voice vote was unanimous on the amendment of Resolution 8.

Mr. Moore commented on the text amendment regarding bio-diesel and ethanol plants. He explained that in 2000 the Committee pledged to continue to review zoning and find appropriate measures to protect agricultural land. With the growth in alternative energy that has come about they have made similar text amendments in the past. The reason for conditional permitted uses is to preserve a plot of land rather than taking, for example, a certain amount of acres and turning them into industrial uses where many uses can be permitted. In this case, a bio-diesel plant and ethanol plant may be used in that area on the exact same acreage with only that area being changed leaving everything else agricultural. Also, when zoning is changed from "A" agricultural to "I" industrial or "B" business that zoning change stays with the land from one owner of the land to another. That is also true here, but the use is limited only to the conditions in the text amendment.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Snell, to allow comments from opponents and proponents of this text amendment and to limit comments to issues pertaining to this text amendment only. A voice vote was unanimous.

Gordon Gates, Attorney, addressed the Board to speak on behalf of a number of people who are opposed to this. He stated that they see this text amendment as the opposite of an attempt to preserve farm ground. It makes it possible to have a factory in the middle of the country without any consideration for the LESA procedures. If someone comes in and asks for an "I-1" zoning there could be conditions imposed to say it is only going to be an ethanol refinery plant. Those could already be taken care of by the text of the amendment to the zoning and it does not need to be in a conditional permitted use. There seems to be an implication that this ethanol refinery under a conditional permitted use is no longer needed and the property will then revert back to row crops. That is not going to happen. If a conditional permitted use is granted and an ethanol refinery is put up that site is going to be an industrial site forever. This does need to be acknowledged.

Mr. Gates stated that the concept that the text amendment is useful because it ensures landowners and farmers will not get stuck with an industrial site across their property is not going to happen. The effect of this is just a disaster not only because of the way it will play out but also just because of the policy here. The objectors are not against an ethanol plant, but have a real problem with this bizarre concept that it makes sense to put these refineries in the middle of a farm field.

Mr. Gates stated that the Board has said a hundred times how much they should value the rural community and the excellent farm ground, but this text amendment clearly turns all this around and says you have changed your mind. There are empty industrial parks all over this county where these oil refineries could be put. Other towns do not have these plants in the middle of a cornfield, but have them on the edge of town in an industrial site with a rail yard and water where they are supposed to be. He stated that he does not understand why this Board wants to make it easier for someone to stick a refinery in the middle of nowhere. An ethanol refinery is not an agricultural use but is an industrial use and they are bright, loud, and run 24 hours a day.

Mr. Moss asked why they think this would be easier for someone to get the ethanol plant into the area by leaving the "I-1" zoning there versus the conditional permitted use. Mr. Gates explained that the LESA system is out the window and is a wonderful tool for a farmer to challenge zoning and has been used by the court systems all the time. All the work put into the LESA system would be gone. Also, to stick an "I-1" zoning in the middle of agricultural is very difficult and is spot zoning of the worst kind. Under a conditional permitted use it is not spot zoning and they would not be able to use that to challenge the zoning. Mr. Moss stated that if he was the neighbor he would want it to stay agricultural if this could not be built versus having that piece of "I-1" zoning where someone could come out there and put in anything. Mr. Gates stated that they already have that tool so why make it easier to solve a problem you don't have yet?

Mr. Hall stated that all of the members have school districts in their areas and the reason they have businesses move in is to increase funding. He explained that if he owned eight acres and it was under the conditional permitted use the taxes on the acreage would be as a conditional permitted use/agriculture, but if the eight acres were industrial it struggles with this issue that they are going to increase traffic and expenses and there will be jobs possibly for people from this area or from beyond this area. He stated that he does not believe they are helping the schools or fire departments or all the needs in their area if they have this. He asked the Board to make sure this is what they want because this would be letting it all out of the bag.

Mr. Moore asked the professional staff if there is any difference in the hearing process between granting a conditional permitted use and a zoning change from agricultural to industrial or business. Mr. Armstrong explained that the process is identical because they would have to file the petition by the same deadline, give the same amount of notice to the adjacent property owners, the same publication is put in the newspaper, same signs put on the property, same hearing is held, and many of the same factors are considered, and it would still go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and then to the County Board. Mr. Moore asked if a landowner has ever come before the body and

changed a parcel of land from agriculture to business or then industrial saying they are going to build a strip mall and then turned around and sold the property to allow another use to take place other than what that initial landowner has stated. Mr. Armstrong stated that it does happen once in a while.

Mr. Moore asked if the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System is primarily oriented towards housing developments. Mr. Armstrong stated that many of the factors are geared towards residential, but this case is a little different because the inquiries they have about these types of uses are in a rural agricultural area and he thinks the Board feels it is not appropriate to apply the same LESA standard to it. If it's really a rural area then it's not going to do well on the LESA system.

Mr. Moore stated that the committee he is the chairman of is going to review the LESA system with respect to how it applies to the business and industrial classifications. There have been a lot of inconsistencies when it comes to the application of industrial versus a residential development. It doesn't mean the LESA system is useless, but means it does need to be reviewed.

Chairman VanMeter asked if the LESA system is advisory or mandatory. Mr. Moore stated that it is advisory.

Mr. Moore stated that there are several farmers on this body and they will tell you the soil samples are not the same as doing a core sample. He asked Mr. Mendenhall to explain this. Mr. Mendenhall stated that the type of soil you find in one area is not necessarily the same as you would find in another area so it is a guideline.

Mr. Moore stated the LESA system is always advisory. Two years ago the Board passed some rules putting every parcel of land into a fire district which helped LESA scores in some areas come into play so more land could be developed for the needs of the residents.

Mr. Pace asked what advantage the County would gain by instituting this text amendment and what they would lose if they don't. Mr. Moore stated that rather than reclassifying the entire plot of land industrial they are telling the landowner they can only use it for that purpose. The advantage would be it limits them to what they can do with that land during the course of their ownership and thereafter. That is not always true when a piece of property is reclassified for industrial or business.

Mr. Snell stated that he thinks this is a good text amendment because it lets the agricultural designation happen if the plant does not get built and this is an important concept.

Mr. Hall asked if they already have that now. Mr. Armstrong explained that from a legal standpoint it would be much better to do that than with a conditional permitted use than to put a contract in the zoning resolution. He stated that he feels more comfortable having this as a conditional permitted use or putting some time limit in a resolution.

Mr. Moore asked the legal staff if procedures currently in place are different than a conditional permitted use.

Jim Grohne, Assistant State's Attorney, explained that the conditional permitted use is simply following a standard set in the ordinance. When you are changing the zoning there is a line between placing legitimate conditions on a zoning application and contract zoning. With contract zoning there is a limitation to the one single use they want. When they have to meet certain conditions to the use it is not contract zoning, but they still have the ability to do anything within that classification as an "I-1". This situation does not happen as often with a conditional permitted use.

Chairman VanMeter stated that there has been an allegation that this proposed text amendment is an attempt to obviate the legal action the opponents of the Waverly bio-diesel plant are seeking in court. Mr. Grohne explained that the text amendment would move the classification for a particular piece of property and in no way affects that litigation which is solely a reclassification of land which took place a few months ago. That is an entirely different classification for an industrial use within an agricultural area. This text amendment does not turn around and change that action and the litigation will go forward on its own merits.

Chairman VanMeter asked Mr. Moore if he was offering this text amendment because he feels a conditional permitted use in this situation would be a more restrictive grant of use for the property and would better preserve the rural character of that community. Mr. Moore stated that is correct.

Mr. Moss asked if this would be the same conditional permitted use if someone had a piece of ground in a "B" zoning area. Mr. Armstrong explained that it would require a "B-3" to "A" with a conditional permitted use for a bio-diesel or ethanol plant.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 8. Upon the roll call vote, there were 19 Yeas – 6 Nays. Those voting nay were: Mr. Bunch, Ms. Cimarossa, Mr. Hall, Mr. Kamper, Mr. Smith, and Mrs. Turner.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

9. Resolution authorizing the Auditor's office to contract with Medical Management Consulting Services, Inc. to provide a comprehensive case management program for Sangamon County.

A motion was made by Mr. O'Neill, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, for the adoption of Resolution 9.

Mr. Kamper asked why the worker's compensation premiums would be going up by about 35% during the course of the fiscal year.

Ryan McCrady, County Administrator, explained that the Resolution reads the loss experience is increasing. Premiums and loss experience are two different things. The worker's comp. premium is actually going down next year by about 10% and the loss experience is what the insurance company pays out for claims. Those can change based on when claims are paid. With the premium going down it only stands to reason the insurer sees it as being less risky because of things the IRS put in place with using a medical case management nurse and with other training programs that were just added recently.

Mr. Kamper asked why this is contracted and not done in-house. Paul Palazzolo, Auditor, stated that they are contracting with Medical Case Management to work with the medical providers and the employee to provide some services which will allow them to return to work a lot faster. They are also working with the Illinois Public Risk Fund through a grant to provide and contract with Medical Case Management Services. They will also be working to provide some safety classes for the employees.

A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 9. Mr. Kamper voted present.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

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

MOTION CARRIED
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

Appointment of James Price to the Divernon Fire Protection District replacing Russell Price for a term expiring May, 2007.

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. Long, seconded by Mrs. Turner, 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. Turner, seconded by Mrs. Long, to adjourn the meeting to the next regularly scheduled meeting on February 13, 2007 or at the call of the Chairman, if earlier, to accommodate the City of Springfield if they are able to finish the first part of the legal work done on the Dispatch System. A voice vote was unanimous.

**MOTION CARRIED
MEETING ADJOURNED**