



JOE AIELLO
SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK

Sangamon County Complex
200 South Ninth Street, Room 101
Springfield, IL 62701
Telephone: (217)753-6700/Fax: (217)535-3233
Website: www.sangamoncountyclerk.com

MINUTES

SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD

MAY 13, 2014

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on May 13, 2014 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman Van Meter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Hall gave the Invocation and Mrs. Deppe led the board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Van Meter asked the County Clerk to call the roll. There were 27 Present – 2 Absent. Mrs. Hills and Mr. Sullivan were excused.

PROCLAMATIONS

Mr. Ratts, Mr. Fulgenzi and Mrs. Ruzic presented a Proclamation to the Operating Engineers Local 965, their staff and the apprentice program workers for their partnership and continued efforts in demolishing dangerous buildings in Sangamon County. Michael Zahn, Business Manager of Operating Engineers Local 965, and Dennis Minick, Training Coordinator, were present to accept the Proclamation. They thanked the County Board for the recognition.

Mr. Ratts presented a Proclamation in recognition of the 50th anniversary of Community Action and proclaiming May, 2014 as Community Action Month in Sangamon County.

PRESENTATION ON THE PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Brian Davis, Assistant County Engineer with the Sangamon County Highway Department, gave a slide show presentation on the Pavement Management System. Mr. Davis stated in 2009 the County Board approved a five-year contract with Applied Research Associates to create and maintain a pavement management system for the Sangamon County Highway Department.

This system allows the highway department to objectively evaluate, assess and manage the 253 center line miles of roadway under their jurisdiction. The data was originally collected in 2009 and supplemented in the fall of 2012. That data included laser profile data, video acquisition and falling weight deflectometer testing. Between those years of data collection, data was simply interpolated by Applied Research Associates utilizing their road care software system. Utilizing that same road care software system, and given current budget inputs, the software system tells them what roads they need to work on and what treatments to perform via a certified cost benefit analysis. Over the first five years of this program, they have seen 55 miles of the 253 miles of their network receive some type of maintenance treatment. It is approximately 22% of the entire network, and has leveraged approximately \$6.6 million with only \$1 million of local input.

Some of the sample projects they have seen over the first five years include: overlays on Buckhart Road and Old Jacksonville Road; cape seal improvement on Waverly Road; cold-in-place recycling and a cape seal on Mechanicsburg to Buffalo Road; cape seal on Williamsville Road and on Cardinal Hill Road; crack fill on various routes including Toronto Road, Farmingdale Road, Old Jacksonville Road and 7th Street in Riverton, which is also a county highway. This year they have scheduled three major overlays for three of their five busiest county highways including Bradfordton Road, Iron Bridge Road and Woodside Road. They are all scheduled for overlays based on the data they put into the system on their current budget numbers. The pavement software system tells them what the best treatment is, on which roads, based on what those budget inputs are. He presented a chart showing the conditions the highway routes are in. The system applies where they are getting the biggest bang for the buck in utilizing those public dollars for improvements. On the agenda tonight they have a five-year renewal of this software program so they can continue to objectively evaluate and maintain those highways under their jurisdiction.

Chairman Van Meter pointed out, it is key to the presentation that the software has enabled them to lever \$1 million in local dollars to \$6.6 million. Mr. Davis explained that they meet with Applied Research Associates on an annual basis to tell them what type of funds they have available. They also meet annually with the Illinois Department of Transportation and know approximately what amount of money the county will be receiving in federal funds for any given year. They will let them know what additional funds are available when the county has projects that are readily available. This software allows them to have the information at the tip of their fingers. They can tell them if there is another \$2.5 million available. They can get on the phone immediately with Applied Research Associates, and they will tell them where the best place is to apply that money.

Mr. Ratts asked what time of year they do sensitivity of the pavement. Mr. Davis stated they do it at different times of the year. Typically they do it in the spring, but have put it off until the fall if they have specific projects going on that year, and they want to see what the data is after they do the improvement. It doesn't have to be collected at any particular time, but they wouldn't necessarily do it during the winter.

Mr. Goleman stated the Road and Bridge Committee had an open invitation in the past to all board members to take a tour and see what these county roads are like and what impact it has. He encouraged everyone to attend when they have another tour. It is quite a cost savings for this county.

Mr. Fraase stated sometimes funds are released from the state because these funds are available. Mr. Davis explained that one of the projects early on was when the ARRA stimulus funds became available. They were able to get on the phone immediately with Applied Research Associates and tell them there were funds available from that contract and ask what road would be the best application for those funds. That is when they said it was an Old Jacksonville Road overlay that went from Farmingdale Road out to Berlin.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the minutes of April 7, 2014. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

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

RESOLUTION 1

1. Resolution approving the low bids for the county bituminous contracts.

Chairman Van Meter asked if there were any questions or comments from the County Board. There were none. He asked the County Clerk to call the roll. Upon the roll call vote, there were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 2 – 5

2. Resolution approving the low bids for the annual township bituminous and aggregate contracts.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Montalbano, to place Resolution 2 on the floor.

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Smith, to consolidate Resolutions 2 – 5. Chairman Van Meter asked the County Clerk to read Resolutions 3-5.

3. Resolution approving the annual agreement with the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission.
4. Resolution approving the purchase of a used compact track loader from Bobcat of Springfield.
5. Resolution approving a supplemental agreement with Applied Research Associates, Inc. for the pavement management system.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Krell, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 2 – 5, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2014-014 – Phoenix Westside Properties, LLC, 4047 & 4055 W. Jefferson Street, Springfield – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Harry “Tom” Fraase, Jr., District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Stumpf, 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 has requested for Parcel 1: a variance to allow four principal uses on one parcel; a variance of Section 17.62.130B to allow two freestanding signs; a variance of Section 17.62.130B to allow two freestanding signs to have a total square footage of 200 square feet; a variance of Section 17.62.130F to allow two freestanding signs zero feet from a state right-of-way instead of the required 10 feet; and a variance of Section 17.62.130F to allow one freestanding sign zero feet from a vehicular area instead of the required 10 feet. For Parcel 2: a variance of Section 17.62.130F to allow one freestanding sign zero feet from a state right-of-way instead of the required 10 feet. Molly Berns, professional staff, stated the staff recommends approval of the sign variances for Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. The standards for variation are met. The existing signs are currently zero feet from the right-of-way instead of the required 10 feet, but do not interfere with traffic visibility when exiting onto Jefferson Street. Furthermore, if the signs were to comply with regulations, they would appear too close to the existing structures and would not be aesthetically in character with similar uses in the area. The professional staff recommends approval of the request to allow four uses on Parcel 1.

The two existing uses had no negative impact on the character of the area; however, since it is difficult to determine if the additional two uses will negatively affect the area, the professional staff recommends these future uses be limited to the existing building that has been subdivided for business uses. Mr. Harrison stated the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the professional staff's recommendation and also recommends approval.

Tressa Hartman, petitioner, residing at 2325 Berkley in Springfield, addressed the County Board. She stated two years ago they purchased the property where Phoenix Collision is located. They subdivided the property with Mrs. Kirbach and purchased that half of the property. Last year they went ahead and purchased the other half of the property located at 4055 West Jefferson. When they did that they began clean up of the property and immediately rented to Benmar Corporation who tried to move their sign there. That is when they found out the previous owner had originally been grandfathered in for the location of her sign. If Benmar wanted to put their sign there, it was going to be a problem because it was four feet into the buffer on the right-of-way and not actually into the right-of-way. They went ahead and used the existing signage that was grandfathered in. They knew going forward, if they want to rent to other business and if they bring in their signs, there would be problems. They sat down with the zoning department to discuss the issues they may have in the future with the property. She had mentioned at the time, she had also been grandfathered in for the multi use. If any of those buildings were vacant for six months, then they would lose that right to rent to a business. They purchased the property for the intent of commercial income, so they decided to put that in with this as well so they can also have the multi use that she had. She had up to eight businesses at one time on the two properties, and now they are just talking about four on one half. They would have one business on the other half, even though they would be allowed a second. So, there would be five businesses existing as opposed to the eight she had all those years.

Gordon Gates, attorney representing the opponents Ed and Ann Midden, addressed the County Board. They reside at 4100 West Jefferson which is just across the street to the south of the property. This particular piece of property has received several different variances and zoning reliefs over the years. They are to a point now where he thinks the County Board just needs to say no. In their view, it is getting to a point where it is just unacceptable. One of the issues is the question about grandfathering. There is no grandfathering in the sense that you are used to on this particular property. The prior user using the property for business uses was not a legal non-conforming use that gets grandfathered in. It was an illegal non-conforming use. The County Board never gave her permission to put four different business uses on a single lot. It was allowed informally. He stated it bothers him they have the idea because the prior owner was using it in violation of the zoning code that petitioner should now be allowed to use it in the same manner. That is not grandfathering by any means. It is the same situation with the signs. You need to look at this one as it stands on its own two feet. They have attempted to use every square foot of this property for various different uses. It looks like a fun house. If she gets what she wants she will get five uses, two entrances, three signs right up against the road. This is a dangerous section of the road. It is 50 miles per hour. You will have people going from 50 to 0 and 0 to 50.

There will be five different uses, five different customers and five different employees. He thinks it is just a recipe for disaster. They had two very dangerous and one fatal accident on that stretch of road, and he thinks they will have more.

Mr. Stumpf asked the professional staff to give their opinion on what Mr. Gates just said since they have their differences on this.

Molly Berns explained where they have a difference of opinion. He is correct in regards to the non-conforming section of the statute which is 17.64. This allows for uses which existed prior to the adoption of the existing zoning code to continue to be used in that manner even if they were a violation of the new regulations until those uses attrite out and cease to be used for a period of six months or the petitioner/owner comes in and seeks a totally different use. Where they disagree is that this is not strictly about non-conforming uses. It is about the number of uses on the parcel. He is correct in that the previous owner had seven or eight different multiple uses. As of December 2010 there were six uses on the parcel. That is verified from a different zoning case, and the zoning administrator went out and investigated it. To say they are legal non-conforming and they should be allowed to attrite out, is contrary to what the current interpretation of the zoning code is. Mr. Gates is correct in that perhaps seven or eight years ago it was the interpretation as long as it was zoned properly for commercial property, the property could have multiple uses. In the opinion of the current professional staff including her, Mr. Sims and others, in reading the strict interpretation of the zoning ordinance, you have to look at the definition of principle use, which is the main use of the buildings or land versus an accessory use. That would be a use which would support the principle use. When you have a piece of property with multiple uses, they are each a primary use. Despite the fact the old interpretation allowed Mrs. Kirbach to have multiple uses on the property, with the new ownership, it was the belief of the professional staff to clean this up and make sure it functions with the current zoning ordinance. The petitioner would present a petition to allow multiple uses on the parcel for your consideration. The other thing staff looked at was that the petitioner is requesting two uses and then two additional uses. One of the standards for variation is the property, if the variance is not granted, continue to yield a reasonable return on investment. One of the things staff looked at is if the variance is not granted, can the property yield a reasonable return on its investment. It appears, unless the variance would be granted, there would be a commercial building that would be vacant at the front of the parcel. That obviously would not allow the property to be used economically and yield a reasonable return. That portion of the property would remain vacant, which creates a blighted building, contrary to good planning principles in their opinion. This is really about the total number of businesses. This should have the effect of reducing the traffic congestion, reducing the amount of traffic onto that particular parcel and actually reduce the intensity of what had been there for many years. That is why the professional staff recommended approval of the four variances, and that is where she and Mr. Gates have a difference of opinion on interpretation.

Mr. Montalbano asked Mr. Gates if he thinks it is illegal and she can't have these businesses in there with the I-2 general industrial business use. Mr. Gates stated she can have every one of these businesses on its own in there because they fit within an industrial use.

What he is saying is, under the code, you cannot have more than one principle use on a building lot. She is going to have four and two. So, any one of these businesses standing alone is perfectly fine within the I-1, but under the code, you can have one principle use and then accessory uses. These are completely unrelated businesses and it is not allowed. There are just too many of them.

Mr. Montalbano stated the zoning allows multiple uses. Mr. Gates stated only if they give it to them. You can allow it as a variance. He is asking that they don't do that, and let the ordinance do what it was designed to do and keep the building lots to a minimum of one principle use.

Mr. Hall asked legal staff if Mr. Gates is correct in saying they need to have a variance granted. Dewayne Gab, Assistant State's Attorney, stated these are legal non-conforming uses because at the time they adopted the zoning ordinances, even though they were not approved, it made it legal conforming by state law. Mr. Gates stated that is absolutely true, except these uses were not there when the zoning ordinance was passed. They have come since then and are illegal non-conforming uses. Mr. Bunch asked if these buildings were there before they adopted the zoning laws. Molly Berns stated the zoning laws were passed in 1969. She does not know if the buildings were there at that time. A lot of the activity with the permitting system was in the early 1990s. It could simply be that the previous property owner was moving a lot of businesses in and out of there and, quite frankly, flying under the radar. Building permits were not pulled, and they could have been operating illegally with a lot of multiple uses for a number of years. Mr. Montalbano asked if someone did give them a building permit to build whatever they were building out there. Mrs. Berns stated there were some building permits issued in 1992, 1993 and 1997.

Mrs. Hartman gave her rebuttal. She explained it came to the attention of the zoning office three years ago, when they came before them to start the subdividing process, that she had multiple uses going on at the time. This is when they decided to grandfather her in. So at least for the last three years, someone has been aware of this. They were under the assumption that it was grandfathered in. They wanted to do this right so they don't run into any problems in the future with respect to being able to rent to businesses. The same goes with signage. They are sure any business that comes out there will want to put up a sign. All down that road is commercial property. They just wanted to bring it to their attention and get everything squared away so they hopefully don't have these issues in the future.

Mr. Hall asked if she has owned the property for three years. Mrs. Hartman stated they have owned the parcel at 4047 for two years and they subdivided it. They have owned the parcel at 4055 since the last day of September of last year. Mr. Hall stated he reads the words economic hardship every so often on zoning cases. He asked if he is correct in saying there is also something on economic hardship on this property. Mrs. Berns stated he is correct. The standards for variation state the property in question cannot be economically used or yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only for the conditions allowed by the regulations.

The professional staff found it was evident the variance should be granted, otherwise the building would sit vacant if she was not allowed to use the two additional uses; therefore, it could not be economically used or yield a reasonable return.

Gordon Gates gave his rebuttal. Mr. Gates stated Mrs. Hartman and the prior owner were operating this property illegally. Now they are coming forward and saying “they got caught”. He knows it’s not her fault, but she stands in the shoes of the prior owner. They were using it illegally and they had too many uses on this property.

She is coming now asking to be forgiven and to correct the problem. This is not grandfathering. This is someone who says “I have got a piece of property that is zoned I-1”. She can use it for all kinds of uses and she wants to cram a whole lot uses into one space. She can make money with this property, and does not need to have six different uses on it.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on the adoption of Resolution 6. Upon the roll call vote, there were 22 Yeas – 4 Nays. Mrs. Douglas Williams, Mr. Goleman, Mr. Hall and Mrs. Small voted no.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 7

7. 2014-015 – Jay Shattuck, 10 Country Lake Road, Springfield – Granting a Rezoning and Variance. County Board Member – Harry “Tom” Fraase, Jr., District #1.

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

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 8

8. 2014-016 – Patricia Hudspeth, 2508 W. Jefferson, Bldg. B, Springfield – Granting a Rezoning and Variance. County Board Member – Mike Sullivan, District #11.

A motion was made by Mr. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mrs. Ruzic, to place Resolution 8 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff’s report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 8.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

9. 2014-018 – Barbara & Bradley DeLuka & Claude Potts, 1180 Willowbrook Dr. & 4063 Thornbrook Dr., Springfield – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Abe Forsyth, District #27.

A motion was made by Mr. Forsyth, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, to place Resolution 9 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 9.

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Montalbano, to go out of the regular order of business and proceed to Old Business. A voice vote was unanimous.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. Resolution 6 – Tabled 4/7/14
2014-012 – John Vandenberg, in the 2200 block of Jostes Rd., Rochester – Granting a Rezoning. County Board Member – Sarah Musgrave, District #9.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Bunch and Mr. Montalbano, to take Resolution 6 off the table. A voice vote was unanimous. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections.

Mrs. Musgrave explained this was tabled previously because they needed some clarification on available water in the area. She asked Molly Berns to give an update on the situation. Mrs. Berns explained there was a lot of discussion at the Zoning Board of Appeals about the water. There are opponents here, but in light of what she is about to say they have withdrawn their opposition to this. The property owner met with the South Sangamon Water Commission. She has a letter from the commission stating they did vote to provide water on Jostes Road subject to engineering and tap fees. They also received a letter from the developer which says, if he is going to proceed with the development he is going to utilize the South Sangamon Water District as the source for water pursuant to the terms outlined in the letter from Mr. McCord from the water district. This will become a part of the official zoning file for future reference related to this particular ordinance.

A voice vote carried for the adoption of Resolution 6. Mr. DelGiorno abstained from voting.

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 10 – 12

10. Resolution approving elected officials' salaries.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, to place Resolution 10 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mrs. Small, to consolidate Resolutions 10 – 12. Chairman Van Meter asked the County Clerk to read Resolutions 11 and 12.

11. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and First Institute Training & Management.

12. Resolution approving a contract with Community Resources and Lawrence Education Center.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Snell, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 10 – 12, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

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

MOTION CARRIED
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

RESOLUTIONS 13 – 15

13. Resolution approving a contract with Paytel of America, Inc. to provide telephone services to jail inmates.

A motion was made by Mr. Preckwinkle, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, to place Resolution 13 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mrs. Sheehan, to consolidate Resolutions 13 – 15. Chairman Van Meter asked the County Clerk to read Resolutions 14 and 15.

14. Resolution approving a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Springfield and Sangamon County for the JAG Grant.

15. Resolution approving the purchase of vehicles for the SMART Transportation Program.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 13 – 15, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

Appointment of Dr. Brian D. Miller to the Sangamon County Board of Health to fill the unexpired term of Dr. Paul Smelter expiring February, 2016.

Appointment of Andy Goleman to the Central Illinois Economic Development Authority (CIEDA) for a term expiring May, 2019.

Appointment of Jim Good to the Sangamon County Extension Board for a term expiring May, 2015.

Appointment of David Mendenhall to the Sangamon County Extension Board for a term expiring May, 2015.

Appointment of Anthony DelGiorno to the Sangamon County Extension Board for a term expiring May, 2015.

Appointment of John Pasko to the Springfield Metro Sanitary District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Jim Reinhart to the Springfield Metro Sanitary District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Clyde Bunch to the Sangamon County Sewer Rebate Benefit Board for a term expiring May, 2015.

Appointment of Judy Johnson to the Sangamon County Sewer Rebate Benefit Board for a term expiring May, 2015.

Appointment of Frank Lesko to the Sangamon County Sewer Rebate Benefit Board for a term expiring May, 2015.

Appointment of Allen Alexander as the Sangamon County Weed Control Officer for a term expiring May, 2016.

Appointment of Steve Voyles to the Auburn Fire & Rescue District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Greg Marshall to the Buffalo Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Gerald Hughes to the Chatham Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Paul D. Smith to the Dawson Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Brian Spelman to the Divernon Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Kenneth Stewart to the Illiopolis Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Leland Rhodes to the East Side Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Carol Buecker to the Lake Springfield Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Frank Stroble to the North Side Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Scott Jenkins to the Pawnee Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Roger Anderson to the Pleasant Plains Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Keith Rigdon to the Sherman Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Sam Collins to the Western Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

Appointment of Keith Hamrick to the Williamsville Fire Protection District for a term expiring May, 2017.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the appointments. A voice vote carried. Mr. Fulgenzi voted no on the Sherman Fire Protection District appointment.

MOTION CARRIED
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

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

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

MOTION CARRIED
REPORTS FILED

RECESS

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mrs. Sheehan, to recess the meeting to June 10, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MEETING RECESSED

Joe Aiello
Sangamon County Clerk