



VILLAGE OF WINNEBAGO

LIQUOR COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, October 08, 2025 at 5:30 PM

108 West Main Street and Virtually

To access meeting from any device: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/336650045>

Or by (Toll Free): 1 866 899 4679 | Access Code: 336-650-045

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:32pm

2. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Liquor Commissioner Frank Eubank, Kelli Jeffers, Jim O'Rourke ABSENT:
Adam Lefevre

GUESTS: Village Administrator Joey Dienberg, Village Attorney Mary Gaziano, Village
Intern Kyle Okubo

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Minutes from September 10, 2025

JEFFERS made the motion to approve the minutes of September 10, 2025, seconded
O'ROURKE. Motions carried on a voice vote of those present.

6. DISCUSSION

a. Tap Wall Concept

O'ROURKE stated that this conversation was a continuation of the discussion
that occurred at the last liquor commission meeting on September 10, 2025. Mr.
Dienberg reviewed the information previously given to the commission regarding the
preliminary idea of a self-serve tap wall that was proposed by the owner of the Table
Talk Supper Club and noted that a summary of the discussion at the last meeting was
presented to the owners. Mr. Dienberg questioned if after discussion, there was any

interest in moving forward with an ordinance being drafted. EUBANK stated that it was not the business owner's intent to serve alcohol from their first day open but did not want this issue to delay their ability to obtain a liquor license. He noted that the owners were not in attendance at this meeting and did not send a presentation or information on their behalf.

EUBANK stated that he believed it would be beneficial to continue on with the conversation, regardless of whether the owners were at the meeting. ***O'ROURKE questioned if there are existing regulations, Attorney Gaziano stated that there was not a lot out there but what was out there, she reached out to and found that they did not consult their attorney.***

Mr. Dienberg stated that his interpretation was that it was handled internally by their staff. Attorney Gaziano stated that at least for one of the municipalities, they had just assumed (that a tap wall would fall under a normal liquor license?)

Attorney Gaziano reiterated the limits of 32oz for beer, 10oz of wine, and 3oz of spirits.

JEFFERS ????

EUBANK noted that the tap wall can have specific limitations set on it, regardless of the liquor license associated. His example was that if a business had a liquor license that allows them to serve hard liquors, the Village's ordinance could limit that a tap wall can only have beer and wine. It would then fall to the applicant to decide whether they want the ability to also serve hard alcohol or if they only want to serve beer and wine. He mentioned that they could also create a new license so that anyone wanting a tap wall could apply for that liquor license, regardless of the other type of liquor license they possess. EUBANK noted that he felt it is important to have a limit set regardless of the route the commission goes.

JEFFERS stated that, like it was mentioned at the meeting last month, it is difficult to discuss the logistics of a tap wall without input from the business owners on what they would like to do. EUBANK noted that one of the more challenging part would be to monitor consumption and questioned what type of system would be put in place to allow for monitoring. He also mentioned that other restaurants within the Village may be interested in a tap wall as well, so the Village's plan moving forward needs to

consider all possible restaurants, rather than custom tailoring to the business currently requesting one.

EUBANK noted that they may want to consider putting a limit on the times the tap wall would be available during a day. O'ROURKE stated he'd be leery of limiting the time of day, and gave the example of mimosas and bloody marys. EUBANK stated that it may be possible to create different limits based on the type of alcohol being served so that certain types of alcohol being consumed needs to be checked more regularly.

Attorney Gaziano reiterated that there needs to be a staff member that is BASSETT trained on the premises whenever alcohol has the ability to be consumed. EUBANK noted that Table Talk Supper Club may want to get their staff in and started, learn who may be a longer term employee, and see who would be interested in BASSETT training but that way they can open their doors sooner. EUBANK stated that there have been businesses that installed a tap wall that saw a 30% increase in profit. He noted that for some businesses, they increased their bartenders' salaries because they had increased revenue. EUBANK didn't believe that adding a tap wall would have a negative affect on the profits long term, mentioning that the initial expense to add a tap wall would likely be great, but that overall it would be more cost effective in the long run.

O'ROURKE questioned if the liquor commission was looking to write an ordinance at this time, to which EUBANK noted that the commission could discuss basic terms that they would like to see and have Attorney Gaziano draft an ordinance to be discussed at the next meeting. Attorney Gaziano stated that it would be beneficial to have the Table Talk owners attend a meeting prior to drafting the ordinance, so that the commission could have some direction on which way to go. EUBANK stated that having a designated employee to stand at the tap wall would be a waste of money for the business. He gave options as to what the designated employee could be doing, such as a hostess or maître d. O'ROURKE noted that the tap wall would likely need to be sectioned off, like with video gaming, to deter underage patrons from grabbing a glass. EUBANK noted that if they have a designated bracelet or card for the wall, the business may not need to rope it off. Attorney Gaziano noted the limits that she had found online to be 32oz of beer, 10oz of wine, and 3oz of spirits. Attorney Gaziano stated that what was explained to her

was that the 32oz of beer limit was what is initially loaded onto the card and then if the patron so chose, they can go to a staff member to reload the card, and if there is no concern of over-serving, it is reloaded.

Mr. Dienberg pulled up the website pourmybeer.com and played a video for the commission on what could be poured from a tap wall.

O'ROURKE questioned if a business should have more than one person BASSETT trained since all wait staff should theoretically be able to identify if someone has been over-served. EUBANK noted that the current liquor ordinance only requires employees who deal with alcohol to be BASSETT trained and not all staff. Attorney Gaziano stated that there was concern that Table Talk Supper Club was planning on hiring teenagers, so not all staff would be able to be BASSETT trained. EUBANK mentioned that if at least one employee, like a manager or a hostess, was BASSETT trained, that this would be a good middle ground. Attorney Gaziano recommended having a backup BASSETT trained employee in case the primary staff was out for any reason. EUBANK clarified that ideally, any shift manager would have the training so a minimum of one BASSETT trained employee would be on the premises any time alcohol was allowed to be served.

JEFFERS reiterated that she really liked the idea because the wall would have controlled pours so there would be no chance of heavy pouring like there would be with a bartender. EUBANK agreed and mentioned that this concept also removed the burden of deciding whether someone had reached their limit from a bartender and that businesses could place maximum caps on what was allowed to be poured indiscriminately.

Attorney Gaziano raised the question of whether Illinois Casualty Company would have a dram-shop policy that required a business to have certain requirements. Mr. Dienberg stated that at the bottom of the pourmybeer.com FAQ section on the website, it has a section that asks "How is this legal?" and continued to read that section which laid out that guests only have access to two drinks at a time and after those drinks, the staff can give access to 2 additional drinks. Attorney Gaziano stated that for the state of Illinois, there are not any statutes that give direction on how to proceed with a tap wall, but rather businesses have developed their own set of rules, not regulated by statutes. EUBANK stated that since there may not be anything for Illinois, it is possible the Village would have the license to create what would work best

within the Village. He mentioned that the Village could look outside the state and if they like what is written for other states, that the Village could then adopt similar restrictions. He encouraged getting feedback from various liquor license holding businesses prior to adoption and then running the draft ordinance past the Illinois Liquor Commission to get final feedback.

Attorney Gaziano stated that in 44 states it is legal to have a tap wall given there is a way to verify age and alcohol limit verification. She noted that using a tap wall as a vending machine is not legal, stating there cannot be an exchange of cash for the dispensing of alcohol. She mentioned that there are requirements restricting the maximum height of the card reader at 48" from the floor to be in compliance with ADA. JEFFERS stated that this may be a good place to start. She then added that they could do an add on to the ordinance afterwards, if their intention is to walk out of the meeting with an ordinance to be drafted by the end of the meeting. EUBANK agreed that some items should at least be figured out prior to the meeting adjourning so that Attorney Gaziano can do some more research, based on their recommendations. Attorney Gaziano mentioned that she had found that there were certain plumbing requirements that the health department requires, but that this would not be an issue that the Village would necessarily need to address. EUBANK questioned if there were any specifics that Attorney Gaziano believed she would need to draft an ordinance or whether she would want to base the ordinance off the general conversations that had already occurred. Attorney Gaziano recapped that overall, the commission seemed to be in favor of the tap wall, and that she would likely add several additional items that the commission could then discuss and remove or edit as they see fit.

Attorney Gaziano reiterated that the Village does not operate business-specific, but questioned if the commission or Village knew what the Table Talk Supper Club's anticipated timeline was. EUBANK noted that the owners of Table Talk Supper Club had mentioned to him earlier in the week that they wanted to open within the next 60 days, approximately by December 1st. He mentioned that they do not necessarily want to serve alcohol on day one of being open and that they were aware that there is a process involved with getting a liquor license. Mr. Dienberg clarified that he believed the tap wall concept would be a general provision under specific liquor license classes. He suggested that business owners would have the ability to apply for their usual liquor license and then the addition of a tap wall would be relatively seamless, but if

the tap wall did not work out for whatever reason, the business owner would still have the capability to serve alcohol under their license. EUBANK agreed that normal liquor license provisions would still be in effect, but the business owner would have the option to add a tap wall under their current license, which would list its own provisions if they choose to add a tap wall. He added that the Table Talk Supper Club could apply for their liquor license now if they so chose, with the option of adding a tap wall at a later date, once provisions and an ordinance are in place. Attorney Gaziano stated that she could see business owners being hesitant to pay the liquor license fee upfront if their only goal is to have a tap wall, only to find out that the board denied the ordinance allowing them. She reiterated while this is a good idea, she isn't sure how much interest there would be.

EUBANK stated that he believes getting an ordinance drafted now and then getting input from the community business owners would be ideal, with the option to make amendments to the ordinance if unforeseen circumstances arose. Attorney Gaziano asked about a summary of interest being posted for the public to know that this is a conversation that is being had, to which EUBANK stated that a press release could be done to share the information. They agreed that having members of the public attend to give their recommendations and concerns about having a tap wall would be beneficial in finalizing an ordinance. O'ROURKE clarified that anyone that is a current liquor license holder would be eligible to put in a tap wall once the provisions are accepted by the Board.

Mr. Dienberg stated that listed on one of the tap wall websites, it was noted that one of their top sellers are to grocery stores so that patrons can have a drink while they grocery shop.

7. NEW BUSINESS

None

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

JEFFERS made the motion to approve the minutes of September 10, 2025, seconded O'ROURKE. Motion carried on a voice vote of those present.

Meeting adjourned at 6:20pm

UNAPPROVED

Rachel Windgassen, Assistant Deputy Clerk
Prepared from recording