



VILLAGE OF WINNEBAGO

LIQUOR COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 10, 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

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Adam LEFEVRE, Kelli Jeffers Absent: Jim O'Rourke

Guests: Attorney Mary Gaziano, Village Administrator Joey Dienberg

3. DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest was stated.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no request submitted for Public Comment.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Minutes from January 08, 2025

JEFFERS made the motion to approve the minutes of January 8, 2025, seconded LEFEVRE. Motions carried on a voice vote of those present.

6. DISCUSSION

a. Tap Wall Concept

Mr. Dienberg explained that the owner of a new business, Table Talk Supper Club approached the Village regarding the concept of a tap wall. He stated that some preliminary research had been done, and Attorney Gaziano had reached out to local municipalities regarding how they have handled a tap wall in their communities. Mr. Dienberg noted that the owner of the supper club was invited to come to this meeting and had expressed his interest in attending but was not in attendance.

Since the owner that brought the concept to the Village was not in attendance to give specifics, Mr. Dienberg explained that there is a computer system to verify a

patron's identification who would then get a bracelet or card or similar verified technology to indicate to the device that the patron was intending to get a specific drink that would then self-pour and monitor how much alcohol that specific patron had consumed. He noted that the Village had not yet spoken to the owner about his plan for staffing, monitoring, or what specific system they were looking to have in place. The owner recommended that the Village reach out to Loves Park to see how they handle tap walls in their community.

Attorney Gaziano stated that legislation and information in general regarding a tap wall was dismal at best. She mentioned that she spoke to the attorney for Loves Park that noted that the city had passed their ordinance under their general liquor ordinance without his consultation. Attorney Gaziano noted that the only information that she did find was from an AI program which stated that at least one employee would need to be BASSET trained, that the system would need a RFID system so it can identify the user and the amount poured, noted house limit restrictions to be 32oz of beer, 10oz of wine, or 3oz spirits per session. It also mentioned that the establishments needed to have licensed servers on the floor, who remained on the floor to monitor the customers for signs of intoxication and cut them off if necessary. The AI generation also noted that all age requirements would need to be adhered to and that high proof mixed drinks would have to come from a licensed bartender, not from the tap wall. Lastly, it mentioned plumbing requirements for cleanliness of the wall.

Attorney Gaziano stated that she could not find these provisions with any municipality at this time or where the aforementioned provisions came from. She spoke to an Illinois Liquor Control Commission field officer who noted he didn't remember ever receiving an email with the protocol he would need to follow and be looking for in regards to a tap wall. The attorney for Loves Park looked at their ordinance and noted that they did not have anything that stated specific requirements. Attorney Gaziano questioned if it would be limited to 32oz of beer on one card, what stopped a user from getting another card and stated that there were many unanswered questions. She noted that there are 10 municipalities in Illinois that have tap walls, but that most are home-ruled, so she attempted to only contact those that were not home-ruled. Attorney Gaziano mentioned that she did contact Champaign (home-ruled) and was told that their municipality puts tap walls under the same

restrictions as restaurants and bars and that they have not had questions thus far. She emphasized that a self-serve tap wall is not a substitution for having BASSET trained employees.

LEFEVRE spoke to his personal experience with a tap wall from several years ago. He stated he was given a bracelet after verifying his ID that he had to link to a credit card. He then paid per ounce poured and that there were about 12 different beers that you could scan a "puck" on the wall for before putting your glass down in front of, and then it automatically poured into the glass. LEFEVRE stated that he settled his charges at the end.

Mr. Dienberg spoke to his personal experience as well, stating he was given a glass and a card to scan. He stated that then each tap was pulled manually by the patrons so that they could decide how much they wanted. He noted that the charges were settled at the end.

LEFEVRE stated that his interpretation, based on what he heard from Attorney Gaziano, was that the max pour is 32oz beer, 10oz wine, or 3oz spirits per level pull. Attorney Gaziano asked if there was any employee stationed by or at the wall during his experience. LEFEVRE stated that he believed there was but that there was also a full bar with a bartender at the location he went to. He stated that there was no wine at this place, just beer tappers.

JEFFERS states that she was stopped by the owner of the supper club in question recently and believes from her conversation that the owner's thought was that all of his drinks would be by a tapper. LEFEVRE noted that the owner would need an employee to monitor the tap wall. JEFFERS stated that one of the positives of this idea is that there is less risk of an over-pour due to it being automated and not poured by a bartender, who could make human-errors, whereas this would all be by automation.

LEFEVRE stated that he is not opposed to having the tap wall. He noted that this may be a unique thing that allows the business to attract more patrons. LEFEVRE mentioned that the owner would need proper staff and have everything operational and in compliance before opening it.

JEFFERS noted that in her conversation with the owner, she got the impression that he did not intend for this establishment to be a full bar- mainly a restaurant. LEFEVRE stated that the owner would still need someone over the age of 21 to hand out wristbands to be compliant with Illinois liquor laws.

Mr. Dienberg questioned whether an ordinance to allow a tap wall would have provisions to make it follow a certain class for the liquor licensing, or if it would become its own class, noting that other municipalities have allowed their businesses to apply for whatever class the business wanted to. Attorney Gaziano stated that in her research, no one had a tap wall as a stand-alone, that most had them as additions to restaurants and bars. She noted that these businesses with tap walls did not have their own class. She mentioned that some mentioned it as a brewery but the language read as though the tap wall was at an actual brewery and then expanded to state it did not need to be a brewery per se, it could be at a different location.

LEFEVRE stated that he only saw a tap wall as reasonable, if they also had it as part of a restaurant or bar to be a special feature to encourage people to come to their location. He noted that he did not believe it needed its own class, that it could be grouped with restaurants and bars.

Mr. Dienberg ask if the commission would want to restrict a tap wall to certain classes of alcohol, which LEFEVRE supported. JEFFERS noted that she believed the owner's intention was to have beer and "a certain mixed drink" in the tap wall. LEFEVRE stated he thought it should be restricted to only beer, but then amended it to include wine, as long as it wasn't a "malt wine". Attorney Gaziano stated her concern was with a cut-off point and implementing a cut off point because then it would not matter the type of drink there was if there was a hard rule of no alcohol beyond a certain point. LEFEVRE noted that he believed the cut-off should be limited to 64 oz. for beer. JEFFERS noted she thought it should be an overall total limit, regardless of the type of alcoholic beverage. She then noted it was difficult to speak specifics since the owner was not there to give them an idea of what he is thinking for his establishment.

JEFFERS stated that she thought it was a great idea if there was the proper controls in place to limit over-serving patrons. Attorney Gaziano noted that this was the purpose of the BASSET training to prevent patrons from being over-served, using the example that certain individuals may have alcohol affect them sooner and differently than other individuals so staff would need to properly be trained to recognize when someone is reaching their limit, regardless of the overall limit on pours.

Mr. Dienberg noted that he believes having an ordinance in place is a good idea, regardless of whether or not this particular business goes through with it, so if there is

interest in the future, the Village would be able to have something already in place. LEFEVRE agreed with developing an ordinance but noted that before discussing any specifics for an ordinance, that the owner needs to appear before the commission to make a formal request, given the lack of information and statutes from the state. Attorney Gaziano stated that if this particular business did not want to further pursue it, it may be more beneficial to wait until there was interest, if ever, given the amount of research she would need to do for this and the expense associated with it. JEFFERS noted that the owner would also need to have a plan for what controls they would have in place.

The general consensus was that more information was needed, prior to them being able to move forward. Mr. Dienberg stated he would send the owner a recap of the meeting, what the commission needed from him if he wanted to pursue this, and that he would need to attend the next meeting, making sure to provide the owner with the date of the meeting.

JEFFERS noted that there would be a limit to how much someone could drink on each card, but questioned what prevented someone from swapping cards with someone else or getting a different card. Attorney Gaziano added the question of if someone could get another card or reactivate their card to continue being served alcohol, since her AI generated reading noted that the patrons would be assessed every so often to prevent over-serving.

7. NEW BUSINESS

None

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Not needed

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by JEFFERS, seconded by LEFEVRE. Motion approved by those present. The meeting adjourned at 5:54pm.

UNAPPROVED

Rachel Windgassen, Assistant Deputy Clerk
Prepared from recording