86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Speaker Burke: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Bishop Mar Paulus Benjamin, who is with Assyrian Church of the East in Chicago, Illinois. Bishop Benjamin is the guest of Representative Kalish."

Bishop Benjamin: "In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Oh merciful and compassionate God, creator of heaven and all that is contained within... therein. supplicate and ask you, as we begin the season of lent, to pour forth your grace and favor up on us at this time of day. Bless this assembly, our Representatives, and their work, who constitute the Legislative Body elected by the constituents of this state for its general good in peace and harmony. We ask that you might protect them even as you protected Moses, your prophet, and Aaron, and the Israelites in all of their progress who were protected in the day by the cloud and all at night by the pillar of fire. You strengthened them to continue their journey until they reach the land of promise and blessing. We ask that you might bless these civil servants gathered together here today, even as you blessed the council of elders of Moses and the company of the Apostles. Give them the courage and fortitude with which you indulged they with the king who was victorious over Goliath. Give them wisdom, even as you bless Solomon with unparalleled wisdom. Deliver them from them all evil, even as you delivered Daniel from the mouth of lions who (unintelligible) in a foreign land of exile. Give strength and courage to these our brothers and sisters as they legislate for greater good of all of our citizens in this state. May they be mindful of the poor and

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

needy among, and the coming of the (unintelligible) and immigrants too has come to make this great county of freedom their home. May they labor for the welfare and health of the citizens whom they represent, and for the good and moral standing of all according to the law of God. Bless this land, the United States of America, from all her enemies and those who hate her. Bless our armed forces, who serve to protect their freedom and tranquility of the citizens of our country. We ask of this in the name of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I thank all of you for giving me this opportunity to pray with you this morning, and especially to Mr. Yehiel Kalish, at whose invitation I am present here today. Thank you, and God bless."

- Speaker Burke: "We will be led in the pledge today by Representative Reitz."
- Reitz et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Burke: "Members, the bishop will be in the well if anyone wishes to speak with him or have their picture taken. Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Carroll is excused today."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Spain is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."

86th Legislative Day

- Spain: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Davidsmeyer and Stephens are excused today."
- Speaker Burke: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 110 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of the Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 775, offered by Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 775, offered by Representative Ammons. be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize Sergeant James Carter for his exemplary work in the murder case of Yingying Zhang and for his service to Champaign County and the entire State of Illinois."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons is recognized on the Resolution."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If the Body can stand in recognition. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I rise to acknowledge the outstanding work of University of Illinois Sergeant James Carter, Telecommunicator Kenny Costa, and Detective Eric Stiverson. On June 9, 2017, an evil person, Brendt Christensen, posing as an undercover officer lured 26-year-old Yingying Zhang into his car as she headed off of campus to sign a lease. Yingying had come to the University of Illinois to pursue her dreams; however, Zhang was unlucky, in the wrong place at the wrong time. Brendt Christensen killed Yingying Zhang. Christensen was arrested on June 30, 2017. The weeks between would challenge law enforcement. We

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

want to acknowledge and thank the various jurisdictions, federal, state, and local officers, who worked diligently to solve this case. They worked tirelessly to find out what happened to Yingying and to locate the person responsible for her disappearance. Today we present, in full, three Resolutions honoring each of them. And under normal circumstances I would not read the entire Resolutions, but these are not normal circumstances. Today I present to the Body House Resolutions 775.

- WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang arrived at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in April of 2017 to contribute to the research being done in the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences; and
- WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang was an environmental engineering scholar from Nanping, a small city in the Fujian province in southeast China, where her parents and boyfriend lived; and
- WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang went missing in June of 2017 after getting into a black SUV near the University of Illinois campus; and
- WHEREAS, After an extensive investigation and search efforts by local, state, and federal authorities, Yingying Zhang was found to be dead in the summer of 2017; and
- WHEREAS, The loss of Yingying Zhang's life devastated the Champaign/Urbana community, the academic community, and the global community, and the University of Illinois honored her life with a number of vigils and rallies; and
- WHEREAS, Sergeant James Carter, a member of the University of Illinois Police Department, made an acute observation while

86th Legislative Day

- reviewing video footage of the car that picked Yingying Zhang up the day she went missing; and
- WHEREAS, Although Sergeant Carter was not assigned to the case, he asked the FBI agents if he could help; this offer proved to be exactly what was needed; in reviewing video footage, he observed that a small, nearly unnoticeable part of the hubcap on the front passenger side wheel of the black SUV was missing; and
- WHEREAS, This discovery enabled investigators to narrow their search for Yingying Zhang's kidnapper down to one man, who is now being held accountable for his heinous crime; and
- WHEREAS, Sergeant Carter's greater body of work and service should also be honored; he has been in law enforcement since 2008; in 2011, he joined the police department at the University of Illinois; since that time, he has been a detective, a field training coordinator, and now a patrol sergeant; his diverse experience and attention to detail has made Champaign County safer for the better part of a decade; and
- WHEREAS, It is likely that the Yingying Zhang case could have gone unsolved if not for Sergeant Carter's work, and now, her family will at least have the comfort of knowing who was responsible in this devastating case of their daughter's murder; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize Sergeant James Carter for his exemplary work in the murder case of Yingying Zhang and for his service to Champaign County and the entire State of Illinois; and be it further

86th Legislative Day

- RESOLVED, That we send our deepest sympathies and condolences to the family of Yingying Zhang; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Sergeant Carter as a symbol of our respect and esteem.

 Thank you, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Burke: "And if... if the Body would take a moment of silence for Yingying Zhang. Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of House Resolution 775. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'... 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 778, offered by Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 778, offered by Representative Ammons. be it
 - RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we commend Kenny Costa for his exemplary work in the murder case of Yingying Zhang and for his service to Champaign County and the entire state of Illinois."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons is recognized on the Resolution."
- Ammons: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And to the Members of the Body, there are two Resolutions remaining, and the officers have joined us in the Speaker's Gallery in front of us. House Resolution 778.
 - WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang arrived at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) in April of 2017 to contribute to

86th Legislative Day

- research in the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences; and
- WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang was an environmental engineering scholar from Nanping, a small city in the Fujian province in southeast China, where her parents and boyfriend lived; and
- WHEREAS, In June of 2017, Yingying Zhang went missing after getting into a black SUV near the UIUC campus; and
- WHEREAS, After an extensive investigation and search efforts by local, state, and federal authorities, Yingying Zhang was declared dead in the summer of 2017; and
- WHEREAS, The loss of Zhang's life devastated the Champaign-Urbana community, the academic community, and the global community; UIUC honored Zhang's life with a number of vigils and rallies; and
- WHEREAS, During the investigation, University of Illinois Police Department (UIPD) telecommunicator Kenny Costa examined a large amount of security video in order to trace Yingying Zhang's movements before she disappeared and found video footage of her entering a black SUV; and
- WHEREAS, The discovery of this footage was a turning point in the case; Kenny Costa's work led to other essential discoveries that helped to narrow the search for Yingying Zhang's murderer down to one man who is now being held accountable for his heinous crime; and
- WHEREAS, UIPD telecommunicators have many responsibilities, including being the first voice you hear on the phone, the first face who greets you at the front desk, and being the person who keeps you calm in times of crisis; with his

86th Legislative Day

- experience in loss prevention and customer service, Kenny Costa is a perfect fit for the job; and
- WHEREAS, Kenny Costa was the 2015 recipient of UIPD's Civilian Employee of the Year Award; his expertise and attention to detail created a turning point in the Yingying Zhang investigation; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that without Kenny Costa's work to trace Yingying Zhang throughout the UIUC campus the day she disappeared, it is likely this case could have gone unsolved; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That due to Kenny Costa's work, Yingying Zhang's family at least has the comfort of knowing who was responsible for her devastating murder, and we send our deepest sympathies and condolences to the Zhang family; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That we commend Kenny Costa for his exemplary work in the murder case of Yingying Zhang and for his service to Champaign County and the entire state of Illinois. Please welcome and congratulate Mr. Costa."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of House Resolution 778. All those in say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 779, offered by Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 779, offered by Representative Ammons. be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we

86th Legislative Day

- commend Detective Stiverson for his exemplary work in the murder case of Yingying Zhang and for his service to Champaign County and the entire state of Illinois."
- Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons is recognized on the Resolution."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you to the Members of the House. House Resolution 779.
 - WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang arrived at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) in April of 2017 to contribute to research in the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences; and
 - WHEREAS, Yingying Zhang was an environmental engineering scholar from Nanping, a small city in the Fujian province in southeast China, where her parents and boyfriend lived; and
 - WHEREAS, In June of 2017, Zhang went missing after getting into a black SUV near the UIUC campus; and
 - WHEREAS, After an extensive investigation and search efforts by local, state, and federal authorities, Yingying Zhang was declared dead in the summer of 2017; and
 - WHEREAS, The loss of Zhang's life devastated the Champaign-Urbana community, the academic community, and the global community; UIUC honored Zhang's life with a number of vigils and rallies; and
 - WHEREAS, Detective Eric Stiverson of the University of Illinois
 Police Department was one of two interrogators in an initial
 interview with the main suspect, Brendt Christensen, in
 Yingying Zhang's case; and
 - WHEREAS, Detective Stiverson leaned on his experience as a seasoned interrogator to encourage Brendt Christensen to

86th Legislative Day

- admit that he did indeed pick up Yingying Zhang, and the investigation unfolded from there; and
- WHEREAS, Detective Stiverson's interrogation helped secure Brendt Christensen's conviction, and he was sentenced to life in prison without parole; and
- WHEREAS, Detective Stiverson has served as an investigator and interrogator for the University of Illinois Police Department, Champaign County, and the State of Illinois for over 20 years; in 2005, he served as a deputy sheriff for the Piatt County Sheriff's Office in Monticello, Illinois, where he was assigned to patrol; in 2012, he transferred to the University of Illinois Police Department in Urbana, Illinois, where he served as a patrol officer until becoming a detective in 2015; he has conducted numerous death investigations as well as several high-profile homicide investigations; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that without Detective Stiverson's skilled interrogation, it is likely this case could have gone unsolved; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That due to Detective Stiverson's work, Yingying Zhang's family at least has the comfort of knowing who was responsible for her devastating murder, and we send our deepest sympathies and condolences to the Zhang family; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That we commend Detective Stiverson for his exemplary work in the murder case of Yingying Zhang and for his service to Champaign County and the entire state of Illinois. Thank you."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of House Resolution 779. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Ugaste, for what reason do you rise?"

Ugaste: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please procced."

"Rep Ammons, I believe has something more. Okay. Thank you. I am rising today on behalf of the constituents of the 65th District. We echo much of... or all of Rep Ammons, comments. To all three of the police officers involved to help solve that case, and commend you for a job well done as well as thank you for your service. A few of us stand especially proud today in that we have a family member that is being honored in Detective Eric Stiverson. And on behalf of all your cousins in the district as well as other family members, we just want to commend you on a job well done. Thank you for your service, not only to the State of Illinois, the University of Illinois and the Champaign-Urbana area, but also just to say we thought you had set a high bar when we initially met you and learned of your marine service, and I believe time assigned to Marine One, and you just keep setting the bar higher. So thank you, and thank you all for what you do."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons, did you have an additional comment? Please proceed."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you. I... certainly thank you to the Body your patience as we read each word over in the Resolutions.

We certainly are honored that the family was able to get some

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

resolved in this case. And all of us know what it's like in some way to lose someone that is so dear and close to you, but to have your daughter or son go away to school and not come back, that is a devastating experience for that family. And so, we are so pleased that our community had any role in bringing some resolution to the family of Yingying Zhang, and we hope that your work continues to inspire others to come forward and help solve other cases that go unsolved. Thank you all some much for your service. And thank you to the Members of the General Assembly."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Welch, for what reason do you rise?"

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Welch: "Madam Speaker, I am honored, as the State Representative, to represent a majority of Proviso Township, having severed 12 years on the school board at Proviso Township High School District 209 and 10 of those years as the board chair. I am truly honored to welcome as my guest here today, joining us up in the gallery on my right is the superintendent of Proviso Township High School District 209, Dr. Jesse Rodriguez. He's been the superintendent for the last 4 years. He has done an amazing job at unifying our community and bringing 9 feeder school districts together under the banner of one Proviso. He's done such a great job, Proviso is losing him to Representative Mason's district. On July 1, he becomes the new superintendent of Zion-Benton High School District 126. I gotta tell you, he is going to be a tremendous loss to our district but one heck of a gain to Zion-Benton High School

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

District 126. And I'd like to give Dr. Rodriguez one big thank you, and a warm welcome to the Springfield Capitol. Let's please welcome him."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

Bryant: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "So I have with me today Miss Kally Mayo. Kally is a senior at Pinckneyville Correctional Center. I'm sorry."

Speaker Burke: "Might be news to her parents."

Bryant: "We hope she never goes to Pinckneyville Correctional Center. She is, however, a senior at Pinckneyville High School, but she wants to... she is going to go to SIUC next year and major in political science. So maybe she'll have a job at the correctional center eventually. Anyways it's been a joy to have her today and look forward to what she is going to do in the future. And I would sure appreciate a warm House welcome for Kally."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bailey, for what reason do you rise?"

Bailey: "Point of personal privilege, please, Madam Chair."

Speaker Burke: "Please procced."

Bailey: "Thank you very much. I rise today to recognize FFA Week in America, originally known as Future Farmers of America. It is now just known as FFA, with 89 percent of FFA students participating who are nonfarm students. Each year FFA chapters around the country celebrate National FFA Week. And this weeklong tradition began in 1947 in conjunction with George Washington's birthday, due to Washington's legacy as

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

an agriculturalist and farmer. As you've heard many times on this House Floor, agricultural is the number one industry in Illinois and Ag education has a long, rich history in our state with many career opportunities in agricultural and horticultural. FFA provides a number of career and leadership training programs for our children and grandchildren with over 70 percent of FFA graduating seniors going on to college. I'm proud to welcome all the young men and women from around the state to the Capitol and especially proud to recognize Lane Harvey of Fairfield FFA in Wayne County in my district, who is the current Vice President of the Illinois FFA. Please join me in recognizing FFA Week, and I look forward to Ag Day here next Tuesday in the Capitol. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Proceeding to the Order of Houses Bills on Third Reading. On page 4 of the Calendar, under Third Readings, we have House Bill 322, offered by Representative McSweeney. Mr. Clerk, please read the bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 322, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Madam Speaker, House Bill 322 is a Bill that was passed in 2015. It would ban red light cameras for non-Home Rule units of government. I've been a long term opponent to long... to red light cameras. I believe that it's about revenue, not improving safety. A 2014 study, commissioned by the Chicago Tribune with Texas A&M professor, shows that it would actually increase rear-end collisions by 22 percent. We all know what happened to my Bill now. In 2015 we have a Senator who is obviously under federal indictment now and we also

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

have a corrupt program. So I think this is actually a great first step toward addressing corruption. I know we're going to see a lot more in this Session, and look forward to recommendations of the task force that is addressing ethics issue. I want to make myself very, very clear. I oppose all red light cameras. I have a Bill that would ban all red light cameras. One of my colleagues here has a Bill, I would support that Bill. There's a Senator who has a Bill to do that, but this is the Bill that we have on the floor today. This is the Bill that I'm calling. This would actually eliminate 45 percent of the red light cameras in the State of Illinois on January 1 of next year. This is a good first step, but I do want to repeat myself, if there is a Bill that gets to the floor that would ban all red light cameras, including my Bill or one of my colleagues, I will vote 'yes' for that Bill. I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wehrli is recognized."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Wehrli: "So, Representative, you mentioned that this is not an entire ban, so people may still get red light camera tickets.

Is that correct?"

McSweeney: "That is correct. In fact, for Home Rule units of government, including Chicago, this Bill would not apply. Again, but to be clear, I know you have a Bill, I have a Bill, others have a Bill that would ban all red light cameras. If I get that Bill to the floor, I would vote 'yes' on that Bill."

Wehrli: "Okay. So Chicago will still have red light cameras?"

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

McSweeney: "That is correct."

Wehrli: "But Cook will still have red light cameras?"

McSweeney: "If it's a Home Rule unit of government, that's... that would be the case."

Wehrli: "Oakbrook Terrace in Oakbrook will still have red light cameras? Aurora will still have red light cameras?"

McSweeney: "So we have 45 communities in the State of Illinois out of the 101 that would be affected by this Bill. And I believe this is the first step. And this is a Bill that is so dangerous to the red light camera companies that they have filled up the room with lobbyist. We passed out of committee 11 to nothing. This is a corrupt program. This is a good first step and I would support a Bill banning all red light cameras."

Wehrli: "Well, I guess my question ultimately is, why not wait and run a Bill that actually bans them in their entirety? Because what this does is piecemeal approach and it... people are going to think... they may read them and misinterpret this in the newspaper, saying that, oh, they took action on red light cameras, when indeed we really haven't solved the problem of red light cameras. We all know that corruption that surrounds red light cameras, so why not wait on this Bill and actually run a Bill that will ban them in their entirety?"

McSweeney: "Well, if you get Bills out of Rules Committee on that,

I will vote for your Bill, and I will vote for my Bill out of
Rules Committee that would ban all red light cameras, but
this is the Bill that we are presented with today."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Thank you for presenting this Bill, David. Just a few brief questions. This Bill address just Home Rule cameras.

Is that correct?"

McSweeney: "Non-Home Rule units."

Skillicorn: "Non-Home Rule cameras."

McSweeney: "Right."

Skillicorn: "And tells us a little bit more about the revenue verses the safety argument."

McSweeney: "Well, I believe this is all about revenue, and I believe this hits low income people. I think this is the most aggressive tax we have in the State of Illinois. This is tax that is... and I believe it is a tax, not a fine, that is aimed at collecting revenue and is aimed at low income people in the state. I have been trying to fight this since I've been in the General Assembly in 2013, and I'm glad I have another opportunity. Again, I passed a Bill in 2015 that was killed by Senator Sandoval, and we all know rest of the history of that."

Skillicorn: "And I'm glad you mentioned the Senator's name. Isn't there quite a bit of corruption around these cameras, I mean bribes, payoffs, and just the general attitude of how these cameras go in and how they are going after motorists and just regular people?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely. In fact, we're in... I'm a baseball fan, so

I think we're in the first inning of a nine inning long
federal investigation on corruption in the State of Illinois,

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

and I believe this is the center of that investigation... one of the centers of the investigation, along with other items. So, yes, I believe we're already stating indictments, we're already seeing problems. I think this is a vote against corruption."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, and to the Bill. I'm going to be supporting this Bill. And just a super brief history lesson. To the people here that support red light cameras and support this money grab, red light cameras are the single reason I got involved in politics. One went up in my neighborhood and I had to listen to people honk their horns. I had to see people maybe casually run through a right turn on red on a Tintersection. A T-intersection that didn't have a whole lot of traffic, a T-intersection that did not have crashes, a Tintersection that was not a safety hazard. Frankly, it's only aimed at the right turn on red. And this has not done anything for safety, yet, it's been a simple money grab for the municipality and many municipalities just like that. So let's start thinking about the single mother who is rushing to drop off her child at school, or you might think about the family member that has a part time job ride sharing, and they might accidently roll through a red light camera ticket or red camera location. And their entire day's wages could be gone by that... just a couple of seconds of indiscretion. Yet, they weren't put in harm, they weren't putting other people in harm. This is frankly a money grab for very profitable corporations and some local tax and spend municipalities. I encourage a 'yes' vote on this. It's time to end this

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

practice. I wish it went farther but that we can do that on another day. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Pappas is recognized."

Pappas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Pappas: "I have a question. I know that you mentioned that you have other Bills that will ban red light cameras in the entire state. Is there a reason why you brought a Bill that specifically targets non-Home Rule communities?"

McSweeney: "This is a Bill that I passed in 2015, passed only out of the House. This is a Bill I could get out of Rules Committee... and this is also a Bill that is... will be addition to other Bills we'll consider. Again, if there is a Bill that can... anybody get out of Rules Committee, including mine or other Representatives who have Bills to ban all red light cameras, I will vote 'yes' on those Bills. I'm also working very closely with Representative Marcus Evans, who supported my Bill in committee. He has a Bill to reform the political contributions, which obviously are big issue by these corrupt red light cameras companies. So I am willing to support multiple Bills on red light cameras, but this is a good start."

Pappas: "Right. I understand that this the Bill that passed out of the committee and that you have other Bills that have not passed out of committee. But my question is, is there a reason why you filed a Bill that specifically targets non-Home Rule communities on this issue?"

McSweeney: "Yes, because this is a Bill that can get done. We had had a Governor in this state recently who wanted to get a 100

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

percent of everything and got nothing. I'd rather get 45 percent of something as a first step to put the focus on these corrupt red light cameras. So that's why I filed the Bill. And this Bill was so dangerous that red light... red light camera companies that obviously we know what happened to Senator Sandoval. We know there's a roomful of lobbyists opposing this Bill, so this is a good first step. This is what I can get done. If, in fact, anybody can get a Bill, including myself, that would ban all red light cameras to the floor, if it comes out of the Senate, I will vote 'yes' on that Bill."

"Thank you. To the Bill. To me this is not a red light Pappas: camera issue, this is a local control issue. We pass many Bills in this Assembly that are geared... that are targeted at non-Home Rule communities. We consistently, time after time treat non-Home Rule communities as though they are less capable of governing themselves then Home Rule communities. When the Sponsor of this Bill filed it, he didn't know which Bills would make it out of a committee. So to me this Bill was filed specifically to target those communities that have least representation, that are already the most restricted in terms of what revenue sources they have and what safety measures they can put in place. And what we're doing by passing this Bill is not banning evil red light cameras, we are depriving non-Home Rule communities of rights that Home Rule communities will continue to have. And so, people will continue to be able to be ticketed for running red lights in Home Rule communities but not in non-Home Rule communities. And to the extent... I understand that there's a

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

perception out there that this... the red light cameras have nothing to do with safety improvement. I have seen reports on both sides, people who say they have made safety improvements and people who say they haven't. I'm not an expert and I can't determine which of them is right, but if in fact there is a slight possibility that safety is improved, why are we only depriving non-Home Rule communities from using this potential safety tool? So I object to this Bill. If you... if there is a Bill on the floor that deals with red light cameras in the entire State of Illinois, I will probably vote differently. But with respect to this Bill to the extent that it targets non-Home Rule communities, who by the way have not been evidence to be corrupt or particularly guilty, I would urge my colleges to vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative DeLuca is recognized."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't know if it's necessary but can we move this to Standard Debate?"

Speaker Burke: "We're on Unlimited Debate."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you. And how many votes will this require to pass?"

Speaker Burke: "It will require 60 votes."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

DeLuca: "Representative McSweeney, I remember you and I having a discussion about this a few years ago..."

McSweeney: "Absolutely."

DeLuca: "...when you called the Bill. And I recently saw in the newspaper, it says, these cameras are nothing more than a get-rich scheme for the companies that install the cameras

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

and the politicians who profit from protecting the companies behind the scam. You stand by that statement, Representative?"

McSweeney: "One hundred percent. Absolutely. In fact, I think the FBI stands behind that. We're seeing what happened right now already, we have multiple indictments. I believe..."

DeLuca: "Okay. So you believe red light cameras are just a scam?" McSweeney: "I believe they are a corrupt scam."

- DeLuca: "A corrupt scam, okay. Representative McSweeney, I have no reason to believe that your Bill is not going to pass today, but I think there's some other perspective that should be on there. In regards to this Bill, do you know why the cameras were originally created? Are you familiar with the reason why the red light cameras and that new technology was brought and started? Are you aware of that?"
- McSweeney: "I am. In fact, there was a Bill that originally passed out of the General Assembly that would authorize that eight counties, so we have the ability to eight counties in the state. The view with that point was that it was going to improve safety. I don't believe that has actually proven out over the years. So that was the original intent of the program, that a new technology would improve safety. I don't believe that has occurred."
- DeLuca: "Okay. So you also don't believe that safety is an issue here?"
- McSweeney: "I believe safety is an issue and anybody who violates the law by red light... by turning right illegally, if the police catch that person, should be ticketed. But I don't

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

believe the red light cameras are the right way to do that. I would let the police do it."

DeLuca: "Are you familiar with what's called the cop-in-the-box?

Are you familiar with those?"

McSweeney: "If you're referring to the copper... the policeman reviewing the video? Is that what you're referring to?"

DeLuca: "No, no, this is a different technology."

McSweeney: "Then I'm not familiar with that, please tell me about that."

DeLuca: "Okay. It's a camera that could be installed in certain areas where the police can remotely see what is going on in a certain neighborhood, problematic corners, problematic neighborhoods. It all... that technology all came around the same time that the red light cameras came up. Were you aware of that?"

McSweeney: "I was not aware of that technology."

DeLuca: "Okay. The purpose of that was to try and keep the resources from the police officers from not writing a ticket to that single mom who's rushing and runs or rolls through a stop light or a stop sign from writing that ticket and concentrating on more serious criminal activity. Are you aware that was the reason why these technologies were created?"

McSweeney: "It might have been the reason, but right now, what is being done is they're targeting the low income people in this state. This is the most regressive tax in the state, and I consider it a tax. It's not about revenue safety."

DeLuca: "Well I'm just talking about the technology right now."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

- McSweeney: "And that technology that we're talking about today is the red light camera program. And again, I believe that is a program that is specifically meant to hurt low income people in this state."
- DeLuca: "Well, we're actually going backwards with this process.

 Are you aware that there is a Bill filed to reform the red light cameras?"
- McSweeney: "Marcus Evans has that Bill and I support it one thousand percent. I want to see multiple Bills 'cause that actually would apply to Home Rule units of government, so I hope we see multiple Bills. I support that Bill."

DeLuca: "Right, I just want to get these issues on the record."

McSweeney: "Absolutely. I support it."

DeLuca: "So you're okay with moving directly to a ban as opposed to working on reforming it?"

McSweeney: "I am, but I also believe, because this Bill does not cover Home Rule, that the Evan's Bill... and he's supportive of mine... would be a very positive step too. So I am supportive of reform, ban, whatever we can get done. This is a corrupt program."

DeLuca: "And I know from serving with you for a long time,

Representative McSweeney, you most of the time take an antitax approach."

McSweeney: "That's correct."

DeLuca: "Do you agree with that?"

McSweeney: "That is correct."

DeLuca: "And these Home Rule communities, once these cameras are banned, will result in a property tax increase."

McSweeney: "I don't believe that."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

DeLuca: "So are you aware that you're actually indirectly supporting a property tax increase?"

McSweeney: "I don't accept it at all. I think this is being used for a permanent revenue source to hurt low income people and what will have to happen is they'll have to cut spending. This has nothing to do... won't remove anything to do with the tax gap. This is a..."

DeLuca: "Okay. So your suggestion to those Home Rule communities, one of which is mine, a town that I represent, cut your expenses."

McSweeney: "Absolutely."

DeLuca: "Okay. I'll make sure that I pass that along to them."

McSweeney: "Please do."

DeLuca: "Are you aware that... well let me ask it to you this way.

If an individual stops at a stop light where there this a red light camera, are they issued a violation?"

McSweeney: "If they stop and actually don't get a ticket then the answer is no, but as you know, one of the big issues here has been..."

DeLuca: "Let me finish."

McSweeney: "No, no, please let me finish."

DeLuca: "No, you answered the question. Let me move on 'cause I only have so much time."

McSweeney: "I have... I don't believe... I'll let you..."

DeLuca: "If a car approaches an intersection where there's a red light camera and they stop and make a right hand turn on red, do they get a violation?"

McSweeney: "What my answer to you is that there has been a lot of data that shows that people have been incorrectly given these

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

tickets. And the people who are hurt the most, incorrectly given these tickets are low income people, who can't afford to take off work, who can't afford the fines. This is a hit on low income people in the state. This is the most regressive tax in the State of Illinois."

DeLuca: "Okay. That's your talking point, regressive tax."

McSweeney: "The most regressive tax."

- DeLuca: "So the question is... the answer is no. If you're approaching an intersection where there is a red light camera and you make a proper stop and then turn right, it's not a no turn on red intersection, you have the ability to turn after a complete stop, you're not issued a violation, correct?"
- McSweeney: "I don't agree with you because I think this program is corrupt. I think that you've seen multiple instances that it's been faulty data and that the people who can least afford to fight it are the ones that are affected."
- DeLuca: "Well, it's very important for people to understand that that's not the case. Are you aware that they are reviewed by the local police departments before a violation notice is..."
- McSweeney: "In most cases they are... but I'll tell you, actually ABC News Jason Knowles has done remarkable work looking at these programs and showing multiply cases where that's not the case. So again, I believe we have a fundamental disagreement. I believe this is a corrupt program."
- DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you for answering the questions. And to the Bill. I'll just say that... the momentum is certainly to ban these cameras. I understand that. They're not popular with the public. I understand when you're rushing... to use one of my colleagues terminology... if you're rushing and you run

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

through a red light or you turn on red where you should not be turning, you are issued a violation and you don't receive that violation until the local police department reviews it. I think it's important for people to understand that. So when this technology is called a scam, it's truly unbelievable. I urge a 'present' vote, nowhere a 'present' vote. We have Bill that's being considered now for a reform, and I think we should hear from that before we ban the cameras. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Jones is recognized."

Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Jones: "Representative, I'd like to unpack several statements you made regarding this Bill and why you did this Bill. I know this is a good Bill and everyone wants to ban red light cameras, but you're creating a catch-22 for Members of this committee because at one point you say you want to target corruption. The towns that were named in this corruption scandal will it ban it... will this Bill ban red light cameras in those towns?"

McSweeney: "So, Representative, we're very early in an FBI investigation. We know that SafeSpeed will be affected. SafeSpeed is the company that's been in the news. They have..."

Jones: "I'm not talking about SafeSpeed, I'm taking about each community."

McSweeney: "Well we are because... we are talking about SafeSpeed because they have non-Home Rule units of government. I think SafeSpeed is a major target in this investigation. SafeSpeed has lobbyists here in Springfield that are fighting my Bill on both sided of the aisle. So all that said, yes, I believe

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

this would target corruption. I think we're early on a federal investigation, and I think we are going to see a lot more."

- Jones: "Again, my question was, each communities that was named in a federal investigation that received a subpoena from the FBI agents, will your Bill ban it in all those communities?"
- McSweeney: "We don't know what communities have received. You...
 we've seen two or three news stories. I believe we're early
 on we'll see multiple. But I am going to tell you that this
 Bill is affects SafeSpeed and I believe that is very
 important. So..."
- Jones: "SafeSpeed is not named in your legislation. So, Rep..."
- McSweeney: "SafeSpeed is all over the news. SafeSpeed is all over the news for bribery associated with it, associated with funds. So, yes, this does affect SafeSpeed to answer your question."
- Jones: "So why did you excluded the City of Chicago?"
- McSweeney: "I passed a Bill in 2015 that just did this. I have a Bill, other Representatives have a Bill. I would 100 percent support the Bill. If you want to file that Bill too, if you can get it out of Rules Committee, I will vote for your Bill."
- Jones: "No, don't put it on me. I'm not filing the Bill, I'm talking about your Bill that you filed."
- McSweeney: "Well then this is the Bill... this is a first step.

 This will eliminate 45 percent of the cameras for communities...

 45 percent of the communities with cameras, so I believe it's a first step."
- Jones: "So do you believe that you're picking winners and losers?

 Why did you... what concept did you come up with to pick the counties that you have named in you Bill?"

86th Legislative Day

- McSweeney: "It's not a county, it's actually the counties... so to back up, those are the only counties that red light cameras are allowed in the State of Illinois. So that's how the law works. When it was passed, eight counties were authorized to have it. That's why those counties are mentioned. So this is not favoring counties over other counties. It is banning red light cameras for non-Home Rule units of government."
- Jones: "So, again, you're going to pick the winners and losers, and not ban this around the State of Illinois. There's a reform Bill that's moving through the House right now. Is it possible for you to pull this Bill from... since you're saying that you would support a reform Bill that will ban it throughout the State of Illinois, stand on your word and pull this Bill until it bans it in the State of Illinois as opposed to doing this Bill right now. Because I believe you're doing this Bill to create a headline. You're not doing this Bill to solve corruption. You're creating a headline that will say we're banning red light cameras throughout the State of Illinois, and this Bill does not do that."
- McSweeney: "I'm doing this Bill to address corruption. I'm working very closely with Marcus Evans who has a reform Bill. I would vote his Bill if he gets it on the floor. I'm going to pass this Bill today I believe. Thank you."
- Jones: "So point to in your legislation where it says that you're dealing with corruption. What language in your Bill says you're dealing with corruption?"
- McSweeney: "The red light camera program in the State of Illinois is corrupt, there is no doubt about it. Ask the FBI, ask the

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

- U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois. I believe this is a corrupt program. This deals with corruption."
- Jones: "So, Representative, can you list and name the Sponsors of your Bill that you have listed? Can you mention that for the record?"
- McSweeney: "That's all of the public record, you can see all of the... you're talking about the Members, the Sponsors and cosponsors?"
- Jones: "Well are you afraid to say that the Illinois Policy
 Institute supports this Bill and..."
- McSweeney: "I'm glad they support it, that's great. They support it. I believe a number of other entities do too. So I am a hundred percent proud of whoever would support this Bill."
- Jones: "And lastly, Representative, can you speak to your Amendment? Your Amendment made one change."

McSweeney: "Right."

Jones: "House Amendment #1 made one change to this Bill."

- McSweeney: "So, I filed this Bill last year and originally it would eliminated red light cameras January 1 of this year, but since it's now being considered, I moved it to January 1 of next year since we're passed the date. That would just simply change that they would have a transition period of about 10 months depending on when the Bill was signed."
- Jones: "So is it possible that you did that to get away from the Home Rule and the vote total that we need for 71?"
- McSweeney: "It... that had nothing to do with that. Specifically that date change had nothing to with any type of requirements in Home Rule and non-Home Rule. That was moving the effective date in the Bill to January 1 of next year, which was

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

different that the effective date that we usually deal with that would affect whether it needs a majority or it needs or whether it needs three-fifths."

Jones: "Representative, I will renew my request to you to pull this Bill from the record and go with a reform Bill that bans red light cameras in the State of Illinois. All of us against red light cameras, we stand against corruption. This Bill is creating the headline for you that will not help solve the issue in corruption that you mention in the towns that you're going after. This Bill does not do that. And to the Bill. If this Bill receives record number... requested of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Burke: "Members, the Sponsor… excuse me... Representative Jones has requested verification, so please make sure you are in your seats. Representative Grant is recognized."

Grant: "Thank you. Representative McSweeney, I applaud your effort to eliminate corruption plaguing the red light camera program. But this corruption impacts all communities with red light camera, so I cannot understand why your Bill only addresses red light cameras in non-Home Rule communities and not all communities. Most concerning, this Bill doesn't do anything to address problems with red light cameras in our state's largest city, the city where corruption with red light camera first surfaced. My district is in DuPage County, all of DuPage County. My citizens come... and are upset, complaining to me that they go to Hillside and they get a red light camera violation, they go into La Grange Park to the zoo. Come on, this cannot just be allowing Chicago where the corruption is. I think I agree with Thaddeus Jones."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Speaker Burke: "Representative Zalewski is recognized."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

McSweeney: "I do. Yes, I do."

Zalewski: "What's the Bill number?"

McSweeney: "323."

Zalewski: "Have you request that it be moved?"

McSweeney: "I have requested that this Bill actually be passed first and that's the Bill that I've targeted. So to be clear, is I would like to have that Bill moved in the future but this is the Bill... no..."

Zalewski: "But have you required..."

McSweeney: "I have requested that this Bill be moved. I requested three Bills be moved, the property tax Bill, this Bill, and a Bill on ethics, which was the request that we have. So this is the Bill, Representative, that I have actually requested to be moved. I know others have Bills that would ban all red light cameras, the Senate has a Bill. So to answer your question specifically, this is the Bill that I asked to be moved."

Zalewski: "So you did not ask for 323 to be moved?"

McSweeney: "323... I have a request for three Bills I said. The answer is this one and I did property tax and I did an ethics Bill. So those are my three Bills."

Zalewski: "Are you under operating on a premise that we are limited in what can request move from Rules?"

86th Legislative Day

- McSweeney: "I believe the three are the top priority, that's my understanding of the rules and that's what I have requested. And this is the Bill that I passed out of committee, this is the Bill that I passed in 2015, and this is the Bill I'm running today."
- Zalewski: "My mayors are going to want to know why you requested this Bill move instead of 323."
- McSweeney: "Because this is the Bill that is so dangerous to the red light camera companies that they acted to bribe a State Senator, they have a room full of lobbyists. This is a first step. This is a Bill that I know I can get passed. As you know, there's a substantial amount of opposition. This is a Bill I could pass at a majority of bases. And anybody gets a Bill or I get the opportunity to bring 323 to the floor, then that's what the Bill I'll pass."
- Zalewski: "You don't think you could've passed 323?"
- McSweeney: "I have no idea. I believe that I can pass this Bill, I hope, we'll soon see."
- Zalewski: "Okay. I've respectfully, David, I find flaw in the logic that 322 was a more passable Bill then 323 given the last 20 minutes of debate where you've elegantly made the case that this program is full, rife with corruption and that there is no conceivable way to save it, and as a result we need to ban the program. So the second point I have is you said you support Representatives Evan's Bill to reform the program. So let's take that to its logical conclusion, and let's say that Bill gets on the board, and you're a full-throated supporter of that Bill, and then that Bill were to

86th Legislative Day

- be enacted along with this Bill. What would you tell constitutes about the difference in those two Bills?"
- McSweeney: "I'd tell them it's a big win because we get to ban red light cameras for non-Home Rule units of governments and we get massive reform for Home Rule units of government. So I'd love to see both Bills. And, Representative..."
- Zalewski: "No, but what if... as I understand it, Marcus' Bill reforms the whole program."
- McSweeney: "It does, but it would actually... in this case it would apply because they would be banned for non-Home Rule, so we'd have a Bill that would reform Home Rule. I've worked closely with..."
- Zalewski: "So you're for Home Rule bad units of government as long as they're reformed?"
- McSweeney: "No... I want to be clear, I favor a ban on all red light cameras, and I can't be any more direct on that. I've been direct from the beginning. If that... if this Bill only passes, that was your question, and we end up with Marcus Evan's Bill, which I like, passing then that reforms would apply to those Home Rule units of government if they're still allowed to have cameras. So I'm supportive. I'm working with him. He voted for my Bill. I support his Bill."
- Zalewski: "Do you at all see the concern among Members that for a short term passage of this you're having a long term effect on the future of the program if there is one? Now I... I'm going to speak to the Bill in a moment, but do you concede that dynamic or no?"
- McSweeney: "I don't, I believe this is a good first step. I respect you, but I disagree."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Zalewski: "Okay. I understand. To the Bill. I think anyone who speaks in opposition to this Bill is going to be perceived as pro-red light camera, and that's fine. And I actually don't know what I'm going to do on this Bill, because guite frankly, a lot of areas that have been affected by this scandal reside in my region, so it's a difficult vote for me. But what bothers me is we're about to have a great debate in this chamber this year about reform and what reform really looks like and what we're doing to solve real problems with how we act in this building. And when you have situations like this where we're going out in... early on, a full six weeks before the Bill deadline and doing something that is going to look great but in reality may not solve every single problem that have, it's going to set back the broader reform conversation in my opinion. We have a lot of work to do on reform and ethics and how we conduct ourselves in this building over the next six weeks and this is not the right start do it. When we're making exceptions and choosing the Bills that we think can get over but we really aren't sure, and we're citing Bills that may come up in the future, and we're supporting both but we don't know why. It's a very frustrating dynamic to the serious nature of the conversation we're about to have in this building. So... and to that point, I'm still not sure what we're going to do on this Bill, but it's a very frustrating dynamic for those of us who've raised the nature that we represent Home Rule, non-Home Rule communities and those mayors are going to oppose this Bill because they don't have a better option out there. Marcus' Bill isn't even on the floor. And we're doing this in a manner

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

that I just don't frankly comprehend. So with that, I yield my time. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mayfield is recognized."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Mayfield: "Representative, did this Bill pass unanimously out of committee?"

McSweeney: "It did, 11 to nothing, and I appreciate the score."

Mayfield: "And that was a bipartisan committee that thoroughly vetted your Bill despite having multiple lobbying groups lobby against your Bill?"

McSweeney: "Yes, that's correct."

Mayfield: "And it was unanimous?"

McSweeney: "It was, yes."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much for that. And this Bill, as you stated, is a starter to addressing the red light camera issue, correct?"

McSweeney: "Yes, Representative."

Mayfield: "And we all know that there's a lot corruption surrounding these red light cameras. So I thank you for that because we do need a conversation starter, we do need to move the ball in the right direction, and that is what your Bill does. I am here to stand in full support of your legislation. I'm encouraging everyone in this Assembly to vote 'yes' on this Bill. These red light cameras have been a crux in the black and brown communities for years. A lot of individuals have lost their cars, they've lost their ability to drive their cars. This... red light cameras have not helped anyone in the communities. We heard that, oh well this is ah... we know

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

it's a revenue grab for the cities and that it's going to raise taxes if we take this money away. I totally disagree with that because that money is not being applied toward our taxes, we know that. And there are other measures, as you stated, they can reduce the size of government. You know there are municipalities with two and three sectaries, they're not needed, all the different assistants that are in there. Other than police and fire, our cities really do need to look at streamlining services. So fighting against this Bill to say that it's going to take money away from the city for those reasons, I disagree. I do stand with you, and I'm asking everyone in this chamber to please stand in support of getting rid of red light cameras. As he stated, and as I will state on this floor also, if there is any other red light camera legislation that comes through, whether it's a complete ban for the City of Chicago, my municipality which is a Home Rule, which I would love to see it ban, I will also support that legislation. Thank you, Representative. Vote 'yes'."

McSweeney: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go... I'm just going to go straight to the Bill. There's been a lot of discussion about like process in other Bills. I agree with that, this may not be the perfect Bill but there's a long process for this to go to. This has got to go to the Senate where it could be amended, it has to go back, it has to go to the Governor's desk. If a stronger Bill comes along the Governor can choose to just sign the strongest Bill. So what we have in front of us... we can only vote on the Bill that's

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

in front of us today, we cannot predict the future. So let's pass this. Let's start the discussion on reform. Let's do something good finally where the people back home can say, okay they're at least addressing some of the issues that have come up. Let's put a bunch of green on the board, get it across the finish line and we'll have further discussion throughout the rest of Session. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Mazzochi is recognized."

Mazzochi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I am a strong supporter of this Bill because I do not like red light cameras. Red light cameras have been a vector that has introduced corruption into DuPage County and into district. My residents don't like it, my residents don't want it. And it's unfortunate that this Bill is actually limited to non-Home Rule units. I would fully supported as well if it was limited to Home Rule units and I would certainly welcome a Bill that was directed towards banning these in Home Rule units. But I agree with the speakers today, this is a good first step to start getting these things out of our cities, out of our towns and getting back to a more solid foundation for municipal funding that does not involve red light cameras that have been so tainted with corruption. And because of that I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McSweeney to close."

McSweeney: "Appreciate a 'yes' vote. This allows us to take a first step towards addressing corruption in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Burke: "Members, Representative Jones has requested a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

their own switches. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 322 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'in favor', 4 voting 'against', and 5 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Jones, you'd like to withdraw?"

Jones: "Withdraw. I withdraw my verification."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Jones withdraws his request for verification. And on this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back on... still on page 4 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 377, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 377, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Yingling is recognized."

Yingling: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an initiative of the Illinois Human Rights Commission. It makes them technical clean ups in the code and renumbers some paragraphs. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Any discussion? Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Batinick: "Representative Yingling, we're a little rusty over here, can you give a little bit more of a detail analysis of what your build does?"

Yingling: "Yeah, no problem. Currently the IHRA cross references to old portions of Article 8, which governs the IHRA C procedures. As the IHAR has been amended over the years, the same cross references no longer refer to the correction language. This was brought to the Illinois Department of Human Rights attention in a current court case."

Batinick: "And this was... this is a gut and replace Bill, correct?"

Yingling: "Yeah, the underlying Bill was a vehicle Bill."

Batinick: "Was the gut and replace voted on in committee?"

Yingling: "Yes, this came out of committee."

Batinick: "And what was the vote in committee on the Amendment?"

Yingling: "I believe it did, hold on one sec. No, I apologize, Representative, it was filed as a Floor Amendment."

Batinick: "Okay. So we have not vetted this Bill in committee at all?"

Yingling: "Give me one second, Rep."

Batinick: "Hey, Rep... Rep, we got our analysis done in time, we're good. We'll let you go. Thanks."

Yingling: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Yingling to close."

Yingling: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 377 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no',

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

O voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Yingling again on House Bill 2211. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2211, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is initiative for Lake County. The measure would put a question on the November 2020 ballot as to whether the residents of Lake County would like to have an elected county assessor."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

Speaker Burke: "Yes, he indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, just real quick, have you talked to all the Members of the General Assembly that represent Lake County? Do you have a..."

Yingling: "Yeah, this was an initiative that went through... I think that we're on number three now, Representative. Third time's a charm."

Batinick: "Okay. Do the people representing Lake County, are they swell with this legislation? Have you had much pushback for other Lake County General Assembly Members?"

Yingling: "Not that I'm aware of, no."

Batinick: "Okay. They should probably speak if they have an issue with it. So I thank you for your time. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Yingling to close."

Yingling: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2211 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2816, Representative Costa Howard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2816, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2816 is a Bill that applies only to guardian ad litem fees in probate guardianship cases. It is an opportunity for the courts and our judges to make sure they have the discretion as to who to allocate the fees for guardian ad litem fees are going to be. It's is actually a protection against our elderly and disabled adults, in that the court has the discretion regardless of whether or not the individual has fees. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis is recognized."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Davis: "Just a couple of quick questions, Representative. Did you meet with the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission on this Bill? I believe they reached out to you. Did you meet with them?"

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

- Costa Howard: "I don't recall. I apologize, Representative. I don't recall if I met with them in the last weeks. I have spoken to them perhaps maybe in the past. This Bill specifically addressed issues that some of our public agencies had to make sure that none of the state agencies would be allocated any fees on the guardian ad litem fees to them."
- Davis: "Okay, but not sure if you... because I think one of their representatives told me that they were trying to at least have a conversation with you, maybe to understand, 'cause I think this is a Bill that has been out there before if I'm not mistaken?"
- Costa Howard: "Correct, this... correct, this Bill... I filed this Bill last year and didn't bring it back to... I held it and didn't bring it back. We did a similar Bill that was in the Senate and we did it through a Senate Bill. The issue with this and why I brought this Bill forward is because we have often times have had situations where we have... excuse me, Representative, I'll turn around, I think it's more polite to look at you when we speak to one another. So I appreciate it."

Davis: "I'm sorry, and I understand it's a little..."

Costa Howard: "So, the reason I brought this Bill is 'cause as an attorney, as a court appointed guardian ad litem, I've seen many, many cases where we have an elderly individual who has an estate, has money, shall we say, that's meant to be for their care and they may have family members who are fighting to take over, who's in charge of those dollars and file frivolous motions and keep cases in court and they're

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

absolutely have no benefit to that ward. And the way the law is currently written, it requires if an estate is open and if an individual has funds, they shall pay those fees. The court has no discretion. Frankly, the court could choose to use their discretion to award... to have the guardian ad litem fees paid from an estate. But I think it's important for the courts to have that discretion to be able to be able to determine who the one who's potentially is has some skin in the game, right? They're going to file motions and they have to know that if there's investigations and such that have to go on that they may be responsible for some of those guardian ad litem fees."

Davis: "Okay. I don't think it's the matter of necessarily questioning what you're trying to accomplish but to the extent in which the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, of which I'm a commissioner, Representative Carroll is a commissioner, Representative Bennett is a commissioner... you know I believe when I had a conversation with their legislative representative they were trying to meet with you to talk about this Bill. And so my question was, did you ever meet with them to talk about the Bill so whatever concerns they had or whatever clarification they needed that they got from you."

Costa Howard: "And I apologize, Representative Davis, honestly don't recall. This was a Bill that I brought last spring. I held it, I didn't move it. And I... if they say that they reached out to me, I don't recall them doing that in this new Session."

Davis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

McDermed: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

McDermed: "Representative, this has come in front of Judicial Civil a couple of times, hasn't it?"

Costa Howard: "Yes, it has."

McDermed: "And haven't you worked to amend it to deal with the concerns of the committee on more than one occasion?"

Costa Howard: "Yes, I have."

McDermed: "And the Bill at this point has... is in conformity with all the suggestions, request, and clarifications from the committee?"

Costa Howard: "Yes, it is."

McDermed: "Thank you very much for all the work that you've done on this Bill up until now."

Costa Howard: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Costa Howard to close."

Costa Howard: "This is a Bill about protecting people and giving the courts the discretion to award fees as such to guardian ad litems and who should pay that. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2816 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4007, Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4007, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 4007 provides that sex education instruction and course material in grade 6 through 12 must include age appropriate discussion on sexting. Just in case some of us in here do not know what sexting is, is a means of act... the means that act of sending, sharing, or receiving or forwarding sexually explicit or sexually suggestive image, video, or text message by a digital or electronic devise including but not limited to a mobile cell phone, computer, or a iPad, or a tablet. Now before I go into the details to why, I'm aware that sex education is not a required course throughout our state, and so, I'm not trying to do that at this time. There are some schools in our state that provide sex education, there are others who do not. This Bill is simply saying those who do provide sexual education instruction to include this. The reason for it, our students ramifications, the to know the legal social need ramifications, and the academic ramifications to sexting. I don't know if any of you know but our ... since 2012 our ... the number of students who have smart phones is up to over 80 percent. With that our students need to know that sexting is a form... sexting a friend or someone who is underage, if caught, is a form of child pornography. And so, there's legal ramifications to this. Now there's also... this also can help... hurt our students academically and our students need to know that there's... with this short term ' pleasure' there is long term consensuses. Once again, I am not trying to mandate this.

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

I'm simply... by saying that all schools need to talk about it, the schools that are talking about it we should be talking about this so that our students will know. I went to the subject matter experts during one of our breaks, which is our students, and I talked to the students and asked them what they thought about this Bill and they felt that this is a Bill that was worth understanding more about. Another thing that I wanted to bring to your attention is that sexting makes it easier for sexual predators and human traffickers to target our young children, and primarily, as we know, they target our girls in our state. So I am willing to entertain any questions. This Bill passed out of committee Representative Reick, I owe you some information, and though this Bill is already on the floor, I will get that information to you. I wanted to let you know that. You have my word, Sir. I will entertain any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bourne is recognized."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "Indicates he will."

Bourne: "Thank you. I know that you said this during the debate.

It was a little loud, so I wanted to clarify with you. One,

are many schools already incorporating this in their

curriculum? Is that your understanding?"

West: "I'm sorry, say that one more time. Are many schools incorporating..."

Bourne: "Correct."

West: "...at this time? I don't know if there's any school that's incorporating this into their curriculum. What I was saying was, sex education is not a requirement for our state, so

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

there are some school that have sex education curriculum, I'm simply saying that this needs to be part of the discussion. This falls along the lines of a Bill that Representative Williams, I believe, passed on last year about consent. We're just adding this to the topic of discussion as well."

Bourne: "Thank you. Yeah, I'm glad that you clarify to again that this is not required of students, not required of schools. I think this is an important addition to be covered in school, so I would ask my colleagues to please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Keicher is recognized."

Keicher: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Keicher: "Excellent. Thank you, Representative West. I think this is an important awareness that we need to develop in our schools, so I appreciate you bringing this today. I just want to circle back on one important point. This... please confirm for me, this does preserve the parents' discretion on whether their student will participate in sex education."

West: "Yes, this does not take any discretion from the parents."

Keicher: "Thank you, Sir. I vote... I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Stava-Murray is recognized."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. I just wanted to thank Representative West for bring this issue to the table. I know we had a Bill last year that dealt with limiting SROs questioning students, and that actually came about from a student essentially taking video of a sexual encounter and then threats from the police that he was going to face child pornography charges. And obviously following that interaction with the police, he proceeded to go to the

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

top floor of a parking garage and commit suicide and had a death by suicide. And so, I want everyone in this chamber to realize that this is not just like a kind of important, maybe important thing for people to know, that we have had at least one death that we know of in this state of a minor who committed a crime unknowingly. And so, I think that it's incredibly important that students have access to the knowledge that what they're doing is not only wrong but actually literally a crime so they can make better decisions. So I appreciate you bringing this, and thank you for your work."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam. Will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Thank you very much. Representative, just a couple quick questions. You know, I'm glad you brought this up, I think this is some good questions already, this is spirted, and this is a topic that is very serious. I was going to lead with a joke about how this... expect this debate to go faster than the first Bill we passed today, but I don't think it's appropriate because this is a very serious issue. So I just kind of want to get to it. This is something that I think that people of the state care about, we care about our young people, parents care about their kids and then... so I'm reading through the language, I don't see anything that bothers me but then I started looking at the opponents and proponents and I do see some proponents that can be a little partisan, like Planned Parenthood, that does bother me as someone that values life. But then... so I see there's 51 opponents. Have

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

you had any conversations why these people have... I mean, its 51 slips here. Have you had any conversations to see what their concerns were?"

- West: "Yes. Actually there was an article, well a journalist who tried to do an article on those 51 opponents, because as you see, I believe there is 965 proponents. A lot of the opponents come from IC4IC, Illinois for Informed Consent. And Illinois for Informed Consent put out a statement saying that majority of those opponents were mistakes that were meant to be proponents of the Bill."
- Skillicorn: "So... and I'll trust you on this. If you're reassuring me that this is not some partisan trap, this isn't something that has to do with abortion, I'll support your Bill. I just, again, want to make sure that's the case."
- West: "The reason why Planned Parenthood filed as a proponent is because they're working on their own Bill that is requiring sex education throughout the state, and they want this particular part, this particular piece for material to be incorporated into their own Bill. And so, they just filed as a proponent in regards to that, that they will be taking this and putting it and adapting it into their own legislation. Nothing more than that though."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. And to the Bill. Thank you for answering my questions. I think that you've been a good sport. Sometimes I do have concerns, I don't think that politicians hundreds of miles away from students should be making policy choices. I think that should be done locally, it should be done by parents that should be done by school boards. I do see this

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

as a net positive and I will be supporting your Bill, Sir. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative West to close."

West: "I want to thank you all for this spirited debate. I just wanted to highlight that I was invited in my neighboring district to a Christian private school, from the principal, to talk about this Bill and get feedback from the students at that school. And that tells me that this is something that is very important. I was told by the administrator that they've had several... within this year alone, 2020, several of their students that got in trouble because of sexting. This may be a discussion that we may try to shun away from, but we have to keep up with technology and this is one way to do it. I would appreciate an 'aye' and I thank you all in advance."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4007 pass?' All voting in favor... all in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'in favor', 0 voting 'against', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Didech, House Bill 4025... record. Representative Moylan, House Bill 4276. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4276, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Moylan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Moylan."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Moylan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, again. House Bill 4276 amends the Department of Transportation Law of the Civil Administrative Code by requiring IDOT to set aside \$50 million to House Transportation Enhancement Program, previously for every two years, now it is required to be every 1 year and IDOT has dropped their opposition."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

McDermed: "Representative, this Bill came up in Transportation Committee last week, correct?"

Moylan: "Yes, Ma'am."

McDermed: "And at committee I was scratching my head because as one of the people that worked on the Bill, I was surprised and baffled by this request for what is basically an additional \$25 million a year for active transportation, because I was unaware that this was any part of the negotiations. So, would you like to clarify the history a little bit here?"

Moylan: "Yes. During negotiations it was proposed that there be \$50 million a year to active transportation and the program. When the Bill came out it stated it would be every 2 years. So this Bill here that I am proposing today clarifies that that. And with speaking with IDOT, it was agreed that this Bill shall proceed."

McDermed: "Well, isn't it true that the Bill stated... the Capital Bill did state \$50 million, but the program to which the \$50 million was allocated or attributed is a two year program. Isn't that true?"

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Moylan: "I think that there was some misinterpretation on that."

McDermed: "Okay. I think that's a fair statement. Who are the opponents to this Bill? I think everybody in this room needs to listen to who are the opponents of this Bill, because you might be interested in who the opponents are. Isn't it true that the road builders oppose?"

Moylan: "In speaking with IDOT, they dropped their opposition.

There are certain people that are opposed and there's certain people that are for it."

McDermed: "Isn't it true the road builders are opposed?"

Moylan: "There's certain people that are for it and there's certain people against it. I would hopefully..."

McDermed: "All right. I just got off the phone with the road builders, the road builders are opposed, Ladies and Gentleman. You might want to... you might be interested to know that all of the allied groups in Transportation for Illinois Coalition, the underground contractors, the road builders, et cetera, et cetera are opposed to this Bill. On the other hand, in support of the Bill are the active transportation folks. So you need to look at your district and think about money because this will be \$150 million out of road projects that will now be allocated to sidewalks, trails, and bike lanes. And vote accordingly whether you would prefer to see more tails, sidewalks, and bike lanes or whether you would prefer to see more miles of road in your district because that's what at stake here."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Skillicorn is recognized."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Skillicorn: "Hey, Marty. How you doing?"

Moylan: "Everything's great, my man."

Skillicorn: "That's good to hear."

Moylan: "Thank you for your support on this Bill. I really appreciate it."

Skillicorn: "Well, we haven't gotten that far, you gotta answer my questions here."

Moylan: "I'm always willing and waiting."

Skillicorn: "So, as I'm reading through the Bill here, and I am reading the same things, the opponents and proponents. Is it just me or is this going to be building things like bike paths and such?"

Moylan: "Correct. Correct."

Skillicorn: "Do bike paths pay motor fuel taxes... or bikers?"

Moylan: "I'm not sure."

Skillicorn: "Okay. Last time I checked the bicycle rider does not pay motor fuel taxes."

Moylan: "There's more to the Bill than just bicycle paths."

Skillicorn: "But it's other alternatives like that. And... well how is it funded? Is it funded through motor fuel taxes?"

Moylan: "It's funded for various different forms. It's funded from the Capital Bill."

Skillicorn: "And what's was the... what was the biggest tax hike that was part of the Capital Bill?"

Moylan: "I don't have that answer right now."

Skillicorn: "Wasn't it the Motor Fuel Tax being doubled?"

Moylan: "There was numerus taxes that were involved in funding the Capital Bill."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Skillicorn: "Okay. Well, to the Bill. This frankly is taking motor fuel taxes from all around the state and sending it to special pet projects, like bike paths and other lanes, to fund projects that are not funded. So basically motorists are paying for other things. Effectively this is wealth distribution people. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Guzzardi: "So, Representative, I just wanted to follow up with you on some of these questions, because I was... you and I worked together with many others on these discussions around the Capital Bill. So was it your understanding when we voted for the Capital Bill that this iTech funding would be allocated at \$50 million per year?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Guzzardi: "And it was my understanding too. And is it also your understanding that in the language that was in the Bill it was, I guess, perhaps unclear as to whether that money was meant to be a one-time appropriation or an annual appropriation."

Moylan: "Correct. Correct. In our conversation with the people that were discussing the Capital Bill, we were on an understanding that it was allocated every year. I have not heard any oppositions from the road builders myself, and speaking with other people that are discussing this Bill there's not any know opponents at the time."

Guzzardi: "And... so this is also my understanding of how this went down, and as you know these issues are very important to me

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

and my constituents, and I know to you and yours, and to many of us here in the Legislature and that we voted in part for this Capital Bill because we believe this appropriation was important. Now, have you heard from any of the groups that have been mentioned so far in floor debate today about their opposition?"

Moylan: "No."

Guzzardi: "Yeah. So I think that it's... well to the Bill. I think it's worth noting that there was opposition to underlying versions of this Bill, but there have been conversations that have been had since the Bill was heard in committee, and the many of the groups that have been mentioned on the floor today as opposed have in fact withdrawn their opposition. So I think that's worth bringing into the record. And I think it's also just worth saying many of us supported the Capital Bill, premised on the understanding that this funding was going to be there year over year. And that was how it was intended to be when the Bill was passed, but do to the interpretations of the statute that funding hasn't been guaranteed year over year. So all we're hoping do here is clarify that this funding stream should be renewed, should be reliable. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He will."

Batinick: "I have a feeling, I'm going to stump you on this one, and I wish I knew the answer, but... so essentially what we're talking about is that additional \$25 million a year... per year for the next 6 years to this fund, correct?"

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Moylan: "No."

Batinick: "All right. What are we talking about?"

Moylan: "The Bill was originally stated for \$50 million a year.

There was... it was incorrectly written, so now we're clarifying. It was..."

Batinick: "I mean additional, from the clarification point, the spread, the delta..."

Moylan: "Right. Correct."

Batinick: "...it's 25 million over 6 years, right?"

Moylan: "Correct."

Batinick: "So in terms what's going to be coming out of the Road Fund annually the next... on a percentage basis what is that? What's... I don't have at my fingertips, and I would hope you would for this..."

Movlan: "I don't have that."

Batinick: "...is this point one percent, point zero one percent?"

Moylan: "I don't have that answer for you."

Batinick: "We don't have any idea?"

Moylan: "I have an idea but I don't have that answer."

Batinick: "We've been getting conflicting information over here on our side of the aisle that some people are neutral who are opponents."

Moylan: "Okay."

Batinick: "And I'm having people saying that they're no longer opponents and I'm having people say that they are still opponents. Would you be so kind as to pause this for a little bit, maybe pull it out of the record so we can get clarification on whether some of these important people are neutral on this Bill or opposed to it?"

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

Moylan: "No, I'm not ready to do that today."

Batinick: "You're not ready... will you be ready to do it another day?"

Moylan: "I'm ready to do it right now."

Batinick: "Okay. All right. All right, well thank you for I guess not answering my questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Certainly I want to clarify a point that was made by one of the Sponsors of this legislation, it is important that this legislation passes today. Some communities, unfortunately, don't have the property tax base necessary to acquire other grants and funding for public service projects in their communities and this helps them get that done. So it helps those communities where I just came, from Southern Illinois through Cairo, Illinois, one of the communities that is really suffering economically, doesn't have the property tax base necessary to do some of the repairs and restoration that's needed in those communities. This is a good avenue and a good walk for the State of Illinois to support those communities, and I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 4276."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Quick question of the Sponsor." Speaker Burke: "He yields."

Butler: "Representative Moylan, was the Department of Transportation opposed to this legislation when it was in committee?"

Moylan: "Originally they were but they dropped their opposition."

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

- Butler: "And could you summarize for me why the Department of Transportation dropped their opposition?"
- Moylan: "Because when we stated the facts about the original negotiations they seemed to come around."
- Butler: "And what were those facts of the negotiation? I see
 Representative Hoffman is on the floor, I believe he is going
 to clarify the facts of the negotiation probably, but do know
 what the facts of the negotiation were?"
- Moylan: "Yes, that the allocated money would be for every year instead of every two years."
- Butler: "Okay. I... you know, along with Representative McDermed and Representative Spain, I was part of those negotiations as well, and this is something I think we've had some confusion on that this really wasn't a part of the negotiations that we were a part of, so I think that's some of the issues here today. To the Bill. I... look I'm a supporter of bike trails. I pay gas tax, I don't mind them going to bike trails. I just don't like the way this Bill is being brought forward like this. I think this should be... we have all spring to figure this stuff out as well, as far as larger negotiations over some of the other things we're doing. I would recommend that we do this in some other fashion and some other form then today and make sure that we don't have so much confusion surrounding this piece of legislation."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to... the previous speaker is correct on many points. I can just tell you at the end of Session when things were coming together with regard to the Capital Bill there were several Members on our side of the

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

aisle who were adamant that this would be a \$50 million a year appropriation for these types for projects. I... and I don't recall if your side of the isle was a part that, but I gave my word that that would be in the Bill. And I think it was misdrafted. And I think that happened. So it is being interpreted that it would be 25 million a year, over a 2-year period. It was intended at the end of Session, according to my word... I'm not saying it was part of your negotiations, but according to my word that it would be part of the Bill and it was misdrafted. So I'm a supporter of the Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He will."

Davis: "According to the analysis, Representative, it talks about funding these types of projects and where I guess what are called high need communities?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Davis: "So, can you speak a little bit to what that is and then also the analysis talks about a sliding scale which would determine what the communities match might be?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir. During negotiations the... IDOT wanted to insert certain language, and we agreed that would help lower income communities have the same qualifications and same construction projects that other communities have."

Davis: "Okay. So can you speak anything to the whole sliding scale issue as to what that may wind up looking like? Is it possible that a community could have zero match?"

Moylan: "Let me just read you what... this language was inserted by the Department of Transportation, provides that local

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

matching funding shall be required according to a sliding scale based on the community size, medium income, and percentage of population living below the poverty line. I think it's very important that we do... you know, share in this caring, we should help out all the communities to making it better, so we can promote bike riding safe streets and such on."

Davis: "I appreciate your ability to rhyme a little bit there, but more importantly, again, is it possible that a community can have a zero match?"

Moylan: "I'm not aware of that right now. I don't think so right now."

Davis: "You don't think so?"

Moylan: "Correct. Right, based on existing program it doesn't state that."

Davis: "Okay, you haven't... well you said the existing program.

Isn't this altering the existing program?"

Moylan: "The existing language that was provided."

Davis: "Of the existing language, so do you have any idea what the floor of a match could be?"

Moylan: "No, I don't have it right this second."

Davis: "Okay. Do you have any idea how that is addressed, put together, calculated? Is it in Rules? Can we add some language to that? I mean just help me to understand it a little bit."

Moylan: "Well, it's important... let me just state this, Representative. It's important that we get this program started because construction season is starting soon. Many communities need additional transportation so people can get to work. As you know, bike riding is very important for the

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

health of our youth today and young adults, so that's why we're proposing this program."

Davis: "Marty?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Davis: "I'm not opposed to the Bill..."

Moylan: "Okay."

Davis: "...I'm just trying to get some clarity. So please don't give me the, we need to do this because construction season is starting quickly, particularly when we know that most of this will be done by unions that are not representative of African Americans. Let's not go there. Just asking for some clarity, do you have the clarity or don't you?"

Moylan: "I have clarity on some things, some things I don't right now."

Davis: "Any clarity on what I asked?"

Moylan: "This clarity is in the Bill that was provided by the Department of Transportation. And we will..."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Moylan: "Okay."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He does."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, we heard a previous speaker say that this was a drafting error, do you agree with that?"

Moylan: "No, I say... I think there was some confusion in the interpretation on what happened on the Capital Bill."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. 'Cause I would say we've got 32 cosponsors on a Bill that was a drafting error of the Capital Bill, to change the trailer fee from 118 back to 18 dollars.

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

So I would ask if we're are taking up drafting errors of the Capitol Bill we consider bipartisan Bills like mine. Thanks so much."

Moylan: "Okay."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Moylan to close."

- Moylan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I respectively ask for an 'aye' vote for this important Bill. I would... hopefully we get this done today and the Governor will sign this so we can start riding our bikes all over town. Thank you, again."
- Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4276 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'in favor', 37 voting 'against', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 783, offered by Representative Wehrli. House Resolution 785, offered by Representative LaPointe. House Resolution 786, offered by Representative Burke."
- Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 117, offered by Representative Harris. be it

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, February 27, 2020, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 3, 2020, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 3, 2020, or until the call of the President."

- Speaker Burke: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, February 27, at the hour of 11:30 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 782, offered by Representative Ford; House Resolution 784, offered by Representative Barbara Hernandez; House Joint Resolution 116, offered by Representative Hurley; and Senate Joint Resolution 51, offered by Representative Windhorst are referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #46, offered by Representative Sosnowski. Be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general

86th Legislative Day

2/26/2020

election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Section 5 of Article XIII of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE XIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 5. PENSION AND RETIREMENT RIGHTS (REPEALED)

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This was First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #46. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."