133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The regular Special Session shall come to order. Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call of the First Special Session for this Session? Leave is granted. The Chair recognizes Representative Golar. Golar. Representative, could you use Representative Dugan's microphone?"

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Golar: "Today, Mr. Speaker, I stand to encourage my colleagues for their hard work during this overtime Session. The task of passing a budget has brought about some pain and tireless hours of negotiations. The recent news about the state budget for fiscal year 2008 and House Bill 3866 is disturbing. Let me take a few minutes of your time to express my thoughts in song. (sings) Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on September 04, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 572 and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 671."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I promise not to sing. I would like to draw the attention to the gallery above me. We just got finished downstairs with a bipartisan press conference drawing attention to the fact that the Governor

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

is once again found a way of not providing the money for the twenty-three (23) school districts that have been on the school construction grant list for five (5) years now. They're here today to put a name with a face of their particular school districts and how important this money is to get released. We asked the Governor two (2) weeks ago to reconsider his decision to not grant them the money because of a paperwork technicality, to no avail. So today I was glad to join Representative Dugan in introducing her Bill that will reappropriate these moneys to these school districts so that they can get paid as well as moving forward with the other schools that have applied to General Election this money. So, if the school districts will please stand, we appreciate your vigilance in coming to Springfield and trying to get your money for your school districts."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. I, too, like Representative Reis and all the Legislators in this bipartisan effort that we have made with House Bill 4130, to reappropriate the money for the hundred fifty million (150,000,000) for the twenty-three (23) schools. So I certainly the superintendents who have traveled to Springfield today to make sure that everyone understands the needs that these schools have and that we also always remember that this is an obligation and a responsibility of this state that was made to these twenty-three (23) schools five (5) years ago. It's time to move forward. Unfortunately, it did not work out as we had hoped in the supplemental, so House Bill 4130 does

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

reallocate the hundred fifty million (150,000,000) due to these schools for the last five (5) years. So again, on behalf of my district and certainly all the districts, again thank you to all the superintendents that came today. It is the responsibility of this state and every Legislator in this General Assembly to make sure that we live up to the promises and to the obligations that we made to these twenty-three (23) schools and all the schools in this state. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

"Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join Representative Reis and Eddy: want to join and thank Representative Dugan for introducing a Bill today that is designed to finally provide the means by which twenty-three (23) school districts plus the City of Chicago can receive funding for construction programs that they've been waiting for, for five (5) years. On various occasions this Body has come together and worked different ways to try and provide a means by which that money could be provided to those school districts. But each time something has come up. The latest example is the Governor's, I believe, misguided belief that there was paperwork still outstanding that these schools had not turned in. Of course, that despite the fact that the Capital Development Board, which is under the Governor's control, never contacted the school districts to let them know that there was paperwork necessary. But I think it's important this Body make a statement regarding the fact that

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

there is still a legislative process. And that legislative process allows the House to pass legislation and make appropriations and that we have the power, given to us by the Constitution, that when we make those appropriations that those appropriations can be upheld. It's important for the twenty-three (23) school districts, but it's also important as we face other issues related to appropriations that this Governor has decided are not part of his agenda. We need to stick together folks. This Body needs to come together and support these twenty-three (23) districts because we're supporting the legislative process when we support the appropriation for those schools that they were promised. I hope you'll all join Representative Dugan, Representative Bradley, myself, Representative Reis, and Beiser, and I can go on, Representative Brauer, and get on House Bill 4130. Everybody in this chamber should sign on to Representative Dugan's legislation as a cosponsor and we could get those schools, those schools that desperately need that money and deserve it so richly, the funds that they deserve. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Riley: "I'd like to echo, basically, everything that was said by my colleagues. You know when Representative Dugan was speaking, it really brought home the importance of this issue. These monies were promised and I think that promises should be kept. There's a personal point that I just want to tell everyone about. One of my earlier Resolutions

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

earlier in the year was to School District 162 in the south suburbs, and superintendent Blondean Davis and Pat Ransford, who's the principal, this school for the last three (3) years basically can typify itself as the best performing elementary school in the entire state. With, ya know, 98s on the ISAT test and to deny a school that had been promised really important monies, I think, just doesn't make a whole lot of sense. So, I would join with my colleagues in saying support this Bill. When a school goes through all of the hard work that all of them do, but certainly 162 does to educate the children of the south suburbs, I think that they should deserve nothing less. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osterman."

Osterman: "A point of personal privilege. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Today is the first day of school for public school students in the City of Chicago and around the State of Illinois and it's a time of renewal. Last year in Chicago was a particularly horrific year for loss of life of school children due to violence, and today I just simply rise to ask that we keep all the school children of our state in our thoughts and with our actions to try to preserve a safe environment for them for the upcoming school year."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since I cannot carry a tune as well as Representative Golar, I will not sing my caucus message here. Thank you. However, I would like to, at the appropriate time call for a Republican Caucus in Room 118."

Speaker Madigan: "Right now."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Brady: "Yes... appropriate time"

- Speaker Madigan: "All right. So, the Republicans should go to Room 118 for a caucus. Democrats can go to lunch. And as soon as the Republicans return to the floor, we will call the Bill that relates to the RTA."
- Speaker Hannig: "The House will be in order. Members, please be in their seats. On the Order of House Bills-Second Reading is... I'm sorry. On the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading is Senate Bill 572. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 572, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation, has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 2, 4, and 5 have all been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Hamos, what is your pleasure on Amendments 1, 2, 4, and 5? Did you wish us to withdraw 1, 2, and 4? Is that correct?"
- Hamos: "Yes. That's what I was just thinking, yes."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendments 1, 2, and 4.

  And Representative Hamos on Amendment #5."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Floor Amendment to Amendment #5. I mean, it... Amendment #5 is a Floor Amendment that makes just a few technical changes. Again, it was really... it's a 230-page Bill and it caught a few errors along the way. It also requires the RTA to provide a seven and half million dollar (\$7,500,000) program for job access in the south suburbs. It makes a correction on how many votes are needed to transfer to the State Board of Investment and it clarifies the disability language. It's a technical Amendment, but it does, in fact, become the

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

- Bill because it incorporates all the other... all the other substance that we had in Amendments 3 and 4."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5. And on that question, the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I don't need to interrupt the debate, I just simply... and I apologize for interrupting debate. We need to add Representative Michael McAuliffe to the excused list today."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, the record will so reflect. Thank you,
  Representative Bost. So, all in favor of the Amendment say
  'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the
  Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. So, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 572, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. As you know, this is the very substantial, comprehensive Bill relating to transit not only in the northeast Illinois region but also downstate. Let me first thank the various people who really are the authors of this. Most importantly, the House Mass Transit Committee, which has been a hardworking bipartisan committee, very actively engaged for three (3) Legislative Sessions, the RTA and the transit agencies, the transit unions, regional and civic leaders and it has been a three-(3-) year effort. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House Mass Transit Committee has studied and analyzed the issue of

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

transit and transit funding for the ... really the past three Legislative Sessions. We could have predicted that this day would come, that they were experiencing a very severe financial crisis and that we would have to attack and tackle The reason, primarily, is because we have not visited or revisited the issue of transit funding for twenty-four This time, this day, has been (24) years, since 1983. coming for the past three (3) Legislative Sessions. If you believe that we don't need another temporary Band-Aid that inevitably will bring back the transit agencies to Springfield year after year, Senate Bill 572 is a long-term, comprehensive solution for regional transit combining funding with reform. If you believe that we shouldn't ... we shouldn't impose a major, new responsibility for transit funding on our already strapped state budget, Senate Bill 572 raises most of the new revenues needed within the region, a modest increase in the regional sales tax and a Chicago-only real estate transfer tax, but... and this is a primarily regional solution for a regional problem. If you are against a CTA bailout, we agree. Senate Bill 572 is not a CTA bailout, but a new funding formula that will distribute new revenues in an equitable and balanced manner to all three (3) transit agencies: CTA, Metra and PACE, throughout all areas of the region. If you agree that we need to provide a stable funding base for paratransit services for disabled riders, Senate Bill 572 will do just It will set aside a one hundred million dollar (\$100,000,000) fund to provide funding for paratransit and by the way, Ladies and Gentlemen, disabled riders will be

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

hit doubly hard if we do not take action because paratransit services are completely dependent on fixed route services. If they disappear, so do paratransit services plus there is going to be, necessarily, a fare increase, a steep one, for disabled riders. If you represent areas in the region with fewer fixed route services especially in our suburbs, Senate twenty million will create а new (\$20,000,000) Suburban Mobility Community Fund to allow more flexible transit services by PACE. If you represent south suburbs and south suburban workers in Cook County, Senate Bill 572 will provide new funding for PACE bus service for south suburban workers in Cook County to reach destinations. If you represent areas that are served by Metra, Senate Bill 572 will provide new bonding authority up to a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) for the needed match from federal dollars to maintain, enhance and expand Metra services, especially for those important suburb... suburb-tosuburb transit expansions. If you represent the fastgrowing collar counties with increasing traffic congestion, Senate Bill 572 will provide an additional quarter percent sales tax for the five (5) collar counties. This is a hundred twenty million dollars (\$120,000,000) in capital funds to be used at their local discretion for road and other transportation projects. In fact, this is a capital program of over a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) for those five (5) collar counties. If you believe that the mayor and the City of Chicago should do more in paying for the CTA's past pension problems, Senate Bill 572 will authorize a real estate transfer tax in the City of Chicago but this must be

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

enacted by Mayor Daly and the city council and it... so it requires the city's partnership in providing funding for CTA's pension and retiree health care costs. If you believe that the RTA's role should be strengthened to create an integrated regional transit system, from basically three (3) independent transit agencies, Senate Bill 572 reforms the RTA Act essentially adopting most of the Auditor General's recommendations to give RTA a new role in regional planning, fiscal oversight, fare and service coordination to pro... to produce a more efficient, integrated, and accountable regional transit system. If you believe and I know many of you, especially on the other side of the aisle do that public employee pension reform must be linked to new revenues for pension and retiree health care costs, Senate 572 authorizes a CTA pension obligation bond to stabilize the pension and retiree health care funds. But it will also require landmark pension and retiree health care reforms, including higher employee contributions for pension and health care, longer years of service, higher retirement age for pensions, limits on health care benefits, governance reforms, elimination of the supplemental executive pension, and ongoing Auditor General financial oversight. This is, Ladies and Gentlemen, what many believe to be a model in public employee pension reform. It's incorporated in Senate Bill 572 and we thank the transit unions and the... and CTA for producing this really important result. If you believe that the RTA board of directors should reflect regional population shifts in the last two (2) decades, Senate Bill 572 changes the membership of the RTA board of directors to

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

add Cook County suburban and collar new county If you believe that the Metra board of representation. directors should reflect each area of the region that Metra serves, Senate Bill 572 changes the membership of the Metra board of directors to assure that each area of the region will have a greater voice in Metra expansion and improvement care about diversity in you contracting and bond deals, Senate Bill 572 will require RTA and all three (3) transit agencies to adopt programs to promote diversity in employment and contracting and issu... bond issuances will need to include procurement goals for minority- and female-owned businesses. If you believe that citizens should have a voice in planning and accountability, Senate Bill 572 increases citizen participation and requires that customer-related performance measures must be adopted, published, and tracked. If you wanted to see fare increases along with new revenues, Senate Bill 572 will require riders to pay their fair share with gradual fare increases over time to meet farebox recovery ratios, but the major, immediate fare increases will not be necessary with this If you represent downstate transit riders and paratransit riders, Senate Bill 572 will allow downstate transit agencies to reach their goal of receiving up to 65 percent of their operating assistance from the state as well as some capital funding through a new improvement fund. parent agency, IDOT, will need to promulgate rules for standard, consistent reimbursement again, greater accountability, greater oversight. If you wanted to make sure that we, as a General Assembly, did everything possible

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

to conduct due diligence before we recommended new revenues, we commissioned the first ever, independent audit of the regional transit system by the Illinois Auditor General and then adopted most of his recommendations for reforms in Senate Bill 572. And in that report, the Auditor General, Bill Holland, said 'transit agencies are facing a serious financial shortfall that must be addressed'. If you care about our process, the process we used to create this Bill as well as the substance, I'm proud to tell you that this was developed through an open, collaborative, bipartisan legislative process that developed unprecedented regional consensus. Ladies and Gentlemen, those are nineteen (19) reasons to support 572, but here is the twentieth. the investments provided in Senate Bill 572, hundreds of thousands of transit riders immediately will be impacted by massive service cuts and fare increases. Four hundred (400) fewer CTA buses will be on the street on September 17, Monday morning. Almost a thousand workers will be laid off. The CTA pension system will catapult toward bankruptcy. There will be economic development impacts throughout the region as businesses have difficulties getting their workers to jobs. A deteriorating transit system will impact all quality of life throughout the region with worsening traffic finally, last but not And least, congestion. international community monitoring our every move for the Olympics for that key decision on the Olympics, may wonder whether we, in Illinois, have the political will to tackle the tough issues of our day. There are twenty (20) reasons to support Senate Bill 572. Rarely do we have an

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

opportunity to vote and to consider an issue that will impact hundreds of thousands of people in just a few short weeks, both transit riders and the people who drive. Rarely is each vote so important. A vote 'yes' today will save the regional transit system and allow for the investments to make and maintain a vital region. A vote 'no' today will devastate the regional transit system and it will go into a downward spiral from which it will not be able to require for a long time to come. Today our constituents, the media and in fact, the world are watching and waiting for this one vote and I hope it will be a 'yes'. I'm available for questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 572. And on that question, Representative Patterson, Representative Patterson is recognized. Representative Patterson, you're recognized. Representative Patterson is recognized."

Patterson: "Mr. Speaker, could the Sponsor please let me know whether or not the funding for paratransit is what has been requested and is adequate or not? And I need to know what does it mean... what is this 'ICE Fund'? It's a new fund. How does that work? It's a coordination and enhancement fund."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Patterson, it's good to see you. And I can see that for you and many other people the paratransit system is really a very essential component of our excellent regional transit system. This Bill, with the funding in this Bill, we will set aside one

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) right off the top for paratransit services. In addition to that, ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) will go into a new fund, the innovation... the ICE Fund we call it... Innovation Coordination and Enhancement Fund and that's to test out new innovations to make it a better system to increase ridership and service, but beyond the ICE Fund, the paratransit system is getting the first cut of all new revenues. Thank you for asking."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Black: "And Mr. Speaker, I hope you'll be generous with the 5 minutes because the opening remarks took about a day and a half. Would the… would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, Representative Patterson brought up the Innovation Fund. It appears to me... correct me if I'm wrong... that that Innovation Fund could be subject to... ya know, the RTA board could give most of that Innovation Fund to the CTA just the way they currently give the discretionary fund to CTA and that's one of the bones of contention, is it not?"

Hamos: "Well, I've never actually heard anybody complain about the ICE Fund in this Bill. It's a very small amount that will be, in fact, the only amount that will be kept at the RTA through the new revenues that we are generating, but whatever is... whatever is provided as a grant under the ICE Fund must transition into full-time fund... I mean, regular

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

funding. So, I don't actually even see the CTA necessarily going for a lot of that money. They will be eligible as will be other players."

Black: "When I have been contacted by METRA and PACE through a... what I'm sure is a form letter, but they do have some concerns about how the Innovation Fund money could be spent in the... that there's no particular restriction that the RTA board could simply give a considerable percentage of that money to the CTA. But... but let me not... let me not dwell on that. Let me ask something that I find very interesting in the Bill. When it comes down to what the state fund will be, in 2006 state funds will be a 25 percent match of all the new funds plus the ADA grant. In 2008, fiscal '08, there'll be a 25 percent match of the old money, the old distribution formula, plus 30 percent of the new. But in fiscal '09, my concern is that the state's share going to the mass transit in the Chicago Metra area will be 30 percent match of all the dollars. That's not capped."

Hamos: "That's not what?"

Black: "I can see that growing geometrically in five (5) to eight (8) years."

Hamos: "Well, Representative Black, for the past twenty-four (24) years the state has had a match on the moneys generated locally. So, 75 percent of it's generated in the region, 25 percent is the state match and that will continue. That's basically a continuation of an old policy..."

Black: "No, I don't agree."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Hamos: "...but it makes sense because the state should, in fact, put something into the regional transit system. Downstate the state provides for most of the transit."

Black: "I don't agree that's it con... it's a continuation of the old formula. The new formula, effective in fiscal '09, is a 30 percent match of all the funds. Now, you're taking in hundreds of millions of new dollars from the sales tax which will grow exponentially. You have high populy... high population density, you're going to continue to shop, your population will continue to grow. That sales tax that is generated by afore, the Chicago Metro and Mass Transit Agency, will... will grow and then your... your real estate transfer tax, which takes the real estate transfer tax up to ten dollars and fifty cents (\$10.50) per thousand, the housing doldrum won't last. That will be considerably more, in my opinion, in five (5) years than a hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000). Let's just say in five (5) years your... your additional sales tax and your additional real estate tax could pump a billion, a billion new dollars (\$1,000,000,000) into Chicago area mass transit. The state will now have to match 30 percent of all of that revenue with no cap. That will be considerably more than we have ever sent to the Metro mass transit area. I... I think that's a weakness in the Bill. There should have been a cap."

Hamos: "Well, again, Representative Black, nobody raised that issue because really for the past twenty (24) years we have had a 25 percent match and that 25 percent match is continuing..."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Black, the 5 minutes have elapsed, but in fairness to your side of the aisle, we're going to allow you to continue with the..."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Hannig: "...debate. And so, Representative Hamos would you finish answering."

Hamos: "Yes. The five (5) percent..."

Black: "Yeah."

Hamos: "...extra that you're talking about is actually a replacement for what we've been putting in the past three (3) years for paratransit that translates to about 5 percent. That's why it was converted to a match, that's the paratransit match, but the rest of it is at 25 percent... it's been the formula for twenty-four (24) years and again, we raised 75 percent of it through the region."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill... if I could. I don't denigrate what the Lady has done and I certainly don't stand in opposition to mass transit, but to say this is not a substantial investment of state money... It's 30 percent of hundreds of millions of new dollars. That... that extra 5 percent isn't gonna be fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000), it's gonna be 5 percent of an ever increasing real estate transfer tax, 5 percent of an ever increasing amount of sales tax revenue that will accrue. You're talking the state's share growing by hundreds of millions of dollars over the next four (4) to five (5) fiscal years. It could be in excess of a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) by FY '10, considerably more money than it has ever been in the history. To say that it's 30 percent, which is a 5 percent

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

bump, that's not accurate nor is it... nor is it honest. That's 30 percent uncapped of hundreds of millions if, in fact, not more than a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) of additional revenue. There should have been a cap on that. And let me just say about the downstate transit. We get a hundred and twenty-five million dollars (\$125,000,000) appropriated to us through IDOT, then we have to literally beg IDOT for equipment and generally, the last three (3) or four (4) or five (5) years, it's been denied. They... they will distribute seventy million dollars (\$70,000,000) of the hundred and twenty-five (\$125,000,000) and then put the balance back in GRF. That's never been a fair method as far as I'm concerned. And in this Amendment, and I congratulate the Lady on at least recognizing that fact, it says, 'we will force the administration to fully fund the transit districts downstate as required by law'. How do you force this administration to do anything? To me that's rather an empty promise. We still have to abide by the hundred and twenty-five million (\$125,000,000). We still have to request that appropriation by IDOT and I don't see anything changing that would make this particular administration more receptive to distributing all of the downstate money that we're supposed to have. I do thank the Lady for... for certainly trying to do that. And again, it's certainly... Mass transit is not just important in the northeastern part of the state and it's certainly important to Chicago and the collar counties, but there are other examples of... than the two (2) I've given... where this Bill needs additional work. I don't think this is the last time we'll see this.

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

seen a variety of deadline dates on a disaster plan for CTA and RTA, we haven't reached that. We may and if we do, I'm sure we'll act on it. But this Bill, for all of the work that the Sponsor has done and I congratulate her on that, still needs some fine-tuning. And until that fine- tuning is done, I cannot support the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Bassi: "Thank you very much. This is an issue that has been a long time coming. There is not, as Speaker Hastert had said, there's not a political decision that doesn't have economic consequences. It's been twenty-four (24) years, Ladies and Gentlemen, since we've dealt with this issue, twenty-four (24) long years. Representative Hamos and I have spent eight (8) years on the Mass Transit Committee and we watched this crisis as it came to a head. There is not a mass transit system in the United States that does not depend on state and federal subsidies. Here we have a 50 percent farebox recovery ratio, and it's one of the nation's highest. We've been able to do that for quite some time. However, the Auditor General has told us we have a structural funding deficit with the RTA system. Seventy (70) percent of the Metra riders have alternative means of transportation. Those of you who travel in the metropolitan area, do you wanna see 70 percent more cars on the road? If you think we have a problem with clean air or lack thereof, look at how much worse it's going to be with 70 percent more cars on the road. Look at how much more time we're going to

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

be needing to get to and from wherever we wanna go. There's an issue with capital. Obviously, we need a capital budget, absolutely need a capital budget. But capital is what Metra's going to be using to run their system as opposed to repairing the twenty-two (22) bridges... twenty-two (22) Metra bridges that currently need replacement. They need capital for that, they've been waiting twenty (20) years for the capital to repair those bridges. They are getting to the point that they're going to be dangerous. In lieu of repairing those bridges, they're going to use that money for... for operations. They're looking at a 10 percent fare hike almost immediately. Lots of CTA riders cannot afford a car, but the local economy in the metropolitan area depends on those people getting to and from their jobs. those folks, the economy is going to suffer markedly. Governor is talking about wanting to start to... to use corporate tax breaks, to close corporate loopholes. thinks that's gonna provide enough money for mass transit, it's not. There is not sufficient money to be able to do that with what he's talking about. It might be a partial capital program, but it's sure is not going to address the standard... the structural funding deficit that the RTA is looking at right now. There's been talk about a Chicago casino that a Chicago casino is going to solve structural funding deficit that we've got with the RTA program. There's not gonna to be enough money from a Chicago casino, after everybody gets their hands on it, to be able to address the structural funding deficit that the RTA has right now. On top of which, it would be at least

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

two (2) years before that would be up and running. Do we need a capital budget? Yes, we do, absolutely, positively, unquestionably. We are looking at at least four hundred and twenty-four (424) deficient bridges in the metropolitan area alone that need to be looked at and that's not counting schools and roads that need to be addressed with capital funds. We don't have a capital budget, my friends. Ladies and Gentlemen, we may not have a capital budget. Leaders aren't sitting down in the same room. It's time for the mushrooms to say, it's time to turn from having politics to going to the art of compromise. It's time to look at what needs to be done and needs to be done soon. carries the paratransit people, 80 percent of those folks are unemployed. They're living on a fixed income. The STAR line in the Southeast Authority will not move forward without the bonding authority. Every laid off member of any of these systems that is laid off, once they come back on, once we finally pass this Bill, is going to need to be recertified, redrug tested and retrained at a substantial additional cost. CTA buses currently are running 17 hours a day, 17 hours a day and many of them are seventeen (17) years old. Will your cars run that long? Is it a perfect Bill? I haven't seen a perfect Bill in nine (9) years down here. But the need is urgent, the time is now. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise to support this critical Bill for Illinois. There will be many reasons that some give for being opposed to this Bill.

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

You'll say it isn't enough. You'll say some of the details are wanting. You'll say you can't afford to vote for something with a sales tax increase even though it may not impact your own constituents. You come up with all kinds of excuses and reasons, but the fact is that this is a necessary Bill for the State of Illinois. The Sponsor has worked with everyone to try to make a Bill that's balanced, that deals with people all over the State of Illinois. Sponsor has worked very hard. In the early stages, I'm not sure I was a supporter of this legislation, but changes have been made to make it balanced, to make sure that all regions of the state get benefits, to make sure that each of the transportation partners in the northern regions of state, Cook and the collars, get what they need to move forward. She's worked very hard to make that happen. answer here is balance. Many of you who will not vote for this legislation today will talk about the tax issue and many of you will later say that why didn't we do something for mass transit, our business community needs it. Some of you who will be opposed to this today are staunch supporters business, but the business community, Ladies Gentlemen, is behind this legislation. They're behind the legislation because they know we need a viable mass transit system for their businesses to be viable. They know we need a viable mass transit system to get people to and from work. For those of you who are concerned about some people in the state, i.e. the Governor and perhaps some others, who have not been friendly to business who don't have a pro-business growth agenda, this is a Bill, while it does have a tax

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

propo... part of it, it's a Bill that is for business. It's a Bill that is a pro-growth business Bill. The business community has gotten behind it for that reason. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, make no mistake about it, this is a large Bill, an important Bill and you can come up with any reasons you want to be opposed to a Bill like this just as you can come up with any reasons to be opposed to a budget that would be twelve or sixteen hundred (1200 or 1600) pages long. You can find an item or two (2) not to like. But we must have a transit Bill. In Cook, and Lake and DuPage and the suburbs and the collars, we must have this. For those who are not in this area who do not think you're affected by it, I think you understand if you think about it that the economics of Illinois depend on viable business all over the State of Illinois. This Bill is balanced. This Bill has the components that are needed to improve transit in Illinois, to give people a chance to get from point A to point B, to give that elderly widow in my district who can't get to the bank or to the doctor or to the grocery store any other way to make sure she has that bus to get where she needs to go. It gives people the opportunity from the suburbs to get into the city, gives people from the city to have their opportunity to go to the suburbs. These people are all traveling to shop and to spend their money and to To vote 'no' on this Bill for political reasons or because you've staked out a position, is not a balanced approach. Join the Sponsors, join the business community, join organized labor, join responsible elected officials around the State of Illinois who believe we must have a

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

transit Bill. This is the Bill. It's ready to go. Please vote 'aye' today."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. I'm going to yield my time to Representative Tryon."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Tryon: "To the Bill. I believe that the State of Illinois needs I believe that the a mass transit Bill. metropolitan area needs a trans... mass transit Bill, now more I believe we need a Bill that is fair and equitable and this Bill is neither for these reasons and I will speak to the Chicago metropolitan area. If we look at governance and we look at the governance changes that are being made, we are restructuring the RTA board and the Metra board. And both in 1983 and in 1985, the RT Act... the RTA Act had a reopener in there that we could readdress the governance structure of the board after the 2000 census. This doesn't contain any provision that would allow for that to happen in the future. The board restructuring as we see it today will, in fact, be the way the board will remain for the next twenty-four (24) years or the next thirty (30) years or until there's another financial crisis that has to be solved. If we look at the ... at the governance structure for Metra and we look at how Cook County is now gonna be represented, not by ridership, but by actual geographic boundaries. And we looked at three (3) Representatives from suburban Cook who are gonna

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

representing the area south of Devon Avenue and one north of Devon Avenue. That person north of Devon Avenue according be representing a million the census data will while of (1,000,000)people the remainder representatives on the suburban Cook Metra board will be representing three hundred to five hundred thousand (300,000 to 500,000) members. That would not be fair. If we look at the RTA and what's being restructured with the RTA in the collar counties, Lake County, DuPage County and Will County each get a seat at the table. Lake County and DuPage County and Will County get to jointly appoint another seat so each of those counties get one and a third members to represent them while Kane and McHenry have to share an appointment. And the appointing authority that is shared is gonna be the county that has the most population. So, in effect, McHenry County will never get any kind of representation. It'll be taxation without representation. That's wrong. wrong when the RTA is gonna be the super mass transit authority that's gonna have to approve all the capital projects and all the expansion needs. That's... that is not fair. Let's look at the tax burden and who pays and how this is gonna be shared throughout the region. If I look at fair and equitable taxation, it's really about what tax people pay per capita and a per capita sales tax today in McHenry County is roughly thirty dollars (\$30) per person. In Will, it's roughly thirty dollars (\$30) per person. Lake, it's forty dollars (\$40) per person. In Kane, it's thirty-two dollars (\$32) per person. In DuPage, it's fifty dollars (\$50) per person. In suburban Cook, it's a hundred

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

and sixty-one dollars (\$161) per person. And in the City of Chicago, it's eighty-one dollars (\$81) per person. Once we raise these taxes, McHenry County will, in fact, be paying ninety dollars (\$90) per person. Lake County will be paying a hundred and twenty dollars (\$120) per person. County will be paying a hundred and fifty dollars (\$150) per person. And a City of Chicago resident will be paying a hundred and one dollars (\$101.00) per person. How do I go back to McHenry Countians or how does any collar county Representative go back to their county and say the per capita tax burden in our county has to be the same as the City of Chicago, or even more in the case of Lake and DuPage, for a fraction of the services. Only 1 percent of the population in those counties generally access mass transit. In my county, a 100 percent pay the tax but only half the county even has any kind of services. This Bill does not provide for an expansion of services to these This Bill maintains services to this area. This areas. will not fix the Blue Line. This will not fix the Purple Line. This will not fix the Brown Line where they have to go six (6) miles an hour. Each of the service providers testified that this will only maintain the services and in Metra's billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) of capital, it will only fund the capital needs that are currently on the books. We need a capital Bill to make a good mass transit Bill. I need to be able to go back and so do the ... "

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your time has expired. Would you bring your remarks to a close."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Tryon: "I need to be able to go back to my county and tell my county I voted for a mass transit Bill that's gonna expand services, that's fair and equitable. And this one is not it. I think we need to go back to the drawing board and fix these problems. We need to send the message to our Leaders. Sit down and get a capital Bill that works. I can't vote on this and hold out for the promise of a capital Bill in three (3) or four (4) years. This just won't be right for my county and in my opinion, for any of the collar counties. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in support of House (sic-Senate) Bill 572. It pains me to know that my colleagues here today are against this Bill because they prefer to have a capital. Like one of my colleagues just mentioned, we cannot depend on a promise. This is not a promise, we're looking also for a capital Bill. We would... we'd have... we've gone without one for many years. wanna mention in case my colleagues did not see the RTA Newsletter, which has a list of supporters. I'm gonna... I'm gonna read this to you. 'Moving Beyond Congestion, Support by Numbers. The RTA's moving beyond congestion plan has secured broad support throughout the region from riders, businesses, leaders, organized labor, and elected officials, including Mayor Daley and numerous county board members and suburban mayors and managers throughout the Cook County... through Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will Counties, six hundred and eighty-five (685) number of partners per transit organizations, seventeen thousand

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

twenty-five (17,025) number of individual partners per transit, one thousand seven hundred and forty-nine (1,749) numbers... number of letters and faxes sent to support of the transportation to lawmakers, eighteen thousand six hundred and twenty-six (18,626) number of grassroot e-mails sent to lawmakers asking them to support this transit Bill.' You've heard from the colleagues... my colleagues here today, twenty-four (24) years we've gone without change, so it is time. It is time to support a transportation Bill that will work for the voters of the State of Illinois. So to stand here today and say that you are representing your constituents, well, let me tell you, you are not if you are voting 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, also, urge everyone here to support Senate Bill 572. I wanna thank the Sponsor for all of her hard work on this Bill over the last several years since the House Mass Transit Committee was formed and all the work that was done as a... in a bipartisan fashion. When we're driving on the roads today and tomorrow and after all of the cuts that are made by the CTA, PACE, and Metra, I don't think we're gonna care if the person in the car in front of us is a Democrat or a Republican. We are gonna care that he's in front of us when he could be on a train or a bus. But what's gonna happen is after these cuts are made in this... in the six (6) county regions eventually we will see dramatic cuts... I think the CTA estimated that on the first day of service... nonservice, there'll be a hundred thousand (100,000) passengers who will not be able to use

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

their service and will be on the roads. They will have to get to work somehow. Disabled people... right now when PACE, whose... who basically is in charge in the six (6) county regions for paratransit. Right now the law is if you live within three quarters of a mile of a fixed route, you'll be able to get paratransit service. However, once cuts are made to that fixed route, there will be thousands of disabled people who depend on PACE that will not be able to get the service to get to work, to get to wherever they're going and that may be their only mode of transportation. So, I urge everyone here, this is not a perfect Bill, we all agree that we need a capital Bill. But let me tell you when you voted this year for a budget and you voted for an education budget as much as we needed a construction program for our schools, we did not say, okay, we're not gonna vote for an education budget this year because we don't have a capital Bill for our school construction, even though, both are needed. We need the operating expenses. We need both. But if... unless we get the operating expenses, a capital Bill will be meaningless because we won't have any transit to operate. And a statistic I just heard, just a 3 percent increase in the number of cars on the roads in our area will lead to a 30 percent increase in congestion. We need this. We need this for people going to work. We need this for disabled... there's a whole host of reasons. And if you'll look at the Bill and analyze it, it also is good if it provides relief as the Auditor General report indicated several years ago... or last year. So, I urge everyone here... we all asked for CTA reforms, we're getting it. We're all

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

asking for a better transit system in our area, we are getting it. But we need operating expenses in order to run it properly and this will give us, you know, the money... if you remember as... said before, we haven't had to address this in the last twenty- (20-) odd years. We're hoping that this Bill will take care of the next twenty (20) years or more. If you remember beforehand, CTA used to come down here every year and ask for money, but we resolved that issue. And we need to resolve this issue right now, again. So, I again, urge your 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 572."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ryg."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of Senate Bill 572. Frustration has been the theme of the 95th General Assembly, not only our frustration but that of all our constituents over the political gridlock that has kept us from resolving the significant issues facing our state. This issue has been on our plate since the formation of the House Committee on Mass Transit in the 93rd General Assembly. We have been at the table on this issue. required an audit of the transit system in northeastern Illinois, which verified that at peak efficiency existing revenue remains inadequate to fund transit. We have listened to the public's outcry for increased accountability and reform in the transit system. There is no disagreement that there is a transit crisis. The RTA, the CTA, Metra, PACE, and downstate transit systems have all testified that Senate Bill 572 is a solution to the crisis in operating funds for transit. Members of the General Assembly have insisted that this legislation include reforms

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

accountability for years to come. The public has shared their stories about the negative and serious impacts on their quality of life should transit service be cut or priced out of reach for seniors and persons disabilities. These are real people whose lives literally depend on transit. And for those of us in the collar counties, we have heard over and over that more funding is needed for road and transportation improvements. agree we need capital projects. But our businesses are clamoring for this legislation to pass so that their employees do no lose the reverse commute and shuttle bug options, which keep cars off the congested roads. local empowerment fund will bring capital dollars to local elected officials, the only capital money with an identified revenue stream. I have received no opposition from my constituents to the increase in the sales tax, knowing how this money will be spent. Let me share the testimony of the Lake County Transportation Alliance, a public/private transportation advocacy group created to build consensus and speak with one (1) voice for one (1) transportation future. The Alliance resulted from summits of elected officials at all levels, fifty-two (52) municipalities, eighteen (18) townships, twenty-three (23) county board districts, eleven (11) state districts, and our federal Legislators. group met and prioritized road and transit needs based on a series of public hearings. Their priority list has been endorsed by elected officials, private businesses, trade organizations and unions, and the citizenry as a way to ease our gridlock in terms of both traffic congestion and

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

political inaction. Our economic future and quality of life are seriously at stake. And this process of consensus building is being replicated in other areas. This alliance testified their support for this legislation, because operating funds are provided to close the verified funding shortfalls of the service boards. It mitigates structural issues related to the CTA Pension Fund and provides for one of the collar counties top priorities, seamless paratransit. The proposed county transportation assistant funds recognize the link between efficient public transit and highways. And the RTA reforms restore confidence in the ability to deliver efficient, integrated public transportation reflective of the region's population and employment growth. This Bill offers a comprehensive regional solution. Most importantly, our actions today will speak volumes to our constituents. Are we willing to support a carefully developed long-term solution and continue to work on larger capital needs? Or do we continue to..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you bring your remarks to a close."

Ryg: "Thank you. Or the question remains if we are willing to participate in silent support of the political gridlock. I urge all of my colleagues to do the right thing and support this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osterman."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

"I wanna first commend Representative Hamos for her Osterman: efforts and those of the service boards. Those that've been on the Mass Transit Committee over the years have seen the change in the service boards working together. And it's a realization on their part that they need to... to get us to work together. But now, they look to us. And there's no one else to pass this on but the 118 Members that are here today, not the Senate, not the Governor. It's up to us. have a deadline in front of us of September 16 and we have days to act. A previous speaker mentioned that there have been fluctuating drop-dead dates. This is it. There won't be a time to deal with this again without cuts. If the CTA moves forward like the other service boards and goes through with layoffs and service reductions, we cannot flip a switch and turn that back on. That'll cost them millions of dollars to rehire people to go through drug testing and everything else. In testimony in the Mass Committee, it's expected that a hundred thousand (100,000) riders are going to leave the system on the day that we... the system begins to go through with the cuts. That's a hundred thousand (100,000) people that are not gonna be in mass transit. That's a hundred thousand (100,000) people that're gonna be cars. That's a hundred thousand (100,000) people that many constituents are gonna be behind on the highways trying to get into the city or out of the city. And many of those people won't come back when we fix the system. Many people, though, have options. Some people can afford to hop in the car, take their family where they want to go. wanna talk for a minute about those who this really affects

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

if there's service cuts and fare increases go into effect and that's poor people. Poor people on fixed incomes that don't have an option to pay more, that don't have an option to walk in and buy a brand new car, that don't have an option of walking and trying to negotiate flex time with their employer, that have to worry about getting their children to childcare and to schools, that are working two It's poor people that're gonna be hurt the most if these cuts go into effect. Those people don't have highpriced lobbyists that are here today watching this, trying to defeat this legislation. Those people are simply looking to us to lead and help them in their lives. These service cuts affect them. In Chicago alone thirty-nine (39) bus routes gone September 16, which in each bus route there's a family that's gonna have to figure out how to get to work, how to get to school. Three hundred and fourteen (314) busses off the streets, each bus with people that they're gonna have to figure out how to live their lives without this service. This is a step backward. As far as economic development goes, communities rely on public transportation. The Edgewater community public transportation is why people choose to live in our community. If the CTA and the mass transit system begin to collapse, so too will the economic development, so too will the housing stock. There've been some that've been concerned about the real estate transfer tax as a way to pay... help pay for this mass transit. If the CTA becomes unreliable, condominium conversions, rentals all will stay vacant. It will affect our community like others throughout northern Illinois. To my colleagues on the other

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

side of aisle, I have heard repeatedly that you want capital and I will share with you what's been stated earlier. want capital, the bigger, the better. We need to work The capital that I want together, though. for community's to improve mass transportation. I wanna build a Metra station. I wanna fix the crumbling CTA structures. Those are ways to use capital. We want capital, but if we fail to act in the next few days on this issue, there's gonna be dramatic cuts to service and fare increases that we cannot turn back. People will leave the system, it'll be a weaker system, and those people's lives will be affected. If this summer has taught us anything, it's that each one of us on this floor has a responsibility to act for their constituents and the greater good of Illinois residents. cannot rely on the Senate to act. We cannot rely on the Governor to act. We cannot rely on our Leaderships to come together. We have to come together as individuals to solve this problem. Today's the day we must do that. I..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you bring your remarks to a close."

Osterman: "I wanna work collectively with everyone in this Body on a capital Bill, but today we must work together to solve this problem on mass transit that affects millions in our state. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Harris: "To the Bill. I won't go over a lot of the remarks that many of my colleagues and the points that they've made so

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

well about the death spiral that ensues with public transportation and ridership and fare collections decline as service declines, which will take years, if not decades, to return once we do get the CTA, Metra, and PACE back into operating order. I won't talk a lot about the wonderful concessions in health care and pensions that the Amalgamated Transit Union made to do their fair share in bailing out our And I understand the concerns about the transit system. governance raised by collar county Members. But I want to echo what Representative Osterman said. In my communities, Lincoln Uptown, Ravenswood, Square, North Bowmanville, a recent study showed that 41 percent of our households do not own automobiles. For many of these people it is a choice that has allowed them to buy homes in our community. It has allowed them to use their families in our community. If the CTA service raise the service for people with disabilities is cut, it will be devastating neighborhoods such as I represent. There's been a lot of concern about the effect of the real estate transfer tax on home values. And I have to tell you that the premiums that people pay to live in neighborhoods such as mine and other transit-rich communities across the City of Chicago, that premium will disappear on those homes if the CTA service is You can talk about the effect that a minimal increase in the real estate transfer will have on home values, but you will see those home values plummet if there's not fast, efficient, clean, and reliable public transportation in the area. Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge you to join me and my

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

other colleagues in voting in favor of Senate Bill 572. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "I'm just so stunned that you called on me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

"Representative Hamos, I probably have just one area Mulligan: that I wanna ask about. I have gone back and forth on this Bill and one of the reasons I originally liked it, it was because I wanted us to solve something this year. What bothers me from the appropriations part of it is the 30 percent match over the years, when I think the amount will go up and there's no cap on that 30 percent where I'd prefer to see 30 percent to a certain amount and then it has to be discussed again. But then I also understand that... and maybe you can explain this to me... is it automatically appropriated or does the General Assembly have to appropriate it? Or does the Governor have to release it just like a pension amount that we have to match, that amount of money is a little bit of a sticking point as time goes on and the sales tax... and the real estate transfer tax goes up? So, could you explain to me what happens to the obligation of the General Assembly as that amount goes up?"

Hamos: "Well, I think it is correct that the amount is automatically put into the budget at a certain level that is set out in the RTA Act of 1983. And since it's part of the State Law to provide it at that level, it does rise as sales tax rises. Let me point out that the sales tax, of course,

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

over twenty-four (24) years has been going up, but relatively... in a relatively small way. That's why these transit agencies have run into trouble. It is correct that under this there will be new sales taxes and a new real estate transfer tax and the same kind of thing will happen. It will be appropriated, but it is only 25 or 30 percent, if you include paratransit, of the total. It is not unreasonable to ask the State of Illinois to provide something toward the Regional Transit System. The Regional Transit System is going to generate 75 percent... 70 percent of it. So, it's a public policy issue. It will go up. It doesn't go up as much as one of the previous speakers said."

Mulligan: "So, what fund does it come out of?"

Hamos: "I'm sorry."

Mulligan: "What line item would it come out of? And where would... where would... what part of the budget would it automatically be taken from?"

Hamos: "It's a public transportation... Public Transportation Fund."

Mulligan: "So, it would be a..."

Hamos: "And there's also a Downstate Operating Assistance Fund, which appropriates about a hundred million (100,000,000) or more. But it's in that section of the budget."

Mulligan: "So, does that come out of GRF dollars?"

Hamos: "It's that transfer out of the sales tax that's collected and it goes through that fund."

Mulligan: "All right. So, is it conceivable that if we don't have enough money to cover that we have to raise taxes in other ways in order to pay something that's an obligation

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

that we're obligated to pay no matter what, just like a State Pension Fund?"

Hamos: "Well, we... you know, this is a State Law. So, if we ran into a problem, I would guess that we could reopen this Act and for that year or a number of years we could decide that the match would be different. For example, in FY '08, we provide that there will be no state match. In FY '09, we provide that it will be half... twelve and a half percent. So, theoretically, ten (10) years from now we could have a bad year. We could come back into the law and change what the match will be for that year or some period of time."

Mulligan: "So, then wouldn't we be reneging on the promise that we made by passing this if we didn't put that money..."

Hamos: "I'm sorry."

Mulligan: "Would we then be reneging on another promise statewide if we didn't put that money in?"

Hamos: "Well, I think that we would at that point, you know, if we… if there was a downturn, let's say an economic downturn, I think the transit agencies would feel it, as well, because the 75 percent that is collected from the sales tax is, of course, very sensitive also to economic problems. So, we would, I would think, call in the transit agencies at that point and negotiate a different kind of approach. But it also has to be appropriated. So, it's the operation of law, yes, it also has to be appropriated. So, the General Assembly could revisit it on a year-by-year basis. In good times, hopefully, that wouldn't happen."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Mulligan: "Well, at the rate we're going the General Assembly will start meeting as long as Congress does. So, I have no idea..."

Speaker Turner: "You wanna bring your remarks to a close."

Mulligan: "Just one other thing. Is it still in the Bill, because it was last time I talked to you, that the real estate transfer tax has to be voted in by Chicago?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, for what reason do you rise? Representative Turner in the Chair."

Miller: "All right. To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Miller: "First, I'd like to commend the Sponsor... I'll be very brief... commend the Sponsor on a very difficult piece of legislation that has taken years. I was on the Mass Transit Committee and have still stayed on it all these years. What the Sponsor has attempted to do is not to create a scenario of winners and losers. And I've learned through the education funding debate that that's the way a lot of these kind of legi... types of legislation... or types of trying to solve problems evolve and get an end to. What she's done is expand the pie. Whether you say this is a perfect Bill or not, it's still the pie is expanded. The fact that the collar counties do get something in this, the City of Chicago clearly does get something in this, and south suburban region and downstate get something in this, too, as well as Cook County. So, that's a very crafty and very hard

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

message to relay in this general... in this Body here and wanted to make sure that that is acknowledged. What our... my initial trepidation with this legislation was because of growth and because of changes that we had a two- (2-) tier transit system here in the State of Illinois... the fact of the matter in northeast Illinois. The fact of matter that other communities had much more options in transit and the southland didn't. Working with the Sponsor we've helped address those problems. The map that had been alluded to as being sort of unfair was from another piece of legislation the way CMAP is, which the Sponsor has articulated. just wasn't something that came up, but it provides a fair representation than what was. The mere fact of the matter that we've had projects that are articulated in this Body are needed. We here in the southland have some of the longest transit times. We in the southland have a need for transportation of those to and from work. We have some of the poorest communities in Illinois in the southland. Those people need transit. And us as southland Legislators respond to it with the help of the Sponsor. And lastly, I wanna point out is the fact that if we don't do something these people do get hurt, people not just in Cook County, southern Cook, where I represent, but in Kane and McHenry County, too, and DuPage. During the Mass Transit Committee we heard from testimony of those on paratransit, as a concern of Representative Patterson talked about their needs in their community. They get hurt. City of Chicago gets hurt by all the discussion that you've heard earlier. southland gets hurt by those you heard early. And I would

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

argue that those businesses that have an opportunity to participate at all levels in this that have been opened up through the minority procurement and disenfranchised have been out of the loop is now offer... has been offered an opportunity in this. These are the reasons why I support this Bill. It is needed in the State of Illinois. It's needed for my community. It's needed for us. Please support Senate Bill 572."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington, for what reason do you rise?"

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I just wanted to say for the record that 572, I know a lot of people that worked very hard on it and I wanna thank the Sponsor and all of those that really did what they had to do in bringing the parties together. But I wanna say the reason that this Bill was slow in coming in terms of me endorsing it is because in my area, in Waukegan, North Chicago in particular, it's impossible for the citizens there to do without Metra and PACE. And particular, because PACE is the artery that gives the people a chance to go to other parts of the county in terms of employment or doctor visits and what have you. And I'm very appreciative to be a part of this legislation now and only now because I know without a green light from Metra and from PACE to make sure that they have the things that are necessary in their future grow to take care of that responsibility then there's no way that I couldn't be for this Bill. So, I'm anxiously awaiting to vote the 'green' button for this Bill. Thank you."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask that if this Bill gets the required number of votes that we would have a verification, please."
- Speaker Turner: "The request that will be honored. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, to support this very fine Bill. Some have suggested that Senate Bill 572 is less than perfect, that may be right but I'd have to tell you, it's as close to a perfect piece of legislation on a complicated, tough, and difficult issue as I have seen in my many years Representative Hamos and the Members of her Mass Transit Committee have done a terrific job taking the time, bringing the energy and the intellect together to craft compromise and consensus among the most diverse, various groups in the State of Illinois. To get the three (3) service boards to come together, along with organized labor, and the downstate mass transit districts, to get consumers, members of the disabled and the abled community all to speak with one (1) voice is very rare in the halls of government. I would say this is a text book example of democracy doing its very, very best. And the fact that this consensus is as strong as it is is reflected in the fact that there's not a civic organization, not a business group, no credible opinion maker in the state who has had anything but good things to say about Senate Bill 572. We've heard there's not enough capital in this Bill. It may be we could use a

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

lot more capital, but have a look at what is in Senate Bill 572. The service boards will have freed up a hundred thirty million dollars (\$130,000,000) in capital they now have to That's a hundred thirty million on operations. (130,000,000) in capital they do not have today. Metra will have a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) worth of bonding authority to expand services and the collar counties, collectively, the collar counties will get a 1.2 billion dollar (\$1,200,000,000) infusion of bond moneys in order to make road and transit improvements. Enough? But it certainly is a lot better than what we have today. I'd say this is a good first step to capital for schools, capital for other programs in the State of Illinois, but to turn your back on this because it isn't everything you want is to miss the point and miss the boat. Others have pointed out that low-income workers, the disabled, many have no other choice but mass transit to get them where they need to go. Let me add to that, the people who are driving on our roads, the people who are going to find themselves subject to more and more hours in travel time on the crowded expressways, on our crowded streets, our crowded highways. The business community estimates that without passage of Senate Bill 572 the regional economy stands to lose two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) a year, two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000). You want capital? Let's not kill the goose that can lay the eggs that will give us the resources for capital. That's in fact what's this Bill is about. on behalf of the riders, the consumers, the people who have

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

no alternative, and on behalf of the motoring public, the only responsible vote on Senate Bill 572 is a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Davis, M.: "Representative Hamos, I have one question. If you can't answer it, I can. Do you know how much a person pays to ride a bus from 95th and Ashland say to 95th and State, you know where the Red Line is? That's okay. That's okay. They pay two dollars (\$2) to ride the bus in Chicago. first bus is two dollars (\$2) and then they usually have to ride an 'L' train, the Red Line, the Orange Line, the Green Line. That's another two dollars (\$2). That's four dollars (\$4) to get to work, four dollars (\$4) to get to school, to get to the hospital, and that's one way. Coming back home it's another two dollars (\$2) on the Red Line, the Orange Line, the Green Line, and another two dollars (\$2) on that bus that gets you to your local street. The only way not to pay the four dollars (\$4) each way is to purchase a card called the Chicago Card. The Chicago Card costs five dollars (\$5) and you use that card, I think, three (3) times and you save three dollars (\$3). In Chicago we have thousands of riders on the CTA on a daily basis. There are thousands of people using the Metra every day. The Illinois subsidy to public transportation has not kept up with inflation. Now, let's think about this. In the State of California 78 percent of their need is subsidized. They get a 78 percent subsidy. In Illinois, the subsidy that we

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

provide public transportation is about 47 or 48 percent. Do we want a real estate transfer tax? No. But do we want people to get to work? Now, I'm just gonna say this. Some people are not concerned with the riders, but they should be concerned with where the riders are going. Riders are going to work for employees who need employees at work. Riders are going to work for employers. Those people in Chicago and other suburban areas that need employees need those people to get there. Without public transportation most of them would never get there. We should not clog up the expressways anymore. The public transportation system help to keep all of that traffic off the road. Now, here's a real big question for all of you. Do you know that when a Chicago... when a public school kid... when 1 percent of the Chicago school kids or any kids are absent from school, that district loses eighteen million dollars (\$18,000,000). When 1 percent of a school district's children are absent they lose eighteen million dollars (\$18,000,000). If these systems shut down... if they have to shut down, your school systems will also be greatly affected. We should put our... what should we say... we should put our biased... our biased concerns behind us. And we should think of Mr. Jones, Mr. Smith, Mr. Burke waiting for a bus. Mr. and Mrs. McGuire waiting for a bus to get to work, to get to school, to get to the hospital. And they don't make enough money to drive downtown every day and pay thirty dollars (\$30) for parking. We need to pass this legislation. We need to support the citizens in the State of Illinois and do what California does, give a decent subsidy to your public transportation

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

system. Julie Hamos, I commend you on the hard work you've put in on this issue. Those tears you shed should not have to be shed any more. This Bill should pass unanimously. Unless we're cold..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Davis, M.: "...they're... If we don't pass this, we'll be looked upon as cold-hearted, callous, Illinois Legislators. Pass this subsidy so these people can get a ride. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you rise?"

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to Feigenholtz: commend the Chairperson of this committee who has worked so diligently and really put her heart and soul into something she should be very proud of. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's very rare that we have an opportunity in this House to vote on something that is actually comprehensive, that is going to solve a problem for years to come, so the people don't have to come back and beg us for solutions year after year after year. We have in this Bill governance reform, pension reform, and obviously, funding reform for a long, long time that will give people who are trying to make serious life decisions on whether or not they should buy another car for the family or sell a car. Whether they should move into the city like many of my constituents and Senator Cullerton here, his constituents, who will say I moved into your district because you had a fabulous public transportation I freed myself of automobile ownership because of the Red Line or the Brown Line or the 156 or the 146 that takes me from Lake Shore Drive downtown to work every day

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

and I love it. I feel like I'm actually contributing to cleaning up the environment to... I'm part of the solution rather than part of the problem. And Ladies and Gentlemen, passing this Bill will help continue that, but if this Bill fails, I'm afraid that it is going to start a spiral downward and a trend to a place that we don't want to go. The other day in the House Mass Transit Committee, Ron Huberman presented some very, very stunning information from MIT about what is going to happen the day after the meltdown and how many riders we, in the City of Chicago, are going to end up losing and losing forever, not just for a short period of time. And the impact that that is going to have not only on the environment but also on traffic congestion, which we already suffer from so seriously. So, I just want to reiterate how important it is that we really think about the opportunity we have here for comprehensive reform. we don't solve this problem right now, next year the numbers get bigger and bigger and bigger. So, I ask you to think hard about having an opportunity to vote 'yes' on this watershed Bill. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley, for what reason do you rise?"

Riley: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Riley: "I'm so anxious. Will the Sponsor please yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will."

Riley: "All right. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think in general, but certainly out in the south suburbs that I represent, mass transit and mass transit infrastructure are

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

so important that they're really the sine qua non of development out in the south suburbs. One thing that I've noticed about this Bill, probably unlike, other than the budget other Bills that I've seen since I've been down here is so many people touched it. So many people touched this When the previous speakers, and I guess one thing about being last in testimony is, a lot of things that were said, ya know, I would definitely echo. But the Majority Leader said that so many people came together on this Bill and that was true. And that was true because it was important to them, it was true because they saw things early on that maybe needed to be changed, and to the Sponsor's credit, she listened, she listened, she let everybody touch the Bill and make the Bill better. And I do think that it's... it's in a finished format. It's ready to go. It's ready to go for the people. It's ready to go to ensure that the people of the State of Illinois, essentially, have a transit Bill that makes sense. Everybody won. I really don't know why oftentimes these large Bills have to be perceived as being zero-sum games. They don't have to be. This is not. Everybody wins. As a Member of the Mass Transit Committee, I know I'm proud to have put a lot of time in this Bill and again, I'd like to compliment the Sponsor of the Bill for the tremendous work that she has done, and the fact that she let everyone speak to her and touch this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

following measures were referred, action taken on September 04, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 572."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hamos, the Clerk has informed us that there is an Amendment #6, which is a technical Amendment that should be on this legislation. Would you like to move the Bill back to Second for purposes of putting Amendment #6 on?"

Hamos: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, move the Bill back to Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 572, Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Hamos, has been approved for consideration."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a technical Amendment that we inadvertently left out of the previous Amendment. This refers to fifteen (15) downstate properties that will now be eligible for operating assistance. These are typically smaller properties that have been working hard to become eligible. We wanted to itemize them again to make sure that the administration was responsive and that's what this Amendment does."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the Adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 572. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Hamos to close."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

"Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this has been an Hamos: excellent debate and I especially thank the last speaker, who referred to something that I think has been a hallmark of our House Mass Transit Committee, an open, collaborative, bipartisan process, something I'm very proud of. believe that this is a Bill that we can be proud to support. I do take offense, really, at only one comment that was made, that this is not a balanced or equitable Bill. I do, again, agree... I do believe that that is what this Bill best represents, and I'd like to quote from a statement we received from DuPage County Board Chairman, Schillerstrom, who said last week that, 'this is a solution is well thought out, anticipates regional needs, considers all the service boards, and is far more equitable than proposals of the past. I believe this legislation', he says, 'has carefully balanced the benefits and taxes fairly across the region.' And again, this is an important component. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have taken an issue that we knew about for the past two and a half years and have taken it right to the cliff. In two (2) weeks there will be really, very significant service cutsback (siccutbacks), fare increases, and layoffs. It will impact not only transit riders, but the quality of life for everyone throughout the region. One of the previous speakers talked about thousands of people impacted every day. Actually, the Regional Transit System provides two million (2,000,000) rides on an average weekday. That's what will be impacted. That's what this vote will mean. We have brought it right to the cliff. Please, let's not jump into this abyss.

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

There are really, very significant consequences to this one vote. Please let your vote be a 'yes'. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "There is... I'd like to remind the Membership that there has been a request for verification. So, we'd like for each Member to vote his and her switch and their switch only. The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 572?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. The Lady's request Postponed Consideration on the Bill. Postponed Consideration is granted. This Bill having received 61... no... Under Second Readings, we have Senate Bill 671, Representative Coulson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 671 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Amendment #1 was adopted by the Body. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Smith, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Smith."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a technical Amendment that would make some changes to the P-20 Council that was created earlier this year by this Body, and I believe has been... now has been signed into law. This would clarify who would actually make the appointment for the special education administrators and specifies that it's their state organization and adult education as well. I know of no opposition. Again, it's really a technical cleanup to legislation from earlier this spring."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the questions is, 'Shall the House adopt... I'm sorry. Representative Black? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. On the memo I received from the Speaker's Office calling me into Session today, you know, after a wonderful summer vacation it's always nice to be back after Labor Day, he only mentioned one Bill. And here we are discussing a second Bill. I don't want to sue him."

Speaker Turner: "Let me first of all tell you that you will get the per diem for today and we are in regular..."

Black: "You're not buying me off, Mr. Speaker. I resent the implication.

Speaker Turner: "But I was..."

Black: "The Speaker said that we were only gonna deal with one Bill. Now, do we have to have another lawsuit here?"

Speaker Turner: "We are in regular Session."

Black: "Oh, we're in regular Session?"

Speaker Turner: "Right."

Black: "I see. Well, a further inquiry. I want to start a committee. Do I need a charter to start the Legal Defense Fund for Speaker Madigan?"

Speaker Turner: "Depends upon how do you want to collect your money. Whether you're looking for a foundations or lawyers."

Black: "I intend to make sure that the Speaker has the finest legal advice that this chamber can afford. So, I'll be around to talk to you. I can't talk to you about that on

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

the state property, but I'll certainly be around to your district offices and I want you to give, give freely, dig deeply. The Speaker Madigan Legal Defense Fund, we need to get serious about it. He needs the best legal defense that we can possibly buy."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you for your comments, Representative. Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 671?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 671, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you've just heard, this Bill is a replacement. Essentially corrects the national board certification requirements that have been changed over time and then make some changes to the P-20 Council, and in the interest of time, I can answer any questions and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a majority of the Amendment that Representative Smith put on this Bill does make some changes of P-20 Council which were requested, and because procedurally we could not make the changes to the P-20

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Council Bill and get it through the House and Senate in time, we have attached it to this particular Senate Bill, 671. Basically, it adds a regional office of education superintendent to the Council, an adult educator, and clarifies that six (6) at-larger members be appointed by the Governor, two (2) from the City of Chicago, two (2) from the suburbs, and two (2) from downstate. It also calls for the... Gov that the meetings be called at the discretion of the Governor. However, they will meet on a quarterly basis on the last Tuesday in February, May, August, and October. This makes sure that the Council will meet at least four (4) times a year. All these have been requested after the P-20 Council Bill was passed and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis, M.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, she will."

Davis, M.: "Representative, is this a Bill that offers some kind of merit pay?"

Coulson: "What this Bill does is changes the National board certification back to the way the teachers wanted it. So, that the National board certification teachers will receive the full amount of their stipends and mentoring dollars that they're owed. They will be treated... the stipend and mentoring dollars will be treated as equally important and it will maintain a positive and understanding working relationship within the national board certification board and the ISBE. And it's basically to correct some major

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

problems that they've had over the last couple of years in making sure national board certified teachers receive their stipends."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Was this vetoed out of the budget?"

Coulson: "I don't believe so. I might have to look into that."

Davis, M.: "Okay. So those teachers who are nationally certified, who become mentors and mentor a teacher for sixty (60) hours or more...

Coulson: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "...will be paid a stipend. Is that correct?"

Coulson: "Yes. Thirty (30) hours or up to sixty (60) hours."

Davis, M.: "And that's as far as it goes?"

Coulson: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "This in no way passes a Bill that says we're gonna pay teachers merit pay for the achievement of their students?"

Coulson: "No. No. I'm sorry. I didn't understand your original question. No, this Bill does not do that."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Thank you, Representative Coulson. And I do support your legislation."

Coulson: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Coulson to close."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. This is an agreed Bill with the teachers and the national board."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 671?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', no 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask an inquiry of the Chair, a point of Order. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 9(d) of the Illinois Constitution, the Governor vetoed or reduced several appropriation items in House Bill 3866. That Veto occurred on August 22, 2007. Governor then returned House Bill 3866 objections to the Secretary of State as he is required to do under Article IV Section 9(b) of the Illinois Constitution. On August 24, 2007 the Secretary of State complied with this constitutional mandate by returning House Bill 3866, along with the Governor's objection, to the Speaker of the House. Receipt of House Bill 3386, or excuse me, 3866, and the Governor's objection, was acknowledged in receipt by a member of the Speaker's staff on a signed form prepared by the Secretary of State. Once the Bill has been returned by the Governor, Article IV Section 9(c) requires this House to immediately enter the Governor's objection upon its Journal. My inquiry of the Chair then, is whether it is in the intention to enter the Governor's objection to this House Bill, which is House Bill 3866, into the Journal and if not, by what authority does the Chair intend to ignore a constitutional clear mandate?"

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman, you've asked a lot of questions here and recited a lot of articles and sections and as a result, the Chair will have to take all of that under advisement and get back to you."
- Hoffman: "Today, Mr. Chairman? Before we adjourn? 'Cause I would like... under what authority the Chair intends to ignore the clear constitutional mandates?"
- Speaker Turner: "We're not ignoring the mandates, we're taking it under advisement and we'll get back to you as soon as we review all those things you just recited to us."

Hoffman: "And will you be getting back to me immediately?"

Speaker Turner: "I will be getting back to you."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "In a timely manner. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"
- Rose: "A point of personal privilege. Ladies and Gentlemen, since the last time we met the War in Iraq took a soldier from our state, in this case from my hometown of Mahomet. Army Specialist Justin Penrod passed away August 11. Specialist Penrod and his family, I believe, are actually constituents of Representative Cultra's, extended family lives in Representative Black's district. It is a great loss for this state, and I would just ask for a moment of silence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, on the Calendar we have House Joint Resolution 71. Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution supports local school councils as effective means of ensuring local school

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

control with Chicago public school district. The Resolution calls for subject matter hearings to be held to discuss needs of local school councils so that their continued success might be ensured."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 71. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, we have House Resolution 620. Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 620 was regarding urging the U.S.EPA and Congress to take some action against the increase in the discharge pollutants from the British Petroleum Refining in Wighting, Indiana. And we were all concerned about that a couple of months ago and I'm happy to say that as a result of the U.S. Legislators doing work and those of us that did this Resolution in committee, that BP Amoco has now, even though they were within the federal guidelines of the EPA, they have taken action not to go forward with this discharge in the lake. Oh, I'm sorry. There was a second Amendment in it."

Speaker Turner: "Take it out of the record."

Bellock: "Yeah. It was ready. It already came out of Rules."

Speaker Turner: "Clerk, what's the status of this Resolution?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bellock, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "You want to consider the Amendment?"

Bellock: "That's it."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock on Amendment #2."

Bellock: "Right."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "You want to finish the Resolution with... as amended?"

Bellock: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Anyways, as I was saying, that since we have done this Resolution I am proud to say that BP Amoco has gone along with what we had asked to do and what the federal Legislators had done and they have agreed not to increase the discharge of the ammonia and the total suspended solids into the lake. So, I thank you for the support that we had in the committee. I think that we were very active in putting more pressure in preserving our lake that, even though they were within the federal guidelines of what they could do, in the last thirty-six (36) years we have done nothing in Illinois to increase any pollutants in the water of Lake Michigan, and that's the way we would like to keep the lake. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Resolution 620. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. We'd like to alert the Body that the schedule for the Veto Session has been passed around. Everyone should have the House Calendar

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

for the Veto Session, which starts next month, October 2, 3, and 4. You should have that Calendar now. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 667, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 668, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 670, offered by Representative Poe. House Resolution 671, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 672, offered by Representative Osterman. House Resolution 673, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 674, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 675, offered by Representative Madigan. House Resolution 676, offered by Representative Madigan. House Resolution 677, offered by Representative Franks. House Resolution 678, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 679, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 680, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 681, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 682, offered by Representative Granberg. Resolution 683, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 684, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 685, offered by Representative Miller. House Resolution 686, offered by Representative Beiser. House Resolution 687, offered by Representative Poe. Resolution 688, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 689, offered by Representative Reitz. Resolution 690, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution 691, offered by Representative Durkin. House Resolution 692, offered by Representative Bellock.

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

House Resolution 693, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 694, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 695, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 696, offered by Representative Brady. And House Resolution 698, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. And Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I noted with great interest, the Veto Session schedule. I was just wondering if the Senate plans to join us on those days?"

Speaker Turner: "I believe you're correct. The Senate will be joining us on those days."

Lang: "They've agreed to this Calendar?"

Speaker Turner: "They've agreed to this Calendar."

Lang: "Well glory be. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, and inquiry of the Chair. The Veto Session is scheduled during the baseball playoffs. Now when the White Sox were running away with the American League pennant not long ago, we weren't in Session during the playoffs. There's still a possibility that the other Chicago team would be in the playoffs. I assume that will be taken under advisement as well."

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

- Speaker Turner: "Because that's a possibility, a real possibility, we will take it under advisement. Just based on..."
- Black: "Just so you know, I'm consulting my attorney."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "I'm sorry, I wasn't paying attention. Did you say that the Senate has agreed to this Calendar? Are they in next week at all?"
- Speaker Turner: "They have agreed to the Veto Session Calendar. Short of that, I don't know what they're doing."
- Mulligan: "So do they have... yeah, you're guess is as good as mine. Except that little committee called JCAR will either meet here if the Senate's in or will meet in Chicago if the Senate isn't in, and I'm curious as to... I guess I'll have to check a Senate Calendar, 'cause I heard the Senate was in on the eleventh and the twelfth."
- Speaker Turner: "I'm certain the Governor has a schedule for the JCAR meeting, a time and a place. And so, you will be informed."
- Mulligan: "I'm sure they'll let us know."
- Speaker Turner: "I'm sure you'll be informed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lyons: "Speaker, for the point of clarification for my esteemed colleague from Vermilion. Representative Black, the White Sox played World Series Game three (3) and four (4) while we were on this floor two (2) years ago. So your memory fails you, but that's the year the White Sox swept. I know it's

133rd Legislative Day

9/4/2007

ancient memory for a lot of us, but two (2) years ago, set the record straight."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you for the clarification, Representative Lyons. And now, seeing no further questions, Representative Clerk move... Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned into Perfunctory Session on Wednesday, September 5, at the hour of 12 noon. In the meantime, the House stands adjourned until Wednesday, September 5, at the hour of 12 noon for Perfunctory Session."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution
669, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House
Resolution 697, offered by Representative Brady. And House
Joint Resolution 77, offered by Representative Osterman.

Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading.
House Bill 4134, offered by Representative Bradley, John, a
Bill for an Act concerning transportation. First Reading of
this House Bill. There being no further business the House
Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."