36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "The House should come to order. All Members should be in their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend John Holst who's with the Zion United Church in Marion, Illinois. Pastor Holst is the guest of Representative Bradley. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Holst: "...for you this morning in prayer. Let us be in the spirit of prayer. Loving and gracious God, we, Your beloved children, call You by many names and with religious diversity as a fundamental sign of our personal freedom within our state and nation. We, this day, praise honor, and worship You differently yet together. Compassionate God, before we submit even one word of prayer that will quide our work this day, let us speak a word of gratitude for our fellow Legislators, women and men who bring wisdom, experience, and at times even opposition to the legislative process. Let us arrive at our work this day grateful to be allowed such a role and the important insight that we do not carry the weight of citizenry alone but in trusted partnership and holy collaboration with You Discriminating God, this day we look to You for strength to serve the citizens of our cherished State of Illinois. Give us the energy to communicate with even one more constituent who needs our attention, discover in us the courage to speak words of compassion and hope even if we feel at times we are speaking to ourselves. Swiftly grow within us an awareness that we are not the only correct, passionate,

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

intelligent and provocative voice, but just one voice prepared to speak at that moment. And above all bequeath in us the empathy to understand that we serve the rich and the poor, the young and the old, those who take for granted equality and those who hunger for it. As we begin our work here this day, we ask You to reveal to all where we've become desensitized to the life of one who lives, loves and achieves differently than we do. Where we have... where we've let our need to be correct to overshadow the creative process of discernment, collaboration and life-changing legislation. Generous God, allow the heart of Legislator and staff member to know the frustration of a parent who cannot find safe adorable child care. Allow the mind of every Legislator and staff member to be prayerful partnership with a teacher who has lost a student to violence, whether it be as the victim or perpetrator. Allow the Body of this... Bodies of this Legislator... these Legislators and staff members to know the exhaustion of working every day and night as a sign of solidarity with those who work day after day, year after year and never feel safe and secure. One day of illness, injury, one missed bus or a dead battery one employment, housing, and advancement is taken away. Still speaking God, lead us to a path of continued healing for our dear state and its covenant people. Let each Member of this legislative group know that You, God, have heard great moments of wisdom, seen examples of justice and fairness lived out in their labors and that You delight in

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

partnering with them in this immense journey to wholeness and peace for all human society, Amen."

Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Cabello."

Cabello - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Flowers, Gordon-Booth and Mell are excused."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Harris is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 'present', a quorum is established. Representative Drury, for what reason do you rise?"

Drury: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."

Drury: "I'd like everybody to welcome Sarah and David Sarowitz, they're our two Pages here today. If Sarah and David could stand up, they're two 10-year-old fourth graders from Ravinia School in Highland Park, which is where I grew up. I hope everybody will take advantage of their services today and we also have... we have their parents who have traveled down and been so kind to bring them here, Steve and Jessica Sarowitz. They're sitting up in the gallery."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Clerk Bolin: Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2210, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2726, and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3359. Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Safety: Police & Fire reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2893. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Restorative Justice reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2961 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2961. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on April 09, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3267 and House Joint Resolutions 24 and 26. Representative McAsey, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 09, 2013: recommends be adopted House Resolution 146. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on April 09, recommends be adopted House Resolution 165. Representative Dunkin, Chairperson from the Committee on Tourism & Conventions reports the following committee action taken on April 09, 2013: recommends be adopted House Resolution 133.

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Representative Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 09, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate for House Bill 3120. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 214, offered by Representative Hoffman and House Resolution 215, offered by Representative Flowers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, we'd like to request an immediate Republican Caucus, please, for... for a while."
- Speaker Turner: "Republicans will immediately caucus in Room 114 and the House will be at ease until 11:45. The House shall come to order. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 09, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 1, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 801, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 1345, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2376, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2499, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2591, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2675, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2695, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2780, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2846 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1515."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, we're going to begin with Bills on Third Reading. The first Bill is House Bill 2311, Representative Beiser. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2311, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2311 has to do with cleaning up the video poker Bill that we passed in the previous. It comes as a result in my area and other areas of the state where certain clubs, namely the Knights of Columbus, have been denied because they're considered a social club and this would simply add them."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman's moved for the passage of House Bill 2311. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Representative Farnham, Feigenholtz, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 64 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', House Bill 2311, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3370, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3370, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3370 amends the Water Rec... Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act to allow them to do two things. It allows them to... to add to the... the types of claims they can use their reserve fund to pay. And it removes a cost ceiling related to repairing and replacing MWRD-owned property that it damaged by fire, flood, explosion, vandalism, or other peril, natural or manmade, that can be paid from that reserve fund. I know of

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

no opposition. It's an initiative of the Water Reclamation District. And I ask to an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, what types of claims are you referencing would you say?"

Burke, K.: "Mainly environmental claims."

Durkin: "Okay. Would they not otherwise be covered through some type of insurance that the MWRD does carry?"

Burke, K.: "They're self-insured. And so this allows them to just increase what they can keep in their reserve fund in order to pay those claims."

Durkin: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3370 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3370, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1849, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1849, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1849 simply allows the... the inspection for safety purposes at mines to move into the future in the fact that right now it's required

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

that a paper trail. This will simply allow iPads and/or phones to communicate with the up... upper... up on the ground level of any problems that might exist, so that those repairs can occur faster. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1849 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Drury, Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', O voting 'no', O voting 'present', House Bill 1849, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 189, Representative Cloonen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 189, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cloonen."

Cloonen: "Yes, 189 is a property tax Bill that will, in most cases, decrease the property taxes and in no crase... no case increase the property tax. Right now, the taxes are calculated at 3 decimal places and automatically rounded up. This will allow the bills to be calculated beyond 3 decimal places, so it's a truer... truer amount that a person pays. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 189 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 189, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2377, Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 2408, Representative Costello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2408, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Currently, if a veteran owns a small business and wants to be certified as veteran-owned, he or she cannot also have their business certified as a minority. This allows for veterans to certify in two categories. This would, in effect, increase the pool of vendors for the State of Illinois and it should also, theoretically, save the state money. Thank you. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2408 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2408, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1516, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1516, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1516 simply seeks to advise that refusal of an institutionalized spouse or community spouse to comply with the federal requirements by failing to provide the total value of assets... The Bill seeks to make sure that seniors and their spouses are aware of the consequences... Now we're back. The Bill simply seeks to make sure that seniors and their spouses are aware of the consequences, if they try to hide assets or refuse to disclose all information that has been asked for when they are faced with Medicaid issues. And I'll be happy to answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1516 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please take the Bill... take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1516, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2687, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2687, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 2687 lowers the maximum requirement for convention and tourism bureaus to 50 percent instead of 100 percent to apply for local tourism funds, which are generated by the hotel tax. This is an initiative of the Illinois Council and Conventions and

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Tourism Bureaus, the Illinois Hotel & Lodging Association and the City of Chicago. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2687 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2687, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2755, Representative Brown. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2755, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2755 effects only my district, but it allows for a fund transfer from the City of Shelbyville to the Shelbyville School District for remediation of the asbestos in their HVAC system. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2755 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Crespo, Sente. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 88 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2755, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pihos, for what reason do you rise?"

Pihos: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

Pihos: "I'd like to introduce my Pages for the day that are with me here: Anna Bleeden and she goes to Algonquin Middle School and Marie Kalas and Marie goes to Montini School in Lombard. So, I'd like them to receive a nice Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to the Capitol. Thank you for your help. House Bill 2339, Representative Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2339, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The purpose of House Bill 2339 is to establish consistency between the Illinois Anatomical Gift Act and the core provisions of the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act as drafted by the Uniform Law Commission as well as implement other upgrades suggested by the organ donor organizations, the Illinois Hospital Association and the Illinois State Medical Society. This is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2339 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lilly, Riley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2339,

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the Journal to reflect that I ment to vote 'yes' on House Bill 2311."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. The record will reflect your request. House Bill 961, Representative DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 961, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 961, this is the Bill that would allow the immediate distribution of the income tax receipts collected to be sent directly to the local government distributive fund instead of going through the General Revenue Fund. Passed out of committee unanimously. There's no opposition. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm... I'm trying to understand the process in which this would work. Do we do this currently with any other... other local government out of another fund, or any other funds?"

DeLuca: "No, we do not."

Dunkin: "So, what would be the process? It would go directly...
the Treasurer's Office or the Department of Revenue would
collect the tax and we would immediately send it to a local
arm of government."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- DeLuca: "No. It goes into the fund which is called the local government distributive fund, which then disperses the money to counties and municipalities."
- Dunkin: "So, we've been doing the current procedure for how many years now as it relates to the local government di... distribution fund?"
- DeLuca: "I don't know how many years it's been happening this way, but since... It's been this way for a long time. I don't have an exact number of amount of time."

Dunkin: "Since the '70s, huh?"

DeLuca: "I would assume so, yes."

- Dunkin: "So, what's the negative impact of sending those dollars directly to the local government compared to sending in the General Revenue Fund?"
- DeLuca: "There's no negative impact. This is the counties and municipalities share of the money and this will help them receive those dollars sooner. As you know that the payments are being delayed to our municipalities this will allow them to receive that money in a more timely fashion."
- Dunkin: "So, does this have anything to do with us considering reducing the local distribution to various local governments across the state? Is this sort of tied into that discussion?"

DeLuca: "Can you... can you say that question again, please?"

Dunkin: "Is this piece of legislation tied into the local government distribution fund regarding us reducing some of those amounts based off of our fiscal issues today? Is this a response to the local government distribution fund as we

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

consider reducing some of those dollars to some of our municipalities?"

DeLuca: "No, this is not in response to some of the proposals that are... that are being floated out there. I've... This legislation has been filed for a number of years. I filed it the last three years. So this has been on the docket for a while."

Dunkin: "So, again, I'm trying to understand. In my detailed analysis here, probably similar to what you share, it says, according to COGFA, the language could be construed to produce a negative effect. The language of the Bill says an amount equal to the sum of 6 percent or 10 percent of the ratio of the 3 percent individual income tax rate prior to 2011 to the 5 percent individual income tax rate after 2010. The language intended to mean that 6 percent of the taxes collected minus refunds; however, it could understood as 10 percent of the taxes collected minus refunds. For instance, taxes collected in the fiscal year '12 totaled 17 billion and the refunded total was 1.4 billon. And it also goes as further to say that the legislation is meant to take 6 percent of the \$17 billion or 1.4 billion 88, which would be about 931 bil... million dollars. However, the language can't be construed as meaning 6 percent of the 17 billion minus \$1.488 mil... billion dollars of the total. It would be 46... \$468 million. COGFA recommends clarifying the language so that the Bill states that the 6 percent is applied to the difference of the income tax collection and deposits in the income tax refund. Can you respond to this?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

DeLuca: "The... the local government's share was 10 percent prior to the changing of the law two years ago with the income tax. That lowered... decreased the local government share from 10 percent to 6 percent. So, this is ensuring that their portion, their reduced portion, that they would be receiving it quicker and that it would be protected. The money would go directly into this fund. That's what this accomplishes."

Dunkin: "So, the issue is that there's a delay of how many months or is it 30 days, 90 days..."

DeLuca: "I'm not sure what their..."

Dunkin: "...half a year, 12 months?"

DeLuca: "I'm not sure what the most recent information is, but it was up as much as 6 months, the delay."

Dunkin: "I guess... I guess my real concern is given where we are fiscally today, does this help or hurt our ability to govern at the state level granted we know we have a whole bunch of not-for-profit agencies, providers of services to the state, certainly municipalities dependent on State Government. Would this help or hurt our... our functionality fiscally?"

DeLuca: "I don't believe it should hurt us at all and the reason for that is because this is the local government's money. This is the money that goes to counties and municipalities and the services that most of us experience when we're at home are services that are provided by our local governments."

Dunkin: "Sure."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

DeLuca: "When we're talking about police protection and fire protection and snow removal and clean water and Code enforcement, all these services are provided by our local governments. This will help allow them to receive their funding in a more timely manner."

Dunkin: "So, in understanding of that rationale, why is there a delay of 6 months?"

DeLuca: "Because right now the dollars are going into the General Revenue Fund."

Dunkin: "Yes."

DeLuca: "And that's the problem. If that's the answer you're looking for, yes. The money is going into the General Revenue Fund and then being transferred into the Local Government Distributive Fund. This would bypass that. This would allow it to go directly into that fund, so it can go to where it's intended to go."

Dunkin: "So, why has there been a problem before? I mean, didn't you introduce this Bill, you say several times, correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Dunkin: "Why... what's the Governor's Office saying in this ro... in this vein?"

DeLuca: "I have not spoken with the Governor's Office specifically on this. They did not file in opposition to it. They have not come to see me that they're objecting to it. My best guess would be they're probably not strong supporters of it."

Dunkin: "So, has it passed the Senate?"

DeLuca: "No, this is a House Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Dunkin: "No. Has... you say you've introduced this over the years. Has it passed the Senate? I'm sure... Well, let me ask... back up."

DeLuca: "This is the furthest the Bill has gone, since I've... since I've carried it."

Dunkin: "And you've introduced it how many times?"

DeLuca: "I think this is the third time."

Dunkin: "And it's gone..."

DeLuca: "It's never gotten out of committee."

Dunkin: "Why is that?"

DeLuca: "Its never been called in committee."

Dunkin: "Why is that?"

DeLuca: "I don't control the Ball... the Bills that are called in committee."

Dunkin: "Is that right? You're the Chief Sponsor. I thought that... You're a... you're a former mayor, right?"

DeLuca: "Yes, I am."

Dunkin: "You consider yourself a responsible then when you were?"

DeLuca: "Absolutely."

Dunkin: "All right. So, all right."

DeLuca: "And Representative Dunkin, this is not my first Bill."

Dunkin: "I'm just curious. I think this is a very interesting dynamic because they're also providers in the state that I would love to have the money that we collect and bounce..."

DeLuca: "Right."

Dunkin: "...outside of the General Revenue Fund directly into paying our providers who provide mental health, who provide access to health care to some of our most vulnerable...

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

populations here in the state. So, this would be very unique for the State of Illinois, correct?"

DeLuca: "It would be in a sense how it impacts our local governments, yes."

Dunkin: "So, can we do this for the lottery? You know the lottery supposed to go directly to education. Can we have those dollars of the lottery bounce, instead of going to the General Revenue Fund, go straight to the schools in some of these municipalities and distributed based off of the formula that they have. Would you support that measure?"

DeLuca: "If there was a Bill that directed the lottery money to go directly to the Common School Fund, yes, I would."

Dunkin: "Can I add that on as an Amendment here?"

DeLuca: "I'll find another Bill for you to do that."

Dunkin: "That's a great idea, I like that. So, last question.

Do you anticipate this Bill passing the Senate chamber and/or the Governor signing this piece of legislation?"

DeLuca: "Well, my first goal is to pass it out of this chamber and that's what I'm attempting to do right now."

Dunkin: "Sure. Well, I see there are a lot of folk who represent municipalities on this particular legislation. Individuals who probably have some experience with local government, so I can see how they would be excited about having money bypass the General Revenue Fund and go directly into the Local Distribution Fund. So, the Governor... Thank you for your effort. I appreciate you explaining this, Representative, former mayor, on your legislation. Thank you."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

DeLuca: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, would it be accurate to suggest that a number of decades ago there was a good faith agreement between the State of Illinois and municipalities and counties from every corner of this state that the state income tax would be a common tax and not established on a community by community basis, which would cause extraordinary confusion and those in expectation that this money was a simple flow through that would go right back to your local unit of government?"

DeLuca: "That is accurate, and the original agreement was 10 percent..."

Hays: "Yes."

DeLuca: "...which now it is 6 percent."

Hays: "So... so, not only has the amount been reduced but really there has never been any overriding reason to hold this money in some kind of a state account that the good faith agreement that was made between the State of Illinois and every county and every municipality in this state was for the dollars to simply flow through the state back to the local municipality. What would be the underlying reason to hold these dollars in Springfield?"

DeLuca: "Well, to be used for purposes other than what they were intended for."

Hays: "So, it's accurate to say there is no reason to do that and frankly this is a Bill that should have be enacted a

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

long time ago. The Gentleman has a good Bill; its time has
come. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this initiative. I think the Sponsor is right on. At any opportunity we have to direct the proper payment of money without it being diverted by the state is a good initiative. The bottom line is the state isn't a good steward of other people's money, let alone its own. Let's get the municipalities and local units of government their money in a timely fashion. I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he does."

Riley: "Representative DeLuca, so what you're doing is you're asking for the entire allotment of money that would be that would normally go to the LGDF to go directly to the LDGF or are you asking for a percentage thereof?"

DeLuca: "No the entire... the entire portion, the entire amount."

Riley: "The entire amount, okay. Thank you so much. And I'm not a member of the former mayor's caucus."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Yeah. Representative, this is a real proactive, I think, piece of legislation that's long, long overdue. I compliment you for this. We are not very good at managing money in the State of Illinois and I think what you're

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

telling me, and correct me if I'm wrong, what you're telling me today is that you're trying to protect your local municipalities so you have core essential services that are counted on every day. Is that correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Kay: "Yeah. Thank you. I think that this is something that we all ought to be engaged in because if we're not you place your community... local communities at risk. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I ask for a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 961 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 961, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2482, Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2482 amends the Counties Code. Requires the annual budget to contain a detailed statement showing any bonuses or increase in salary, wage, stipend, or other form of compensation for every agency, department or other entry receiving an

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

appropriations from the county. This is a... there was Amendment yesterday that passed which exempts from the reporting requirements employees in the collective bargaining unit. And I request... respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2482 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2482, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3157, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3157, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3157 makes a technical change with the Department of Revenue. It's an initiative of theirs. This Bill amends several actions of the Income Tax Code regarding corporation and 'cause... excuse me... conduct business outside the State of Illinois. The Bill had a few issues and it was cleaned up, so we added the Amendment. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, could you just give us some examples of what substantively this Bill will change because I see

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- there are some opponents. And I'd like to know what their opposition was?"
- Evans: "A lot of opponents had some issues before we made the change. We deleted the issue regarding to unitary business group; a lot of the opponents had issues with that. Pretty much this Bill, at this point, consolidates some forms and..."
- Franks: "Did your Amendment take away the opposition of those groups?"
- Evans: "Yeah. That was my understanding. That's why it passed unanimously through the committee."
- Franks: "Okay. So, we took out the unitary issues. So, what's left? Is it just more paperwork or...?"
- Evans: "Exactly, yes, yes."
- Franks: "So, there's no real substantive changes you're saying.

  It's just changes to the paperwork on the forms... on the income tax form."
- Evans: "Exactly. It helps the Department of Revenue just... it just streamlines some... some issue with the Department of Revenue. So, there was no real big issues with it."
- Franks: "Well, what will that do? Will that increase tax revenue for the state? Is that their goal?"
- Evans: "That's the goal. Yes, Sir."
- Franks: "Okay. And is there specifically... How would our tax revenue increase as a result of this Bill?"
- Evans: "Well, in the issue of less manpower, less steps for business to have to go through in identifying the revenues that could potentially be missed. That was my understanding."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Franks: "How would this change the apportionment of gain by partnerships and Subchapter S Corporations?"
- Evans: "I'm sorry, Representative. If you'd repeat that again, please."
- Franks: "How would... I'm looking at our analysis and I'm trying to understand the changes regarding the apportionment of gain by partnerships and Subchapter S Corporations."
- Evans: "It's my understanding, Representative, it's regarding to the… the apportion that's outside the State of Illinois. So, for example, if a company is doing business outside of the State of Illinois with partners outside of the State of Illinois, that that portion outside of the state of Illinois will be apportion to Illinois so."
- Franks: "It wouldn't be exempt? 'Cause the way I'm reading it is it would be exempt unless it was created here in Illinois. For instance, let me give you... for example. Let's assume you have an interest in a Subchapter S Corporation and as a result you have you to file K-1. Your corporation has businesses in 14 separate states."

Evans: "Yes."

- Franks: "Okay? So how would that affect a nonresident... let's assume it's an Illinois Subchapter S Corporation. You have an investor who lives in Indiana, that investor invests in the Illinois Sub S, but then, that Sub S has business interests in 14 separate states. How would it affect the owner, the investor in Indiana, in this Illinois corporation?"
- Evans: "Well, the revenue realized by the nonresident will still be apportion in some way to Illinois."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Franks: "Would it affect... but only that portion that's actually earned in Illinois, correct?"

Evans: "That's my understanding, Representative."

Franks: "Okay."

Evans: "Explained to me by the Department of Revenue."

Franks: "I just don't want to have an unintended consequences where folks are having to fight with their own Department of Revenues to show where the moneys were... were gained. Okav."

Evans: "And I understand, Representative, but it was my understanding that those particular issues where cleared up..."

Franks: "Okay."

Evans: "...before I got to this point."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "Again, I urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3157 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3157, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2919, Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2919, a Bill for an Act concerning workers'..."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2574, Representative Davidsmeyer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2574, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB2574 makes a slight change for the requirement for a hunter safety course. It takes into account all of the number of hours and days that a veteran has spent in firearm safety. And it just requires hunters... veterans to take only the online portion instead of the 10-hour in person class."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "You know, we don't haze anymore."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Bost: "It is your first Bill, correct?"

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, yes."

Bost: "Okay. All right. I just want to be sure. I really actually do have some questions though. The analysis said that originally... the original Bill was the Amendment that came from IDNR. They needed the Amendment. Did that Amendment just say that they had to take the course, or what exactly does the Amendment..."

Davidsmeyer: "The Amendment just added the online portion. The concern was that they have the opportunity to review the game limits and things of that sort, number of birds you can shoot, things of that sort."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Bost: "Say that again, I'm sorry. Can you repeat that? What was it... what was it they were... What was their problem with it originally?"

Davidsmeyer: "The main concern was that they didn't have any type of course that talked about the game limits..."

Bost: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "...number of birds you can kill things of that sort."

Bost: "Okay. So, basically by taking the online course you'll be able to understand the limits. Is that..."

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Bost: "Okay. Did... I know that I think your family has come here to watch you present your Bill, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, Sir."

Bost: "You know Adam Brown a few years ago when he presented his Bill... first Bill, he actually had his dad on the floor with him."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Bost: "Advised him."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Bost: "So, you don't need any advice. I think you're doing a great job."

Davidsmeyer: "He told me it was actually bring your family to work day today, so that's why I brought my family."

Bost: "Fantastic. You haven't made that into a Resolution, something we can put into permanent law."

Davidsmeyer: "We will work on it."

Bost: "Okay. All right."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."
- Franks: "I'm trying to figure out what you're doing here. My analysis indicates that you would allow veterans to do a in... an online course for an Illinois Hunter Education card, correct?"
- Davidsmeyer: "It... the online portion is a portion of the 10-hour in person course, yes."
- Franks: "What's the difference between the online and the in person?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Everyone is required to take the in person course which talks about firearm safety and things of that sort. This Bill gives them the opportunity to receive credit for all the hours and days and months of training they have had with firearms."
- Franks: "What happens if they haven't had training with firearms?"
- Davidsmeyer: "The... actually, IDNR has the opportunity to decide what exempts them from this from their military record."
- Franks: "Is that going to be in rule? I'm serious and I'm not sure how that would work. And let's assume we have someone who's in the military who's never had to go through that kind of course."
- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. IDNR has the opportunity to say you have had sufficient training through your military service."
- Franks: "Then who has to get the Illinois Hunter Education card? Who's required to get that?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Currently, as of January 1 of this year, if you were born after 1980. So, if you were born a year after

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

myself, you're required to get the hunter safety training course."

Franks: "Is there any grant? Let's assume you've been a hunter for a long time and you were born after 1980 and you've had a FOID card, even though you've had a lot of experience hunting, would you still have to do the Hunter Education card?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, you would."

Franks: "Even if that person had more experience with firearms than someone who's in the military?"

Davidsmeyer: "And this Bill does nothing to do that, but yes, that is the case."

Franks: "Doesn't seem fair."

Davidsmeyer: "I agree."

Franks: "Well, why don't we expand that for people who can demonstrate that they've had extensive hunting training?"

Davidsmeyer: "I'd be happy to work with you on that Bill."

Franks: "If you'd like... we've got another week if you'd like to move it to Second."

Davidsmeyer: "No."

Franks: "And I'm not trying trip you up..."

Davidsmeyer: "We're..."

Franks: "...but I just think it seems fair."

Davidsmeyer: "We'll go ahead and move this."

Franks: "All right. Well, maybe..."

Davidsmeyer: "And I'll work with you on another one."

Franks: "Would you be willing to have it amended in the Senate and sent back over that way, as many Bills are."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Davidsmeyer: "Not at this time. I think this serves the purpose."

Franks: "Well, we'll talk to you about that 'cause that happens a lot. I'm really not trying to trip you. I just think it's... if you're trying to give people with experience a break, I think we should give everybody with experience a break."

Davidsmeyer: "And we can work on that, definitely."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer to close."

Davidsmeyer: "I think this is a very commonsense Bill. I hope that everyone will consider voting 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2574 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Martwick, Smith, Franks. Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2574, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I made a erroneous vote on 2482.

I'd like to be recorded as a 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The record shall reflect your request. House Bill 310, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill..."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2753, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the record... read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2753, a Bill for an Act concerning energy. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this Bill implements a number of recommendations from the Offshore Wind Advisory Council's report from last year. It creates a policy task force to develop an appropriate mechanism for purchasing and selling power from offshore wind energy projects. Second, it requires the Department of Natural Resources to develop a detailed sighting matrix to identify areas that might be prohibited or preferred for wind energy. And third, it allows the department to adopt rules with consultation with EPA, Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Power Agency and the Commerce Commission. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Osmond: "Representative, could you tell me, in this task force that you're setting up, will they have input from the people that live along the shoreline?"

Gabel: "So, this task force is simply to look at how you would get the power from the offshore wind to the land. It was something that we couldn't come up with in the task force which did have a lot of representation from community residents. We are very far from doing anything in the lake

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

right now, so the rules will state very clearly that there has to be a lot of input from community residents before anything can be developed anywhere."

Osmond: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

- Davis, W.: "So, Representative, if I understand this correctly, this is trying to figure out how to move the energy from point a to point b, sell the energy. Am I reasonably correct?"
- Gabel: "Well, the previous task force, we really didn't have the people on that task force to look at that question, that whole question of how you get the energy back, how you sell it. Yes, how you get it back and how you sell it. So, this task force would be to bring people together who have more knowledge about that to come up with some recommendations."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I want to... I'm definitely going to support your Bill, but I would like to know if you will be interested that when this Bill goes over to the Senate that maybe some language could be added that speak to how... how in terms from the business standpoint, smaller minority business may have opportunity to participate in this venture."
- Gabel: "Absolutely. And that should be included in the rules that the department designs as well."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I guess the question is, if it's not explicitly stated in the legislation versus saying please

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

don't hold it up or anything that kind of... anything like that. You know, when it goes over to the Senate, can some language be added that speaks to that?"

Gabel: "Okay. Thank you. Yes. We can work on... we can work on that in the Senate."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Do you feel the energy? How much energy is that generated would you say, Robyn Gabel?"

Gabel: "You're a big blow hard. I think a lot of energy."

Dunkin: "Can you put me on your Bill as a cosponsor?"

Gabel: "I can. Thank you very much."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Couple questions. I know that this is an issue up in the City of Evanston. How far does their zoning authority go? Does it even go into Lake Michigan?"

Gabel: "Pardon? How far does what?"

Durkin: "Do they have zoning authority to go into Lake Michigan?"

Gabel: "No, the state does."

Durkin: "All right. Now, can the State of Illinois actually put these wind turbines on Lake Michigan without getting these approval from the... Is there a Great Lakes Water Commission?"

Gabel: "There would be many, many hurdles to overcome before anything could be put into the lake. Yes, there are federal agencies that it would have to go through."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Durkin: "How many of these big wind turbines would you like to see along lake Michigan?"
- Gabel: "I don't have an opinion on how many or if... what this does is it just looks to see if there are any appropriate places."
- Durkin: "Oh, I know exactly what it does, but let's think about the broader issue of what you're trying to do and you wouldn't be supporting this unless you thought there was value in putting these big windmills, metal windmills, along lake Michigan. Now, I... we drive down to Springfield on a weekly basis and checkered from pretty much from Grundy County all the way to Bloomington to our left there are an absolute incredible amount of these... of these wind turbines. Do you think it's a good idea to put them on water?"
- Gabel: "My understanding is that the energy that we have in the lake, the wind energy, is much, much stronger than the energy we have, that the wind that is produced on the land."

Durkin: "All right."

- Gabel: "That because they would be in the lake, first they would be at least six miles out so you would hardly be able to see them. It would be like a thumb nail and... they also would be much larger than the ones on land so you would need many fewer to get similar energy."
- Durkin: "But I do also know boaters will take their boats out beyond and as far as they want. I... I know what you're... this is about a task force, but I do not support the idea of putting these up on the Great Lakes. And you know, I've had

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

discussions, while I'm not a... much of bird enthusiast, I like to see them in my backyard, but there is a lot of people concerned about the fowl that will be caught up into these machines. And it's going to change the direction of some of these..."

Gabel: "All that would be looked at."

Durkin: "I know, but I think it's a bad idea. Thank you."

Gabel: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, the Great Lakes protection and offshore wind developments go hand in hand. With careful siting and extensive community involvement, offshore parks will only be located, designed and monitored in a way that safeguards the eco system. Protecting Lake Michigan is a critical part of what is best for our state. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2753 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 90 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2753, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

Davidsmeyer: "As we mentioned earlier, I have family here today; I wanted to introduce them. My wife Kristen is up

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

here in balcony; in the gallery, my mother Kay and also my district director Jenny is here with me today."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Ann Williams."

Williams: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an announcement."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

Williams: "Tonight, the Green Caucus will be hosting a briefing on the renewable portfolio standard in Room 413 of the Stratton Building. The briefing is open to all. It will start at 4:30 unless Session goes later, then we'll push it back. If you can't make it tonight, tomorrow we'll host another briefing in the first floor conference room in the Senate. So, please stop by and learn a little bit about how we set the standards for utilization of renewable energy in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. House Bill 772, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 772, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I address to the Bill...

House Bill 772, I'd like to welcome our Secretary of State

Jesse White to the House Floor."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome, Mr. White."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 772 is an issue that was taken up by the safety advisory task force that Secretary White is the chairman of and I'm a proud member of. What this Bill basically does is it establishes a

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

online training course for 18- to 20-year-old kids that have not taken part in a driver's ed or graduated driver's license program. This will be monitored by the Secretary's Office."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

McAuliffe: "Representative, I have the privilege to serve on the task force with you and I think this is excellent legislation. I do have one question. Would anyone that say. would be 30 years of age, never had a driver's license, would they have to participate in this program too?"

D'Amico: "No. This just only... this only pertains to 18- to 20- year-old kids."

McAuliffe: "Okay. So, that'd be 18, 19, 20, 21. Do you think that anytime that maybe we can maybe revisit and see how that program works with younger people and maybe anyone that would be able to get a driver's license that they should maybe take some type of course beside just going to the Secretary of State's Office and getting a license, if they would pass a road test?"

D'Amico: "Yes. It's definitely something that could be looked at in the future."

McAuliffe: "Okay, to the Bill. I commend the Sponsor and also Secretary Jesse White for having this task force. We do a lot of listening and have various groups come in and talk about the problems and anything we can to make our... our roads safer. And I ask for a 'yes' vote on this legislation. Thank you."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, was this the Bill yesterday that you moved to adopt the Amendment and then you were going to speak on it today?"

D'Amico: "Yes."

Reboletti: "What happens right now if you're 18 to 21 and didn't take any classes in high school or any driving courses, anything online and..."

D'Amico: "Well, right now, once you turn 18 you can just walk into the Secretary of State's Office and get your license with no training at all. So, what this would do, this would require you to take this online course so at least you know the rules of road when you're going to... before you're going to go and take the test."

Reboletti: "Is there a behind the wheel still required for these individuals?"

D'Amico: "There is no behind-the-wheel requirement for them yet."

Reboletti: "Is that something you plan on working on, I would assume?"

D'Amico: "It's something we might look at. I mean, they will instruct them on a lot of the rules of the road, such as texting and driving and some of the other Bills that we have worked on here in the past. But that is something definitely that would be up in the air I would like to work on."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. Representative, you know, I admire any legislation that helps young people today, at least this is not a punishment to them."

D'Amico: "No."

Davis, M.: "But I am concerned with those who don't have access to a computer. Are you... is there any listing of where there might be able to go, if they don't own a computer at home? I know libraries, many of them, do have computers that the public can use, but are there any locations besides a library that kids can use or young people can use to avail themselves to such a program?"

D'Amico: "Well, the library would be the perfect place to go that is also overseen by the Secretary's Office. Plus, I think, we'll probably have something that we'll be able excess at the Secretary of State's Office as well."

Davis, M.: "Oh, they can go to the Secretary of State's Office and do that as well?"

D'Amico: "Well, they monitor the libraries."

Davis, M.: "Well, I know. Okay, well, of course. Do you think that... I see you have no... they have no opponents to this legislation?"

D'Amico: "There are no opponents to my knowledge."

Davis, M.: "Teachers unions didn't oppose?"

D'Amico: "Nobody opposed it."

Davis, M.: "Well, I think it's great legislation and thank you for bringing this forward. Thank you."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

D'Amico: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Mautino: "And I apologize. Over some of the noise, I didn't hear the explanation of the Amendment. So someone who is 20 years old now... How does this change? Let's take a 20-year-old coming back from the service. Right now, he could walk in, take a driver's license test, get his rules of the road book, pay his fee and go. What... what happens now?"

D'Amico: "All this is going to require is an online course, if you're 18 to 20 years old to go and get your license.

That's all. It's just... it's approximately 6 hours."

Mautino: "Okay. So, it's a 6-hour online course for these... for these adults."

D'Amico: "Yes."

Mautino: "And will they be able to take it right at the facility from the Secretary of State?"

D'Amico: "No. We don't plan on having it right at the facility.

Obviously, you can do it in a library, you can do it on your home computer."

Mautino: "Who's... who is certified to... do we have certified schools here in the... that can do an online program or what's the structure for that?"

D'Amico: "They're going to be putting that out for bid and they're going to be accepting applications for... There's companies out there that do this."

Mautino: "Okay. And what... what's the cost of the company online. I know that we get \$5 as a state for it, but what...

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- This formerly free service, what is it now going to cost someone to go get?"
- D'Amico: "They're expecting it to be about 25 bucks for the test."
- Mautino: "Twenty five dollars for the test and for the course itself?"
- D'Amico: "Yeah. And that's roughly. I mean, it's not set in stone."
- Mautino: "Okay. I was going to say I saw that it said other applicable fees. Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate the clarification."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico to close."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 772 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

  Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 772, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3152, Representative Durkin.

  Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3152, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."
- Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3152 will allow District 204 which is Lyons Township High School to be removed or to eliminate the auspices of the Township School

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Treasure Act... Treasurer from their operations. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate... Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "So, I noticed this yesterday, Representative, so I just wanted to ask very briefly. So, this just removes the high school from underneath the treasurer's..."

Durkin: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...whatever? So, the treasurer still functions for everyone else?"

Durkin: "It does not eliminate the office for the elementary schools. They will still be functioning."

Davis, W.: "Just... and just out of curiosity, 'cause in the analysis you mention some challenges that people in your district have talked about with their treasurer's office. So, why only do the high school and not everyone else?"

Durkin: "I did talk to... The function of the school treasurer right now is to do payroll, make investments. They receive the money from the assessor and then they will distribute it accordingly. Right now the school treasurer in Lyons Township is under investigation. Lyons Township High School, as many other schools who've exempted out, do have the wherewithal to be able to make their investments and also do payroll. Right now, their only function for the treasurer's office is to bring checks about a mile away, they have them stamped by the treasurer and they bring them back. That's for employees. So, we feel that it's a better use of the high school's resources to keep that money, it's

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

approximately a quarter million dollars a year, have those functions served by the high school who has the sophistication to do it. I talked to elementary school districts, I spoke with superintendents, and some of them do not have the depth to be able to perform those functions. So, I said I will keep that and they preferred that they stay within the treasurer's office operations."

Davis, W.: "So, they're not concerned about the investigations that are existing, like you just stated or..."

Durkin: "Yeah. I am. They're not."

Davis, W.: "I am; they're no. Okay. Thank you very much,

Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin to close."

Durkin: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3152 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3152, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1192, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1192, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1192 as amended addresses an issue that pertains to the local health department in my district. The health district is structured in a unique way that makes it

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

difficult for them to comply with current food inspection policies established by the Cook County Health Department, not too long ago. I worked with the department and various others that were concerned and we agreed to address the problem through an intergovernmental agreement. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1192 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the roll... record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1192, is hereby declared... having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fortner, for what reason do you seek recognition? All right. House Bill 830, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 830, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 830 is an initiative of the Metro Counties Association which, as you know, is 15 of the largest counties in the state. This would address the collecting of delinquent fines. It says that the fee that could be charged of a delinquent amount will be 30 percent plus each taxable court cost including the cost of service to process. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 830 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bellock, Currie, Smiddy, Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 68 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 830, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2454, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2454, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2454 makes a couple of modifications in respect to townships and their meetings, particularly the annual meetings. What it does, first of all, it provides a greater period for notification extending from 10 to 15 days so that we can make sure notice gets out for anyone about upcoming meetings, but also it clarifies that if there are to be advisory referenda that emerge from the annual town meeting, they have to be focused on the matters that the township is assigned to do by statute. And it's not just open-ended, but it keeps them focused on the business at hand. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2454 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Thapedi. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2454,

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3075, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3075, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill concerns screening for children. So, we all know that when they start school they take an eye exam, they take a hearing test and many times there are students with perfect vision and perfect hearing who still, for whatever reason, can't link the two together. Because of this many school districts have misdiagnosed children and thought they were autistic, put them in special ed. There's all kinds of programs out there, many of which are used in Europe and we had a doctor come before committee and testify about her work on the subject. This Bill would create a pilot program in select school districts that would study this and require that, in those select school districts, they do other kinds of testing. It's very minimal cost because it only requires something like a bell. And... I think this would help school districts and maybe get many kids out of special ed that really don't even belong there, saving the schools lots of money, saving parents lots of headache. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Davis, W.: "Representative, according to the analysis it says that this pilot program will be in selected school districts. Have those school districts already been determined or how will those school districts be determined?"
- Lang: "We're leaving that up to the State Board of Education, but certainly if a school district wanted to do it, they could go to the state board and make the request. It won't be forced on anybody, Representative."
- "Understood, but does this Bill set forth any Davis, W.: quidelines or criteria by which the state board will make that decision? And I quess what I'm getting at, is that if you look at, you know, the disparity of funding in school districts and I appreciate what you're getting at about maybe taking schools off of special ed or out of special ed that may not to be there because they aren't seeing the board properly or they have some hearing challenges. But when you look at the cost of special ed, there are some school districts who can't afford, you know, to pay the higher cost of special ed versus some school districts that can. So, if there's any way to talk about looking at school districts that maybe don't have local resource or aren't getting as much money as other school districts, maybe as a way in terms of the selection process. So, I'm just wondering is there anything that can help in terms of making those decisions?"
- Lang: "Well, I'd be happy to work with you and perhaps go with you to the State Board of Education and make that suggestion and if you think this Bill needs amending in the

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Senate on this issue, I'd be glad to work with you on that as well."

Davis, W.: "Well, I appreciate that. Again, I appreciate what you're doing. I want to... I'm definitely going to support the Bill, but you know, there are probably some school districts that could use that kind of look versus other school districts, not that they all don't want to reduce those costs but some the cost is more burdensome than others. So, maybe there is a way we can look at it in the Senate."

Lang: "Thank you."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "According to this, how long is the pilot program supposed to last?"

Lang: "The state board and the State Department of Public Health would work that out. There's no specific link. There's no specific time it would start. They would determine that by rule, Representative."

Willis: "And then, if this is a successful pilot program which
I anticipate it would be, then would every school be
required to have a speech or an occupational therapist on
their rolls to implement this program?"

Lang: "Well, that's undecided and we don't really know, as we stand here now, who the right professional might be. It could be a pediatric optometrist or ophthalmologist.

There's all sorts of different professionals who could be

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

involved in this program. What we want to do mostly is start this pilot and see what we find. But I think we're going to find that there are a lot of kids that have been misplaced over the years and this program will help us start to weed them out."

Willis: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, you know we're all concerned about funding and in our analysis here it's a little bit blank when it comes to the funding of this program. Is there some estimate that you can give us as to the cost of this program?"

Lang: "Yeah. Virtually zero, Representative, because the doctor who testified, testified that with... just by purchasing a bell, a simple bell, you can learn a lot about a child. The training would be done within the... the in-service programs and other training that teachers and other professionals at the schools do now, so there would be no additional cost, really."

Pritchard: "Was this the same doctor that did that study with dogs, Pavlov?"

Lang: "No, Sir."

Pritchard: "Okay. I just wondered when you're talking about bells. So, you're saying that there's no cost... there's insignificant cost to this and that it would help in providing services to students."

Lang: "Absolutely, Sir."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the ... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Soto: "Yes. Representative Lang, I just want to mention, I did have the demonstration. I just wanted to let my colleagues know I was very impressed with it. Yes. The do... I had the demonstration and they did put the bell in front of you. You're supposed to close your eyes and follow it and that then will indicate whether you have an issue, you know, that the school will address. I just want to stand in support of this Bill. It's a very important Bill. I think that many students... children have been misdiagnosed. And I think that this is a good pilot program. It doesn't cost money; it makes sense. And again, I did have a demonstration and I know that I'm hard of hearing on one the other. So, yes, when side than I had that demonstration, it did indicate that. So, I stand here in strong support of this Bill and I encourage my colleagues here in the General Assembly to also join us and support this Bill. It's a good Bill and I think it's going to make a lot of sense when it comes to our students doing better in school and that's why we're here. We all always run on the issues of education and this is an education Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3075 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3075, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2643, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2643, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is House Bill 26... 2463 the Vulnerable Adult Fatality Review Team Act. It's an initiative of the Attorney General. It establishes 13 fatality review teams for vulnerable adults to assist local agencies in identifying death due to abuse or neglect, facilitate communications between persons reporting or investigating deaths and determine if deaths can be prevented and report findings to agencies as well as to the Executive Council of the review team. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Representative, can you explain to me... I'm sorry, I missed part of your opening remarks. Whatever... what agency is over going to see your adult death review team?"

Martwick: "This would be the Department of Aging would oversee this. They would appoint members to 13 review teams statewide."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Brady: "In other than, obviously, the age group, how is this differing from the child death review teams that we have across the State of Illinois or elder abuse deaths that have occurred across the State of Illinois and review teams?"
- Martwick: "The specific difference is that this is to address a hole in those teams. So, as you mention, you have children, we have seniors. What this does is this covers situations where it involves the child of... I mean, excuse me, an adult 18 to 59 years of age residing in a domestic living situation where they have a physical or mental disability that impairs their ability to protect themselves from abuse or neglect."
- Brady: "And don't... don't those agencies already have internal review policies that they have to comply with according to the State Law?"
- Martwick: "The problem is, is that there are several different agencies that have jurisdiction over different situations and what this does is this ties this all up and coordinates it."
- Brady: "So, basically, this is going to be a task force that reviews reports generated by either the coroner or medical examiner at the time of death on the case and/or law enforcement agencies?"
- Martwick: "There... there are specific instances where a review...
  where these teams would perform reviews. The instances are
  where the death involves a blunt force trauma, where
  there's an undetermined or suspicious manner, if it's
  requested by the decedent's attending physician, referred

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

by a health care provider or if the decedent was a subject of a case involving abuse and neglect."

Brady: "And I'm assuming that none of these members have any type of financial compensation for their service. Is that correct, the task force members?"

Martwick: "I don't believe that there's any provision for financial compensation."

Brady: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I certainly appreciate the Representative's work here and I know how well intended it is, but I think what we're doing is creating an agency we already have in local governments called the county coroner or medical examiner in their statutory authority to conduct death investigations that they presently have. So, I appreciate the efforts and understand well intentions, but I'll be voting 'no' on the legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, why is the Illinois Department of Aging an opponent to this legislation?"

Martwick: "There was some concern because there is a... the department... of course, this changes it from a... there was a 'may' in the law. This re... this is a 'shall' and there was some concern because the... this is an expansion. There are currently adult fatality review teams that deal with elder deaths. I think there's 6 of them; this would expand it to 13. And you know, I'm sure this creates some additional

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

work for them, so I imagine that's why they're opposed to it."

Reboletti: "Is there additional cost to them? Do we know if there is?"

Martwick: "I mean, there is... there is no that I'm aware of. Yeah, I mean, they have concerns that there would be an additional cost because obviously it's more work. But I mean, this is... this is... all of the people would be performing their role in these review panels as part of their... their conditions of their employment anyway so."

Reboletti: "And to follow up on what Representative Brady said, do you... Is this usurping authority away from the county coroners to conduct death investigations? They already have that authority to make that determination."

Martwick: "No, Representative, I don't believe it does because it... the coroners are included on these teams. This is a... these review teams are only to be used in certain circumstances, not every death. So, the coroner would still be reviewing the vast majority of deaths. These teams are assembled to review specific cases or when requested..."

Reboletti: "Speaker, I can't... I can't hear."

Martwick: "...and the coroners would be... coroners would be a member of the... of the team. So, this is providing additional expertise to investigate..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative."

Martwick: "...a particular incident."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Can we please get some order in here. Members are having trouble hearing.

Thank you. You may proceed."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Reboletti: "I'm sorry, Representative Martwick, I didn't get a chance to hear about the last 45 seconds of your answer."

Martwick: "Yes. So, the coroners would be would be... a member of some of these panels, of these teams and their authority would not be usurped. Remember, these teams are only... they would only engage a review under certain circumstances or when requested by... again, in certain cases. So, the vast majority of cases, the coroner would still be reviewing. These are specific cases and the coroners would be a part of these teams and the idea of these teams is to provide expertise in a big panel that it goes beyond what the coroner has so that the coroner can bring their expertise and rely on other law enforcement personnel and physicians and whatnot to help review the cases."

Reboletti: "Can you walk me through a hypothetical of where this would come into play, a circumstance?"

Martwick: "Well, I mean, I can't walk you through a hypothetical, but I can... I can cite from the Bill. There is, for instance, you're talking about someone 18 to 59 years of age. So, someone that's not qualified as a senior, vulnerable senior, but... so, you take someone who is... has a mental or physical disability that impairs their ability to protect themselves from abuse or neglect. So, you start with that. Number 2, there's a death involving a blunt force trauma or there is a case that there is alleged abuse or neglect. That's where the teams would come in, or if it was requested by the attending physician and his staff."

Reboletti: "This is in any domestic living situation. It doesn't have to be in a nursing home or assisted living

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- facility. This could be in somebody's residential home, apartment, hotel."
- Martwick: "Again, yes, this is any domestic living situation, but this is... it's not every case. It's cases that meet a certain criteria or where there is a specific request."
- Reboletti: "Representative, who would ask for the investigation of this panel? Who triggers the investigation? I mean, obviously, the coroner's going to conduct their investigation. How is this team brought into review? Who asks for them to come in?"
- Martwick: "Well, they could be requested by the decedent's attending physician. Okay. So, that might be in a case where, for instance, where there's not a blunt force trauma involved, right. There's not a death that is... obviously requires some sort of investigation, but perhaps there is some allege of neg... allegation of neglect. The attending physician notices something that this person who was vulnerable not... was vulnerable and could not protect themselves from neglect, and therefore, they were neglected and to the point that they died. So, the attending physician in the hospital might... could then trigger a request for this."
- Reboletti: "But those folks are probably mandatory reporters.

  Wouldn't they be... already be reporting to the coroner, to
  the State's Attorney's Office, to the sheriff about a
  suspicious type death?"
- Martwick: "I imagine they would, but again... I imagine you're right. I don't know. I would assume then that an attending physician would report something suspicious to law

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

enforcement. But again, what this does is this takes a situation where what they... what their request would do would be in addition to that, would trigger this review team which, again, instead of just the coroner reviewing this case then the panel would be engaged and you would have a broader base of experience. And again, it's not just to determine the manner of death. The purpose of this is to assist local agencies in identifying death due to abuse and neglect. Also, to determine if deaths could have been prevented to affect policies, so they're reporting findings. Again, this is not just to deal with a specific situation, but to establish findings that might lead to policy changes that could prevent these tasks in the future."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Martwick: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Gentleman's legislation as this is part of an ongoing effort to address cases of abuse and neglect of disabled adults in residential settings that have come forward in recent years where the existing investigatory system has truly failed adults with disabilities. And I'm very glad to have worked with the Gentleman, with the Attorney General, with the various departments to expand on an existing concept that has been used by the Department of Aging to prevent abuse and neglect cases for elders. So, the reason the Department of Aging is involved is we're just trying to not reinvent the

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

wheel, but to expand that to a population of folks who are not DCFS, who are 18 to 59, who are living in residential settings who have disabilities. I think it's a commonsense approach. It is... got a proven track record and it will prevent harm to some of our most vulnerable citizens. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative, reading our analysis and I have to apologize when the discussion started I was on the phone and if I missed any part of it I hope I'm not being... I'm duplicating anything. But nowhere in our analysis does it mention law enforcement and it would seem to me whenever you have any type of blunt force trauma, law enforcement would be notified. Am I missing something here?"

Martwick: "Yeah. Representative, the teams do involve law enforcement. So, again, this is reviewing the death. The teams will consist of one member from each of the following categories. So, a physician knowledgeable about abuse and neglect of vulnerable adults."

Sacia: "Could... could I interrupt one moment, Sir?"

Martwick: "Of course."

Sacia: "But let's take the team concept out of it for a minute.

Where we are today, without this being put into place, we have a... we have an individual found deceased. The coroner or medical examiner rules that it's blunt force trauma, but we don't know if he was hit upside the head or if he fell down the stairs, or just what it is. But wouldn't law

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

enforcement have already reviewed, if you will? Can you... can you share with me that examples exist where we have someone deceased from blunt force trauma. Would there not be a law enforcement, at least an initial effort to notify law enforcement, the coroner would get there and say we have blunt force trauma. I think we'd better call the state's attorney."

"Well, Representative, I'm sure that everything that Martwick: you've said is true, but remember that the idea of these death review teams goes beyond simply investigating. There is an investigatory part of it which is why they do include enforcement. They include representatives of Department of the State... State Police and state's attorneys and the coroner. The idea is that this is for vulnerable adults. These are people with... whose physical or mental disability prevents them from defending themselves from abuse or neglect. So, we start with that premise. Now, you add the blunt force trauma. Yes, I'm sure there's been an investigation that's been initiated, but in this sense the idea of the... of the panel is more than just to determine who's at fault. There's no doubt that I'm sure that that portion of this investigation is best served by enforcement, no doubt, but this goes beyond that. purpose of these teams is not only to assist local agencies in identifying deaths that are due to abuse or neglect, but also to facilitate communication between persons reporting or investigating the deaths, to determine if these deaths could be prevented and then to repot these findings to the appropriate agencies to effect policy that might prevent

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

these deaths from happening in the future, for vulnerable adults."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you. We worked all summer with Representative Harris on the Bill. I think this is in reaction to all the deaths in Belleville. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Bellock: "Okay. But we have not passed Representative Harris's Bill yet on the floor, correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Bellock: "I think it would have been easier for the Legislature to understand your trailer Bill if we had done Representative Harris's Bill first because that showed the structuring of what we were trying to do to make things more accountable. I don't understand why we're doing the trailer Bill before the regular Bill."

Martwick: "Well, they... they're all... I mean, they worked together, so I don't see the problem, but I, you know..."

Bellock: "Well, it was just my suggestion that I think everybody could have understood what the problem was to begin with, how we were going to address it. I mean, I'm in support of this. I'm just saying that I think it would have been easier to do the first Bill before you do the trailer Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Martwick: "Thank you." Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Kay: "Representative, Representative Harris is standing next to you there and I'm... how you doing... and I'm curious as to the duplication here of effort that is being made in your Bill and Representative Harris's Bill which, by the way, I am a cosponsor on and specifically, I'm looking at the function, the investigative function that you're looking for here, as it... as it applies to Representative Harris's Bill and what the department has already done with respect to bringing in a new OIG and handling the line staff function differently in the field and up to Springfield. So, what are you doing differently here than Representative Harris's Bill?"

Martwick: "Well, Representative, this is all intended to be moved together, is my understanding, but this addresses this specific instance and it's filling this specific hole in what we have going on right now. And if it winds up as part of a bigger Bill at the end, that's great, but we certainly don't want to... we don't want to take a chance that this part would not be part of the final Bill than if it... What if the final Bill doesn't pass? This... this part is important and..."

Kay: "Sure."

Martwick: "...that's why I'm moving to get it passed now."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Kay: "So, you don't think that Representative Harris's Bill covers the aspect of the... or the deficiency that your Bill addresses?"

Martwick: "Yeah. Of course, we want to try and put them all into one Bill eventually, but as I said, you know, I... there's no guarantee that when Representative Harris presents his Bill that this provision, which would be a part of the bigger Bill, would pass. This is an important provision, so that's why I thought it's best to do it now. If it is then, you know, if this is amended or if this is replaced by the bigger Bill at a later time, I'm in all in support of that..."

Kay: "Yeah."

Martwick: "...but until that happens, I think that this is a good thing to move this forward."

Kay: "Yeah. One last... one last question, Representative. I have a vested interest in this for a lot of different reasons, and won't take the time to tell you why at this point, but what is it that you're going to be doing here, and I know you may not know what Representative Harris's Bill contains, but it's pretty all inclusive and it comes from a number of hearings. What is it you're going to do that Representative Harris's Bill doesn't do? Because I'm not sure I see what it is and maybe I just have missed it."

Martwick: "Again, I'm not suggesting that there's anything that is terribly different in what's contained. But Representative Harris's Bill is a bigger Bill, so there's other... other parts of it. This addresses one specific situation."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick to close."

Martwick: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2643 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hammond, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 78 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2643, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the record reflect that Representative Senger will be excused the rest of the day."

Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request. Thank you. House Bill 973, Representative Hatcher. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 973, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hatcher."

Hatcher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 973 gives the opportunity for a existing fire district for permissive use to use an empty building for another reason. Currently, there is a guideline set up that an empty or being used fire district house can only be used six times a year for serving any kind of alcoholic beverages. This building is standing empty, has the opportunity to perhaps rent to a restaurant but cannot do so unless we can change the rules for this one building and this one fire district."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 973 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. On a count of 75 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 973, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3122, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3122, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 3122 is the annual transfer Bill for the Auditor General and basically what it is, is it has a listing of funds. Whenever the Auditor General conducts an audit, moneys are transferred there in order to pay for the audits. He does audits of both the management and the financial side of all of our agencies. And this is the Bill which allows him to take from these funds, place it into his audit expense fund and thereby conduct the audits for the State of Illinois. I know of no opposition. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3122 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3122, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Bill 2934, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2934, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. This Bill is actually an initiative of the child care providers in the community who looked at the work that we did to provide Internet safety protections last year and have asked to be included in those same protections. So, it's gimply an opportunity for them to post a notification on their website as to whether or not they do any sort of a background check and provide some guidance as to how people can make better informed decisions about the people that they're utilizing to provide in home care for their children and their elderly. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2934 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2934, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2642, Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2642, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Toll Highway Act. It requires that signage be placed at every toll collection station including electronic toll collection station informing the user of how much the toll is. I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, don't we already notify people that are paying cash how much they're paying?"

Kosel: "Yes, we do but not electronically."

Franks: "Does it really matter electronically."

Kosel: "It's my money; it matters."

Franks: "No, but I mean, you've already done it. I mean, you know you're paying half the... you're paying half the rate of the cash payers, right?"

Kosel: "If you would like to know how much you pay, you have to look at the cash station amount, divide by 2 as you're driving through."

Franks: "Correct."

Kosel: "You should... it is your money that they are taking; it should be transparent. We should know how much is being charged against our charge cards or... or however you're paying for that I-Pass."

Franks: "Where... where would you put these signs?"

Kosel: "The tollway... the tollway had... we had a discussion with it. There's several places that they could do it. They could do it... they could do it after the tolls so that there's no choice, you know, as to so you can't see it

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

before. Every other state that does this posts how much they are so we are the exception in not telling people how much they're paying."

Franks: "Is there a cost to this? Have you figured out what that would cost?"

Kosel: "It does not... it does not say what kind of sign. So, literally, they could... they could put a bumper-type sticker... oversized bumper-type sticker on an existing sign, if they wanted. I would hope that they would do it the most economical way possible, but I..."

Franks: "'Cause I see oftentimes they've got those electronic billboards that they're always putting things up or they also have some that when you're driving on the Kennedy they'll have an amber alert or something. Could you just use those changeable electronic signs?"

Kosel: "You could use... you could if they thought that was the safest way to do it."

Franks: "Why is the Illinois Toll Highway Authority opposed?"

Kosel: "I have found they... they did not sign in in opposition
 and it's not listed as opposed on my analysis."

Franks: "On the Democratic analysis it indicates they are opposed. I don't know if anyone has talked to them."

Kosel: "I have talked to them several times and then they had some concerns about safety, but they did not... they believe that they can handle it."

Franks: "Okay. Well, thank you."

Kosel: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel to close."

Kosel: "I would ask for your support."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2642 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2642, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1533, Representative Nekritz.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1533, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill"

Speaker Turner: "Leader Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1533 deals with the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council. It does two things for the… and the acronym is SPAC. One, is it exempts SPAC from the Personnel Code. The reason for that is that the positions that SPAC hires are very specialized, requiring advanced degrees and… and so they have trouble filling that through the Personnel Code. And secondly, their… their statutory authorization only lasts for a few more years. So, it is a short-term exemption that we would be offering them. And the second thing the Bill does is to ch… change some of the appointments to the council itself and how those appointments are made and who sits on the council."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1533 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1533, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3233, Representative Leitch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3233, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill responds to concerns that have been expressed throughout most of rural counties downstate and involve complying with a number of new rules, challenges to providing EMT services, services in those counties. At the request of the Marshall County Fire District, I have this measure which would enable them to have a front-door referendum and increased the levy from .3 to .4 percent. I think it is very reasonable and I think for the safety of these counties and the great concerns they have as more and more volunteers are unable to continue volunteering, it's very important that we pass this measure and help out these counties. I this also add t.hat. issue was studied Representative Moffitt and former Representative Dugan, who had conducted a series of task forces hearings throughout the state and this is among the remedies that that report suggests. So, I would ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Reboletti: "Representative, where'd the .4 percent come in versus the... I know this says the current statute provides for the .3. Why up to .4?"

Leitch: "That was the request of the Marshall County Fire District."

Reboletti: "How much would that help them generate? What would that allow them to do?"

Leitch: "I'm not sure how much specifically that generates, but that was the request that they offered."

Reboletti: "And why aren't they able to go to referendum on their own? They are up to .3 but not up to .4?"

Leitch: "They're... apparently, they are capped at, right now at .3."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch to close."

Leitch: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3233 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Will Davis, Sente. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 71 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3233, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3199, Representative Riley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3199, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Al Riley."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3199 just endeavors to have CMAP, which is the MPO for the Chicago Metropolitan area, come before this Body before their annual budget. As you know, again, CMAP was the amalgamation of CATS and NIPC into the regional planning organization for the six-county area and we did that by statute in 2007. There's a lot of things that they control. They do a lot of very important land use and other planning and because they do that and because we partially fund them, they should come before us before their annual budget. And that's what 3199 endeavors to do. And I'll answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3199 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3199, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2762, Representative Scherer. Mr... Out of the record. House Bill 1206, Representative Sente. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1206, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1206 is a Bill we have passed on true... two prior occasions. MABAS is an intergovernal... a governmental consortium of 111 local governments ensuring fire emergency management service and special teams mutual aid assistance under the Illinois

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Intergovernmental Cooperation Act. MABAS has been leasing office space from the Village of Wheeling and receiving property tax exemption. They would like to purchase the building and property, which has been off the tax rolls for 20 years and therefore, would like to codify their tax-exempt status into law. Everyone is in agreement. The Village of Wheeling, Cook County, and Illinois Department of Revenue take no issue with the request. And it passed unanimously out of Revenue. Happy to take questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1206 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1206, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2639, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2639, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2639 was brought to me from the Department of Military Affairs and would it let them establish by rule a recognition... a program to allow the Governor or the Adjutant General to recognize individuals or organizations who have contributed to the advancement of the Illinois National Guard. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2639 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2639, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2969, Representative Smiddy. Out of the record. House Bill 2752, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2752, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2752 protects taxpayer who are choosing to do the right thing by entering a repayment plan with the Department of Revenue. This legislation prohibits the department from putting a lien on the property as long as the taxpayer is in compliance with the terms of the repayment plan. This will help encourage taxpayers who have in the past fallen behind in their tax payments to continue to follow their plan and repay it to the state. This is an initiative of the Department of Revenue and I have no opposition on the Bill. And I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2752 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kay, D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2752, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 983, Mr. McSweeney. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 983, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 983 simply improves a voter accountability. It gives the ability of local taxpayers to move forward with a backdoor referendum for alternate revenue bonds. I'm a big supporter alternate revenue bonds as a financing source. All that we're doing is making it easier for citizens to do a backdoor referendum. We're also eliminating conflicts in which feasibility consultant can also be an overall consultant on the project. This is a commonsense piece of legislation that is good for taxpayers. All that we're doing is lowering the number of signatures that are required to do a referendum. For all the good alternate revenue projects out there, they have nothing to be concerned about. For the projects like golf courses that have stuck local taxpayers responsibility, it'll just simply give voters the ability to approve these projects in the future. So, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. On this question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I appreciate working with you on this Bill. You spent a lot of time and effort in this near and dear to our hearts being from McHenry county. One provision you did not discuss in the... in your opening was the conflict of interest provision that I think may be the most important one here. Could you explain that to the Members of this General Assembly?"
- McSweeney: "Thank you very much. What we are simply doing, as I said, is making sure that the firm that does the revenue projection is not the same firm that is doing consulting on the project. It completely eliminates the conflicts that exist so that we will have a very unbiased forecast in the future without any types of conflicts."
- Franks: "And we've seen in the past that there has been conflicts and as a result the taxpayers have had to pay dearly because when these alternative revenue bonds have been issued, tax... in many instances, taxpayers home property taxes have gone up exponentially to cover the shortfall. Isn't that correct?"
- McSweeney: "That is correct. In fact there's actually a great example in our backyard in Lakewood... McHenry County."
- Franks: "And I know that those that have came after them were very upset that they... they were saddled with these additional taxes."
- McSweeney: "Taxpayers were very upset and that's why we're just trying to bring some commonsense reform, giving voters more say and also eliminating conflicts. And I appreciate the work you've done on this legislation with me."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Franks: "And the other issue that you did in this I found fascinating is it gave additional time for taxpayers to collect the required signatures and actually reduce the required signature amount still making it difficult to get, but some... but at least attainable, correct?"

McSweeney: "That is correct. We're just simply increasing the number of days from 30 to 45 and we're reducing the number of signatures from seven and a half percent of the registered voters to five percent or 5 thousand whichever is less."

Franks: "Well, thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker and the Members. I'd encourage an 'aye' vote here. This is a very impressive Bill. I know it's your first Bill and it's one that I think will make a large difference to many people. I think it tightens up the alternative revenue bond issue. I think it protects our taxpayers. I think it gives the taxpayers a voice. And I'm thankful to work with you on it. And I encourage all to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Willis: "I see some opposition from some groups and I was wondering if you could explain what they're opposing?"

McSweeney: "I think some groups simply don't want to reduce the signature requirement. I agree that alternate revenue bond are a very important source. We have negotiated with a number of the parties that are involved to actually get a Bill that we think makes sense. Some parties still do not want to make any changes in the current law. All that we're

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

trying to do is reduce the number of signatures, bring about accountability and that's what the opposition is about right now."

Willis: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Dunkin: "I did not hear or it was not clear as it relates to why there's so many opp... so much opposition, Representative."

McSweeney: "Representative..."

Dunkin: "'Cause it's very difficult to hear. You see how I project through the microphone. Can you..."

McSweeney: "Sure."

Dunkin: "It's tough to hear you."

McSweeney: "Right. And Representative, right now the concern among some of the opposition is they don't want to make any changes to the existing law. Our view is that we need to bring more accountability. All that we're simply doing is reducing the number of signatures that are required to do a backdoor referendum. We're increasing the accountability and there's still some..."

Dunkin: "What do you call the referendum, again?"

McSweeney: "It's a backdoor referendum. That means that it's..."

Dunkin: "Like back order."

McSweeney: "Backdoor referendum means that the actual constituents can demand a referendum. There's a process for doing it. It's not an automatic referendum, but if, in fact, residents and voters want to do a referendum, they

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

have to get a certain amount of signatures. That is what we're facilitating here. We're actually reducing the number of signatures that are required in order to get that done."

Dunkin: "So, 4 thousand... so, we're looking at going from 4 thousand to 200, correct?"

McSweeney: "No. Actually, the Bill goes from seven and a half percent to the lesser of 5 percent or 5 thousand registered voters and that's 4... over 4 thousand registered voters in a district. For under 4 thousand, Representative, there really is no change to the current law. What we're doing is just simply making it the lesser of 15 percent or 200 voters. So, the real change here is for 4 thousand and above governmental entities. Any governmental entity with 500 thousand or more inhabitants is exempted from this Bill."

Dunkin: "So, why is this important for us to do at this moment, now?"

McSweeney: "Representative, we're having some major issues in my area, McHenry County. We have a situation that an alternate revenue bond was issued for a golf course. That golf course failed. The property tax owners were stuck with the bill. We also have a situation in many areas there've been abuses. I mean, alternate revenue bonds, again, are a great source of financing; however, when there are projects like golf courses in which the taxpayers will ultimately get stuck with bad projects, all that we're trying to do is bring about some increased accountability. We want to give the taxpayers the ability, if they want to, to try to do a referendum. We're just making it easier."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Dunkin: "So, now, who brought this legislation?"

McSweeney: "Actually, I brought this legislation with Representative Franks. We've worked on this legislation, developed it together."

Dunkin: "Okay. Was...is the Illinois Policy Institute connected with this in any way."

McSweeney: "Not at all. They have issued support. They had nothing to do with the legislation. And this was Jack Franks and I who worked on this together. We worked with Charlie..."

Dunkin: "Jack... Jack Franks?"

McSweeney: "Representative Franks."

Dunkin: "Really? You guys share a pretty sort of common legislative policy ideology here?"

McSweeney: "Every once in a while we do, yes."

Dunkin: "I've always figured that Jack Franks had a different political ideology than a lot of us here on this floor 'cause he has a different way of perce... you know, perceiving government and the approach towards government. I'm trying to still figure out Jack Frank's perspective on how government should function. Can you elaborate? 'Cause I see you guys are cosponsors here and Kay, Dwight. This is a pretty interesting trio here. Can you imagine being in the same vehicle or truck with Jack Franks, Dwight Kay and yourself, McSweeney? You're driving, right or Jack's driving?"

McSweeney: "I think Jack would be driving that car."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Dunkin: "I can believe that. So... I know Jack. Jack's a friend of mine and some people don't know Jack, but I know Jack. So, would this im... would this impact the City of Chicago?"

McSweeney: "No it would not."

Dunkin: "Any other municipalities?"

McSweeney: "Any governmental entity with over 500 thousand inhabitants is exempted from this legislation."

Dunkin: "Over how many?"

McSweeney: "Five hundred thousand."

Dunkin: "Five hundred thousand?"

McSweeney: "Yes, Sir"

Dunkin: "So, that's... so, what do the other Legislators feel about this legislation since they're pretty much below 500 thousand?"

McSweeney: "We've developed a great biparitson support base. We passed the Bill out of committee on an overwhelming basis."

Dunkin: "Unanimously, it came out of committee."

McSweeney: "Not unanimously."

Dunkin: "Let me check that. Hold on, hold on."

McSweeney: "Not unanimously. Yeah. We had..."

Dunkin: "How did it pass out of committee, Representative?"

McSweeney: "We had 2 votes against it, Representative."

Dunkin: "What were their... what were their issues? I'm curious.

This is pretty important, you know, getting a shorter amount of signatures to get bonds, right?"

McSweeney: "That's right. And it's su..."

Dunkin: "Okay. All right. Is there anything else you want to enlighten or share with this Body before this legislation passes, Representative?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

McSweeney: "I would appreciate the support of this Body with this important piece of legislation."

Dunkin: "Before you leave. What's your interpretation...
anticipation of this pass in the Senate."

McSweeney: "I'm very hopeful it's going to pass the Senate."

Dunkin: "Have you identified a Sponsor yet?"

McSweeney: "Actually, I have and I have the support of... in the Senate right now. And I'm going to push this Bill hard here in the House and in the Senate."

Dunkin: "So you're going to go over to the Senate and push this Bill as well?"

McSweeney: "Yes, I am."

Dunkin: "Who's the Senator that's going to carry this Bill?

'Cause you know Senators don't like to be pushed from what
I understand."

McSweeney: "My local State Senator Pam Althoff has filed for this Bill."

Dunkin: "Pat Althoff, is she or he new?"

McSweeney: "No, Pam Althoff has been here for a long time."

Dunkin: "Oh, Althoff. Pam, oh yeah, the red head. Does she know Jack? Oh, she don't know Jack... which, I mean."

McSweeney: "She knows Jack. She knows Representative Franks very well."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thanks for the clarification, Representative."

McSweeney: "Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just... was that your first... is this your first Bill, Representative?"

McSweeney: "Yes, Representative."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Davis, W.: "It... Oh, it is?"

McSweeney: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "I don't think we knew that. Well, I was... I was just asking a question that's all. I was curious based on the nature of Representative Dunkin's questioning, but actually, I do have kind of a more serious question..."

McSweeney: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "...if I may add. So, the... the backdoor referendum that you referred to, is that to get the voters to support the bond or the other way? I mean, I guess what I'm trying to understand because when you lessen the signature requirements and you're talking about more accountability, how does fewer signatures amongst a pool of voters equal greater accountability?"

McSweeney: "Representative, this is to put it on the ballot.

That's simply all that the backdoor referendum would do.

Reduce the number of signatures, if people want to move forward with an effort for accountability, to put on the ballot. We're just simply reducing the number of signatures that are required to put it on the ballot."

Davis, W.: "So, put that in context of the example you used about the golf course."

McSweeney: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "So, if the golf course… if the bond to, I guess, move the golf course forward had been put on the… And though you're saying and it maybe… It was not put on the ballot?"

McSweeney: "No."

Davis, W.: "Or maybe it should have been put on the ballot?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

McSweeney: "Voters should have had an opportunity with less signatures to put it on the ballot. It was not put on the ballot. It was an absolute disaster. The taxpayers were stuck with this. All that I would do in this legislation is simply reduce the number of signatures that are required to put it on the ballot."

Davis, W.: "To put... so, to put the bond that would have went to cover the golf course."

McSweeney: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "Would have put it on the ballot and you would have reduced the number of signatures to allow it to be a ballot initiative versus an arbitrary initiative by the local unit of government?"

McSweeney: "That's correct. It would just simply reduce the number of signatures to allow it to be on the ballot and there would be a yes or no vote about approving the... the alternate revenue bond."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank... thank you very much for that. So... so, back to Jack again. No, I'm just joking. Thank you very much, Representative."

McSweeney: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sure."

Reboletti: "Representative, why weren't you looking for any Democrat Sponsors on your Bill? You only have... you only have Republican Sponsors on your Bill."

McSweeney: "A very fair point."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Reboletti: "And I was wondering if Representative Dunkin knew Jack better than some people say you don't know Jack, Representative. Is that true? I have nothing further. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney to close."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Brauer, Cavaletto, Costello, Lilly, Sims, Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis. Members, please give Representative Davis your attention."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Davis, M.: "I'd like to announce that one of our third oldest Members in this Body lost her brother yesterday, Mary Flowers. I'd ask that the Body stand for a moment in respect to Mary Flowers' brother. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Next we have House Bill 3003, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3003, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3003 creates a Childhood Cancer Research Board that reviews grant applications, makes recommendations and comments and consults with the Department of Public Health in making grants from amounts appropriate from the Childhood Research Fund to the public and private and not-for-profit entities. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Hoping to have your support. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3003 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ives, Cavaletto. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3003, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3380, Representative Tabares. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3380, a Bill for an Act concerning business."
- Speaker Turner: "Out of the record, please. House Bill 962, Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 962, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 962 is cosponsored by every member of the International Trade & Commerce

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Committee. By way of background, Mr. Speaker, in 2005 the General Assembly found it was in our best interest to create a not-for-profit corporation, not an agency, to foster trade opportunities with the world. By law, the Illinois Global Partnership is to maintain an office here in Springfield as well as in Chicago, both offices quickly emerged as global leaders. For example, the World Bank has a competitive process for countries to follow in order to qualify to do business with them. The World Bank actually has a program where they select Private Sector Liaison Officers. In 2008, the World Bank had 80 member countries the PSLO program, the United States had representative office and that was here in Illinois. And as you can imagine, as having our own World Bank PSLO office here in Illinois, trade with our foreign partners flourished from 2005 to 2008. Since that time, there's been a rapid decline in our trading opportunities with our foreign partners. And the purpose of the Bill is twofold: Number 1 for the General Assembly to follow the directives of the Illinois Global Partnership Act by waking up and jumpstarting the dormant IGP. And secondly, to ensure that the proper transparency safeguards are in place for the IGP to operate and secure billions of dollars in contracts and jobs for and with our international trading partners. I know about no opposition. There should be no opposition. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 962. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

wish? Have all voted who wish? Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 962, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2761, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2761, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2761 is an initiative of MABAS which is Mutual Aid Box Alarm System. We've been working on this for two or three years. And with the Amendment that's on it, there's no opposition. The Trial Lawyers are neutral and I want to commend them for working with us. And we've also agreed that there'd be no changes in 2014 unless they were mutually agreed. What this allows for is that we can have mutual aid across state lines and think what that potentially does. It brings a whole additional group of assets potentially available, if we can work with communities across state lines. It's permissive, only if local agencies want to join and have mutual aid across state lines. So, it's an opportunity to bring additional services both ways. They can help us; we can help them. And we've worked out the details with the Trial Lawyers. I certainly would ugre a 'yes' vote for this. It'd provide a quicker and more effective response in the event of an emergency in a neighboring state or they'd come to our

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

rescue. Lots of proponents, no opponents. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2761... The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2761 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2761, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3262, Representative Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3262, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. What this Bill does is it clarifies the intent of legislation passed in 205. It was thought that the legislation passed in '05 would give public water districts and non profit water companies the ability to place water lines on highway right-of-way when private easement was not obtainable. It has since been suggested that the change in the Highway Code was needed also. House Bill 3262 will amend both the Public Water District Act and the Highway Code stipulation that the water districts have the ability to place these pipes in the highway right-of-way. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no de… Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Davis, W.: "Representative, when you talk about easements along the highways, are you talking about highways that are only owned or that are state highways or county highways? Is it possible that a... the land or the easement next to a highway could be private property?"

Verschoore: "Well, if it... next to the easement could be, but I think highway... all highways, county, state and federal highways are owned by government."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, the easements, no easement would be private property?"

Verschoore: "That's the way I understand it, yes."

Davis, W.: "The way you understand it?"

Verschoore: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank you."

Verschoore: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you. Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman yields."

Kosel: "Does this only effect water districts or could a for
 profit water company also take advantage of this Bill?"

Verschoore: "No, Representative."

Kosel: "No what?"

Verschoore: "Only public water districts."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Verschoore: "And non profits."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Franks: "Presently, Representative, if there is to be an easement granted, does it have to be consensual?"

Verschoore: "Have to be consensual?"

Franks: "Consensual. It has to be agreed to by both parties."

Verschoore: "By the state and the water company, I would assume, yes."

Franks: "No. I'm talking about presently. Be... before this Bill, should it become law? For one to obtain an easement, doesn't the one who's giving the easement have to actually agree to it?"

Verschoore: "I would say yes."

Franks: "Okay. But this would change long-standing tradition in the State of Illinois. And this Bill would say that the property owner would have no say whatsoever, and they would have... and an easement would be given by right over their property."

Verschoore: "No. Thi... This would give... This with a... If they don't want to give an easement, this could go on the right-of-way of the state or the federal highway. It wouldn't affect the constituent or the home... or the landowner. The way I... the way I see it."

Franks: "That's not how I read it by our analysis because if a homeowner or a property owner owned the land on both sides of the road, this Bill would say they could not object and that an easement would be automatically given to them."

Verschoore: "The highway auth..."

Franks: "It'd be taken from them, actually."

Verschoore: "The highway authority would have to authorize it in order for it to go through the... on the right-of-way."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Franks: "But the homeowner or the property owner would not be reimbursed. In other instances when an easement is given, the property owner would be reimbursed. But what you're saying here is, is that this easement will be taken from the property owner and that property owner will not get any remuneration for the use of their property."
- Verschoore: "No. But there won't be... it won't go through their property. It would be on the highway. It would be..."
- Franks: "No. It would go through their property the way your Bill reads. This would take away a private property owner's ability to object to an easement if you're dealing with a public water authority."
- Verschoore: "Well, that's what... that's what it says."
- Franks: "Okay. Do you think that's the right public policy to take away private property owner's rights? Don't you think it'd be... make more sense to allow them to be... to continue what we've been doing and to negotiate and make it a consensual transaction, or if they... if they don't agree, to go to a court and perhaps get eminent domain. But I'm concerned that this would take away... this Bill, should it pass, would take away private property owner's rights."
- Verschoore: "Well, if they wouldn't agree, then there... we wouldn't... they wouldn't be able to lay the lines and they wouldn't be... people wouldn't be able to get water. So..."
- Franks: "But they... but they do have a way to get around that.

  If they couldn't agree, they could go to court. And they could get an expedited hearing; they can do an eminent domain proceeding. Why would we take away a procedural

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- safeguard and a property right 'cause this is not something that we should be taking lightly?"
- Verschoore: "No. I don't take it lightly, but I... the highway authority still has to agree to it. So, it'd be the state agreeing with it."
- Franks: "I get that. But that's the government agreeing to do something with my land. Perhaps, I don't wish to have the government decide how my land is to be used unless they'd like to take it by eminent domain, which they have that right. I'm just wondering, have they... is there a specific situation here that they're trying to solve that they have not gone through the procedural safeguards that are presently existing?"
- Verschoore: "Well, when the property owner refuses to grant the easement, that's what the pur... the purpose of this is... is to..."
- Franks: "I know. Is... I think a better solution would be perhaps to give an expedited hearing on eminent domain so the parties could be heard. I just hate to take away someone's private property rights without any chance of remuneration without any chance of being heard. Because what could happen, for instance, if... if the water authority was actually wrong, that there might have been a better place to run an easement than through someone's private property 'cause there's no chance here for any appeal or for any independent third party to weigh in."
- Verschoore: "I think the reason for this, Representative Franks, was... that's the case. There was no other place to

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

run it other than on the... on the highway, highway property."

Franks: "I'm sorry. I had trouble hearing you. I apologize."

Verschoore: "I said I think the reason for it was there was no other place to run it and that's why they wanted to run it on the highway easement."

Franks: "Well, my question is, is there any other remedy, presently, that they could do? Could they go to court for this?"

Verschoore: "Not that I'm aware of."

Franks: "Okay. Well, I appreciate your answers. And I... I will stand in opposition because I think that property rights are pretty sacred, and I think there's other ave... avenues here that government could go forward including eminent domain. And I'd like to see this changed to, perhaps, allowing for a quicker eminent domain proceeding whether than stripping someone of their property rights without them having any say. So, I'd encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Verschoore to close."

Verschoore: "I think we're going to pull it from the record and see if we can work on this a little more."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill from the record. House Bill 2768, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2768, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2768 is a Bill that requires local school districts and local police

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

departments to communicate with each other regarding gang activity. This is a Bill that basically extends a law that is already in effect that covers the Chicago Public Schools and already requires the Chicago Public Schools to report gang activity between schools and local police departments and vice versa. I'm asking the House of Representatives to extend this to the rest of the state."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Welcome back up there. I know that Lou came in for a minutes and did a good job. You do a better job. So, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."
- Reboletti: "Representative, why are the Chicago Public Schools not included in this Bill?"
- Welch: "This particular Bill, Representative Reboletti, does not include the city because they are already included under 105 ILCS 5/34-8.1. That Bill that's currently in existence has the exact same language as this Bill, and it only covers the Chicago Public Schools. I'm taking that Bill and extending it to the rest of the state. And this is a valuable tool that suburban police departments, particularly in my district, would really like to have at their disposal."
- Reboletti: "How... how has the success rate been with CPS and this initiative? How has it worked so far?"
- Welch: "I... I don't have that information. I do know that a lot of the suburban school districts already do it on a

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

voluntary basis, and... and they have reported great success with... with it."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Welch, I'm sorry I didn't hear your report on this particular Bill. Could you explain, again, what this Bill does?"

"Representative Davis, this Bill basically requires Welch: communication between the local school district and the local police department. Basically, what we're trying to do is to prevent spillover into either entity. If there's a gang fight in the local cafeteria on a Fr... on a Wednesday, the principal or his designee is responsible to let the police department know. Vice versa if there's a... a gang fight in the community on a Saturday or a Sunday, the police department's required to let the school know. What happens? The school has increased security on the next available school day. You don't have a gang fight that happened in the community spillover into the school. I think it's... This is all about the safety of students and the welfare of our kids. And I think it's a good Bill for our state."

Davis, M.: "I just want to ask a few questions. How does this Bill relate to the privacy of school… of children? You know there's a Privacy Act where you cannot give the names of children to outside sources. So, are you saying that this privacy law is no longer to be adhered to, that the names

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- of children who are involved in a so-called gang fight, their name could be given to the police?"
- Welch: "Well, Representative Davis, the Bill, specifically, says illegal gang activity as a criminal offense... I'm sorry. It specifically talks about the illegal use or possession of weapons or illegal gang activity. So, if a student is involved in that type of behavior, I certainly believe that they're entitled to waive that privacy."
- Davis, M.: "So, if they're involved in fighting or what else...

  what else would you say re... requires a police
  notification?"
- Welch: "It... The Bill says illegal use of weapons or illegal gang activity. So, if it is a gang fight, which I recently had in the school district that I serve where we had two large gangs at war fighting each other and that fight in the cafeteria, we reported that to the local police department. And this Bill would require that all school districts do that across the state because we don't want what happened in the local cafeteria to spillovers into the community and cause something... greater havoc."
- Davis, M.: "So, am I correct in looking at the analysis that Chicago is excluded from this legislation?"
- Welch: "Chicago is already under a similar Bill. So, there is no new... need to duplicate that. Chicago is under 105 ILCS 5/34-8.1. What we're doing is taking that Bill and extending it to the rest of the state."
- Davis, M.: "So, Chicago already has legislation in which if there's a fight in a community that the school districts, even though the kids probably go to many, many different

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- schools, the school districts have to be told that there was a fight, when it occurred, and so forth?"
- Welch: "Your... you're using fight without gang before it. I think it's important to distinguish. Kids are going to fight; we know kids are going to fight. There's a difference between a fight over a boy or something or a girl than a gang fight. A gang fight is something that, I think, we should all be concerned about, and we want to make sure that we maintain safety in our public schools."
- Davis, M.: "Representative Welch, I'm sorry, I was a teacher for a number of years, and I don't know the difference between a gang fight and a fight. Can you kind of elaborate on the difference between a gang fight and just a fight?"
- Welch: "I... I think it speaks for itself, Representative."
- Davis, M.: "I mean, are they wearing uniforms or we identified them as members of certain gangs. I mean, literally, if you see two bunches of kids fighting does that mean it's a gang fight? I don't know."
- Welch: "Well, most of the educators that I've spoken with and certainly the law enforcement officials, they know who the gang bangers are, and they monitor those individuals. And if those are the people that we're trying to target here if they are involved in a gang fight in a school because the gang..."
- Davis, M.: "So… so, all we're doing is notifying somebody. The police are notifying the school; the school is notifying the police."

Welch: "This is notification."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Davis, M.: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is another Bill that is probably very good, but I'd like to see a Bill, one day, where the children are not being punished but where the children are being helped and assisted. You know, I'd like to see a Bill, one day, where a park district has to offer free classes for children. I'd like to see a Bill, one day, where there must be some kind of supportive athletic or resource material for kids rather than punishment. I get tired of these Bills attempting to punish children. But I will vote for your Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "When I asked the question... I know that your intent on this Bill is very good, but when I asked you the question in committee of why Chicago was not included in this Bill, the response, and perhaps you have better information at this time, was because with all the other duties that the police have there aren't enough to respond to every gang activity. So, that answer has changed today and I'm not quite sure why?"

Welch: "Representative, I have better information today. And that answer I gave you was at the… the first time I called it. I withdrew it and called it a week later and I had better information. And I did give you the correct information at the time it passed, and it passed on a 9-0 vote with you abstaining."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Pihos: "And I've, also, reached out to all of my superintendents. I represent about 11 different school districts and all my police chiefs, and they say they work very well together with their schools and this is already in effect. So, I'm just not sure why we feel we need to mandate this. I happen to agree with Representative Flowers; we need to provide more opportunities for students to be distracted from getting involved in negative activity. And I... I really think your intent is good. I, also, made some inquiries and understand that this is more unique to your own school district and not the other school districts that I made the inquiries of. So, I just want to bring that to the Body's attention."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Sente: "I just want to bring to this Body's attention that I applaud the Sponsor for this Bill. Last year, we passed reciprocal reporting that already allows local law enforcement to speak to the school district. And the protections were included in that Bill for certain crimes and possession of handguns was already included. It included all the schools in the state, and they had to speak to a very specific individual at the school, the items that they spoke about had to be oral, it did not penalize the student, and they, also, got the possibility of assistance within the school for a social worker. So, I wholeheartedly support this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in very strong support of the Gentleman's Bill. It was mentioned earlier by another Representative about protection. Well, I don't think this Bill can be construed as anything but protecting young people in the school. It's unfortunate that when activities happen in the school, they carry over into the community, and vice versa, when things happen in the community sometimes they carry over into the school. So, if we're talking about protecting our young people, there's no reason why this information should not be shared. Again, education officials that are working every day and know the students in their schools, they know who they're affiliated with and what those affiliations are. So, I see ... I see that it's reasonable that if, again, an incident happens in the school, why not notify local law enforcement so that when school lets out maybe there's a greater presence of law enforcement in that community near the school when it happens to try to mitigate any problem. And then, vice versa, if there's something that happens in the community, why not inform local education officials including a principal and others that something happened in the community, so they can be on a higher alert the next day or the following day when those kids now come to school. So, I think what the Representative is asking for is definitely reasonable. I don't think it necessarily violates any... any privacy issues in that respect since they're just simply sharing information about an incident that happened in the community or in the school. So, again,

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

I encourage everyone to support the Gentleman's Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Christian Mitchell."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "To the Bill. I just want to commend Representative Welch on this initiative. I think it's a great example of being smarter on crime. And I'd ask to be added as a cosponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a good Bill. I think it goes to the safety and welfare of students and teachers. And I ask that the Body support this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2768 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2768, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3128, Representative Williams.
Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3128, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill involves the restriction of custody and visitation rights for children who are conceived as a result of rape. Let me share some shocking statistics with you. Despite the unfortunate comments made last year by the now former Senator from

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Missouri, pregnancy from rape actually occurs with significant frequency, estimates say up to 30 thousand pregnancies as a result of rape per year. Can we get some order, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Members of the Body, it is becoming increasingly difficult to hear. Please respect the Sponsor and quiet down so everyone can hear. Thank you."

"As I said, a significant number of pregnancies Williams: result from rape every year. And... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a large number of women choose to keep their children and raise them. It's shocking to contemplate, but some of these women actually find themselves fighting with their attackers for custody of their children. Under current Illinois law, a woman who is raped can have visitation and custody privileges of her attacker restricted but only if there's been a criminal conviction. This Bill would make a small but important change to the law to provide that a woman who does not have a criminal conviction against her attacker but who can prove by clear and convincing evidence that she was raped, may seek to restrict custody and visitation rights. This is important for two reasons. First, as we all know, rape is one of the very most underreported crimes, and less than five percent of rapes result in a conviction. Second, and more significantly, this would bring the law about rape into... into line with the burden of proof that is used for other situations in civil law. For example, if a woman goes to court seeking to remove custody and visitation because her child is abused or neglected, the standard of proof is clear and convincing

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

evidence. We're seeking to right this wrong. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "To the Bill. First of all, I'd like to congratulate Representative Ann Williams on this Bill. When she first considered this very important Bill, she recognized the importance of its impact and the necessity to build coalitions, not only across the aisle between Democrats and Republicans, but among the membership with opposing ideas on social issues. This Bill protects and strengthens women's rights and a children... a child's life not to be victimized again by the criminal or by the legal system. I strongly urge you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Thank you. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault, the Illinois Attorney General, the Illinois State Bar Association, the Chicago Bar Foundation, and the Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3128 pass?"

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3128, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2250, Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2250, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis."

- Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is to amend the current Tobacco Act to make it prohibitive for minors to purchase e-cigarettes. E-cigarettes are nicotine transporting devices and currently there is no law on the books because they weren't around when the Tobacco Act was put in. So, this is to add e-cigarettes to that and to prevent minors from being able to purchase this. And I'm willing to take any questions from the floor."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2250 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hatcher, Hays. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2250, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2376, Representative Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, will you please move this Bill back to Second Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Reboletti, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, on Floor Amendment #1 it changes, in the language, the Illinois Association of Park Districts

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

with an organization that represents the park district created in the Park District Code. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2376. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2754, Representative Poe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2754, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Poe."

Poe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this a license plates for the National Wild Turkey Federation. And what's unique about this, the money that is collected will go back into the habitat and help the State of Illinois maintain that. So, this is a license plate that's a little bit of unique. The extra money those hunters are going to spend is going to stay in the state to help out education and the wildlife habitat. So, I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Have any of these license plates funds been swept in the past?"

Poe: "I'm not aware of that."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Moffitt: "Do you have any assurance that this won't? I... I like what you're doing and very much in favor of it, but..."

Poe: "This... this money actually goes into a fund. And this fund then you... to get money out of it you have to write grants, and the grants will be used for the education, outreach media, and to protect the habitat of wild turkeys in Illinois."

Moffitt: "So, it'll go directly into that fund that's a sep..."

Poe: "Yes."

Moffitt: "...separate from... And it would be at the time of payment of the fees for the plate?"

Poe: "There's fees in it for the Secretary of State. And then, \$25 of the extra \$40, initially, will go to the habitat fund, and then the \$15 will go to the Secretary of State. On renewal, there will be a \$27 extra fee and 25 will go back into that fund and \$2 will be extra for the Secretary of State."

Moffitt: "I certainly agree with what you're trying to do. And this is the case of the interest group or those that... that us that support projects like this where they are paying their own way, but I just want to make sure we do everything we can to make sure that... that funds generated by a project like this go where we intend them to go and go where the people that would purchase these plates intend them to go. Too many times things have been swept in the past and that's... we need to stop that procedure. So, I agree with what you're doing and certainly work with you to continue to make sure they go where they're intended. So, thanks for your help."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Poe: "And that's... and that's the intent that the money stay into that fund."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Poe to close."

Poe: "I just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2754 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Arroyo, Tabares. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 105 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2754, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1391, Representative Yingling. Out of the record. House Bill 2317, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2317, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2317 is a... is a Bill that would simply say if a county treasurer wishes to e-mail someone's property tax bill to them, they have that option; however, it must be at the discretion of the property tax owner. We had a situation in Cook County where our treasurer e-mailed property tax bills to certain individuals, not all individuals, and there were mistakes made and individuals got other people's property tax bills. Acknowledging that these are public records, it still makes the most sense for the... for the property tax owner to choose whether they get that bill via e-mail. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, is this a statewide application or

this is specifically crafted for Cook County?"

Zalewski: "Representative, I believe it's statewide."

Durkin: "Okay."

Zalewski: "It's in the Counties Code."

Durkin: "And how much do you estimate that the county spends yearly on the production of that bill in the mailing and the postage?"

Zalewski: "I... I don't know, Representative. I wouldn't want to..."

Durkin: "It would be... But it's... but it's significant, correct?"

Zalewski: "Yes. I would say."

Durkin: "So, if we can move people towards this type of system, it's going to be much easier and more cost-efficient way of giving taxpayers notice of their tax bills, correct?"

Zalewski: "I certainly would like my bill e-mailed."

Durkin: "I agree with you. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "I just have one quick question here. I see that the property owner or the taxpayer has to request in writing to get it e-mailed."

Zalewski: "Sure."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Willis: "Is there a way to allow them to e-mail the request to be e-mailed, if we we're trying to go maybe paperless. Wouldn't that be a good way to put that in there?"

Zalewski: "You know, Representative, it's a excellent suggestion. I... I think the county treasurer or the county collector and it's... it's the intent of the Sponsor that the collector in writing language of the statute would... would cont... contain e-mail. I certainly can work on... on in the Senate if... if they see fit to do that or we can do trailer legislation, but that's a good suggestion. I think the Bill covers that. But if you need some more clarification, we could work on that."

Willis: "Okay. Thank you. I'm going to vote for the Bill. I like it."

Zalewski: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Moffitt: "Representative, I certainly understand what you're trying to do. It could cut a cost. I'm a former county treasurer, and so I commend you for that effort. But only if the taxpayer requests it, otherwise it would still be by the traditional method..."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Moffitt: "...of sending in the mail."

Zalewski: "That's..."

Moffitt: "Okay. There are some follow-up correspondence that are required if taxes... property taxes become delinquent.

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

That... We're not changing anything in terms of that formal notice are we 'cause it becomes a certified letter and..."

Zalewski: "Not... not that I'm aware of, Representative."

Moffitt: "So..."

Zalewski: "That's not the intent of the Bill either."

Moffitt: "That part would stay the same because I certainly think..."

Zalewski: "We did... We just..."

Moffitt: "...certified notice would be more effective than an e-mail notice of a late..."

Zalewski: "We... Yeah. We just want to ensure that if the county collector wishes to engage in e-mail correspondence, that they have a written request on file first..."

Moffitt: "Sure."

Zalewski: "...from the taxpayer."

Moffitt: "So, you're trying to bring some reduced cost and efficiency to government. I commend you for it."

Zalewski: "Sure. Excellent. Yeah. Correct."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2317 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2317, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2656, Representative Senger.
Out of the record. We will be returning to the Order of

36th Legislative Day

- House Bills on Second Reading. The first being House Bill 2379, Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2379, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Third Reading. House Bill 2401, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2401, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2498, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2498, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2881, Representative Monique Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 3006, Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3006, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

  No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 630, Representative Farnham. Out of the record. House Bill 3230, Representative Farnham. Out of the record. House Bill 84, Representative Franks. Out of the record. House Bill 922, Representative

36th Legislative Day

- Hurley. Out of the record. House Bill 3029, Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3029, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2767, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2767, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1345, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Manley."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 197, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 197, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

  No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2647, Representative McAsey. Out of the record. House Bill 2664, Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2664, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1345."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments have been adopted. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Manley."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table House Amendment #3 and move to adopt #4."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady has moved to withdraw House Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is tabled. Representative Manley."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I'm moving for the passage of Floor Amendment #4 of House Bill 1345. As amended, this Bill would reenact the fatal accident memorial marker program which was passed unanimously by a previous General Assembly as a pilot program. This Amendment is a technical fix that will make it identical to the language of the original Bill in those lines. And it also changes the name of the Bill to Adam's Law. I urge for the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 1345. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the

36th Legislative Day

- Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.
  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3388, Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 2471, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2471, a Bill for Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3009, Representative Durkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3009, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2428, Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2428, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Conroy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Amendment 1 of House Bill 2428 adds to the current Bill a member of the task force representing a principals' or superintendents' organization. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2428. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3267, Representative Will Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 1532, Representative DeLuca. Out of the record. House Bill 3319, Representative Halbrook. Out of the record. House Bill 2961, Representative Drury. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2961, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Drury."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury."
- Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2961 adds in opening the postconviction hearing to juveniles. It also takes care of some language in subsequent postconviction hearings who is entitled to receive them and just cleans up some other language throughout the Bill. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2961. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Drury."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury."
- Drury: "Floor Amendment 2 also cleans up the language in Section (f), again, cleaning up the language from the Supreme Court opinion. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2961. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2641, Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2641, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Members, we'll be heading back to Third Readings. First on the list is House Bill 1138, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1138, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1138 makes it unlawful to possess wildlife or parts of wildlife that were illegally taken into the state or country of origin and then transport it to Illinois. Such possession would constitute a Class B

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

misdemeanor which is a penalty of most violations of the Wildlife Code. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1138 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1138, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3067, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3067, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3067 simply revises the Procurement Code that allows our community colleges to purchase the same way our K-12 does of perishable items... food items. This is just trying to clear this up so that they can go ahead and make those purchases. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. I... I always worry when someone says simply. So, I got to ask some questions, if the Sponsor will yield. I think you yielded. Representative, does this change the Procurement Code in the sense that you're lowering the amount or I'm sorry, increasing the amount of what would be exempt for bidding requirements?"

Bost: "Yes. Yes, it does. But it only increa... the only items are produce, perishable items... food items because they have

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

to be purchased at a quicker rate. Okay. And that's the idea behind it. There's still oversight on it, but... but it allows them to do that."

Franks: "What are you changing it from and to?"

Bost: "Right now, it falls under... Let me just read it to you, Jack."

Franks: "Okay."

Bost: "In the pro... in the provision, this requires contracts to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder and removes the exemption from the contracts for materials and work that have been awarded to the lowest bidder but must be revised causing expenditures not to exceed 10 percent of the actual contractual price. It adds exemptions to the contract for the purchase of the perishable foods and perishable beverages. So..."

Franks: "What's the practice now? And then... I guess that might be easier."

Bost: "The practice now is..."

Franks: "What's the practice now and what are you trying to change?"

Bost: "...is they have to go out and they have to bid it over a long period of time. This actually, from what I understood and... and this was brought to me by the community colleges, is that right now that because of that they can't get the best items necessary because of the long-term bidding process. So, the short-term bid allows them to... the fluc... to go with the market."

Franks: "They have more flexibility."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Bost: "More flexibility in the market because produce changes from week to week. And whenever we start buying... and one of our universities... or one of our community colleges actually has a cooking school for the, you know, and the arts and because of that, they want to be able to get the best price for that week 'cause this could vary back and forth."

Franks: "All right. So, it's more like real-time pricing..."

Bost: "Correct, correct."

Franks: "...like we do with energy."

Bost: "Right."

Franks: "Okay. Now, is there any procedural safeguards here to make sure that we're still getting the best deal?"

Bost: "Yeah, that was asked in committee, and basically it goes before the boards themselves. So, they do have... there is a safeguard there on... on the check and balance."

Franks: "So, you'd still have the same where there couldn't be any insider dealing or..."

Bost: "Correct. That..."

Franks: "...conflicts of interest."

Bost: "...that was discussed in committee."

Franks: "Okay. So, the goal would be to save money and probably to get fresher produce."

Bost: "Correct."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm trying to understand, sort of the genesis of it, I was trying to follow your line of response

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

at least. So, is there a particular college or university, community college that's experiencing this?"

Bost: "This... this will affect all community colleges. Okay. Right now, K-12... this is the exact same language that K-12 has, okay, for their procurement. So, this does... for... for their concern, if they're just serving meals, they'll be able to do this, but then the other ones that are the culinary arts programs, they'll also be able to save money this way."

Dunkin: "So, does this apply to all community colleges or just public universities... public..."

Bost: "All... all community colleges. This is..."

Dunkin: "...that receives..."

Bost: "...this is just with the community colleges. Yes."

Dunkin: "So, this has occurred what... in some colleges in your particular district or..."

Bost: "No, this is statewide. This is statewide."

Dunkin: "I get... I know what the intent of the legislation is, but I'm trying to figure out, sort of, what was the genesis of this legislation."

Bost: "The genesis of the legislation is the fact that the... the representative that represents our community colleges came to me, asked me to carry the Bill, and it was because of the concerns that they had and where they were missing out on these opportunities for fresher produce and adjusting the prices based on the... on the market price of that particular week of those particular products instead of the long-term bid which then all of a sudden could trap you in

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

a situation where you'd actually pay too much for... because of the bid."

Dunkin: "So, this was one college?"

Bost: "No. No."

Dunkin: "So, according to my analysis I have here, the Illinois

Community College Trustees Association. So, isn't that a

consortium of all the community colleges?"

Bost: "That's all the community colleges. That's correct."

Dunkin: "And they recommended this as a resolution?"

Bost: "They recommended this piece of legislation. That's who I'm carrying this legislation for. Yes."

Dunkin: "Okay. And the other point is... so, in excess of 10 percent of the total contract price."

Bost: "Correct."

Dunkin: "Can you explain that to me, again?"

Bost: "From what I understand, because you're... because you're bidding on a perishable item, so we had to set a number and 10 percent is the number that they set, so... so that's reasonable, is the 10... 10 percent waive that would go back up and down. So, it has to be... you only got certain people that are going to be able to provide this. And... and this is just the same language that's in K-12, at least that's what was explained to me."

Dunkin: "I guess my mind-set when it comes to colleges or K-12 is, the kids in K-12, they... they don't have that many options there, you know, whatever is there they have to serve; whereas, in community colleges, it's not like they have a meal plan, am I right, because it's a commuter college."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Bost: "Correct."

Dunkin: "And they sell... they sell the product."

Bost: "Correct."

Dunkin: "So, I'm..."

Bost: "And they all... Some sell and some actually have the college course where you learn to prepare food and this is... this works for them too."

Dunkin: "So..."

Bost: "This actually allows that produce to be purchased under this as well."

Dunkin: "But if... if the community colleges were to acquire the produce, it would simply allow probably 90-plus percent of them to sell to the students, correct?"

Bost: "They do sell to the students, yes."

Dunkin: "Right. Unlike a... a elementary, secondary educational setup where, again, they have no choice and even with those... those kids who are in state universities where, again, they have a choice but they don't have a choice. In other words, if they're paying for a meal plan, they have to, you know, either take it or leave it. And so, I can see... I can see that, I guess, I didn't realize that in this particular situation where you have folks selling products to kids or to students compared to them having a meal plan where they really have no say over... too much say over what's being served to them, how this, you know, what type of goal we were headed towards or precedent in this case and/or demand for this type of legislation."

Bost: "Repre... Representative, I can't answer that question because I can just tell you that this is the procedure that

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

they use. I... I really didn't go into that much detail with them to find that out, and I'd love to answer that question for you, but I don't think I can because..."

Dunkin: "So..."

Bost: "...because the thing is they produce a... a product for meals the same as K-12 and... and those meals are then served to the students. And so, this would, not only work with that, but it would also work with the produce and those perishable items that are purchased for the training of these up and coming chefs."

Dunkin: "Sure. Well, that's... I understand the up and coming culinary component, but it's different when you have college-aged kids who are paying to receive their particular product... produce or food."

Bost: "Okav."

Dunkin: "It's unlike, you know, kids who are high school and below where they are... they're either going to eat it or not. And..."

Bost: "Well, actually, I don't know how it is in your high schools and that's not what the Bill does, it doesn't deal with K-12, that's already in there. But K-12 you have, at least at our high schools, we have one serving line that serves certain products and another serving line that serves another group of products, and your community colleges some of them do that exact same thing."

Dunkin: "Sure. So, this... this, also, goes to not only food but materials and work that involve expenditures in excess of \$25 thousand to the lowest bidder. Does this... what about office supplies or other items?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Bost: "No. No. This has nothing to do with it."

Dunkin: "Only food?"

Bost: "This is only... it is only perishable items."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Pihos: "And I'm going to start out with an apology because I apologize that I did not know that you were carrying this Bill. And the real genesis of this Bill is from the College of DuPage because this Bill was brought to me by them. And I called their college president on numerous occasions to find out what the need for the construction portion of the Bill was, and they told me they could not give me an answer because, obviously, in DuPage County we don't have a lack of responsible bidders or good bidders to build on construction. And in their last construction project, there was an excessive number of overruns and an excessive number of work order changes, so in consulting with our staff, I found out that this could, indeed, drive up construction costs. And none of that..."

Bost: "Rep... Representative, if I can, this Bill doesn't have anything to do with construction."

Pihos: "Oh."

Bost: "The original Bill that... that was the original Bill. This is... this is legal."

Pihos: "So, this is not House Committee... this is not Amendment 1?"

Bost: "It is Amendment 1."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Pihos: "Well, Amendment 1 says restores current law with respect to the exception for contracts and materials. I might be reading it incorrectly, then. I had suggested to them that they separate out the two Bills. So, am I correct or incorrect?"

Bost: "It... it goes back to how it... that is... that's taken out.

That..."

Pihos: "The construction part."

Bost: "The construction is not in there at all. No. This is just perishable items. That's the only thing we're changing. We're just adding that to the list."

Pihos: "Okay. And that's what I suggested they do, so I support your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost to close."

Bost: "I think it's been well debated, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3067 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mitchell, Sommer, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 89 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3067, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1375, Representative Beiser. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee retirement benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Beiser."

36th Legislative Day

- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the firefighters to clean up a disparity between survivor's benefits. Currently, if a fireman dies and has a spouse, the spouse receives his pension... 50 percent of his pension and then if there's a surviving dependent child, that child gets 20 percent. But currently, also, if a child... firefighter dies without a surviving... without a surviving spouse and has a dependent minor, that dependent minor only gets 12 percent. This just brings that parity up to 20 percent. It doesn't penalize the minor child for the marital status of the firefighter."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1375. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bellock. Mr. Clerk, please take the roll... record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1375, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect that Representative Halbrook is excused the rest of the day."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request. Thank you. House Bill 733, Representative Cloonen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 733, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Cloonen."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Cloonen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Members of the General Assembly, this is simply a Bill to allow the large animals that are caught to be taken into cus... taken into shelter and allows them, not custody, yes, shelter, thank you, and allows them time so that they can be housed. But it, also, allows the fact that if they cannot be adopted or taken back to the owners, that they be humanely euthanized. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Are there questions?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Representative, when we're talking about large animals, what type of large... I mean very large dogs, very large... I mean, what type of animals?"

Cloonen: "Specifically, it includes bison, cattle, swine, sheep, goats, horses, and geese, also camelids, and fowl.

Yes, it even includes ducks and geese."

Bost: "And does it include ratites?"

Cloonen: "It does."

Bost: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure. A ratite used to be a pretty important thing around here and as long as that's in there, we're fine."

Cloonen: "It does."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cloonen to close."

Cloonen: "Yes. This is so... and I understand it's a tough vote, but because it's so expensive to house all of the animals, the county controls are not in the business of being horse farms and so, sometimes they do have to be humanely euthanized. And again, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 733 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bellock, Pihos. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 80 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 733, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2455, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2455, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2455 clarifies how snow removal can take place from private properties on to public ways. Under the current law, institutional properties cannot plow their snow on to public ways; however, private peop... private residences may do so. And all this does is provide an exception to that that says that if the snow is plowed in such a fashion that would create a safety hazard as deemed by the local police then they can't do that. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, didn't we see this Bill last year that, I believe, Representative Jones was carrying?"

Fortner: "That may well be. I... I was not carrying this Bill last year. So, I've spent some time looking into the question since then."

Franks: "Has is changed since it failed 19 to 87? Is there any substantive changes in the Bill?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Fortner: "I do not know."

Franks: "Okay. But what the Bill is intending to do is to criminalize putting snow in the public highways from private drives?"

Fortner: "The... We have a number of places in statute where if the public do certain things that cause a traffic hazard, local government can restrict that."

Franks: "But this is a crim... this would criminalize putting snow in a public highway. I just want to be clear on that."

Fortner: "This... Which again, for many other private property owners that is already the case; it would be a petty offense. Right now, if you were a commercial property owner, and you moved the snow from your commercial property, you would... you would be... you could be cited for that if it created a problem. In fact, there... not only if you created a problem, you could be cited in any case and..."

Franks: "What's the penalty though? Isn't the penalty a criminal penalty?"

Fortner: "It's a petty offense."

Franks: "It's a criminal penalty though."

Fortner: "It's... But it's the same as already exists..."

Franks: "Okay."

Fortner: "...for other private property that's properties out there."

Franks: "I just want to be... I understand it's the same, but we are criminalizing this behavior. Now, let's assume that I live in a... I have a rural district much of its rural and have long driveways, and let's assume that, you know, I get it plowed out in the morning and get it cleaned... and get

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

the driveway clean. And after I get it clean, then the snowplows come on the... on the highway and absolutely clog my driveway. It's not safe for me to come from the highway back up because I can't get out now because I'm doing this myself. So then, I have to push the snow back on out and hopefully over. If someone deems it could be hazardous, would that be sanctionable? Would... Could I be arrested?"

- Fortner: "Well, first of all, the only person who can make that determination would be local law enforcement. Your... your next door neighbor, if they thought it was a problem, they don't get to make that determination."
- Franks: "What... But I didn't create the hazard. I plowed out my driveway. I got up at five in the morning, but then my county didn't come until 6:30. It's time for me to take the kids to school. I'm blocked in, now, because they've closed up my drive with the snowplow, so I bring down my 4x4 and push it out again. I don't want to go to jail for that. And I... I just don't know why we would... why we would pass this kind of law."
- Fortner: "As I said, we have other provisions where individual property owners can't do things to make a hazard in... to drivers going through."
- Franks: "But what happens if the state creates the hazard? What happens if it's the government that creates the hazard because they're the ones who blocked my driveway after I cleaned it? It happens all the time. They don't pick up their plow."
- Fortner: "Well, where did you... well, I guess the question is where did the snow go in the first place?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Franks: "Well, what happens oftentimes is, you know, they're in a hurry, they go by a driveway, and instead of picking up the plow, they let it keep going 'cause they're on... they're on a big highway so they push it and they just fill up the drive again, at least the base of it. But I think there ought to be something written in here that the... that those that are cleaning it off have an affirmative obligation not to push snow into private driveways because that's the only reason you'd have to push it out."

Fortner: "Well, I guess, when you say pushing the snow in the private driveways, obviously, the first time a plow goes through, the plow blade is going to push uniformly at all points. It's pretty hard to distinguish as that first time the plow goes through what's a driveway or not. They're just going to clear the road."

Franks: "No. I don't think it's that hard. I think you know where a driveway is. I've... I buy my little green sign which has my number on it; it shows what rural route I'm at. They can find it. I know it's not convenient for them because they'd rather go at 45 miles an hour with the plow down the entire time instead of having to pick it up when they're coming to driveways, but they don't pick them up when they come to driveways."

Fortner: "I don't think it's always as clear where the driveway is as you seem..."

Franks: "Okay."

Fortner: "...to think it. When... when I've seen, you know, snow fall more than four or five inches, it gets pretty hard to tell exactly where that driveway is."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Franks: "Let's..."

Fortner: "Maybe in your area it's clearer."

Franks: "No. No. Let's... Okay, I'll go with that. Let's assume they can't find the driveway then, again, the homeowner's not the one who created the hazard at no fault to their own. But they would be held to a standard that the plow operator isn't held to..."

Fortner: "Well..."

Franks: "...by using your terminology."

Fortner: "Where would you suggest the homeowner place the snow in such a way as to not impede traffic?"

Franks: "Yeah, I know that's the problem. And that's the...
that's the crux of this issue here because if they should
push it out, and they don't think it's a hazard, and let's
assume they've already... they've already done it once and
then the snowplow comes up and punches them in so they
can't get out. So, they bring their 4x4 and push it out
again, and they leave a dusting or a quarter of an inch or
a half an inch. Could that be determined a hazard because
it may turn into ice later or become black ice? I think the
hazard determination, even though you're leaving it to the
police, could mean anything."

Fortner: "Well, I... I would hope that the kind of example you give of someone pushing a dusting or a quarter inch that law enforcement would be reasonable and would recognize that that does not constitute a hazard."

Franks: "I would hope too."

Fortner: "Certainly, law enforcement I've worked with, I think, would make that reasonable determination. I think we're

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

much more concerned with it if there's a heavy snowfall, and someone moves a significant amount of snow that does create a significant hazard. I mean, that's what this is trying to get at 'cause I've certainly seen that sort of search... situation occur where that does become a real hazard, and you've got cars trying to go around. It can obstruct the vision, and you have a, you know, potentially dangerous situation."

Franks: "Well, to the Bill. And I appreciate my friend's work on this. The Bill failed last year 19 to 87, and I don't think it's any better. And I appreciate your concern, but I don't think this is the way to do it, to criminalize this kind of behavior. And I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in a... in a former life, 20 years ago, I used to run a snowplow business where we cleaned drives, cleaned parking lots. And what... what scares me the most about this Bill, sure, when you push the snow you try to push it across the road, you try to move it both ways, but if you... if you get a policeman or something you leave a few crumbs lay out there and if they don't know jack, they could give you... they could give you a ticket or a ticket for doing that. But none of these operators do this on purpose. And I live on a state highway where you've cleaned them all out and here they come, they fill them and you're continually trying to fight that battle. But if you don't get back for three or four hours when you're making your rounds to clean that back up, some other policeman could come along and give a ticket because they know who

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

those operators are. Then, if you get a policeman that really doesn't care for that operator, this is an opportunity for him to start giving tickets when he really shouldn't be. So, I'd encourage a 'no' vote too. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what would... this would be an ordinance violation or this would be a uniform traffic citation? How would this be issued?"

Fortner: "Well, I think it would be issued in the same way whatever the jurisdiction is doing right now in the case of private commercial properties where that is already a prohibited activity."

Reboletti: "And so, you're just making it from a residential activity. So, I'm trying to figure out how a... how would a ticket be issued because... would the neighbor call and say that you plowed your snow into the street or on to the public way; and therefore, you're in violation of the statute. And so, the city police come out or the Code enforcement folks come out and issue a citation. Is that how you see this happening?"

Fortner: "Well, again, different jurisdictions, I don't know if all of them do it the same way, but a jurisdiction... let's say we take the case that exists, right now, under the law. If a person who owns a commercial lot should plow their snow into the street, that is, right now, a violation of State Law and can be cited as a petty offense. All this

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

does it says, if a resident does it and only in the limited case where it is determined that it becomes a hazard... traffic hazard, then it would be applied in the same way that already exists in law for all those property owners that are not residences."

Reboletti: "I appreciate what you're trying to do,
Representative. I think about this in terms of like the
snow police trying to come out and determine who plowed
this snow where, is it a hazard. There's a lot of different
people making determinations as to what should happen here.
I'm just trying to visualize this in a court of law and
trying to be adjudicated, and I'm having a lot of trouble
with digesting it. So, I cannot support your legislation,
Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Fortner, just... just to make it clear again, what is the penalty that this Bill is endeavoring... endeavoring to... to levy?"

Fortner: "It creates this to be a petty offense; the same standard that exists right now for commercial properties that plow their snow into the right-of-way."

Riley: "Okay. So, it's a petty offense. Wouldn't you also say that this Bill endeavors to deal with the issue of public safety, generally?"

Fortner: "That's specifically why the exception was drawn that there has to be a determination that it creates a traffic safety hazard."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Rilev: Gentlemen, I think the opponents of the Bill, they have their particular standpoints, many of them are really reasonable, but I think that this Bill also has merit. Now if you look, at least as far as my analysis is concerned, two proponents are the Illinois Municipal League and the Illinois Association of County Engineers. I mean, these aren't exactly folks that we would not trust. And let me remind those of us who were here last year, those freshmen who are new, you might look at that 19 to 87 as it was mentioned by Representative Franks, I have to tell you that we were in a hurry to get out of here. I think that the Bill, which is a serious Bill, the debate became a little frivolous, and people were watching the board; whereas, that might be funny, I think it took away some good points of this Bill ergo that particular result. I think that we should look at this Bill for the merits; I do think that it has merits. I'll be supporting it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "To the Bill. I just got off the phone with a former Sponsor who is monitoring progress, Representative Jones, and he said that he did not feel this was a good Bill and is requesting everyone to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner to close."

Fortner: "I'd like to take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 2918, Representative Costello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2918, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Assembly. House Bill 2918 is cleanup language from a Bill that passed this chamber unanimously in May of last year. It deals with roof bolts. The manufacturers' machinery equipment tax exemption is the exemption that's used by coal and aggregate mines. This would simply add roof bolts to that exemption. And this was requested by the Department of Revenue. Thank you. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2918. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2019... 2918, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3190, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3190, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3190 deals with a disease of meningitis. Meningitis progresses so rapidly and its effects are so severe that it was determined that if you could vaccinate students at sixth grade and eighth... and eleventh grade, it would help protect them from potentially devastating disease. Immunization falls... This type of

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

immunization falls under the 16 preventable services covered under the Affordable Care Act. This is not a mandate. There was no opposition in committee and... I'm sorry... any opposition in committee was removed by the two Amendments we put on here. And the insurance industry and the doctors are neutral. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3190 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3190, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3218, Representative Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 3175, Representative Hatcher. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3175, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hatcher."

Hatcher: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 3175 gives the Department of Public Health the opportunity to target the funds now being used as part of the Illinois Breast and Cervical Cancer program to folks who are most in need. This is an opportunity to... to fulfill some of the main directives which makes sure that everyone gets the opportunity for breast cancer reconstruction and information."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3175 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3175, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2376, Representative Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2376..."

Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. House Bill 2905, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2905, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2905 is a Bill to protect homeowners. I think now working with the Court of Deeds office in Cook County you've got a lot of individuals who are purposely clouding titles. I'll give you an example. You got a lot of senior citizens who... whose titles are being tampered with, thus they're losing their properties. And when a property is passed down to children or relatives, what have you, there's all type of issues in regards to the title. So, I ask your support for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Franks: "Representative, what we're trying... Let me ask, what's the genesis of this Bill?"

Evans: "I think the genesis of the Bill is to, you know, protect homeowners and to protect their titles. Clearly, as you can see, I know you're looking at the analysis, it's going to take it to a Class IV Felony..."

Franks: "Okay. Now, when you..."

Evans: "...rather than a misdemeanor. So, it's a penalty enhancement to a sense or to a degree."

Franks: "Why do we want to make a felony on what's a essentially a civil issue because when you cloud a title that's... it's... it can be rectified in civil court. For instance, if you put a lien on a property due to a foreclosure, that's a cloud on a title. And if the foreclosure was..."

Evans: "Yes."

Franks: "...inappropriately placed and you do the lis pendens, which is a lien, one can then file an action in civil court to have the lis pendens removed which is a civil action. Why would we convert what's essentially a civil action into a Class IV Felony?"

Evans: "I think, Representative, you know, when you're talking litigation or what have you, a lot of people may not be sophisticated enough to hire an attorney and go through the entire process. I think we want to tell people that... that's out there, unlawfully and intentionally doing these things, to stop doing these things because we need to protect people in our community, particularly, senior citizens, low-income individuals who's just trying to hold on to

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

their property and particularly for individuals in poor communities, so."

Franks: "Can you give us some examples because I'm... I'm reading what you're saying, here, and it says the unlawful clouding of a title means intentionally recording or causing the recording of a cloud on title that is not recognized as a legitimate legal theory by the courts. So, what would happen if someone filed a lis pendens in a foreclosure suit, but in... but they made a mistake and instead of doing a foreclosure it should have been a straight collection suit. Would this fall under your Class IV Felony?"

Evans: "I think you said the keyword; they made a mistake. This is intentional, unlawful crime."

Franks: "But they intentionally recorded it. I mean, they did it... they thought they were going to do a foreclosure, but instead, they said you know what, forget it, we're going to do a straight collection suit 'cause we really don't want the property. And they put the lis pendens on there and then they forgot about it because nobody showed up to court and they said forget it; I don't want the property. I'm just going to do a straight collection suit; I don't want it. Then, these people could be deemed felons."

Evans: "It is my understanding that if it's not intentional, it's not unlawful; therefore, they wouldn't fall under the circumstance that you're... or the example that you're bringing up, Representative."

Franks: "I tell you I've never filed a lien that hasn't been intentional. I mean, it's an intentional act. The only way it's going to happen is you have to physically or send

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

someone over physically to the courthouse and have this thing recorded. I'm just concerned that we're going to be making a higher penalty for... I understand, right now, it's a misdemeanor, but don't you think that's enough. Do we really need to make felons out of people? I think enough people have enough trouble getting a job as it is."

Evans: "Yeah, but these individuals are... generally, are specifically targeting a certain group of people; people that are not able to protect themselves, people that are not financially stable. So, I think that it's necessary to send a message to those people."

Franks: "What would happen if we change this and not to make it a felony unless it was a repeated offense. This looks like it's a first-time thing. And I just... I'm very concerned that we're going to be making felons out of people who really aren't felons. I think our jails are overcrowded enough. I think we have a lot of people... it's questionable whether we're doing society any good by keeping so many there. I'd rather have people as productive members of society, earning a living, and paying taxes. So, if someone... do we really want to increase the penalty so much that someone's going to have to be in prison for more than a year? Do you really think that's fair?"

Evans: "Representative, I think it's fair. A home to some people is all they have. And if an individual is attempting to fraudually tax someone's property, I think they need to be protected. The seniors in my community need to be protected that all they have is their home. Cases like this come up all the time, talking to the Recorder of Deeds of

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Cook County, needs to be addressed, and they need to know that it won't be tolerated."

Franks: "Well, if it..."

Evans: "I ask for your support."

Franks: "If it comes up all the time, how many people have been convicted of a misdemeanor, which is presently the law, how many people have been convicted of a misdemeanor and gone to jail for this?"

Evans: "I can get that information to you, but I don't have that at this point."

Franks: "Well, I think we need that now because I don't know why you're trying to enhance it unless there's some type of... this is being perpetrated to everybody. Are we looking for a solution for a problem that doesn't exist?"

Evans: "I believe it's... it's definitely a problem, and I think it's necessary to send a message to those individuals."

Franks: "Well, to the Bill. I, respectfully, disagree with my friend. I know what he's trying to do. I just think there's enough felonies on the books; I don't think we need to add another one. We al... This is already a misdemeanor, and for essentially a civil action, there are remedies at both civil actions; there's remedies in chancery, and here you also have remedies in criminal court. To make this a felony, I think, is a mistake and bad public policy. I'll be voting 'no' and encourage you to do the same."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. No, I... I have a question to the Sponsor. Sponsor, does this, also, include quitclaims when...

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

when there's a... a contractor who tries to quitclaim a senior citizen's property?"

Evans: "Representative, I'm not... It does not include... No."

Soto: "No. Okay. 'Cause that's something that... something, right now, that's happening. I know that I've had some constituents come in, especially senior citizens, and some of these developers are quitclaiming their property, and then they're coming to my office, devastated, crying. You know, when it's a senior citizen, someone who's vulnerable, we really need... need to look out to them... for them. So, if there's any way that we can add quitclaim, you know, to this Bill, this is the Bill that I would be supporting 'cause this is a good Bill. So, something that maybe we can work on."

Evans: "And Representative, I... I know we're kind of going all over the place with this Bill. It's specifically catered to those individuals that are intentionally and unlawfully trying to file a claim to your... to the title of your property. So, it's... not... it's people that know what they're doing and they're going after people and they're generally going after people that are easy to be targeted and victimized."

Soto: "I think this is a good Bill. I support this Bill because it's something similar to the quitclaim. It's a very important Bill. I urge this General Assembly to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. To the Bill. For the Body's edification, this is the Bill we voted on two weeks ago when it was mine;

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

when the board blew up, you all remember that, and we all went home. This Bill had 110 votes when the board blew up. So, it's the same Bill just a different Sponsor. I... I heard the comments of four other speakers; let's remember a couple of things here. This is an initiative of Karen Yarbrough, who used to be one of us on this floor, she's the Cook County Recorder of Deeds. And she's seen a whole mess of inappropriate and fraudulent deeds filed and documents filed. What she's trying to do is keep people stealing other people's homes, from unwarranted liens on people's property; that's what this is about. The ... the person that files a document erroneously or mistakenly is protected because this Bill requires intent. To commit a felony requires intent. And so, all... all the Recorder is trying to do here, and all the Sponsor's trying to do here, is enhance penalties for, basically, taking somebody's title and making a mess of it for their own purposes. Sometimes it ... it could be a family member having a squabble with you. Sometimes it could be a creditor having a squabble with you. All we're trying to do is keep people from doing that. Doesn't keep people from filing an appropriate lien; it doesn't keep people from filing an appropriate document. This is actually a really good Bill and requires your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Representative..."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- Reboletti: "Representative, I'm trying to figure out why you're moving it up to a Class IV. Has there been an issue with prosecutions in Cook County that they won't take these cases 'cause they're only misdemeanors, and they want to investigate them, and that... this will make it easier to investigate those 'cause they'll indict them with a Class IV Felony? I'm not sure what... why we need the extra step up."
- Evans: "I believe that the answer is deterrence. We want to send a message to those individuals that are coming after those individuals trying to take their property."
- Reboletti: "How many cases have been charged and prosecuted in Cook County with respect to clouding of title last year, are you aware?"
- Evans: "I do not have a spec... specific number, but I know there are instances of this happening."
- Reboletti: "I mean... and I can appreciate the Recorder wanted to stop this practice, but I... has a misdemeanor not been enough to stop it? I don't know if I've ever heard of this case... this type of case being even charged before. So, I don't know if this is something that has been charged, have people been charged, what are the dispositions once they are charged and tried or plead guilty? So, that's what I'm trying to figure out, first of all."
- Evans: "Well, there are instances, Representative, and I can provide some information for you afterwards."
- Reboletti: "Well, I... that's what I was wondering if you'd be able to tell me now before I... I vote on the Bill because I just had some concerns that a Class A misdemeanor probably

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

is sufficient to charge somebody to do the investigation. You could put them into jail for up to a year; you can put them on two years probation. I'm just trying to figure out what makes it more heinous now than last year that we would need to make it a Class IV. That's what I'm... I guess I'm asking."

- Evans: "And as I mentioned before, Representative, I believe it's to send a message. It is an issue; it is a concern. The Bill passed before, and I can give you some information afterwards, with specifics to make you feel a little more comfortable. But it's definitely an issue that... that needs to be addressed, that needs to be addressed with a strong message."
- Reboletti: "And aren't there already other means which prosecutors can charge people: identity theft, deceptive practice, forgery. There's other things on the books, right now, that they could charge people with filing false public documents. I mean, aren't those charges sufficient as is? Speaker, I can't..."
- Evans: "And I... and I understand your concern, Representative, but I really believe that we need to send a message with this... with this particular Bill."
- Reboletti: "And that was another thing I was... I was going to ask you which... and I appreciate your responses, but I guess, had the Recorder indicated to you how many cases she saw since she's taken office that this is... and I've heard about this on TV, so I've seen it in the news and what the problems are... but how many cases has she dealt with? How many cases have been prosecuted?"

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Evans: "As I mentioned before, I don't have a specific number for you but these cases do exist. I've heard of them in my communities throughout the years. So, I was not shocked to... to hear about it when I heard particularly with the Recorder. And I can give you incidents and specific numbers afterwards."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Evans: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we all know a lot about the foreclosure crisis that's happened over the last several years. This is a ... this is meant to address a component of that foreclosure crisis where you have fraudulent scammers coming in and filing, as one of the former speakers mentioned, quitclaim deeds, inappropriate liens, and foreclosing on them on those people who, frankly are... are vulnerable and... and subject to these to kinds of scams. This is not going to fill up our jails. This is ... this is not ... not so prevalent that we're going to have thousands of people doing it, but those that are doing it, it is... it should be a felony, I think. If they're... if you're... if you're... and taking an inappropriate action and taking away somebody's home, I think the threat of a felony for... for doing that is something that we should be ... that is appropriate and it's appropriate policy for the State of Illinois. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just amazed at this legislation that it brought out a colleague of mine, my friend, Jack Franks, who's against enhancement. I'm amazed that you are arguing fervently against penalty enhancement of criminals. This must touch on a certain class of criminals maybe like lawyers or realtors or business folk. I'm... I'm... You, too, Reboletti, I'm surprised. You're against this type of penalty enhancement, but when it comes to letting certain other pieces of legislation it's like, wait a minute. Amazing. You sound like Monique Davis and Mary Flowers over the years, Jack Franks. I'm amazed. And I tell you, things certainly change. You got Mark Kirk changing his mind, and Jack Franks changing his. I'm... This is a... To the Bill. This legislation is one of the pieces of legislation that could impact someone's life for quite some time; their family, their livelihood, their future. And typically, I'm not a big penalty enhancement person, but some things make sense. When you intentionally, the operative word, when you intentionally doctor up legislation that has a delirias affect or impact on someone's property, here in our state and in our county in one of the large... the largest county of Cook, it's... it's amazing. So, I am in favor of this particular penalty enhancement because of the nature... the egregious nature and intention of this type of behavior. And I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. This has all been very wonderful, some of this discussion and I think we also need to realize that at

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

times that we do reinvent the wheel, and we often overlook that we currently have Sections in the Illinois statutes that apply to the situation which we're trying to correct. Now, if you look to the forgery statute, it states that a person knowingly commits a forgery when, with the intent to defraud, he or she knowingly makes a false document or alters any document to make it false and that document is apparently capable of defrauding another. Now the previous speaker, similar name, I'm not going to mention his name, I'm not going to give him the ability to stand up and make any more comments, he can go to the Dominican Republic have all as much fun as he wants over there when it's necessary, but the point of the matter is, is that that is currently law; it's a Class III Felony. We are now making this cloud of title fraud a Class IV Felony. You are diluting it, making the crime weaker. If we believe that it is a crime that should be enforced, then I think there needs to be a better job of investigating it, bringing it to the state's attorney, and allowing them to proceed with a forgery action which is a Class III. Now, you have a conflict in the statutes. You're creating a situation, for the prosecutors, who are not going to sure... ensure what law they are going to apply because the forgery statute does cover everything which is trying to be accomplished in this Bill. We don't need it. We already have a law in place. And I would suggest it, if you vote for this Bill, what you're doing is that you are diluting a Bill that's... the law that's already strong on the books that covers this situation. I'd vote 'no'."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "To get back to Representative Reboletti's concern, since December, the Cook County Recorder has had 50 co... 50 complaints about this issue already. I think, Representatives, I hope you all will see that this Bill is important to protect homeowners navigating the legal system. For some it's a difficult task, for some a momentous and almost impossible. So, let's protect these people. Let's send a message that this will not be allowed. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2905 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Harms. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 68 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2905, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3063, Representative Roth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3063, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Roth."

Roth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3063 provides that when a new principal is hired, they will have the option to... excuse me, when a new principal is hired and the two-year evaluation process is already in place, then the principal can choose whether... when a new principal comes into the building that's already in lot that they can choose to evaluate the teachers at that point. And if they

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

so choose, then they can move it to a every two-year evaluation. So, that wasn't very clear. So, let me just give an example. So, if I'm a new principal... if I'm a teacher, excuse me, if I'm a teacher and I come into... and it's 2012 and I'm evaluated, then I can be evaluated in 2014. If a new... if a new a principal comes into the building in 2013, they can choose to reevaluate everyone; that's current law. All this Bill does is clarify, do I get reevaluated in '14 or do I get reevaluated in 2015, that two-year. This would only be for excellent and proficient teachers. Teachers that are ranked or rated as unsatisfactory and needs improvement, they would continue to be evaluated every year."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3063 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jakobsson, Nekritz, Riley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 88 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3063, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 34 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1515. Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to Second Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1515, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the adoption of Amendment

2. And I'll explain the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1515. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1515,

Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1515, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. With the Currie: Amendment, the Bill does essentially two things. First, it restores the underlying language of the Bill, inadvertently removed by Amendment 1, that permits the State Treasurer to take excess money from the... the automated teller machines that it uses in state parks and state buildings and put the excess above administrative costs into the State Pension Fund. Also, today, from the unclaimed property moneys, the Treasurer is enabled to keep 2.5 million on hand to pay claims; the rest goes to the Pension Fund. Under this Amendment, he'll be able to keep more money in case more money is needed to pay the claims before sending money to the Pension Fund. In addition, the Bill, as amended, makes statutory the proposals that were agreed to at the bargaining table between AFSCME and the Governor's Office with respect to retiree health care. It basically does two

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

things. It says that not just people who are part of the SERS system, but all retirees who are not eligible for Medicare will be entitled to opt out of the state health care system. For those who have worked for the state for 20 years or the system for 20 years, they will be given the opportunity of an incentive up to \$500 a month to opt out. For those with shorter terms of services, the department will be able to establish a lower dollar amount. And second, in order to make sure that the state can quickly, efficiently move to provide a private vendor for people who are Medicare eligible, and today the state pays the excess cost of their health coverage that which isn't paid by Medicare, the contract called for finding an outside vendor who would assume liability and pay those secondary costs. What this language does is enable the activity to happen more quickly to avoid certain provisions in the Procurement Act so that the Chief Procurement Officer would work with CMS in finding a vendor in a timely fashion. COGFA would not have a 30-day approval period, but it would continue to have oversight over the... the contract itself as it would any other contract today. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your support, so we can get this show on the road."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1515 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hays. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1515,

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

- having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to the Order of... Order of House Bills on Second Reading, Representative Sims, you have House Bill 2527. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2527, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 3380?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3380 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Please move that Bill back to Second Reading.

  Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 211, offered by Representative Leitch. House Resolution 212, offered by Representative Lilly. And House Resolution 213, offered by Representative Lilly."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you seek... I'm sorry. Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "I rise on a point of personal privilege, actually two items. For the Illinois Black Caucus Members, we will meet... meeting 30 minutes after committee today. So, 30 minutes after committee. We're pushing the meeting back. And for those of you, I mentioned yesterday that Representative Jehan Gordon-Booth that her brother had

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

died. The Black Caucus has... we have commissioned a charter bus to go have dinner and commune with her tomorrow evening. We will be leaving the Stratton Building at 4 p.m., returning approximately around 9. The bus holds approximately 50 people. If you are interested in traveling, we will be going to Jehan Gordon's house actually to have... partake with her and her family. If you're interested, please let me or my secretary know as soon as possible. I appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committee was canceled today:
Insurance was canceled. Meeting immediately after Session
is the Approp. Elementary & Secondary Education Committee
at... in C-1, Counties & Townships in Room 115, Mass Transit
in Room 413, Labor & Commerce in Room 114, and State
Government in Room D-1. Tomorrow morning at 8:30 is meeting
the Human Services Committee in C-1, Judiciary in D-1,
Transportation: Vehicles & Safety in Room 115, and
Elementary & Secondary Education in Room 413. The Revenue &
Finance Committee has been moved to 9:00 in the morning
meeting in Room 114. Once again, the Revenue & Finance
Committee is now meeting at 9:00 in the morning in Room
114."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members. Please be advised that substantive Amendments must be filed with the Clerk by 3 p.m. on Friday. That's substantive Amendments must be filed with the Clerk by 3 p.m. on Friday. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will... Leader

36th Legislative Day

4/9/2013

Currie moves that... that the House adjourn to Wednesday, April 10 at 10 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House will stand adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Senate Bills. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1340, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This was referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."