54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 13, recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1479, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1842, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1931. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 14, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1801; ref... approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 530."

Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Chris Gearhart who is with Lakeview Presbyterian Church in Vernon Hills, Illinois. Reverend Gearhart... Gearhart is the guest of Representative Sente. 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."

Reverend Gearhart: "Let us pray. Lord, out of Your good will, put Your gracious hand of blessing over this Assembly and all the proceedings of the day. Bless the staff, the Clerks, the visitors, and each Representative. Those with any personal concerns or needs today, Lord, we ask You to tend to them, and then give a peace that this day's proceedings might go forward undistracted. Lord, You, we ask to lead this august Body into a deep wisdom to

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

legislate just laws for this great state. Bless the committees meeting later this afternoon, and give the ability for thorough, informed deliberation emanating from our diversity of backgrounds, constituencies, perspectives. May we be open-minded and humble and unified even as we remain curious, questioning, and assertive. Grant to us a selfless devotion to the common good and to represent our constituents with integrity. We trust You, Oh Lord, to work in and through us to preserve justice, equality and the common grace that the State of Illinois may, by Your grace, remain great and good, Amen."

- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Thaddeus Jones."
- Jones 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. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Will Davis and Soto are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect all Republicans are present and ready to do the work of the people."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 present, a quorum is established. Representative Mitchell, for which... what reason do you rise?"

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

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

Mitchell, B.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, above me... behind me, in... in the Republican side of the gallery and they're standing up, are one of the best classes in the State of Illinois. It's the third-grade class from Carrie Busey in Champaign, Illinois. And I've got to be a little personal here. One of the teachers is my cousin Katy Hogan-Bribriesco. There's Katy, and then they are, also, a guest of Representative Hays. So, they're actually in Representative Hays's district, so they're both our guests today. Give them a big House welcome."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 341, offered by Representative Leitch, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "A point of personal privilege."

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

Demmer: "I'd like to welcome to the House Floor my parents,

Marilyn (sic-Mary) and Skip Farrell, who are down from

Dixon visiting for the day."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Members, we're going to begin with House Bills on the Order of Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 532, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 532, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 532 is an extension of the electroli... Electrologist Act for 10 more years. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm... I'm sorry. I was just making sure things were coming up on the Calendar that... that's fine. I don't have any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, what's the typical time when we extend a... an Act?"

Zalewski: "I think it is 10 years, Representative."

Franks: "Were there any changes in the underlying Act?"

Zalewski: "Technical and... I think there were technical changes and those requested by the department. Typically, the department asks for some cleanup when these things come... come around."

Franks: "And I'm not sure what an electrologist is."

Zalewski: "I... one moment, Representative."

Franks: "I'm just wondering why we're licensing these people.

I'm not sure what they do."

Zalewski: "I think, if I... if I remember correctly, electrologists deal with a specific type of skin... have contact with the skin. And so, if that's the case that... it's important for the department to know if there's any updates in medication or... or treatment techniques that they need to be aware of."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Franks: "Well, if you can find out what it is, I'd appreciate it. Mr. Sandack..."

Zalewski: "I will."

Franks: "...suggests that I may need some help with one, but I'm not positive."

Zalewski: "I think you're doing good in that department, Jack."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, good afternoon. How are you?"

Zalewski: "I'm good, Dennis. How are you?"

Reboletti: "Did your... I'm doing well. Did your counsel help you with what..."

Zalewski: "He had a..."

Reboletti: "...electrologist is?"

Zalewski: "...he had more artful way of putting it. It deals with the removal of hair follicles from a person's skin."

Reboletti: "You're not saying anything about Senator (sic-Representative) Sandack, are you?"

Zalewski: "No. Senator (sic-Representative) Sandack, he...
unfortunately, this doesn't apply to him for a variety of
reasons."

Reboletti: "I have one other question before the Senator responds. Why did we raise the fine from 5 thousand to 10 thousand dollars?"

Zalewski: "We had this question earlier with respect to another licensure Act. I think the department's preference is to

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

keep the statutes consistent, Representative, and this is the way they've been going."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "I... I think my name was used in debate not once, Speaker, but twice; once disingenuously and once, I think, earnestly. The for... the first speaker was earnest although, I think, he would be a candidate for this services. The second disingenuous speaker probably could use a little of this service himself, but I shan't discuss where, when, and what circumstances. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "On that note, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 532 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 Chapa LaVia, Dunkin, Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 532, having received the Constitu... Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jakobsson."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

Jakobsson: "We are honored today to have with us in the gallery, right up above me, Jesse Delgado. Jesse Delgado won the Big Ten in the NCAA Championship for the University of Illinois on March 23 of this year. He's the first U of I

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

wrestler to be named national champion at his weight class and that's the 125 pound, and the first wrestler at any weight from the school to win a national championship since 2003. So, let's, please, give Jesse Delgado a big, warm House of Representatives' welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. House Bill 533, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 533, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 533 is, again, a extension of the Registered Surgical... Surgical Assistant and Registered Surgical Technologist Act. It's similar to what we just discussed. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 533 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 Cassidy. Dunkin, Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 533, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brady, for which re... what reason do you seek recognition?"

Brady: "A point of personal privilege, please?"

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

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you please give a nice, House of Representatives' welcome to my Page today, who's a foreign exchange student from Germany and attending Tri-Valley High

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- School back in my district. Please stand up, Luisa Lutz from Germany, who's our foreign exchange student Paging today. Welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome. Members, we're going to move some Bills from Second Reading to Third Reading, so please be in your seat and ready. Senate Bill 1456, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Moffitt."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Floor Amendment #1 is agreed language in committee. This is to set qualifications for appointments to fire district trustees. And the Associated Firefighters had some things they wanted to get worked out. This is their language, so Floor Amendment 1 is an agreed. And I would move its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1456. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Moffitt, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Floor Amendment #2 originally was a separate Bill.

  And I think... I think Representative Mitchell was going to

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- comment on Floor Amendment #2, if he'd might, if you'd allow him, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "I'm working with Representative Cavaletto on this, so excuse me. Pardon. This is a permissive referendum. And I apologize; I appreciate your... your patience with me. It's a... can I have the language? Come back to us, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'll just hold this on Second, pending some discussion. We've adopted Amendment 1, and then we'll come back so there can be adequate discussion on 2. If that's... I would ask for that. But keep it on Second."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, can we hold Amendment 2 on the Order of Second Reading. Hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1737, Representative Brown. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2197, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Members, we will be doing Third Readings. Beginning on page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

205, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 205, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 205 is an initiative of Comptroller Judy Baar Topinka. And they have requested that if a unit of local government procure... this would allow a unit of local government... them to procure a third-party vendor to identify whether people owe a unit of local government money. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Reboletti: "Representative, what if the people are in the process of challenging whatever the fee or fine is? Is that money held by the Comptroller in a... in a separate fund so that if there is an issue and the person ends up prevailing, is there a chance they'll get their \$15 back or is that automatically... that fine kept?"

Hoffman: "Well, I'm not aware of... of that scenario, if there's someone challenging."

Reboletti: "Here's what I mean, Representative. Mr. Speaker,
I'm having trouble hearing. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we keep the noise level down.

They're having trouble hearing, speaking."

Reboletti: "Representative, what I'm anticipating is, if I owe outstanding speeding ticket fees or fines, but it turns out

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

that I go back to court and the case is dismissed but the money has been taken out of my check, as a Legislator or as a state worker, do I get that \$15 processing fee back eventually? Is that given back to me because now I... I really didn't owe that money or how does that work, if you're aware?"

Hoffman: "No. So, this... this is an instance where the Comptroller, currently, can contract through intergovernmental agreement, and they do it with 90 or so municipalities and counties where if they... that municipality or county is already owed money. So, in the... in your scenario, it would already have been adjudicated; they'd owe money. And if the state, then, has some money that's supposed to go that individual, they can withhold that money and they can pay that municipality what is owed."

Reboletti: "So, that..."

Hoffman: "So, it would not be a case where they would be in adjudication; it would be postadjudication."

Reboletti: "So, there would been a judgment rendered at some... a final judgment..."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...at some point would be rendered?"

Hoffman: "And all they're asking here is to be able to get a third party to do the matches, so that they can then collect more money for local governments."

Reboletti: "And that's what the \$15 is paying for is the..."

Hoffman: "Yeah."

Reboletti: "...that third party?"

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Hoffman: "It's 15. It's currently... already they can charge 15.

This would say, in this case, if you owe the money, you'd pay 20 and that money, then, would go to pay this third-party vendor who would do the matches so that the municipalities or the counties or the townships or whatever can... can get their money that's owed to them."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Representative Hoffman, can you tell me something, or are you aware, of what the process will be to choose this third-party vendor?"

Hoffman: "It's... the testimony from the Comptroller's Office is that they already went through an RFP process. I believe, and don't quote me on this, but I believe that there's seven or eight people that bid on it, and I think that they've chosen, through an RFP process, they've chosen a vendor. This, then, would allow them, as that vendor goes through and does the matches, that... this would allow them, then, to charge a fee to pay that vendor."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Yeah. Representative, what kind of enhanced identification service will this provide?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that these vendors have access, apparently, to Social Security numbers and they would,

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

then, match that and identify... other identification to amounts that are owed from the state to that individual to amounts that are owed to local governments. Then they would match them and what they would then do is pay the amount... instead of paying the amount to the individual, they would pay it to the local government for the amount that's owed. Does that make sense?"

Davis, M.: "And then, the local govern... for... are you saying if... and I heard another question on the other side of the aisle. Are you saying that if a person has outstanding... some bill to the State of Illinois, they can take it out of what exactly?"

Hoffman: "They already can and they al... they already... if it's to the State of Illinois, they already do the matches internally."

Davis, M.: "Mmm mmm."

Hoffman: "That's easier because they have the information from the state. We... I wasn't here, but you guys, apparently, passed the law that said that the Comptroller's Office can contract with local governments to do the same thing. So, let's say that... that the State of Illinois has a tax refund, but you find that that individual, who's about to get their tax refund, also owes local government some money. So you can, then, contract with the Comptroller's Office and then the state will pay the local government the amount owed. This says that they can get a third-party vendor to do that process and do that match, and it'll enhance the number of matches so that we can get the money to the governments that are owed to them."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Davis, M.: "So, do you know approximately how many local governments are asking the state to do that service?"
- Hoffman: "My analysis says that the... there are more than 90 cities and villages that currently contract with the state, currently. But I think, with this enhanced service, probably more will contract with the state."
- Davis, M.: "So, the state will not be responsible for any additional money to this selected vendor. All this vendor will get is the fee. Is that correct?"
- Hoffman: "It's my understanding that this is like a per collection fee. We would not..."
- Davis, M.: "So, the state will not have to give this vendor another large amount of money, that it will only be able to profit from the \$20 fee that's collected or the \$15 fee?"

Hoffman: "That's my understanding, yes."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Speaker, thank you. To the Bill. They owe me money. Can I get the \$20? We haven't been paid our per diem for how long? Seriously. And you said next week. I think it's a great Bill. I think everybody should vote for it. But we do need our per diem."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 205 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 Davis. Mr. Clerk,
please take the record. On a count of 91 voting 'yes', 25

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 205, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hatcher, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hatcher: "A point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Ma'am."

Hatcher: "Many of us have communities' leaders that are attending Springfield today, both to learn through their own meetings, and learn watching us on the floor. I have the privilege of introducing the Yorkfield City Council which is attending from my district up there. Raise your hand. Thank you all."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

Representative Sandack."

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

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

Sandack: "I, also, have a guest here. Todd Scalzo is here in the crowd. Todd is a member of the Wheaton City Council where he worked hand in hand with our own Representative Jeanne Ives. Todd is a passionate public servant and probably the number one train enthusiast in the State of Illinois. I hope we can give him a nice, Springfield welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol. Senate Bill 206, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 206, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 206 is an initiative of the Illinois Secretary of State. They wish to be more efficient with the issue of when an employee takes a leave of absence to either hold public office or, you know... they want to make sure that they can control that process better. We'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate... seeing some debate. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Bost: "Right now, how is leave of absence happens and... and what is the difference with the way they're wanting to do this?

  I mean, isn't it just they put in a request? Is this... change the number of days?"
- Zalewski: "So, right now, there's no rule, Mike, that regulates their ability to... to take a leave of absence and go on and do something else. We would want to limit that and make sure we don't have individuals going off for long periods of time indefinitely."
- Bost: "Okay. If... if they're elected to office, for instance, they would be able to take a leave of absence right now or what... what other reason? I mean, this won't affect... quite often, we have people leave for military purposes. That won't change, right?"
- Zalewski: "So, to your... to your point. It's only... this Bill only affects those who wish to leave for elected office, Mike."

Bost: "It does only affect those..."

Zalewski: "Yes."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Bost: "...leaving for... Okay. That... I appreciate that. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Yeah."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 206 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present, Senate Bill 206, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 338, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 338, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Last year, when we increased the cigarette tax to help fund the Medicaid program, we applied the tax to little cigars. In so doing, we redefined little cigars as if they were, in fact, cigarettes. Thence, followed a lawsuit, and in order to settle the lawsuit, which will leave little cigars classified as little cigars, but continue to impose them the tax. This is an agreement between the cigar... little cigar manufacturers and the Department of Revenue. I encourage your 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 338."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Yes, will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Bost: "Leader, so, was this a part that was... the little cigars,

  I guess, they were forgotten in the original language of
  when we taxed or..."
- Currie: "No. They... somehow they got redefined in ways that didn't work for the manufacturers. The Cigarette Tax Stamp Act, then, began to apply to them, but you can't stamp them because the boxes aren't the right size. So, this redefines them in a way that they were earlier defined and settles a lawsuit."
- Bost: "Okay. And... and the tax on that will, then, be the exact same as what the cigarettes are, correct?"
- Currie: "And... and that has been true. That was part of the original Bill, but the original Bill was not artfully drafted."
- Bost: "That happens now and again. Yeah. So, does this have anything... you know, a couple of years ago, we dealt with the cigar wraps and I didn't know if it had anything to do with that. And if that was the case, I was wondering if Representative Dunkin might comment on those or Representative Durkin, eith... either one. I think those are both very important to them. But I... but the Bill, as itself, without that, I guess, I'm okay with."
- Currie: "You're... you're exactly right, but in fact, unfortunately, nothing to do with that."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Harris, D.: "Representative, in committee, just to be clear, all we're doing is redefining little cigar... cigars..."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Currie: "Exactly."

Harris, D.: "...and making no increase in... in the taxes..."

Currie: "Right."

Harris, D.: "...and making sure that the distribution is in accordance with what has already been done with the other parts of the Act?"

Currie: "Exactly right."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "I'd appreciate your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 338 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 73 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 338, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 494, Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 494, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 494 puts a unified streamline system in place for the dissolution of units of local government with governing boards appointed by the DuPage County chair that have been found to be duplicative, financially unsustainable, or lacking effective oversight. The dissolution would be through ordinance with sufficient public notice given and would also be subject to a backdoor

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

referendum to give voters a choice to ensure an open, transparent and fair process that will result in cost saving measures for DuPage County and its taxpayers. I appreciate your comments, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Reboletti: "Representative, what agencies would the county have jurisdiction over if this referendum... the backdoor referendum would pass?"

Conroy: "Approximately 30, all located entirely in DuPage County. These are all units that have a majority of the board appointed by the DuPage County Board chair. And the fire protection district and the water are both not included because they have more than three employees, the Water Commission."

Reboletti: "Would the Bensenville-Elmhurst Fire Protection
District that encompasses unincorporated north Elmhurst, I
know you're familiar with that, and the White Pines area,
is that in this legislation?"

Conroy: "If they have more than three employ... if they have less than three employees."

Reboletti: "It's... it's a paper fire district, so they don't..."

Conroy: "Then, no, they're... yes, they are included."

Reboletti: "Then they are..."

Conroy: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...they are included."

Conroy: "Yes."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Reboletti: "And how will this process work? What would the county... walk me through it so that everybody here can understand and the media's listening. So, for that fire protection district, which is a fire... it's a paper fire protection district. They don't own any machinery, they have three board members appointed by the township supervisor, they have a budget and they hire out. They hire Elmhurst to do the fire protection portion. They hire... Bensenville provides the ambulance service. How will the county board move forward to try to determine if they should be abolished or changed in any way?"

"The way the process is set up to work is that the DuPage County Board proposes an ordinance, the dissolution of unit of local government. The ordinance is published in a newspaper and on the county board website. The county board produces an audit of claims and receipts, property inventories and debts. The county board adopts another ordinance to dissolve the unit. County board petitions in Circuit Court for an order designing a trustee dissolution in terminating the unit of government board members term. The state's attorney will become the unit's local representative. The county treasurer will become its treasurer. The county clerk will become its secretary. The voters have a full... have a time frame in which to petition for a backdoor referendum, if this is something they don't want. If the dissolution is approved, services are absorbed by municipalities, other units, or by the creation of an FSA."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Reboletti: "Would the people in that paper fire district be the only people that would vote to dissolve that paper fire district or is that a referendum that is countywide?"

Conroy: "This is decided by the DuPage County Board chair."

Reboletti: "So, that would be in the... in the ordinance, then, that... so, Chairman Cronin and the members would then lay out an ordinance and that maybe to... there's about 600 households there."

Conroy: "Correct."

Reboletti: "So, they could define an ordinance that would say these 600 households can vote to abolish or dissolve this unit of government."

Conroy: "That's my understanding."

Reboletti: "Okay. So, if that fire protection... paper fire protection district is dissolved, it has a levy. Does the ordinance, if it is to be dissolved, and let's say it was partially given to Elmhurst and partially given to Bensenville, beside the responsibilities of providing fire protection service and ambulance service, do those communities then have to pick up the tab or does that levy... can a portion of their levy be given to those municipalities to provide those services or do the residents now have to take care of that, meaning the entire City of Elmhurst, entire Village of Bensenville?"

Conroy: "The trustee in dissolution does not have authority to decrease the property tax levy affecting the provisions of fire and EMS services for applicable paper fire districts when the levy was already in fact... in effect on or before the date of dissolution."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Reboletti: "Would that be... would that be similar... For legislative intent, is that also similar for a mosquito abatement district? So, if that were dissolved... I'm trying to think about how... how... and I've talked to..."

Conroy: "Yes. They could continue to levy the same."

Reboletti: "So, then... but then, also, the... the county board could choose to dissolve the levy as well and not give any additional dollars for a municipality or whatever agency gets the services or responsibilities of those services."

Conroy: "Correct."

Reboletti: "Is there... is there a... any type of report that DuPage County is... will render to the General Assembly to show how this process is working? I know I serve on a Local Government Consolidation Task Force with Chairman Franks and a number of us, and we've been to DuPage County to talk about this particular legislation. Will they be providing us with any additional information pursuant to this legislation besides maybe them issuing us a report saying this is working, it might work in other counties?"

Conroy: "That's not in this legislation. No."

Reboletti: "Is there a... is there a sunset on this legislation or can they... can the DuPage... DuPage County, in perpetuity, continue to file ordinances and look to dissolve any of these forms of government listed here in this Bill?"

Conroy: "No sunset."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we talk a lot about dissolving forms of government or streamlining and finding efficiencies of scale. And what we find out in our Local Government Consolidation Task Force

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

is there's always push back from some entity. At some point, we have to try to do something different. And I think that DuPage County's chairman and its board members have provided us with a pathway to at least attempt to resolve some of these issues and see if it works for the people in the second largest county in the state. In the county of DuPage, we have, I believe, 54 mosquito abatement districts. And I, as well as all of us here, are concerned about any type of infectious disease, any of those concerns. Do we really need 54 entities spraying for West Nile Virus? How do we go about dissolving these entities or streamlining these entities? The DuPage County State's Attorney embarked on over a two-year lawsuit to dissolve some type of sanitary district that didn't even exist anymore. We have sanitary districts that represent very few people and nobody has any idea what they're being paid, if they have a website. There's no accountability. There's no accountability transparency. And so, maybe this will shed some sunshine on the entire process. I know that it's the desire of DuPage County to be a leader in this. Thank you, Speaker. And I would believe that this could definitely be a model used across the state. It is time to stop talking about reducing our 7 thousand levels of government and actually put something into action. And I would urge an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Fortner: "Representative, the previous speaker talked about examples with the fire districts. I see that the DuPage Water Commission is one of the exempted entities. What's the rationale for that?"

Conroy: "Anyone who has more than three employees, paid employees."

Fortner: "Any entity that has more than three employees?"

Conroy: "Yes."

Fortner: "So, does that mean that the DuPage Airport Authority would not be affected? My analysis says that it would be affected."

Conroy: "The Airport Authority is included, and I'm trying to get you an answer to that question. If you'd like to continue, we're looking for the answer for you."

Fortner: "Well, my concern is that the DuPage Water Commission a statutorily construct... has a special constructing it. The DuPage Airport Authority, which also employs many people, also has a similar special statutory section and I guess, I'd like to understand why it's not treated the same way as the Water Commission. Like the Water Commission has a lot of special regulations, in the case of the Airport Authority, there's FAA regulations, a lot of specialized work that it does, and I think it's a very different category than the small districts that, again, the previous speaker talked about. I certainly support the ability to do it for things like mosquito abatement and all these other small paper districts, but I think this district rises to a different level and that's why your answer's very important to me."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Conroy: "Yeah. I'm sorry, Representative, but the Airport Authority... there's no answer for that. It has not been brought up to... in this Senate Bill."
- Fortner: "So... so, you don't have any understanding of... so, I'm trying to understand, why was the Water Commission, then, exempted out specially? It has, as I say, special statute creating it, but so does the Airport Authority has special statute creating it. I'm just trying to understand why one was taken out in the Senate Bill and not the other."
- Conroy: "When the Senate Bill was created, the two were taken out with the understanding that anyone with over three paid employees would be exempt."
- Fortner: "Right, but that's not what the current Bill reads.

  It... that number of employees only applies to the fire protection districts and determining whether they are exempted or not. And in the case of these other districts, as I say, they really, I think, should be treated in the same manner if what you say... I mean, I agree with what... what you're saying, but that's not what the Bill is saying that came over from the Senate. It has left the Airport Authority which has many, many employees doing very specialized work, much like the Water Commission does. And I think they really should be treated in the same fashion."

Conroy: "I can find that out for you and let you know."

Fortner: "Do you want to take the Bill out? Can we talk about this, and then..."

Conroy: "No."

Fortner: "Well, so you're going to find out before we vote, or am I have to vote without knowing the answer?"

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Conroy: "We can make a call."

Fortner: "I'd appreciate it. As I said, I don't have any objection to having this Bill brought up immediately again as soon as you made the call. I just... I don't want to be holding up other business if you're waiting on the call."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, we have a few people wishing to speak, so we'll go ahead and move on to the next speaker and they can get back to you with that information."

Fortner: "I'll be able to speak again then without having my name used? Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to be clear. This Bill does a lot of good things. It provides a backdoor referendum for the protection of taxpayers. It exempts operational fire districts. It ensures the ... diminution of fire services. It maintains the current tax levy. It provides for a five-month review period. It increases time allotted for presentation of trustees' proposals and provides flexibility in special service areas. In sum, this does what we always talk about trying to do when we're on the election campaign tour... trail, provide value to taxpayers. This is an opportunity to vote for a good government initiative that will save taxpayers' dollars and act... actually consolidate duplicative services of government. You got to vote 'yes' on this one. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Moffitt: "Representative, I hope I don't ask something that's been answered. I apologize, but I still would like to direct some questions at you for my own information. As this is in the present form, are the fire districts still opposed?"

Conroy: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear your question."

Moffitt: "Are there opponents that... to this, and I thought the fire protection districts were opposed."

Conroy: "There was one fire protection district that was opposed."

Moffitt: "Okay. What..."

Conroy: "It was only... everybody else was eliminated."

Moffitt: "What about the Association?"

Conroy: "Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts is an opponent, and the Metropolitan Agency... the one fire district is still a proponent."

Moffitt: "Okay. Now, you've referred to... but the Association is opposed. You said they're actually officially opponent."

Conroy: "Yes."

Moffitt: "You've referred to paper districts, and I don't have any of those. I'm not that familiar. I don't... I don't think it's a district like we have of most other places in the state. Would this, in fact, potentially leave any areas without fire protection?"

Conrov: "No."

Moffitt: "Who would take over any responsibilities of an abolished district, whether it be traditional or paper? Who would take over those responsibilities?"

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Conroy: "They would continue to levy a tax to be able to protect these areas."

Moffitt: "And who... you say they would, who's the they?"

Conroy: "The county would take responsibility for that."

Moffitt: "Okay. So, they're going to continue to levy the same tax that was there?"

Conroy: "Yes."

Moffitt: "So, how is that saving money?"

Conroy: "They can decrease it as long as it doesn't affect...
interfere with safety."

Moffitt: "But there are... are there real people in positions in this, what you call, a paper fire district?"

Conroy: "Often, no."

Moffitt: "So, then the county board is doing what probably, in most of the rest of the state, fire trustees would do?"

Conroy: "If they are doing any service, the county would take that over and contract for that."

Moffitt: "Okay. So, I... in that one particular part, I don't see where there would be savings. And can... can voters now, by referendum, consolidate any of these taxing bodies or eliminate them?"

Conroy: "Some of them, but it's inc... it's very unclear as to which ones."

Moffitt: "Okay. Well, I... I certainly, you know, agree with what you're trying to do, make government more efficient, no problem there. My only concern is if we're leaving areas less protected or unprotected, or lesser quality of protection than... than we currently have. That would be my only concern. So, thank you for your response."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Representative... and... and, Mr. Speaker, it is a little noisy in here, and I would..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative."

- Riley: "...ask for a little bit of silence 'cause this is a very important Bill. I mean, this isn't a run of the mill issue.

  All of our Bills that we hear are important, but this one is extremely important."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, can we bring the conversation down or take the conversations to the back of the chamber?

  Presenters are having a trough... a tough time hearing. Thank you. Representative Riley."
- Riley: "Thank you. Earlier, you said something about the trustee in dissolution, about some power that they did not have, and you were speaking about a levy. Could you restate that?"
- Conroy: "When I went through the process of how this would go about..."
- Riley: "You had made a statement that the trustee in dissolution did not have some sort of power when it came to a... a levying taxes. And I just want you to... to restate that because I didn't hear all of it, but I wanted to be sure that I understood what it was you were saying."
- Conroy: "Trustee in dissolution will have the power to levy rebate taxes to pay for the unit's debt outstanding upon dissolution..."

Riley: "Okay. I... All right."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Conroy: "...because of dissolution."

Riley: "I see number two. I see that. I thought you said something about they did not have some sort of power. My rejoinder was going to be, they have a lot of powers as elucidated in our analysis. They have an extreme amount of powers."

Conroy: "Correct."

Riley: "Are you familiar with the emergency financial manager that's going on in some states that the Governor appoints, and they more or less come in units of government and sort of put them in receivership? Are you... are you aware of... of that?"

Conroy: "No."

Riley: "Okay. I... I would ask that you... you might want to look into it. This is a different level of government and of course, there are some differences, but there's a lot of similarities with regard to the power that this trustee in dissolution has. I mean, it's... it is not unlimited, but it's... it's pretty close. And there's good points on both sides of this issue, there really are, but oftentimes, some things have sort of obfuscated, a lot of truth hides in plain sight. What one person's efficiency may be, may be taking a franchise away from someone else. So, how would you explain to some people who might say, well, wait a minute? I'm... you know, you're taking this away from me. I might want this unit of government. And I'm not talking about paper governments. I'm talking about a real unit which could go away with a somewhat unlimited powers that this Bill will be giving them."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Conroy: "There's a thoughtful process put into place, and there's a time frame when it has to be posted, and there's a provision for a backdoor referendum if the voters choose to oppose."

Riley: "What is your feeling... well, let me just ask you this question. There's no sunset provision on this Bill, correct?"

Conroy: "Correct."

Riley: "And let's face it, you know, we're all subject to whether or not the voters want any of us to come back and serve in these offices. What would be prohibiting a new county board from, you know, doing something untoward with the power that this Bill will be giving them? Where's the checks and balances to be sure that that doesn't happen?"

Conroy: "Well, first, the county board is elected, so the voters have the right to choose who they put in that place."

Riley: "Yeah. I just ... I just said that."

Conroy: "Correct."

Riley: "So, we... we understand that."

Conroy: "And then, on top of that, they have the opportunity...

this is posted, there's a process in place, and they have
the opportunity to use a backdoor referendum to oppose."

Riley: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. You know, I'm... I'm not given to telling Members how to vote for something; you got to vote for this, you got to vote for that, but I just hope that all of the Members see what this Bill is all about. What it does, what it doesn't do, what it has the potential to do. So, the only thing that I would say is you

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

just be very thoughtful, you know, with regard to your vote because of what this Bill is endeavoring to do."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Durkin: "Representative, I'm fully supportive of your Bill. But I have a question regarding... regarding the mechanics of it. We... we want to reduce the governments in DuPage County, some of these unnecessary boards and presumably, some of these employees may be assumed by the county. But for some of those employees where the jobs are no longer going to exist, I would assume that they have some type of retirement plan, whether it's through IR... IMRF or other type of pension fund. Who assumes the liability or who assumes the pensions for those individuals when that body has been dissolved; they're not retained, they're not brought back by the county, and their jobs cease to exist? Who's on the hook for that?"

Conroy: "This doesn't affect anything that they've earned at the time of dissolution."

Durkin: "Okay. But if that body is no longer in existence, who is going to pay for the benefits moving forward after... of which they've earned up until the date of the dissolution?"

Conroy: "The county would be responsible for any outstanding debts."

Durkin: "All debts, and that would include pension debt, correct?"

Conroy: "Correct."

Durkin: "All right. Thank you."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I've been hearing... listening to this debate, and some of the questions were, this does not have a sunset provision. I'd like to know that if you found, after this is enacted, that there was issues that needed to be remedied, would you have any trouble coming forward and filing Amendments to the Bill subsequently to tighten language or if it's not working, get rid of it completely?"

Conroy: "I would not. I think the point of this Bill is it's a good government Bill, and I think it's a big step in the right direction, and we want it to be thoughtful, and we want it to be done right."

Franks: "This is not the Bill that you had, previously, dealing with forest preserves, is it?"

Conroy: "No, Representative, it's not."

Franks: "And there's nothing in that deal... there's nothing in this Bill that deals with that issue, is there?"

Conroy: "No. Unfortunately, there is not."

Franks: "Now, in this Bill, here, how many units of government could possibly be affected? Would that be around... is it like 13 or 14 units of government that would be affected by this Bill, potentially?"

Conroy: "To the workings of the crafting of this Bill..."

Franks: "Yes."

Conroy: "...it was moved down to about 13 or 14."

Franks: "Right. So, what you're really trying to do is to have a laboratory in DuPage County to look at efficiencies in

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

government to see if consolidation and cooperation would work on a different scale. Is that your idea here?"

Conroy: "Yes, it is."

Franks: "And the... and the only opponent, right now, is the fire protection district, correct?"

Conroy: "Correct."

Franks: "And you've put in procedural safeguards to protect those fire protection districts as well, haven't you?"

Conroy: "Yes, we have."

Franks: "Okay. I... to the Bill. And I appreciate the Sponsor's hard work. This is something that I've worked on as well. She's done a better job of it than I have. She's been able to get it to the floor. I think it takes some courage here because people... we're trying to do something that hasn't been done before, but something that's long overdue. What we'll be doing is allowing one county to try something to see if it works, and if it doesn't work, then we'll get rid of it. But I don't think that we should be afraid of trying new things, especially when our government is so much larger than that of other states. Illinois has over 7 thousand units of government. It's untenable. Many times, we can't get people to serve. We have lots of issues on accountability as well. There's simply so many units of government that no one can actually watch them all. I think that this is an idea whose time has come. There's very little downside risk here, whatsoever. The arguments that I've heard against it are not based on fact but more on fear; and those can all be addressed. I'd encourage an

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

'aye' vote. And again, I appreciate Representative Conroy for fighting for this. I think it's very important."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Okay. It appears, Representative, that you have a good Bill here. But I do have some questions, and it just comes from my analysis. But in my analysis, it lists the number of board appointments and members that serve on various committees and boards and protection districts and so on and so forth. And then, it also goes on to talk about appointments of major... the majority of the members to ethics commissions, public aid, board of review, workforce, and on and on and on. My question is, what keeps DuPage County from just doing this themselves?"

Conroy: "There is no process. It's not statutory. And it's...
it's expensive and time-consuming."

Kay: "Well, maybe I'm not clear. Is there a State Law that
 governs how counties run themselves?"

Conroy: "Each individual one is different."

Kay: "Well, my... but that..."

Conroy: "So, some of them are statutory and some of them are not in terms of the commiss... individual commissions."

Kay: "Wouldn't it be good to break those out and deal with the ones that are statutory and let the county deal with the ones that aren't?"

Conroy: "I... I think the purpose of this Bill is good government and to not have repetitive government. And for that reason

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

alone, we've already gone from 30 down to 14, so we've already eliminated quite a few."

Kay: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I... I think this is a good initiative. I... I, frankly, would've liked... I understand this is an experiment. I, frankly, would've liked to have seen this expanded to the entire State of Illinois because I think there's not a county that would not benefit from the ability to... to begin either in-house or through the statutory requirements of paring back government. I heard 7 thousand units of government; it's more like 9 thousand units of government. And I think it's time to make a change and do it now. I commend you for picking up a Bill like this; it's a tough one. These are not easy to carry, and I think you're to be commended for your effort in this regard. And I'm certainly going to support your Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I yield my five minutes to Representative Fortner."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. I just want to follow up on our question. So, is it, then, we... we agree in the understanding that there had been this request for the Water Commission, but the Airport Authority, even though it is also governed by the same kind of special statutory requirements, was not excluded. So, my question for you, to follow up on that, would be, would you commit to support a trailer Bill that would then exempt the Airport Authority from this Bill, should it become law?"

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Conroy: "Yes, Representative, I would. My understanding is that the Water Commission was taken out at the request of a mayor, and the Airport Commission had not been... no one had come to our attention with that. But yes, I would support a trailer Bill for that."

Fortner: "Thank you very much. With that, I'd certainly be able to support the Bill with that commitment. The Airport Authority is a special body; it has a... its own special statutory area because it owns an airport and that's connected with various federal regulations. I appreciate your response on that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just, hopefully, to clear up some... some questions here. I know several have spoke about the fire protection districts who are in opposition, and both of our analysis, both the Republican and Democrat side, has it listed that way. I, myself, just talked with Ed Kruse, with the Illinois Firefighters Association, who said that both for the fire protection districts and the Illinois Firefighters Association, they negotiated this Bill in the Senate, came to an agreement, and the opposition was actually removed. So, from... from them, they say that there is no opposition to this."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy to close."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. I would like to thank both sides of the aisle on this. There was a lot of... a lot of work done on both sides. This is a Bill that is supported by both sides. It is a good government Bill that will affect DuPage County. And I think... I would encourage other

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Representatives to look into their own districts and see if this is possible for them. I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 494 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 Sente, Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 494, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 723, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 723, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 723 allows for the City of Chicago to issue a liquor license to a restaurant that is located within 100 feet of the church if the restaurant meets certain criteria. This restaurant is in my district. We have a letter from the aldermen of support and the church where it, currently, 100 feet from the restaurant, also, has written a letter of support. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 723 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 Mayfield, Hays, Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 723, having received

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read the status of Senate Bill 1565."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1565 is on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAsey. Representative McAsey, on House Bill 1565, would you like to move this Bill back to Second? Yes. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1738, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1738, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 13... excuse me, 1738 makes several changes regarding video gaming. It allows the use of electronic cards when using video terminals. It removes a thousand foot restriction for establishments. It allows the central communication system vendor to be licensed as a video gaming manufacturer or distributor. There are nine provisions in the Bill. It also allows for the video gaming operator and licensed video gaming establishment to split the annual hundred dollar terminal fee, and requires the Gaming Board to adopt rules establishing standards for advertising. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote, and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Mautino: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Bost: "You know, I listened to this because I was waiting in committee while you were presenting the Bill, and I just want to make sure that... now, right now, other states... our law, right now, goes above and beyond what other states do. Is that not correct?"
- Mautino: "That is correct. The bulk of the Bill, most of the Bill, is agreed to changes by the Gaming Board. And also, they're neutral on the provision which would allow for the terminal operator and the assistance management to be one."
- Bost: "And... and really, the only one who would be negatively impacted if we don't change this is a vendor who is right here in the State of Illinois, correct?"
- Mautino: "Yes. That's very true. And it's WMS Games and they and Scientific Games Corporations merged. They have the merger actually approved and in place prior to our changes in the law. When we passed the trailer Bill for the original gaming Bill, at that point, we said you cannot be both a... the manager and the distributor. At that point in time an Illinois-based company, Williams Manu... Manufacturing Systems, already had \$6 million worth of machines out in the market. They have suspended operations pending approval of the merger. The Gaming Board has given its blessing. They will make firewall rules simp... very similar to the other 14 states and jurisdictions that do this."
- Bost: "Right. So, there will be controls on it, but this will still... how many... how many people do... does this company employ?"

Mautino: "Oh, in this, I know there's a..."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Bost: "About... about 1700, is that right?"

Mautino: "I was going to say 16 or 17 hundred, primarily, in a couple of the districts up by Chicago."

Bost: "Well, and... and because of that, I will be supporting the Bill. I know there's others that kind of question the rules and everything like that. But... but I think that the answer, the fact that... that it will still have a separation in there that would still do the safety and..."

Mautino: "Yes."

Bost: "...be like the other states."

Mautino: "There's a hard firewall against any transfer of data, so there wouldn't be the issue of cherry picking. The Gaming Board, Caleb Melamed, had come to the table and expressed that they are very comfortable with the way this is structured, and they see no problems or any conflicts of interest."

Bost: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mautino: "Hi, Jack."

Franks: "Hi. I'm not sure I understand the one provision with the thousand foot restriction from simulcast bat... betting areas. Can you explain what that change is?"

Mautino: "Oh, sure. The offtrack betting... the offtrack betting, right now, there... there was a restriction that was placed in law. And so, if someone moves into an area, let's say you have video gaming terminals there, one provision of it says that if someone moves into an area within that closer...

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

closer than a thousand feet, you don't have to give up what you have now."

Franks: "Okay."

Mautino: "That's one of the rule changes, and that was pretty important. The other one is an offtrack betting system can... they may have a bar... a bar, a dinner area associated, they would, then, be allowed to, also, have that in the same building. There was a specific instance where you had an off-track betting facility and a couple doors away was another place that had machines in place."

Franks: "Okay. All right. I get that. And the other issue was the fact that you would allow, now, a distributor to also be an operator and you were talking about the firewall?"

Mautino: "Sure. The... the law changed, actually, right in the middle of this. We're the only state that has this provision. But we passed the law, the Gaming Board went out for a management contract. They goofed up the first round of proposals. So they had accepted bids; Scientific Games bid in the first round. They found that there was a complaint against the bidding process, so then they rebidded again. In another year, the Scientific Games, also, won the second bid by our Gaming Board. So, in the meantime, there was a bid cast. We changed the law. We brought the trailer Bill to clean up the Act, and we put a prohibition in place. Now, at that time, there's already a merger pending, and they are the game... selected Scientific Management are running the system. So, we put this in place afterwards. And this would allow, with the proper firewall so that are no conflicts of interest, and we brought up the

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Gaming Board. They're comfortable with the language. They drafted the language and see no reason for concern. So, they're neutral."

Franks: "And other states allow this now?"

Mautino: "Yes. All 14 other jurisdictions."

Franks: "Okay. They haven't had any problems with that?"

Mautino: "No."

Franks: "Now... now, is there an antiseizure provision in this, as well, by the... by the police?"

Mautino: "Yeah. So, if you're, for example, if you're training people to use these systems or to repair these systems, you can have those on-site; they can't be seized. Though, it's may... you may not be doing it in a licensed... under the Act, you have to be a on-premise location serving alcohol. We have some institutes, community colleges, other places they'll be working in."

Franks: "But just for training, it's not for actual..."

Mautino: "Correct."

Franks: "...betting. Okay. And who's... who's against it, now, then?"

Mautino: "The Church Action on Alcohol and Addiction Prob...

Problems, Coalition to Protect Illinois Gaming Act, which
is a group I've never heard of."

Franks: "Okay."

Mautino: "And the... probably Bally, which supposed to be one of their competitors who did not bid for either of the management contracts."

Franks: "Well, thank you for your explanation. I appreciate it."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Mautino: "Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, I'm just wondering why the conflicted provision that was important enough to add three years ago with WMS's strong support now no longer matters."

Mautino: "Mr. Chairman, if you could... Speaker, if you could bring the volume level down. I apologize. I didn't hear you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the volume down in the chambers. Take all conversations to the rear of the chamber, please. Thank you."

Mautino: "Okay."

Sandack: "And I'll speak up. I was wondering, Representative, why the conflict provision was important enough to add three years ago with WMS's strong support no longer is important to have in the Bill."

Mautino: "I think at the... during the time that we did the cleanup of the Bill, we were still in the process of bidding. We had actually... the Gaming Board bid it, goofed it up, there was an objection, rebid it again. So, at that time, the... there was no thoughts of... there was really no conflict, and we hadn't passed a law that said there was a conflict. So, as part of the cleanup language, we did this and no other of the 14 jurisdictions had done it. That's..."

Sandack: "Okay."

Mautino: "Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ann Williams."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong, strong support of this Bill. This WMS Gaming has a large facility in my district. One of the few large, industrial facilities in my district, and I have 550 jobs in my district alone. We all talk about, and I guarantee all of our campaign literature talks about, retaining jobs and creating jobs in Illinois. This Bill is exactly that. We want to retain the… a thousand-plus jobs that are in Illinois, right now, and add new jobs when this merger takes place. This is a multinational merger. We don't want Illinois to lose out on more jobs. I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I'm chatting with Representative Flowers. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, has there been any loss of revenue to the State of Illinois or sales because of our prohibition?"

Mautino: "As far as the..."

Reboletti: "What's up... like why..."

Mautino: "They've... well, they've ceased... they have ceased while the... while this matter is being decided. They have ceased placing the games out, collecting revenues there. Their general loss at this point, to date, is about \$2 million. Now, if they have to pull all of their equipment that they have out there from the... from the locations that are paying 30 percent of their take in taxes, that's an additional 6 million in just equipment. So..."

Reboletti: "So, if I already own a..."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Mautino: "...there would be that plus ancillary job losses; people not installing, collecting, fixing, repairing."
- Reboletti: "If we don't pass this, who is filling the void, then, with respect to selling those machines and... is there another company that's already selling in the marketplace?"
- Mautino: "Oh. There are... there are a number. I believe there's six certified companies, and I'm told that that is the coalition to protect Illinois Gam... Gaming Act would be the other certified competitors who can sell within the State of Illinois, all located outside of the State of Illinois from their bases of operations."
- Reboletti: "Right. It's... it is also my understanding that WMS could've already sold about 200 more machines if we didn't have this prohibition, so we're... there could've already been machines up and running."
- Mautino: "That's... that was the \$2 million that I was referring to, yes."
- Reboletti: "That's... that's the two million you were referring to?"
- Mautino: "They would've had 200 more machines, so... another..."
- Reboletti: "Is there... was there any issues with the coin operators at some point or is that being... being worked out?

  Were there any objections from them?"
- Mautino: "There are no objections from the... no objections from the coin operators."
- Reboletti: "Makes perfectly good sense."
- Mautino: "This... this was their initiative, actually."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Reboletti: "And I appreciate that because I... I'm saying... I'm looking at to making sure that there was no other opponents to the legislation as it's written. So..."

Mautino: "It's correct."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

"Thank you, Speaker. I, also, rise in strong support of this legislation. There is a building in my district as well, and we employ several hundred individuals. It is a very good company. I've had the opportunity to tour it myself. We're interested in growing business, keeping jobs here in Illinois, letting our business expand. As you heard from a former Representative, there's a unit district. There's opportunity here for maybe a... even a third or a fourth expansion into someone else's district. This is what we want. We want businesses that are going to grow and expand, they're going to hire local individuals and their... those families that live here in Illinois will then take this money that they received and put it back into our economy. We do not want those funds going to other states. We want to make sure that we're voting 'yes' on this Bill. It is a good Bill and it will grow business. I think that's very, very important. It is... other proponents that were not listed in your analysis are the Illinois Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the AFLCIO, obviously, the City of Waukegan, and the City of Chicago. So, I'm recommending a strong 'yes' vote to this legislation. Thank vou."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Kay: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"
Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Representative, I'm not a proponent of... of gaming or gambling, so I need to ask the question, here. I'm looking down the list... I'm looking down the list of those who are opposed to your Bill, and I see Bally's in there. They're pretty big, aren't they?"

Mautino: "Yes. They are. Well, they're a competitor..."

Kay: "They're a competitor. They're..."

Mautino: "...and to me, that's a market share issue."

Kay: "Is there any concern... is this Bill really about trying to keep certain Illinois gaming businesses in this state, not allowing people to poach our business, or not?"

Mautino: "As for... as for me, what I would say on there is the fact that it is an Illinois-based company is very, very important. But also, the reality that an Illinois-based qualified, certified supplier for our Illinois program was purchased for \$1.2 billion. I mean that's... and while the contracts were being applied for, we changed the law and were the only state that has done it actually in the midst of... of the purchase, which was approved by the... it has to go through its security's authority which was approved properly. And it protects an Illinois business and about 1700 jobs in Representative Mell's, Representative Mayfield's district, Representative Williams, and that's not to mention the other people throughout the State of Illinois who repair them, service the machines."

Kay: "I... I think it's important people understand if I... I think
I did understand your answer to me correctly. I think it's

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

important to understand that what we're doing here, whether you're for or against, is that you're protecting Illinois businesses that are in this business as opposed to those people who would come in and either purchase or try and run out, one way or another, those people who are in the business in Illinois today. And I think for that very reason, I'm going to support your Bill, although I'm not a gaming, gambling person. So, thank you, Representative."

Mautino: "Thank you, Dwight."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 1738. And I appreciate the debate. This is an opportunity to help to save, and keep, and grow Illinois jobs, but also, to allow some corrections that are necessary in the rest of the Bill for our Gaming Act to work property. It's in its infancy; and I think that with these changes we should definitely have a strong firewall and be able to preserve some very important Illinois jobs. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1738 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 Arroyo, Chapa LaVia, Smith, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 71 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1738, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 341...
  correction... 340, offered by Representative Hatcher. House
  Resolution 342, offered by Representative Senger. And
  House Resolution 343, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Turner: "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 Smith."
- Smith: "I want to be record... Speaker, I want to be recorded as a 'yes' on the Senate Bill 1738."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request.

  Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point, Sir."
- Sandack: "DuPage Mayors and Managers are down, West Suburban Mayors' Conference, Naperville, Downers Grove. A whole bunch of western suburban towns are here. I'd like to give them a nice House welcome, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

  Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, tonight is the last dress rehearsal for Capitol COWL. I would like to see everyone there at 5:30, and we will be at the Crowne Plaza. See you there, 5:30, Crowne Plaza. Be there."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

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

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

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

- Zalewski: "The... Once again, a reminder, a White Sox Caucus Thursday night. The Sox versus the Angels, the 16th. It's slipping away from us, so we need to get the... get the ship in the right direction. So, Wednesday night, White Sox Caucus meeting."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "I'd just like our Members to welcome one of our former Members, Representative Chuck Krezwick, who's down in the front. Chuck, good... good to see you back."
- Speaker Turner: "Chuck. Welcome back, Representative. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "There have been two committees that were canceled for this afternoon. The Agriculture & Conservation Committee has been canceled. And the Environment Committee has been canceled. The 2:30 committees are now meeting at 3:00. The 2:30 committees are now meeting at 3:00. Meeting at 3:00 is the Approp-Elementary & Secondary Education Committee in Room D-1; Insurance in Room 114; and Public Utilities in Room 413. Meeting at 3:30 is Financial Institutions in Room 413; Consumer Protection in Room 114; and Health Care Licenses in D-1."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to have an immediate caucus, and we will be done in time for the committees. One... one hour."

54th Legislative Day

5/14/2013

Speaker Turner: "The Republicans will meet in Room 114 immediately following adjournment. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will adjourn 'til Wednesday, May 15 at 12 noon. Representative Currie moves for the adjournment of the House. Seeing no objection, the House is adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3630, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."