136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor A.B. Bennett who is with Pawnee Assembly of God in Pawnee. Pastor Bennett is the guest of Representative Poe. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Bennett."
- Pastor Bennett: "Let us pray. Heavenly Father, we thank You for this day that You've given us all to live this life in the full. May the events of this day, in this House, be led by Your guiding hand, Your voice of wisdom. May today be filled with life-changing, purpose-driven, fruitful activity that makes a difference for the good those whose Members... Members of this House have been elected to serve. May the conversation and actions of this Body be motivated by love for You and one another, by the hope that today brings to us new opportunities and possibilities and the faith that all things are possible through You. Today, God, I pray that Your will be done in all that we do. I thank You for every Leader in this room today. Guide and provide everything they need to conduct with integrity, honor, and respect the legislative agenda for this great State of Illinois. God, today we depend upon You. In the name of Your Son, Jesus, I pray today, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by a person who needs to feel better 'cause he was the victim of a bad call, Mr. Drury."
- Drury et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Hernandez."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Sosnowski is excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 116 Members present and the House does have a quorum. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bills 3796 and House Bill 3815. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2758. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2730. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3125. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 345. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1681. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1134, offered by Representative Ford and House Joint Resolution 98, offered by Representative Acevedo are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Bellock: "I have a wonderful group that's up in the balcony. I'd like them to stand up. The MWAH group. And this is a group that's been in existence for 30 years, working with young people, going around to different schools, talking about values and hardships that young people and adolescents face. It's Ray Moffitt and Landon Ballard and his brother, Levi Ballard. And they're just, as Landon said to me, wanting to change people's lives. So, thank you for visiting us. I hope everybody will give them a warm welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please, Sir."

Brauer: "Ladies and Gentleman, up in the gallery behind me we have Franklin Middle School Beta Club, led by Mr. and Mrs. Zinnen. The Beta Club is committed to recognizing and promoting high academic achievement, encouraging service to other, and developing character and leadership skills. And what a better example that we can show them today. Please give them a warm Springfield welcome."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House of Representatives. Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Cavaletto: "I would like to welcome Jonathon Bursott as my Page here for a day and his parents in the gallery from Marion County, Raccoon School. And let's give them a welcome to this Capitol, please. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us today. Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Hays: "Please welcome in the gallery, behind me, if they would stand, GED students from the Center for Children's Services in Danville. They're making their first visit to our Capitol. Please welcome them and their instructor, Bill Miller. Welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Thanks for being here.

Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Pihos: "Yes, I would like you to help me welcome my two Pages for the day, Eva Bein from Edison Middle School in Wheaton, she's a seventh grader there, and I was a former teacher there and Michael Zima from Glen Crest Middle School in Glen Ellyn, where he is an eighth grader. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Glad you're with us. Members, moving to page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, the first Bill is House Bill 4665, Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4665, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4665 makes changes to the membership of the Interagency Committee on Employees with Disabilities to provide a forum for problems of general concern to state employees with disabilities. Also, to provide a clearinghouse of information for state employees with disabilities to promote affirmative action efforts. And last but not least, strengthening the affirmative action programs for employees with disabilities. This is an initiative of the Department of Human Rights. It will make... this committee will be an 18 members of this committee. It will be cochaired by Department of Human Services and Department of Human Rights. And the committee will meet six times annually, bringing about an annual report to the Governor. If there's any questions, I'll be happy to ask... to answer them at this time. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Brady, Davis. Mr. Brady. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5395, Representative Monique Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 5732, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5732, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a local Fox Metro. For years, except prior to me doing this, Leader Cross put in some legislation that there would be some parity for... because it's a taxing body that would reflect the community. Presently the way it's made up, it's... it's all... all Republicans on the board except for one Democrat. And Senator Holmes and... we were looking over the roster and we decided to change it back to the original language. In this case, there's still going to be a Majority Republican board and a Minority Democratic boar... Members, two Democratic Members and three Republican Members. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Davis, Hammond, Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we're moving down the list of Senate Bills-Third Reading. The first Bill is Senate Bill 122, Leader Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 122, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 122 requires businesses certified for the Business Enterprise Program to be 51 percent or more owned or controlled by one or more minority persons, one or more

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

females, or one or more persons with a disability. Currently, if the combination of minorities, females, and people with disabilities own 51 percent or more of a business, the business can be certified for the BEP certification, even if no single demographic of the owners owns 51 percent or more. BEP certification gives businesses an edge in acquiring state contracts. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader yields."

Franks: "Mr. Turner, when we had this in committee, I know there was some questions as to potential unintended consequences. Have you had a chance to go through that? Because I didn't know... I thought we were going to call this later, quite frankly. I didn't realize this was going to be on the board today. So, have you had a chance to talk to some folks? 'Cause I know many Members in committee had questions on this because of what... what may some of the unintended consequences are. Have you had a chance to work through those?"

Turner: "Yeah. We had... I've had some discussions with the Members and the original Sponsor in the Senate as well as interested parties. And we came to the conclusion that what we're trying to get at is specifically stated right here in the Bill. And that is that we'd like BEP certification to go for firms that are wholly owned by minority in... in whole or in part more than 51 percent. And that's... that's specifically what we're trying to target, so."

Franks: "I get that. But was there any analysis done to determine whether we would be steering business to just a few firms

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

instead of getting to the goal of having more minorities involved? Because if you're requiring 51 percent ownership by a minority, you're changing it... you're changing the law significantly because before, you could have two or three different groups make up that minority. Now, you're requiring only one group to make up that minority. And my concern is you might not have adequate folks to bid except maybe one or two, so we might be enriching one or two minority firms at the expense of all the others."

Turner: "Right. And that's a consideration that we... we thought about as well. But, you know, the... right now, we have... yeah... What you find is just combinations of women, disability, minority, whatever the case may be and, you know, minority firms or all women firms or people with disability, they're not... they're not given those opportunities. They end up losing out. So, we want to just bring some truth and clarity to it, some transparency to it and just make sure that what the program was set up for is being executed."

Franks: "Well, looking at the analysis right now, and we'll use the example, if a third of a business is owned by a minority man and a third by a nonminority female, and a third by a nonminority male with a disability, this business can be certified as all three: minority, female, as well as a person with a disability, even though no single demographic owns more than 50 percent of the business. This Bill would change it where you have to be 51 percent of one of those three groups. Is that correct?"

Turner: "This changes... yes. There has to be 50... 51 percent or more in one of those three groups."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Franks: "Has there been any analysis whatsoever, how many firms, then, would be excluded from the old rules? Should this Bill pass, how many people would fall off with their ability to bid?"

Turner: "No."

Franks: "I'd like to know that. And I'm concerned that if we pass a Bill like this that we may shrink the actual number of folks who can bid instead of expand. And I think your goal is to expand those people who can bid and I'm concerned that without the knowledge, that we could actually be contracting. And I think it might have an opposite effect."

Turner: "You may be pleasantly surprised, though, and find out that we discover more minority firms or more women firms and more people with disability to step up to the plate and now be able to take advantage of some of these BEP certification and what comes along with it."

Franks: "But what would stop them from doing it now? Because if they're already 51 percent owned as a minority or a disabled or a female, they can do it. What this is doing is contracting the amount of people who can actually bid. It's not expanding it, it's contracting it."

Turner: "They may be currently facing some hurdles, in terms of them getting contracts or that sort of thing. This would allow the certification to go for truly what the original intent of the BEP program was, and that is that we get minority owned wholly firms an opportunity to participate."

Franks: "But Representative, they can bid right now because they already... I'll wait 'til the staff talks to you."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Turner: "Frankly, Representative, people right now are skirting the rules and... and firms that are not wholly minority or... or businesses, these combinations there... or combinations of them together and conglomerates that come together to take these contracts, we're not given truly BEP firms an opportunity. So, this will... this will help them. And that's why we're doing it."

Franks: "Representative, I'm not questioning that. And I don't know much about the bidding process. I'll admit that. I do know how to... I do know math, though. And I know that if you take away the ability and you have to be at 51 percent, you're going to be taking away other people who could be bidding. So, what I'd like, and I would ask you to consider perhaps taking it out of the record and getting some information on what the global number would be, should this Bill pass, because I think we might be surprised that it may shrink the number of minorities that could actually bid. Because right now, nothing is prohibiting any minority who owns 51 percent from bidding, but this Bill will prohibit any minority who owns less than 51 percent from bidding. So, my concern is that this could have an unintended consequence in actually barring minorities from bidding, as opposed to making it easier. And that's why I want to see what the numbers are."

Turner: "I don't think that we'll have a problem finding minority contractors who can live up to this goal."

Franks: "Well, they are right now. That's my point. Right now, you have the ability if you own 51 percent. Okay. I'm... I'll go to the Bill. I understand what the... what the Representative is trying to do, but I just... I don't think we have enough

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

information here. Because right now, anyone who owns 51 percent or more, whether you're disabled or a female or a minority male, can bid. That doesn't change anything. What this says, though, is if you're a minority male or a minority female or disabled, that you won't be able to bid unless you own 51 percent. So, this is a bar on many and I know that's not what you want to do. So, that's why I think we need more information and I'm very concerned about this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cloonen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cloonen: "Thank you. I have a couple questions on this. For those firms who are already certified that may be a third and a third and a third, will they be kicked out or will they be grandfathered in?"

Turner: "I think that they would not qualify for BEP certification going forward, should this Bill pass."

Cloonen: "So, you will take program... you will take companies out of the opportunity to bid?"

Turner: "This Bill will require that they be 51 percent or more, small number."

Cloonen: "Okay. So, the answer's yes. And then, also, are you aware that for different agencies in the State of Illinois there are different certifying entities?"

Turner: "Yes. That may be the case."

Cloonen: "Pardon me?"

Turner: "I... IDOT gets federal money. So, I mean, that's different."

Cloonen: "Yes. So is this not for IDOT projects, then?"

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Turner: "This... this will be for state projects funded with state money."
- Cloonen: "Well, some of the IDOT projects are funded federally and state."
- Turner: "Well, if they're receiving state money and it's a state contract, they will have to comply with this... with this BEP certification."
- Cloonen: "And are you aware that..."
- Turner: "Federal supersedes, but... but..."
- Cloonen: "...are you aware that CMS has a different certification policy than IDOT?"
- Turner: "That's... that's mostly because IDOT deals in federal money. CMS is strictly with state funds."
- Cloonen: "All right. And for CMS, CMS accepts the certifications from other groups such as Women's Business Development Center in Chicago. Will this not accept that, then? Will that not be one of the qualifying entities?"
- Turner: "As this pertains to BEP... BEP certification, we're talking 51 percent or more for minorities, women, or people with disabilities."
- Cloonen: "So, if... if currently, if CMS, therefore CDB, accepts the certifications for Women's Business Development Center in Chicago and if Women's Business Development Center in Chicago accepts 33, 33, then you would not accept that certification."
- Turner: "Are they trying to be BEP certified? Are they looking for BEP certification?"

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Cloonen: "Yes. In some instances, it's all one. In some cases, it's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program, in other cases, it's female and other cases, it's minority."
- Turner: "So, if they're looking to be BEP certified, then if this law were to pass, they would need to be more than 51 percent wholly owned by a woman, a minority, or a person with a disability."
- Cloonen: "All right. And are you aware that a few years... a couple years ago, IDOT was actually trying to get more businesses certified into the program and become prime contractors? And in the end, not very many more were able to do that. Are you aware of that?"
- Turner: "That may be the case, Representative, but I'm not discounting that. I'm just talking specifically about this legislation right here. That's what I'm concerned with."
- Cloonen: "Yes. I'm just saying that this was... that before, we've tried very hard to get more companies into the program. And it's been very difficult and I'm concerned that this would make it even more difficult for businesses to be certified as a minority."
- Turner: "I don't think we'll have trouble finding businesses that are certified as a minority with ownership over 51 percent."

Cloonen: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, when we had this Bill in committee,

I thought there was an understanding we would hold this on

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Second Reading. Has that... I mean, why are you moving it forward at this time?"
- Turner: "Because we were... we had discussions following committee.

 We were looking for an Amendment or looking to make an Amendment to the Bill, but we weren't able to come up with anything that would get us to the point. So, I just warned the chairman that I would be bringing the Bill to the floor for a vote."
- Pritchard: "Well, that isn't the agreement that we had when we passed it out of committee."
- Turner: "We agreed that if I can come up with a commitment... an Amendment, we'd bring it back to the committee. But I didn't... we weren't able to come up with an Amendment that we could agree to."
- Pritchard: "So, in other words, we're still dealing with the questions that have been raised here this morning that the intent of getting more minorities to have state business is perhaps at risk here?"
- Turner: "I think that the intent of what we're trying to do will be accomplished with this Bill."
- Pritchard: "So, can you give us any evidence of how successful this program has been in allowing minority-owned businesses to get more of state construction money?"
- Turner: "I think that the program has been successful. We're...
 we..."
- Pritchard: "Do you have numbers, though?"
- Turner: "...would like to market more, get more people certified and get more people involved with it and we're looking to..."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Pritchard: "I mean, I have minority businesses that don't have an opportunity to do this. And they would say the program is failing. That's why I ask do you have any data that suggests this program is moving us in the right direction?"

Turner: "That this law is moving the program in the right direction?"

Pritchard: "Right. Our current program of 20 percent of contracts going to minority-owned businesses."

Turner: "For... for BEP?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Turner: "You're saying for B... for BEP certification, do I have a problem with the program? I think this Bill will help the program."

Pritchard: "Well, I'm not sure how it can help, if there's going to be fewer businesses eligible."

Turner: "This Bill will help minority businesses that are 51 percent owned... more by... by minorities, women, or people with disability become BEP certification... BEP certified."

Pritchard: "Well, but the point is, as we have just heard from the previous speaker, businesses where there is minority ownership but it's less that 51 percent are not going to be able to participate."

Turner: "Right. But what we're..."

Pritchard: "And more importantly, I want to make sure that the...
the law is followed in terms of... or the goal in the law is
followed where we're trying to get a bigger percentage of
businesses able to get state contracts."

Turner: "The issue is that many minority businesses aren't... aren't able to participate and get these contracts and get... because

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

you have groups of women and others and you know, conglomerates put together and they never get a chance."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I think there's some real concerns here about the intent that the Sponsor has and what may happen. And I think he ought to go back to his first idea of getting some Amendments and trying to improve this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, have you spoken with any contractors in the state about their ability to find BEP contractors to meet those goals?"

Turner: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And what are you... what are you finding?"

Turner: "That minority companies, businesses that are women-owned and disability... people with disabilities would like to see a certification that... for BEP that requires it be over 50... 50 percent owned in part by that... that group."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, on... on large construction projects, I've talked to a number of contractors that say they're having a very hard time finding any BEPs that can fulfill the requirements that are needed under the current requirements. So, if we make those current requirements more strict, how are we going to help... help those contractors find and fulfill those requirements?"

Turner: "These businesses exist. They're out there. We just have to do a better job of getting them certified, bringing them

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

into and getting them involved with the program. And this will encourage them to do so."

Davidsmeyer: "If they exist now, they're not bidding. So, is there something that we could do to make sure they have access to these bidding documents, make sure they have the availability? I know that we passed a Bill last year that allowed IDOT to help minority contractors with loans and things of that sort. Are there any efforts that... like that, that might help this more than... more than this Bill?"

Turner: "We're going to highlight pieces of legislation like this and do more outreach to make sure we're getting people certified and encourage them to take advantage of this program. I think this would do so."

Davidsmeyer: "Have you seen the BEP certification process in paperwork?"

Turner: "In paperwork?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. Have you seen that paperwork?"

Turner: "Like, how big the stack of papers is?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Turner: "No, not directly."

Davidsmeyer: "It... it is very difficult and very cumbersome and I have spoken to a number of businesses who would actually meet this 51 percent or more requirement who no longer fill out that paperwork because it is not worth it to them."

Turner: "It's doable. And this will encourage them to fill out...

fill it out. We need to get more people certified, more
businesses certified. And this will help with that."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... I would encourage you to continue to work on this. I think there's a lot of problems that we have in

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

this state with contractors trying to find minority... minority contractors to fulfill the requirements. And I look forward to working with you in the future to make... make this better, to make sure that minority-owned contractors can work in the state, will work in the state and continue to provide great bids and great work, so."

- Turner: "I appreciate that point, Representative. And why don't we take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker, so that we can continue to talk about it?"
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record, please.

 Senate Bill 587, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 587, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 587 is an initiative of the Career and Technical Ed Centers. What it does is basically address what we think was an oversight with a larger Bill related to certification last spring to make sure that specifically skilled instructors in career and technical education centers have longer time to make sure that they are able to take related coursework and pass the basic skills test. It will essentially give them until they're going to renew. I will ask any questions and appreciate the support of the Body and the many cosponsors of the legislation. I know of no opposition. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hays. Please take the record. On

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Harms."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Harms: "Today, Representative Brady and I have a guest who's paging for the day from Pontiac, John Shrewsbury and his mother is up in the gallery, Stacey. If we could give them a Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks for being with us in the Illinois House today. Senate Bill 646, Representative Osmond. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 646, a bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 646 is an initiative of the Department of Insurance. It amends the Insurance Code to provide protection to citizens who procure insurance benefits through a fraternal benefit society. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Who came up with this idea?"

Osmond: "I think it's called the Department of Insurance."

Franks: "Oh, wow. So, you're relying on government now for ideas.

That's scary."

Osmond: "Yes, it is."

Franks: "Okay. Is it... do the..."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Osmond: "It's actually correcting something that probably one of the previous Legislators put in place. It needed a little twerking."

Franks: "Twerking."

Osmond: "Twerking."

Franks: "Be careful. It could hurt your back."

Osmond: "Yeah."

Franks: "So, this is... this came directly from Director Boron?"

Osmond: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Well, I trust Director Boron. But what I'm concerned about with this Bill is that it's your last Bill."

Osmond: "Yes."

Franks: "Am I correct?"

Osmond: "Yes, it is."

Franks: "That just isn't fair."

Osmond: "Well, I think I've been here long enough that it's time to move on."

Franks: "Well, you're going to be missed."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Franks: "Really. You're one of the… one of the people I really admire. I'm going to miss you so much when you're gone. Just want you to know."

Osmond: "You know, you can call me anytime you want to make me a better person."

Franks: "You're wonderful. So, I hope we all vote for this Bill, and seriously, JoAnn, you're going to be missed. Thank you..."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Franks: "...for all your hard work."

Osmond: "Thank you."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Davis, Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let's hear it for Representative Osmond. Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It was just a point of personal privilege..."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Bellock: "...about Representative Osmond. And I know there'll be time later, but this being her last Bill, just wanted to say how appreciative we are. She... her husband, Tim, came in with my class and then JoAnn took his seat. And nobody has done a finer job in this House than JoAnn Osmond, with all the respect and integrity. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "You know, when you see certain people and they come to...

Let me just say this. No one on the floor has the experience or understanding that this particular Member does. Let me tell you why. She knows what it's like to be a legislative assistant, she knows what it's like to be a spouse of a Legislator, and she knows what it's like to be a great Legislator. Not often do we have people in this chamber that have the experience and the knowledge of this Lady. And she'll be... you should all miss her. I'm going to."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair.

Representative Davis."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to say to Representative Osmond that I have really enjoyed working with you in Insurance. You were very knowledgeable, you were very helpful and we do appreciate all of your behavior in that committee. I want to say that I knew your husband, as you know, first. I knew Representative Osmond, the first one, and it was a pleasure to meet and work with you, the second one. You were both a very wonderful couple and I want you to know that this Body, we appreciate the work that you have put in to be a great Legislator in the State of Illinois. I am pleased to know you and I'm really sorry you're leaving. Leave some of your kindness over there. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Kosel: "I'd like to introduce my Page today, Michael Murray from
St. Ray's in Joliet. He is an eighth grader and we are glad
to have him here today."

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

Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Just a little follow-up if you would, personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Moffitt: "Follow-up to Representative Osmond and I'm... we're all honored that we got to serve with... with Representative JoAnn Osmond and it's also very unusual to have served with a Legislator's spouse. It was an honor to serve with her spouse. Obviously, we all wished that the circumstances of getting to serve with JoAnn would have worked out differently. And she

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

mentioned that she's in a very exclusive club too, a widow's club. So, it's a tribute to your husband, but he was a great Legislator because of you too. So, you've... you've done a great job for your district twice. My wife was here last night and we were in my office there for a little bit and we have this big picture of John Wayne, that big one. And she was saying, I don't remember when you got that and was that a poster that you had framed. And I said no, that was Representative Tim Osmond's. The big portrait, the big, big framed picture of the Duke. And when he passed, Representative JoAnn Osmond brought it and several other John Wayne items into me. A book and several items because Tim Osmond really liked John Wayne. So, I just want to add to JoAnn, the ... the expertise that you brought and it provided us in so many areas. Just the ... the appreciation for the process, the institution. Your background in... on insurance. If there was an insurance Bill, a lot of other things too, but insurance, I knew that we would get straight, accurate, important information. And when Representative JoAnn Osmond was speaking, you'd better be listening because you had something to say and we sure appreciate it. And JoAnn, I miss Tim. I miss the Duke. We're going to miss you, but you keep coming back and checking with us, okay? Thank you for all your service. God Bless."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

McAuliffe: "Upstairs in the gallery, we have, from St. Juliana's, we have teachers, Sasha Johnson, Nicole Dal Santo, and parent, Kathy Flynn. They're here with the seventh-grade students

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- from St. Juliana's on the northwest side of the City of Chicago, where the MVP Senator Mulroe's wife works, and also where I happened to meet my wife and we got married at the same church. So, greetings to all from St. Juliana's, a great school."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol.

 Representative Hays."
- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 587, Senate Bill 587. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request.

 Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought this was Representative Osmond's last day, but it's her last Bill. But I, too, would like to take this opportunity to say that I also had the pleasure of serving with your wonderful husband and the pleasure of serving with you. And you were the Minority Spokesperson on my Health Care Access & Availability Committee. And I want to thank you for your kindness. I want to thank you for your demeanor because lots of times the committee could have gotten out of control had it not been for your comments. So, thank you very much. And once again, it's been my pleasure to serve with you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."
- Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to echo Representative Moffitt's comments about Representative JoAnn Osmond as well. I've had the pleasure of serving with her as a Lake County Representative, watching her and modeling some of the things that she does. I also have had the good fortune to work with

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

your husband, JoAnn, as one of my clients. And so, I knew him before I had the opportunity to come here and get to know you. But I would say your dedication to working in a bipartisan fashion, your integrity, you are never afraid to take on hard issues. You're just a true role model for me and I will miss you very much when you leave. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Tryon."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Tryon: "You know, when you come here, you know someday you're going to leave. Somebody once told me the General Assembly was just a passing parade. And I kind of put that in perspective. I often say it's more like a ride on an... in an amusement park; someday it starts and someday you have to get off. And while you're here, you get to do some good things and you cross the path with other Legislators. And Representative Osmond and I have, since I've been here, somehow been connected by being next door to one another. For like four years, my office was next door to her office. In fact, I moved into her old office and then I moved away from her and then ended up living next door to her in an apartment complex at 5th and Jefferson. So, during that time period, you seek advice from her and she was always... always there to give me advice and let me know when I was doing something wrong and also supported me on those few occasions I was doing something right. But JoAnn, it was a pleasure to work with you. I did not have the honor of knowing Tim, but I heard a lot about Tim. And one thing I can tell you is he married a

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

great woman who carried out, I think, his goals here as well as your goals. And everybody here, I think, is better for having been able to work for you. So, I want to thank you for being a great mentor, a great neighbor and for letting me use your office. So, thank you and good luck."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Tracy: "Certainly, I didn't know this was going to evolve into this. But as a person who has sat by JoAnn Osmond for eight years, and don't judge her leadership by my product, she's mentored me and been a great friend and seatmate and taught me so many things about what is good about Illinois and what we are here to do. And I always said if she left, I'd have to go too because I couldn't imagine this place without her, as I'm sure all of you can't either. But she deserves and has, I know, our upmost respect. Just as I saw a gentleman in the gallery, Joe Lyons, there's few people that meet the standards of those like them and I thank them for their service to the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. JoAnn, I'm going to save my comments on your last day, so somebody's left to say something nice on your last day to you. Congratulations, we all love you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Continuing down the Order of Senate Bills on Third Reading. Senate Bill 1048, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1048, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1048 is an initiative of the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys. This Bill is designed to protect those in the twilight of life and those in the shadow of life. There is a disturbing increase in occurrences of undue influence of our elderly from their caregivers... by their caregivers. Caregivers often take control of seniors' assets by having themselves included in the senior's will and no one finds out until after that senior has died. Under current Illinois law, a claimant must file legal action against a caregiver and prove that the caregiver intentionally breached his or her fiduciary duty. This is a difficult burden as the testamentary documents are presumed to be valid. In addition, the caregiver may use the funds of the decedent's estate to defend such a claim and then they walk away without penalty if they lose. Senate Bill 1048 creates a result... a rebuttable presumption that certain testamentary transfers are in excess of \$20 thousand to caregivers and those would be void automatically. I ask for an 'aye' vote for this important initiative to protect our elderly."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1048 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1048, having received

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1996, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1996, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1996 is a proposal to allow those who are currently prevented from having any driving privileges, as a result of having their license revoked for the rest of their life, to have an opportunity to go before the Secretary of State's Office, go through an appeal process and have a determination made as to whether or not they would be entitled to a restricted driver's permit, which limits individuals as to the time of day and the locations they can drive. And also because the... the suspension... their lifetime suspension is a result of multiple DUIs, these individuals would have to drive with a Breathalyzer, the BAIID device for the rest of their life at their own expense. This... we discussed this legislation last year. I've made several changes this year as a result of some discussions with the Leader on the other side of the aisle. I think this is a really solid proposal that gives hope to individuals who have actually turned their life around and can demonstrate it with... with solid evidence and give them an opportunity to be the productive citizens we would want them to be."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Ives: "I understand the intent of this Bill, but why don't we have this at three DUIs? Why is it four?"
- Nekritz: "Representative, we do… we do have this process at three DUIs. They do have to go before the Secretary of State and go through an appeal process."
- Ives: "So, after three DUIs, they get another DUI. I mean, basically, right now, the way this legislation that you're presenting, they have a fourth DUI and they get this driving privileges. Then if they have a fifth one, then it's mandatory revocation for the rest of their life, correct?"
- Nekritz: "They would not have another opportunity to go through this."
- Ives: "Okay. So, what I'm saying is, why isn't that opportunity
 after three or even two?"
- Nekritz: "Representative, you feel free to introduce that legislation. But right now, it's my understanding that after... there is an appeal process through the Secretary of State's Office, and if the Secretary of State declines to give them driving privileges back, then that... that's the decision that's made."
- Ives: "So, potentially after two or three DUIs, they can never have the driving privileges. Is that correct?"
- Nekritz: "Honestly, I'm not that well-versed enough to know after two and three, but I do know that there is a Secretary of State appeal process that you have to go through at those level... at those convictions as well."
- Ives: "So then, why are we doing this legislation if they already have to do that at two and three?"
- Nekritz: "Because there is no opportunity after four."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Ives: "I just think the bar should be lower and not higher."

Nekritz: "Feel free to introduce the legislation, Representative."

Ives: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, this Bill, I believe, came up last year, did it not?

Nekritz: "It did."

Harris, D.: "And it failed last year, correct?"

Nekritz: "Thank you for reminding me. Yes."

Harris, D.: "No, that wasn't said in a derogatory term. I voted against it last year. But I do have some questions. As I understand now, the Bill, it permits an individual who has four DUIs and has lost his or her driving privilege to ask the Secretary of State to get this restricted driving permit. That's not automatic that it's granted by the Secretary of State, correct?"

Nekritz: "It is... it is not automatic by any stretch of the imagination and there are some standards set forth in the Bill as to the evidence they have to present in order to be able to... to get that."

Harris, D.: "Right. And that person has to wait five years in order to make that request, correct?"

Nekritz: "Five years from the completion of their last sentence."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Harris, D.: "Right. And... and the person has to show that they have gone through a program and have... have been clean, if you will, for five years, correct?"
- Nekritz: "For three... for three. They have to demonstrate that they've been alcohol-free for three years."
- Harris, D.: "Alcohol-free for three years. And they have to drive with a BAIID device for blowing in the… in the tube device, the BAIID device."
- Nekritz: "Correct."
- Harris, D.: "And that BAIID device has been improved that now there's also a camera attached to it so that the person is actually the person blowing into it, not somebody else."
- Nekritz: "Correct."
- Harris, D.: "And that BAIID device has to be... that driver is retested after every couple of min... 5 or 15 minutes to make sure that they're still the dri..."
- Nekritz: "My understanding is that sort of randomized that way to... and periodically asks the driver to reblow."
- Harris, D.: "And the person has a restricted driving permit or can get his restricted driving permit only for certain purposes. In other words, it's not completely... they can't have free rein on the road. They drive to and from work or to the grocery store or something like that."
- Nekritz: "That's correct. And those locations are up to the hearing officer to make those decisions as to where and when."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. And after a year, they get retested by the... or reviewed by the Secretary of State. Is that correct?"
- Nekritz: "No, I'm not... that legislation does not require that."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Harris, D.: "Oh, well, it says the… my analysis says the RDP is valid for only one year, after which it is subject to review as well as subject to cancellation."
- Nekritz: "I'm... I'm sorry, yes. My understating is yes, that they would be subject to a review."
- Harris, D.: "Right. So, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, as I mentioned at the start, I voted against this Bill last year. It is somewhat of a controversial piece of legislation in that an individual who has four convictions for driving under the influence of alcohol, one would say that person does not deserve to be behind the wheel of a car, operating a vehicle on the roads of the State of Illinois. However, I think there are sufficient standards built into this Bill now that, as the Lady explained, make it... the opportunity for an individual who has rehabilitated himself or herself to have that opportunity to drive in limited circumstances, not free rein on the road, that I believe this Bill now deserves a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Kay: "Representative, I'm curious about several features of this Bill. Who determined the blood alcohol... or blood alcohol content for alcohol?"
- Nekritz: "I'm not sure I understand what you mean, out on the road?"
- Kay: "Well, you've got some guidelines filled in here and I'm
 curious about how you came up with .05, .08 threshold."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Nekritz: "Representative, those are... those are in existing law right now."

Kay: "Okay. You sure it's not .02?"

Nekritz: "The only number I know off the top of my head, Representative, is .08."

Kay: "Okay. How did you determine the guidelines that are set forth in your Bill? Did the Secretary of State work with you on this?"

Nekritz: "We worked mostly with the State Bar Association on it and... and lawyers who practice in this area. But we also took input from... from colleagues that were in this chamber to make sure that they were strong enough."

Kay: "Again, so you didn't talk to the Secretary of State?"

Nekritz: "We've talked to the Secretary of State at... a lot on this."

Kay: "Okay."

Nekritz: "I don't know whether they... I just... it's been so long, frankly, Representative, since we talked to them about the contents of the legislation that, you know, it's been almost two years since we drafted it."

Kay: "Right. I understand. I understand."

Nekritz: "So, I don't remember whether they specifically weighed in on it. I suspect they did, but I can't swear to that right now."

Kay: "Is he... is the Secretary of State supporting your Bill?"

Nekritz: "He is neutral on the Bill."

Kay: "He's neutral on the Bill. I'm curious about the scenario here where you've got an awful lot of guidelines set out that

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

you, I think, tried to think out very well. Would you put them in the categ... category of fail-safe?"

Nekritz: "Well, there's nothing in life that's fail-safe,
Representative."

Kay: "Exactly. I'm curious about the... and if you recall, I passed several pieces of legislation that had to do with Trooper Mitchell, who was responding to a call driving 105-10 miles an hour. He struck two young ladies, the Uhl sisters, and killed them on Highway 64. I'm curious if the Secretary of State's opinion that he should not have his driving license reinstated would impact your opinion as to whether this is a good or a bad Bill."

Nekritz: "Representative, I certainly don't know the circumstances of your case. I can only tell you that, you know, we... they're... we had some very compelling testimony when this Bill was before the Vehicles Safety... Transportation: Vehicles & Safety Committee from individuals who acknowledged their mistakes, paid their... paid the price for those mistakes but were now 10 or 15 years down the road, had turned their life around, were model citizens, working in their church, helping others overcome alcohol addiction, and... and were looking for a little ray of hope as to be... so that they could conduct their life and become, again, be the productive citizens I think we would all want them to be."

Kay: "Representative, I'm all for worthy causes. I think this is a serious Bill, though, and I'm trying to frame my questions so that we understand how serious this matter could be. My last question, however, is simply this. You're not suggesting

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

that anybody ask for a waiver to go to work on a safety-sensitive job, are you?"

Nekritz: "I didn't... I just didn't hear you."

Kay: "We have certain people that have work permits and they would engage, if they could, in driving, or flying, or running a boat, whatever the case might be, up and down the Mississippi River. You're not suggesting that we allow this kind of privilege for safety-sensitive activities, are you?"

Nekritz: "Representative, you're talking about, like, a CDL or a boating license or that kind of thing?"

Kay: "Exactly."

Nekritz: "Okay, I apologize. I didn't understand the question.

This only... this only allows a restricted driver's permit,

which is defined in law as being a... for a... like, for not... not

for those kinds of activities."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I appreciate your comments."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "You know, as I said... as I said in some of my remarks, we had... we had some very compelling testimony before committee from a police officer whose brother could benefit from this, from a gentleman who, you know, made some mistakes in his youth, was now married, working at his church and helping others overcome their addiction. I think this is the kind of Bill that we need to... to offer these people hope. I know that it's controversial. I know that it's difficult. But I think it's the right thing for... right policy for the State of Illinois."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1996 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.
 Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill to the Order of Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 2952, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2952, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill deals with storage liens on those self-storage places where we all take the stuff we can't fit into our homes. These folks have liens if you don't pay your bill. And all this Bill does is allow peop... these facilities to serve notice that they're going to enforce liens by e-mail along with regular mail. That's all it does."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will Leader Lou Lang... I could ask you, but I'd rather do it on the record. Would he yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Franks: "I'd like to know how this will affect the show Storage Wars."
- Lang: "I'll have to do some research on that, Sir."
- Franks: "Well, it's a great show. And what happens is when people don't pay, the owners of the storage facility get to sell the

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

property via auction, public auction. And if you have the money, you could buy it."

Lang: "It doesn't impact that issue at all. It just allows them to serve the notice by e-mail."

Franks: "Okay. 'Cause I want to make... I'd like... I'd really like to see that show come to Illinois. I think we could have some, you know, growth potential out of that."

Lang: "I'd be happy to join you in anything that adds to the economic vitality of Illinois, Sir."

Franks: "All right. Well, thank you. I just wanted to make sure we weren't taking away one of my favorite shows. Thank you."

Lang: "You were enlightening, once again, Sir."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2952 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 109 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no, 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2952, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 647, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 647, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 647 is a final product on an agreement about telehealth. The insurance industry, the doctors, the hospitals, the nurses, and all

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

parties are happy to move this forward. It is not a mandate. It essentially defines what 'telehealth' is for those insurance policies that cover telehealth."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think this is something that is really needed, especially in rural areas. We worked on this several years ago for psychiatrists on Medicaid for telehealth. And this is long in coming so that people, especially in rural Illinois, are able to get good medical... access to medical care. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 647 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 647, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2583, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2583, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2583, what is basically known as the sign and drive Bill. If you get pulled over for a petty offense, you can sign and... the ticket book instead of forfeiting your license to the clerk. I appreciate... I'll answer any questions."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, I had some questions for you, but in particular, the Secretary of State's Office, when you were in Judiciary. What is the value of a driver's license with respect to bond? Because there has to be a bond amount. Do you recall what that amount was, Representative?"

D'Amico: "I do not. I don't remember what that amount... what that amount was. But basically, what... what's been happening here is the... the clerks are all in favor of this as well... as long as... as well as the Secretary of State because licenses have been getting lost when they're turning them in. And as long as they're minor offenses, they'd just like to have the person sign the ticket book and be on their way."

Reboletti: "And isn't there issues also, Representative, when people lose their driver's license to a speeding ticket, then the license expires. The people resolve the ticket, then they can't get their driver's license back 'cause the clerk can't turn back an invalid driver's license. Is that another issue that comes up?"

D'Amico: "That... you are absolutely right."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's time that the State of Illinois joined the 21st century in the way that we do business with respect to issuing traffic citations. And as everybody knows who has a driver's license, it's not only important to have the driver's license for purposes of driving, but that's usually the only ID that most people have. So, we've heard horror stories, when I was a prosecutor,

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

people missing flights, not being able to go to the bank and to do other business where an ID was needed. I think it makes sense. There are still safeguards, that if a person doesn't show up, that a license suspension could occur. There'll be a stop on the driver's license and when that stop occurs, the person could not renew their driver's license until that ticket was addressed. So, thank you, Representative D'Amico, for your hard work on this. It's a Bill... the time has truly come for this. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cabello."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Cabello: "Representative, could you tell us that, if you get pulled over for a DUI, the license itself is actually worth \$100. Is that still going to be the case, and they get it back?"

D'Amico: "Yes, if you... if you get pulled over for a DUI, you would not qualify for this. You cannot sign and drive."

Cabello: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I also think this is a very good idea. A lot of times when police officers take a driver's license, they get lost. It's... it's a good Bill. I appreciate an 'aye' vote as well."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2583 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no, 0 voting

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

'present', Senate Bill 2583, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2620, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2620, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2620 is an agreed legislation. What it basically does is raises the weight limit for sewer vactors or sewer cleaning equipment by 12 thousand pounds, only in... in emergency situations. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, this is for emergencies that require sewer vehicles?"

Rita: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Can you tell me why the Illinois Association of County Engineers is opposed or are they still opposed?"

Rita: "So, my understanding is on the underlying... prior to... to bringing this, the language to it that they're not opposed.

My understanding that no one's opposed to this."

Franks: "Okay."

Rita: "After they agreed some language and put in emergency situations. That's... that's my understanding. I... this is IDOT's language that IDOT came up with."

Franks: "Who would determine the emergency?"

Rita: "The municipalities. So... so, most municipalities, they don't have their own sewer department, so they contract with private

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

companies to do this work and sewer construction maintenance and repairs. So, the municipality would determine if it's an emergency."

Franks: "Okay. And there's no new fee here, 'cause I know that many of these require special hauling vehicle permits. You're not requiring anything additional here that already... that doesn't already exist. Is that correct?"

Rita: "No. No. No new fees."

Franks: "Okay. Well, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Representative, why is it that DuPage County is opposed to
this?"

Rita: "I think that's under the same... what Representative Franks said. Under the underlying Bill when it was first put together, they were opposed. But my understanding, they worked with IDOT and the different parties and once they put this language that is... that we're looking at here today, that it's no opposition. To my understanding of that."

Kay: "And is it also your understanding that these companies that do this hauling pay motor fuel tax in the State of Illinois?"

Rita: "Yes."

Kay: "Thank you very much, Representative. I think you have a
good Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "So, for the record, what I'd like to... to state on this that, you know, most of the municipalities didn't have their own sewer department, so they contract out with these

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

companies to provide sewer cleaning and jetting trucks to respond quicker and more efficiently when these municipalities decide that there's an emergency, allowing them to travel at higher weights. What it will do is, right now, our law has the weight limits that just slow this process down. And I think that by allowing, under these situations, that towns can decide that something needs to be addressed urgently, let's say a potential sewer obstruction or structural cave-in that could put the public health or property at risk, to allow these trucks to come in at a higher weight to address the potential hazard to a situation as soon as possible. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote in this."

Speaker Turner: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2620 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no, 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2620, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2664, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2664, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is designed to protect innocent homebuyers from predatory practices and predatory fees. Over the last several years, innocent homebuyers have been gouged for millions and millions of dollars as a result of these predatory practices and predatory fees. This Bill would eliminate predatory fees and protect

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

innocent homebuyers. Additionally, this Bill requires prompt disclosure of financial information for a condo association to new homebuyers. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Association of Realtors, the Illinois Bar Association, Predators Coalition Community, Bankers of Illinois, Illinois Bankers Association, the Illinois Credit Union League, and the Illinois Association of Realtors. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill does not protect predatory buyers. This... this Bill is all about taking away personal property rights. What you have here is you're limiting... you're limiting the amount of money that these homeowner associations can get back after being... having a unit that is foreclosed on. You are limiting it to 9 months Typically, these home... these regular assessments. foreclosures take 18 to 36 months. They involve attorney's fees. During that 18 to 36 months, you have accumulated special assessments on the property. You've accumulated more than 9 months of regular assessments on the property. You've accumulated attorney's fees on trying to close on the properties. This Bill basically says to people who have actually done their due diligence and paid their homeowner assessment fees that we don't care that you're a good provider for the homeowners association, that you've paid your bills on time. We're not going to allow you to recoup those costs. And essentially, this hurts responsible, current owners, who are left holding the bag for the common expenses of property maintenance, snow plowing, landscaping, and other expenses.

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

It says that we don't care about you. And this Bill, really, if the real estate... real estate agents would think about it, this actually will hurt the sale of future condos and townhomes that are under homeowner associations. If you pass this legislation, here's exactly what's going to happen. They're going to say, we're going to have to mitigate our risk because we can no longer place the lien on the... that a foreclosed project or a property has for special assessments and other assessments and attorney fees. We... we have to mitigate that risk, so now we're going to push every expense we possibly can into a regular assessment. And you're going to up the regular assessment so they can at least get more of it back. The truth is, is that if you allow this process to work through, the seller does not pay for this anyway. In a foreclosed property, what will happen is the bank will have to take a lower selling price to compensate for the liens that are currently on it. Meanwhile, the seller is getting all the benefit of having that property have been maintained by the other homeowners in that association. They're getting all that benefit and so, they should be accepting the price that's included in that benefit. If you fail to do this, you are absolutely going to raise regular assessments for people that own townhomes and own condos. That's all you're going to do. They're going to have to mitigate this risk somehow. This is a taking of personal property by... and there's other ways that you can compensate for this. There's no way that we should pass this Bill. It's really damaging. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Yingling, I have a couple questions for you about the intent of this Bill. And I believe it's a very, very complicated situation. But I... I first want to clarify who... the Association of Condominium and Townhome Owners are opposed to this. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

Feigenholtz: "And can you tell me why, if this Bill is seemingly so simple?"

Yingling: "Because in 2007, the Homeowners Association, along with their affiliated organizations, pushed through the current law in the General Assembly. And what that does is it opens up a blank check that puts all of these predatory fees on the backs of homebuyers. So, as a result, there is... well, Representative, there's a lot of money to be made right now with the current law, and all of that money is gouged from innocent homebuyers. That's why the opponents do not want this to be changed."

Feigenholtz: "What... but what does this do to the associations that they're so opposed to this? My office has been deluged with e-mails and calls. People are sort of panicking because it seems as though there's no consideration for the impact that this is going to have on condominium associations."

Yingling: "Absolutely. They on... from a sales standpoint and from a market stability standpoint, Representative, it serves the condo associations better to have tenants within their condos paying assessments on a monthly... on a monthly basis. The current law only allows the condo associations to recoup 6 months' worth of their back assessment. This would extend

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

it to 9 months. It was my understanding that the initial conversation wanted 12 months or the initial negotiations, they wanted 12 months. The proponents wanted 6 months. This was a compromise at 9."

- Feigenholtz: "But wouldn't you agree that this significantly puts condominium associations at a greater disadvantage? You're sort of taking negotiating powers with unit owners and banks away from them."
- Yingling: "I... I don't understand your question. Condominium associations don't have negotiating power in this situation."
- Feigenholtz: "Well, I... I believe that the attorneys that represent them do and they're gravely concerned about the fees and costs that can be collected, the total amount that can be collected, and the limitation of the 9 months."
- Yingling: "Representative, I think you... I think you hit the nail on the head there, that the attorneys don't want this. The reason the attorneys don't want this is because right now, it requires legal action for the condominium associations to collect any sort of back assessment. So therefore, the attorneys have to take action. This new law eliminates the need for condo associations to even have to take legal action. There automatically guaranteed 9 months at the point of the foreclosure sale. There's no need for... for legal action or court action. So, again, I think you hit the nail on the head there as to why the attorneys who are representing these condo associations are against it, because they can no longer bill at, you know, exorbitant fees that end up on the backs of innocent homebuyers."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Feigenholtz: "But... but the people who remain in the condominiums, in those buildings, Representative Yingling, are going to have to absorb the difference. And ultimately, in my district, condominium owners who've been paying an assessment are going to incur a much larger cost. So, the responsible owners are going to end up holding the bag. That's what you're doing with this Bill. You are moving the cost on to the owners of the condominium association that live in the buildings. These are people who live on fixed incomes."
- Yingling: "Would you... would you prefer for the unit to remain vacant? I mean, if it remains vacant there are no condo association fees that are being paid. And the most that any condo association can recoup is 6 months. So, what this Bill does is it allows for a new buyer to get into a condo faster and they pay 9 months' worth of back assessments. Right now, the condo association only gets 6 months of assessments. This Bill allows for people to get into the condo faster, start paying assessments, plus they have to pay 9 months of assessments as opposed to 6, like the current Bill says."
- Feigenholtz: "But do... do current condominium owners in the building, will they incur greater assessments because of this law? That is a yes or no question."
- Yingling: "That... you can't answer that question. I don't know how a specific association is managed. Each business... an association is a business, Representative. And each business is managed differently."
- Feigenholtz: "So, you are asking for predictability on the buying side, but not on the other side. So, I... Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This Bill is not soup yet. I understand the

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

issue. I understand the problem. If you have a lot of condominium associations in your district, take a close look at this because I will guarantee that assessments are going to go up for your condominium owners if you vote on this Bill. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we have 15 people seeking recognition on this Bill. So, going forward, we're going to move to the timer. There will be a timer of five minutes with no extension of time after your time is expired. I'm going to do a threeminute timer. The next speaker is Representative Cassidy."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In the... the prior discussion between the Sponsor and... and the Representative, the Sponsor suggested that this Bill would eliminate the need for condominium associations to utilize legal action and they would therefore save funds. Unfortunately, that's simply not the case. The length of time that is involved in foreclosures, in particular with condominiums in districts like ours, we have high-rises that are half empty due to foreclosures. And the associations are... are really overwhelmed with the actions they need to take. They need to take action to... to get tenants out. They need to take action to get tenants in. They have to repair these buil... these spaces after they've been trashed by... by people in foreclosure. These foreclosure actions drag on for much, much more than 9 months. What I do understand and respect about the Sponsor's intentions is that buyers do need certainty. These units do need to get back into the marketplace. They do need to be ... be resold and reinhabited so that these buildings can regain some stability. I don't believe, as the previous speaker said, I don't think it's

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

soup yet. I believe there is middle ground that will protect the current residents in these buildings, protect the interests of the… of the condominium associations, protect the interests of the folks who are trying to put these condominiums back on the market. We're not there yet. I look forward to working with the Sponsor to get there. But we're not there. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield. But one second, Representative, before we start. Excuse me, Members, can we please bring the noise level down and take all conversations to the rear of the chamber? It's increasingly... it's becoming increasingly difficult for the Members to hear the debate. Can we please bring all noise level down and take conversations to the rear of the chamber. Thank you very much. Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, just a couple of brief questions. I want to try and clear up some questions that I have, that I think might be pertinent here. So, under the current law, and I heard some testimony, I don't know. I've never been party to a foreclosure proceeding, but I heard 18 to 24 months is roughly an average. You're a realtor. Would you know, roughly, foreclosure time for a condominium unit?"

Yingling: "It... it truly... it truly depends on the lending institution."

Martwick: "Okay. Well, let's just say 24 months. Under the current law, they would be entitled to 6 months of... of association dues. Is that correct?"

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Yingling: "I'm sorry. What was that, Representative? What was your..."

Martwick: "I said, under the current law, they would be entitled to recover 6 months of dues, not 24 months, right?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

Martwick: "Okay. But assuming then that the person who owns the condo and has stopped paying their mortgage and then begins to stop paying their association dues, we don't know immediately on day one that they're going to go into foreclosure, right? They might just be, like many people, just slow on paying their bills, right?"

Yingling: "That could... Yeah. That is correct."

Martwick: "So, you're not going to file legal action right away.

But eventually, 6 months, 8 months, 9 months you start to say, hey, we're going to send you letters, we need to get you to pay your association dues. So now, under the current law, knowing that you can only collect 6 months of back dues, but yet this might be a year into it, it's probably appropriate under the current law to take legal action. Wouldn't you agree?"

Yingling: "Yeah, right. That's... that's..."

Martwick: "As it exists today."

Yingling: "...that's the... that's the way the law is written right now. In order for an association to even get that 6 months, they have to take legal action."

Martwick: "Exactly."

Yingling: "What this new Bill does is it says you don't have to take legal action. You will automatically get 9 months' worth

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

of back assessments when that condo unit is sold at the sheriff's sale."

Martwick: "Perfect. So, what you're telling me is that people who, let's say, for instance, a condo that's been vacant for 24 months and they've hired an attorney, which is appropriate under the law, and they expect under the current law that they will be able to be reimbursed for those attorney's fees. Does your Bill give any credit to those people who have been operating under the law as it stands today? Or does it, for those people who have already incurred legal bills, does it allow any grandfather provisions so that... so it changes from this point going forward?"

Yingling: "What it provides for is an additional 3 months of additional assessments as opposed to 6. So, it does not have a grandfather clause."

Martwick: "Okay. So, those people who may have incurred legal fees over the course of 2 years, they are then... those associations then are required to, if that 9 months of dues does... does not cover their legal fees, then they would... they would be required then to spread those fees out over the people... the other members of the condominium association. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "When... when a... generally, what happens with the condo association is after 2 to 3 months' worth of back payments, their counsel goes in and files a motion in court. So, by the time it gets to a foreclosure, they've already filed the paperwork. When it gets to a foreclosure, what this new language is saying is that you have... you automatically get 9 months."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick... Representative Lang in the Chair. ...your time has expired. If... you have a few seconds to complete your thoughts that would be all right, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in fact, I am done with my questions, and I will yield."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Zalewski for three minutes."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think there's a lot of confusion here about what this Bill really does. And I would advise everyone to simply look at the proponents of the Bill. When... when the realtors and the lenders tell you that they need this to help spur sales, they're not doing it because they are making it up out of thin air. It makes no sense to have fallow units sit out there for no good reason because these assessments have built up over a period of time. I know it's disappointing to the occurrent assessment owners. I know it's not fair. We deal with issues down here all the time where people are victims of unfairness. But the fact of the matter remains, the Gentleman is presenting a Bill that provides certainty and clarity in the statute and allows the units to move. It's an important Bill and I think the Gentleman has done his level best to ensure stability in the market and bring fairness to all parties. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams for three minutes."
Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Williams: "Representative, you used the term compromise earlier in the discussion, but this Bill is far from a compromise,

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- correct? I mean, there's a substantial amount of opposition at this point."
- Yingling: "I... I believe this is a very fair Bill, given the circumstances that we're facing right now and given the amount of money that these innocent homebuyers have been gouged for over the past several years."
- Williams: "But it's not compromised at all. In fact, the discussions were fruitless and you don't have agreement on this Bill."
- Yingling: "Representative, I... you know, obviously, I'm... I'm still a freshman here and one thing that I have learned very quickly is that this chamber loves compromised Bills. They love agreed upon Bills. It's easy to make a decision how you're going to vote. You generally vote 'yes'. But the reality is that you can't always have an agreed upon Bill and sometimes there's just no more... no more room to address a situation. This Bill is very, very fair. It... it gives condo associations 9 months as opposed to 6 months. Condo associations don't have to take legal action and the most important part is that we are not allowing the law and attorneys to prey on innocent homebuyers."
- Williams: "Okay. I... you've articulated that. I just was trying to get to the point and say that there is a very strong amount of opposition. Thank you very much, Representative. I have heard too... been over my... my e-mail box has exploded and phone calls in oppo... strong, strong opposition to this Bill. I think we need to give careful thought to a Bill that is opposed, not only by my colleague from Wheaton but my colleague from Rogers Park. Seriously, there's some major issues if they're

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

both in agreement in opposition to this Bill. So, I think we need to look carefully at what we're doing here. Additionally, I think an important point that wasn't brought up is that this Bill puts the risk on the homeowners at a time when many homeowners can't afford to take the risk. Most other states put the risk where it belongs and that's on the banks. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill and encourage the Sponsor to go back to the drawing board and see if we can work on something that is actually a true compromise. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, you corr... you state, and I... on a number of occasions here, that the monthly assessments now could be collected over 9 months, back 9 months versus just 6 with no problem, correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "The Bill also, though, legislates that the associations will, as I understand it, will no longer be able to collect for special assessments, late fees, back charge fees, attorney fees, court costs, and other related sorts of fees. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "The... there's no longer a need after this Bill for legal fees or court costs and the other additional fees that are made up with the additional 3 months of assessments."

Harris, D.: "Okay. I... I buy the late fees, chargeback fees, attorney's fees, and the other. I want to key in on, for a second, on special assessments. Let me give you a very specific example. Both of my sons happen to be owners of

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

condominiums. My one son had a special assessment for some balcony repair that had to be done that all those owners of balconies had to pay a special assessment. Now, if he… if that unit were foreclosed on and the new owner came in, that new owner would benefit from the repairs that were made to the balcony. Wouldn't it be fair that that new owner should pay that portion of the special assessment that improves and increases, presumably, the value of the property?"

- Yingling: "No. And there's two point to that. Number one is that whatever that improvement is, is based on the sales price. The units are sold as-is. So, that... so, that value that was added to the unit is already built into the cost. Secondly, is why should you ask somebody to pay for something that they have not enjoyed the use of? It's essentially, you know, asking... I'm sorry. Go ahead."
- Harris, D.: "Well, the first... I will tell you, having... having been involved and tried to help my sons in their purchases, the first thing they asked when they went to the... before they went to the... the agreement to buy was what are any special assessments that have been levied by the condominium association. So, and you say the... the new owner, should that person be forced to pay for some improvement because they didn't enjoy that improvement. I would tell you yes, because that improvement is benefiting their property and has to be paid for somehow."

Yingling: "And that's represented in the sales price."

Harris, D.: "Oh. Well, it may or may not be, given the fact that this is a foreclosed property. I understand your answer. Let me say this, though. There was a question earlier about

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

whether or not this is a matter of compromise. I'm not sure that... that this has really reached a compromise state. You say sometimes you can't compromise. My sense is, from my discussions, if you remove the special assessment issue from what cannot be collected, you might get agreement on both sides here and would have this Bill... have this Bill pass presumably easily, but given the situation right now with these exclusions that cannot be recouped, especially the special assessments, I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel for three minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "Can you tell me how... if this Bill significantly differs from House Bill 2646 that we heard last year?"

Yingling: "The difference is that I was a 'no' vote on that Bill and now I'm sponsoring this one."

Kosel: "So, this is the same... To the Bill, please. This is the same Bill that we heard last year that was defeated... Excuse me, everybody listen... defeated in this chamber 41 to 70 votes. And the reason that it was defeated was because this will have significant effect on the associations of these townhomes. I originally had the sponsorship of this Bill and was very disappointed when we could not get people to come to the table to talk about it. I think that there is a very serious problem that is based on this Bill and this is not the solution. There can be extreme damages to these union... units that are under foreclosure be... from frost, from broken pipes, from vandalism. None of this could be picked up by the association and these are not necessarily damages that are

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

just to the unit but to the whole structure. This can cause serious, serious fee increases to everyone who owns a condo within your district. And I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Please..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. Excuse me, Representative, I thought you were completed with your remarks."

Kosel: "Please, please consider this very carefully and think about how you voted a year ago. Again, it was defeated 41 to 70 just a year ago."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack for three minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is one of those Bills where both sides have compelling arguments and we have friends on both sides of the issue. However, it's not without... this... the problem... there is a problem right now. We have units that are... that are dilapidating, that are going vacant for longer periods of time than they should and we have probably a glut of properties and buyers that could be, frankly, surprised and burdened by walking into a situation where they find themselves facing a larger debt than they anticipated. I will speak to an issue that I... that I... I'm going to encourage the Sponsor to consider going forward, if this should pass. And I intend to vote for it. I think there are areas of compromise that can still be achieved. I think there are areas where both parties can find a better solution. But for right now, this is what this Bill does. It caps the amount an unsuspecting innocent buyer would have to pay on a unit he or she wants to buy. That makes units move. That moves markets, that gets commerce going, and it gets people in units that want to live in those units. I think that supersedes the

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

current state of the law. I think it's better than what we've got right now. Do I think further improvement is necessary? I do. Do I think there's opportunities for compromise so that unit owners and associations have opportunities to cap their losses as well? I do as well. Look, this form of ownership has its expense. You don't just have neighbors, you have financial partners. And unfortunately, the financial partners are more likely to have to pay for this than innocent purchasers. So, that's where I come down on this. I urge a 'yes' vote, but I also urge a trailer or continued negotiations towards a better Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin for three minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, to what extent or degree did you negotiate this Bill and with who... what parties?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry. What was that?"

Dunkin: "To what extent did you, if you did at all, negotiate this Bill with various partners?"

Yingling: "This was... this was passed out of the Senate nearly unanimously and I picked it up here in the House, Representative."

Dunkin: "So, you didn't... so, all right. So, there's been a number of questions to some of the items on this Bill, and how it's going to impact actual condo owners and the various associations. Are you willing to negotiate some further items in this Bill to make it soup, as one of my colleagues mentioned... mentioned earlier?"

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Yingling: "You know, I am... I am certainly more than happy if all the parties can agree upon a trailer Bill to run that. I think, right now, we have a very serious situation where innocent homebuyers are being gouged and we can't afford to wait any longer before this Body takes act... action. Sometimes it isn't a perfect solution. But this is the best path forward we have at this point and I think that this is something that this chamber needs to pass and... and move forward to protect the consumers."
- Dunkin: "Right. Representative, I certainly understand and I appreciate you picking up the Bill. But are you willing to work with and negotiate with some of the... your own colleagues here who made mention of some of the items here in this piece of legislation?"
- Yingling: "Like I said, Representative, is yes, I'm absolutely willing to negotiate out a trailer Bill. But I don't feel that the market and the consumers can wait another year and... and spend another year being gouged millions and millions of dollars as the market still remains soft."

Dunkin: "Sure."

- Yingling: "And so, that's why I feel that we need to move this Bill. At this time, I'm happy to go back and do a trailer Bill and work out any... any issues that might happen at that point. But I think it's important to remember that this is an issue that's been being discussed for the past two years."
- Dunkin: "Sure. And so now, I think, you know, to your credit with picking this up, it's an opp... it also is an additional opportunity for us to come up with a comprehensive approach, because a lot of us represent condo owners."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Yingling: "Mmm mmm."

Dunkin: "A lot of us live in condos or we have someone that's connected. And so, all we're simply trying to do is come up with the best people... the best piece of legislation to the greatest extent possible to that end of making sure that buyers and actual residents benefit from the actual exchange. We want foreclosed units off the market. Believe you, me, I have tons of ... of condos in my district. So, I think, you know, maybe you'd be willing to work with us to help us get it to where we want it to be and so that condo owners are not necessarily left holding the bag because we're trying to figure out why there's so many condo owners who are against this piece of legislation. And so, again, my question is, is it okay for you to pull this out of the record and to work with us, your colleagues, so that we can just add some more items that we would have added in the trailer Bill? Are you willing to do that?"

Yingling: "You know what? I believe so strongly in this Bill, Mr. Dunkin, and I believe that the consumers have been being gouged for years and years and years with predatory fees that I feel we need to move this forward at this time and get some protection in place for the buyers and the consumers. These innocent bystanders are being preyed upon and I think that we need to, as a Body, move this Bill forward in its current condition. And I'm happy to go back and... and do a trailer Bill."

Dunkin: "So, all right. Last question. So... so, you're not willing to work with us?"

Yingling: "I'm willing to work with you on a trailer Bill."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Dunkin: "But... but this Bill failed the last time; you were here."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin, your time has expired, Sir."

Dunkin: "Thank you. Last question, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Dunkin: "...with respect. Representative, all we're trying to ask is that you can pull this from the record for now, so we can work with some of the particulars on this piece of legislation and that way it will be a comprehensive enough Bill that can succeed, at least out of this chamber, 'cause it didn't before. I think it's a fair request, as your colleagues are asking. So, can you work with us?"

Yingling: "Let me think on that one. Just give me... just give me a couple minutes. Okay? Let's continue with debate."

Speaker Lang: "You don't have long to think. Your turn to close, Sir."

Yingling: "All right. Well, this is, again, this is about protecting innocent buyers from fees, predatory fees that have gouged them for millions and millions of dollars over the past several years. This is a Bill about stabilizing the market. This is a Bill about protecting the consumer and we should… we should absolutely adopt this Bill. And I encourage a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Costello, Mr. Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

passed. Senate Bill 2694, Mr. Drury. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2727, Mr. Andrade. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2727, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 2727 would ban microbeads from personal care products in Illinois. Microbeads are small plastic beads which have become a popular ingredient in personal care products such as exfoliating body washes and soaps and also can be found in toothpaste. These small plastic beads are now being found in sediment and many water bodies including the Great Lakes. The beads can absorb toxins from the environment and can be ingested by the fish, which we later eat. Plastic pollution is a growing problem in Lake Michigan and this Bill is a small effort to minimize that pollution. This Bill will protect one of our state's greatest assets which is Lake Michigan. This Bill has been agreed to the ... by the Illinois Environmental Council and the Chemical Industry Council of Illinois, as well as other environmental business groups. Manufacturers are already phasing this product out. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote to help protect our Lake Michigan. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Andrade, is this Bill effective immediately?"

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Andrade: "No. This Bill is not effective immediately. This Bill would ban manufacturers from making products for sale with microbeads in December of 2017 and bans retailers from accepting products for sale in December of '18... 2018. But also, the over-the-counter personal products are given more time because there's FDA approval and that would be from 2008...
'18 and then be banned from being accepted for sale in December of 2019."

Riley: "So, just, you know, in terms of clarity, those things are already on shelves will have an opportunity to be a..."

Andrade: "Absolutely."

Riley: "...sold and... Okay. Thank you."

Andrade: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Switches are in the same place they were yesterday, Ladies and Gentlemen. Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Nekritz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2797, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2797, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2797 amends the Video Gaming Act consistent with the Riverboat Gambling Act. It creates an exclusion list for people who have previously violated the Video Gaming Act with the rules adopted under

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

the Act. It also creates an exclusion list for persons whose conduct and reputation is such that it would call into question the integrity and honesty of the video gambling... of video gambling operations. If someone is on the list, they'd be prohibited from being licensed under the Act or from engaging in activities, agreements and transactions that are authorized under the Act. This is an initiative of the Illinois Gaming Board and the Chicago Crime Commission. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. There's a reason why JCAR did a prohibition on what the Gentleman's Bill would seek to codify and that's because this Bill is loaded with unfairness and arbitrary standards that would be set by the Gaming Board and have a very, very deleterious effect on the people involved in this matter. The Bill wouldn't create an exclusion list that would create many un... intended consequences adversely affecting businesses and individuals not directly related to the gaming industry. The current language should have been amended in the Senate. Senate Amendment 4 would have clarified and taken care of this problem, but for whatever reason, it was not enacted. The current language would be amended so that the Gaming Board would decide who's eligible and what due process is afforded and what to exempt. This Bill would exempt employees of licensed establishments including bartenders, cocktail waitresses, cooks, all those type of people could fall within the scope of this list and be prevented from continued employment at licensed establishments, even if they have

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

little or nothing to do with video gaming, such as serving video gaming patrons. This would exempt providers of nonvideo gaming goods or services, such as food, beverages, coinoperated amusement devices not prohibited by the Gaming Act, vending machines and the like that could fall under this exclusion list. Even landlords could be placed on the exclusion list who merely rent to any tavern who was seeking to get a gaming license. This would exempt existing contracts entered into prior to the enactment of this Bill. We should be requiring hearings as a matter of right, not at the whimsy of the Gaming Board. So, as... as the issues are very, very prominent, this is a gross violation of anyone's due process. It's a Bill that does not provide any kind of standard fairness to people who are in the industry who happen to work at a tavern, who happen to have existing contracts, and should be sent back and have the Amendments made. Why should the Gaming Board have the power that the Liquor Control Commission doesn't have all kinds of arbitrary power that would have this impact on people who otherwise are law-abiding and who are otherwise simply working in these establishments? So, I would strongly encourage a 'no' vote. I would urge the Sponsor to take this out of the record and fix this Bill, because it ... in its present form it is not... should not be acceptable to those of us in the General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the motivation here, but I... I am deeply concerned about the overbroad application of this list. For those of us who are concerned about folks who have paid their debt to society and are

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

attempting to... to reenter the workforce and... and build a new life, the hospitality industry is one of the very few areas that are open and available to them. If... if these employees have nothing to do with the gaming operation, it is mindboggling that they should have to lose their jobs and have one more avenue cut off to them. I do believe that there is a path to get the protections, that the protections should exist within the gaming operation, but we should not, by any means, be cutting off opportunities for folks who can work in the hospitality industry, who can be servers and busboys and bartenders and cooks and make a new life. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to fully support the remarks made just a moment ago by the Gentleman from Peoria. As a Democratic Member of JCAR, it's interesting that both the Democrats and the Republicans who have reviewed this issue both in the House and the Senate have agreed that the language is presented in this Bill is overly broad and will have an undue, deleterious effect and unintended consequences on many, you know, innocent people who are not the intent of... control of the gaming industry. As previous speakers have said, suddenly, people who are cooks, people who wash the floors, people who have been waitresses in an establishment for years and years could face themselves with loss of employment simply because they appear on some list that the Gaming Board has deemed to make them unworthy. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know, in JCAR, we prohibited this from happening because it was bad public

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

policy. All of us want to be sure that our video gaming and gaming establishments and those who serve gaming and video gaming itself certainly meet the highest qualifications, but we do not want folks who are, you know, innocent people going about their daily business of their lives to be harshly penalized. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Arrovo: "Representative Drury, I was the one that filed this Amendment to your Bill and I would ask you to see if you could pull this Bill out and add the Amendment to your Bill. This is going to hurt a lot of innocent people that don't have anything in common with gaming. You got a lot of cooks, a lot of people that are bartenders, like... I'm echoina Representative Leitch's comments, I think he's got a lot of good comments, that you're doing something that's going to hurt a lot of innocent people. And I urge you to pull this Bill out... out of the Roll and see if we could add that... I mean, I know your intentions are good and we're going the right way, but we would like for you to put this Amendment on it, too, so it doesn't hurt the small people."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "In response to your question, Representative, I want to make clear what this Bill does and does not do. It creates an exclusion list for people who have violated the Video Gaming Act. It creates an exclusion list for people who shouldn't be engaged, according to the Gaming Board, shouldn't be engaged in the conduct 'cause it hurts the integrity of the business.

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

I've talked with everybody who's come to my office about this Bill and I can tell you that not one waitress, not one cook, not one person has come to me asking me not to run this Bill. And this fear, that we're going to have all of these waitresses and cooks and people trying to get back into the workforce on this exclusion list simply isn't true. The Riverboat Gambling Act has an exclusion list with the same exact wording, the same exact wording, and there are less than 40 people on that list. In the whole state, less than 40 people are on that list and that list has been in existence since the 1990s. What we are saying is that if you don't belong in the industry 'cause you've already violated the rules or if your conduct and reputation will hurt the integrity of gaming in the State of Illinois, which we all want to protect, you'll go on the list. There's no issue of due process in this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury, you'll have time to close."

Drury: "Yeah, but I'm responding to the question, why I'm not accepting the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Beca..."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Drury: "And so, there is due process in the Bill because you can go to the courts. And those of us who... who have practiced in the administrative realm know that your client always wants to get out of the administrative realm and go to court. This Bill lets you get there right away. So, I've studied the Amendments hard, I've talked with everybody whose wanted to do it, I've had people try to intimidate me and scream at me about accepting the Amendments. I've stood up to them. And I'm asking all of us to do the right thing today and pass

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

this Bill so that the Gaming Board can have the authority it needs to keep the integrity and honesty of... of gaming in Illinois where it needs to be, which is a goal that we all want."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Dunkin: "Now, I know... I know my Sponsor... the Sponsor's way across the aisle. Oh, there he is, right here. Right next to me. Representative, so if I'm a barkeep... just for clarification, if I'm a barkeep and someone has... someone in the workforce has a felony conviction, can I work at that restaurant or that bar that has the machines in the back or somewhere in that facility?"

Drury: "Can you restate that? I don't know that I understood the question."

Dunkin: "All right. So, I work as a barkeep or a waiter or a waitress, can... and someone... would I be in violation if someone has... if someone has crossed the threshold or served an exconvict in that establishment?"

Drury: "So, if I understand your question, you are a person who hasn't violated the Video Gaming Act."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Drury: "You don't have anything in your background that calls into question your integrity."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Drury: "You'd be able to work that establishment. Now, if the owner of the establishment was on the list, there may not be

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- machines at that place because they'd be on the exclusion list, but you wouldn't lose your job, absolutely not."
- Dunkin: "All right. So, I'm just trying to get some clarification.

 Are we doing this right now, currently, with our... with the other casinos?"
- Drury: "The casinos have a list, yes."
- Dunkin: "So, how does that compare to this piece of legislation?"
- Drury: "The verbiage is... is as close as it can be, except this is video gaming and not a casino, but I mean, we took the language from the Riverboat Gambling Act."
- Dunkin: "Okay. Would that be an economic impact if this legislation becomes law to some of these companies, these bars and restaurants who may have employees with potentially questionable backgrounds?"
- Drury: "I don't think so. There's... No. I don't see how it would."
- Dunkin: "Okay. I'm just trying to wrap my head around it. So, what inspired you to bring this legislation?"
- Drury: "This was an initiative that came up from the Gaming Board. It's a good initiative. It's going to, you know, increase the integrity of... of the gaming industry, keep it where we all agree it needs to be. And it doesn't make sense that we have it for the riverboats but we don't have it for video gaming, which I should say that Illinois has more video gaming terminals than anywhere in the country and we don't have any way to put anyone who doesn't belong in the industry on a list. And this is just saying give us the authority to do this and if someone thinks they shouldn't be on the list, they can go to court and get off of it."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Dunkin: "Okay. Well, I think what... what some people may not be aware of, tell these folks what your background was."
- Drury: "I'm not going to do that, Sir."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin, have you completed your remarks? Mr. Arroyo is recognized. I fear I cut you off, Sir. When he was..."
- Arroyo: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "...when the Sponsor was answering your question. I apologize."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You did cut me off. But that's not the first time you've done that, Lou, but I'm okay with that."
- Speaker Lang: "And it won't be the last either."
- Arroyo: "I'm okay with that. But I would like to ask Representative Drury would he consider taking it out of the Roll. He didn't answer me yes or no."
- Drury: "I'm not going to take it out of the Roll at this time."

 Arroyo: "Okay. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. There's a trophy out there that doesn't have a Member. And this might be one of them, because this hurts a lot of people that don't have anything to do with gaming. So, if everybody pays attention, I think I would like to give my good colleague, Mr. Drury, this trophy today. If whoever has it now wants to keep it, then vote for it. But if you want to get rid of it, this is the time to get rid of it. Thank you. I urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'm not sure how many cooks or bartenders or waitresses may have stopped at your office Representative, but I get paid by those people to represent

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

them in the 45th District. And I get paid to be their voice. And so now, as we had discussions about minimum wage and people with convictions trying to find work, we'll now punish those individuals and not give them an opportunity when they have absolutely nothing to do with the actual gaming portion of the restaurant or the bar or the establishment. They don't participate in the profit. So, any regular business owner could not hire a person with a felony conviction because that would be some... some form of corruption, which is untrue. This would turn contract law in the State of Illinois upside down. And existing contracts would no longer exist."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Reboletti. Ladies and Gentlemen...

Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Please. Thank you very much.

Please proceed, Sir."

Reboletti: "So, now we... now we get to the realm of taking contracts that are existing and tell those individuals those no longer exist. We changed Illinois law and you're contract can be torn up at any time, depending on the whim of the General Assembly. Where's the due process in this Bill? We don't have any. It's discretionary based on the Gaming Board. Representative Arroyo had an Amendment that would have addressed all of these concerns, but the Sponsor wouldn't let it have its fair hearing here. And that's unfortunate. Nobody wants corruption in this building, in gaming, or anywhere. Well, I appreciate this is an attempt to do that; it doesn't. What it does is put people out of work. It puts businessmen and women... losing contracts. And I don't think it gets to the heart of the matter. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Thapedi: "Mr. Drury, I can appreciate what you did yesterday on the ball field by taking out one of the JCAR Members, but unfortunately, the JCAR Members here are going to have some difficulty in supporting your Bill today. I'd like to get a little clarification from you on a couple of issues. First of all, what is your understanding as to why JCAR took the action that it took and not supporting the proposal that you're bringing here this afternoon?"

- Drury: "I believe one... one of the... the considerations was that JCAR didn't believe that the Video Gaming Act included language in the statute to allow JCAR to take the action to put people on the exclusion list."
- Thapedi: "So, as a result of that, you're trying to rectify the Gaming Board's attempt at promulgating rules that did not have statutory authority by obtaining that statutory authority here, now, and today. Is that accurate?"
- Drury: "Well, we're trying to put into law that the tools necessary to allow them to move forward, yes."
- Thapedi: "Okay. But you should also be aware that one of the concerns that occurs now with the... with the legislation as you have presented it is, is that potentially, you could be voiding out existing contracts. Are you aware of that?"
- Drury: "I'm aware of that, Representative. But every contract that someone enters into under the Video Gaming Act and under the rules currently under the Act contains a clause and if you... if your license is revoked, the contract will be revoked. So, everybody goes into it with eyes wide open. If the

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

contract is already paid for and in effect, you can't lose your contract. This would only effect an installment contract where payments are going forward. You wouldn't be allowed to get the continuing payments. But if you shouldn't be in the business to begin with, then you lose that privilege. Being able to be in the video gaming industry in Illinois is a privilege, it's not a right. And the Gaming Board has always had the right to take away that privilege. And this is just saying, if you're going to be a privileged person, you have to play by the rules or you'll be on the list, just like we do with riverboats."

Thapedi: "Well... well, here's the concern that I have is that, unfortunately, they brought out a trophy that I wish that it was a different trophy and I don't want to see you get it. And having said that, it's my understanding from meetings that we had in JCAR was that a proposal was brought forth to you, I guess I'll call it the Arroyo Amendment that potentially would have put to rest a lot of the concerns that members of JCAR and JCAR staff had. Are you not inclined to accept the proposals that are enclosed or included in what I'll call the Arroyo Amendment?"

Drury: "So, I... it was interesting 'cause no one came to me with the Arroyo Amendment. I heard about it from some... some third party..."

Thapedi: "Okay."

Drury: "...which was interesting, but having looked at it, the Arroyo Amendment and yeah..."

Thapedi: "Have you reviewed it?"

Drury: "I've reviewed it, yes."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Thapedi: "In full?"

Drury: "In full."

Thapedi: "Okay."

Drury: "And so, the problem is that it... it guts... it guts the Bill.

And I can't do that. It has so many exceptions to the rule
that there's no rule anymore and so..."

Thapedi: "What do you mean by that?"

Drury: "It... the number of people that it puts on there. It... who says except for this person, except for that person, and less this and less that. And this Bill that we have is a very clear Bill that provides due process. People can go to court. So the people are saying that they're not, it's just not... simply not true. It's... it's a narrow restriction. Everyone will have the right. And if you look at history, only 30 people or 35 people have been put on the other list. So, this fear of ruining the Illinois economy because of an exclusion list, those are good talking points, but they're simply not accurate."

Thapedi: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. As a JCAR Member, and I know that the Chair is also a Member and unfortunately, you're not able to speak, so I will try to speak for you, in that, in JCAR we work together as a collaborative, bipartisan team looking at policy, looking at the best interest of the people of the State of Illinois. We looked at this issue and actually we talked about this very issue just this week. And having said that with majority of the JCAR Members not supporting the proposal, I will not be supporting... supporting the proposal. And I urge all the Members to vote 'no' on this Bill."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And if for some unknown reason this would get enough votes for passage, I would request a Roll… a verification."

Speaker Lang: "That will be acknowledged, Sir."

"Thank you. Just like been some excellent points made here, and it would really put some people out of work. I don't want to go over that again. But I want you to just consider the following, and I was really hopeful that the Sponsor would pull it out of the record. The Legislature, we the Legislature, lose our voice on this issue if we pass this and... and give this authority to the Illinois Gaming Board. With JCAR, every Member in here has a voice because it's... it's made up bipartisan. And I think for you to give up that voice would be a huge mistake. JCAR is ... should not be circumvented. There have been some people in the past, even Governors that have tried to circumvent JCAR, which is really circumventing your authority and that has been established that was the wrong thing to do. It's... Gaming Board does not have legislative representation like JCAR. It's a dangerous, dangerous precedent to circumvent JCAR when it's already acted on this. I think it's important that we respect the institution that we have in place; it's a tried and true way to handle business to make sure the voice of the people as well as the voice of the Legislature is respected and honored. Please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the last speaker, first off, in

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

the process. And I feel like we're... we're walking away from those Members of JCAR, who we trust tremendously, if... if we support this Bill. The concern I have is another concern and that is that because the way this is being portrayed, if all of a sudden you're going to vote 'no' that you all of a sudden want to support some kind of organized crime. And... and that's the way this House quite often spins in elections. And it doesn't matter whether it's on your side of the aisle or our side of the aisle. The sad thing is, is this Bill in itself is flawed. It is my hope that the ... that the Sponsor would pull it out of the record because I do believe that there's a problem here. I do believe that it does endanger certain employees that shouldn't be endangered. Everything that we do here has consequences. This does affect people's lives. Not a single person on this floor, I believe, would support organized crime, criminal activity in the gaming. But yet, also, other people's lives are being affected here. And we joked and we would talk about the ... we'd talk about the trophy. But folks, this is serious business. You have people that can be negatively impacted, that can lose the income to their family, based on a vote like this. Like I said, I know the political spin. Oh my goodness, you want to support organized crime. No, you don't. There's nobody on this floor that does. But we also know that there's a process... it's sad that... that it's been explained several times over that we have a process. We have JCAR for a reason. To circumvent them now is the wrong thing to do. Folks, you've each got to weigh out what you've got to do politically, if you don't want the spin that... that you know, on the organized crime and all that. So, you know,

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

targets, watch yourself. I understand that. But I don't think this Bill should pass. I think it should go back to the drawing board. It's... it's not ready. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury to close."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's... it's a sad day. This Bill, if you read the Bill and you look at what the Bill does, does not take employment away from anybody. It doesn't take authority away from JCAR. It actually gives JCAR the authority. JCAR will still have to approve any rule that the Gaming Board passes to allow for the exclusion list to exist. it is giving JCAR authority, not taking it away. Obviously, there's well-orchestrated talking points here and that's fine. But the fact is, this Bill is being presented to keep the integrity of gaming in Illinois, to help us restore trust in Illinois in all aspects. Now, we... we can talk about how some waitress is going to lose his or her job, but my guess is, not one person in this House has been approached by a waitress scared of losing her job. They probably were approached by the same person in the pinstriped suit who kept coming to my office. Now, it's... it's... people are going to vote how they're going to vote. But the reality is, this Bill merely gives the authority to put someone on a list who has already violated Illinois law or someone whose reputation is such that they shouldn't be allowed in the gaming industry. This has been going on since gaming was invented. But in Illinois we're going to say no, we don't need to have this list, we don't need to regulate gaming and anyone who wants to be in the industry is fine. And we're going to handcuff our Gaming Board, who's appointed by the Governor and approved

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

by the Senate, we're going to handcuff them from doing their job. So, vote how you're going to vote. I strongly ask for an 'aye' vote. It is a vote for good government. It is a vote for keeping gaming clean. And it's the right vote. But if you don't want to and if you want to give me a trophy, that's fine. I know that this... I know that this is the right thing for the gaming industry that we should all want. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Acevedo, Ford, Lilly, Unes, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 19 voting 'yes', 89 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. Senate Bill 2829, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2829, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill... Floor Amendment #1 became the Bill yesterday. It simply allows those owners of single and multiple family residential dwellings to go in and recover court... court costs and fees if they successfully appeal a municipal fine. This is an agreed Bill after the Amendment. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Mr. Zalewski, do you live in the City of Chicago?"

Zalewski: "No."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Ives: "Okay. I was just wondering why they're exempt from this
Bill."

Zalewski: "I think their... Jeanne, their sort of municipal... their

Home Rule unit gives them different way of doing
administrative hearings under the... under the Code. And as a
result, the language that we're putting... providing doesn't...

would not work under their Home Rule unit ordinance."

Ives: "Is there..."

Zalewski: "They would..."

Ives: "I mean, I just have a problem that we're continually... we're sitting here as a State Body and we're carving out particular people for special treatment and we're not including certain people in other laws, and I just... you know, is there any way we could include them so that..."

Zalewski: "Well..."

Ives: "...everybody was subject to the same State Law?"

Zalewski: "Well, I would say, Jeanne, that the... the proponents were okay with exempting them. So, if... if they came to an agreement that it was okay for the city to be exempted, given their own rules and their own ordinance, it doesn't make any sense for me to... to go against the agreement."

Ives: "Well, obviously, they're in favor of it. It benefits them,
 but..."

Zalewski: "It doesn't benefit the... the rental property owners to...

for the city to be exempted unless they felt that way. The

proponents felt that it was okay."

Ives: "I just... I just think that we should do... we should have everybody included in this Bill. I just don't understand why Chicago is excluded, that's all. Thanks."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Zalewski: "Duly noted."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Please vote 'aye'."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Drury, Dunkin, Harris, Hoffman, Jones. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2972, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 2992, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3000, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3000, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Illinois... Illinois Department of Natural Resources. And I'm sorry, the computer seems not to be working, so give me a second. Mr. Speaker, can I pull this out of the record? There seems to be a problem with the computer."

Speaker Lang: "Well, then, I hope you're okay on the next Bill. Senate Bill 3022 is yours as well."

McAsey: "Well, yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please read 3022."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3022, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. So, Senate Bill 3022. Yesterday, House Committee Amendment #1 was tabled, so this legislation is just the Bill as it came over from the Senate. It very simply changes the date that the Statutory Court Fees Task Force needs to render their report. It changes that date from 2014 to 2016. And I would ask for the support of the Members."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Currie, Demmer, Drury, Feigenholtz, Mayfield, Nekritz. Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 10 Bill, having voting 'no'. And this received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAsey, just wave at me when you have that other one figured out, okay? Senate Bill 3038, Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill. I understand there's an Amendment, Sir. Mr. Clerk, place this order... Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3038, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sandack, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack on the Amendment."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment is essentially a gut and replace. The Amendment becomes the Bill. Weeks ago we passed SB2003 before an Amendment could be adopted. On Third

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Reading, I'll explain the entirety of the Bill. But the Body should know we passed the Bill unanimously last time."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The ayes have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3056, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3056, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3056 essentially adds a modicum of transparency and equity to mass transit service delivery in northeastern Illinois. And essentially, for months we've been working on, actually this Bill and a lot of other issues that have occurred with regard to the operations of RTA, Metra, Pace, and the CTA. And essentially what this Bill does is, a) it requires RTA prereview of certain service board agreements, it requires RTA Board prereview of employee bonuses, affords the RTA greater access to service board financial records, institutes an RTA and Service Board revolving door prohibition, creates an online mass transit transparency database. It also tasks RTA with creating a geographically equitable transportation system. It requires the RTA to consult with IDOT development of their strategic plans, specifically the Office of Planning and Programming. And finally, it requires RTA to cooperate with governmental and private industry... entities in

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

the development of bikeways and trails. And I'd request an 'aye' vote. And I'll answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Riley, I appreciate what's laid out in our analysis and some of the items contained in your Bill look familiar to me and my... my friend, Representative Tryon. This... at least my analysis suggests that the CTA is opposed. Is that still the case?"

Riley: "The CTA is opposed. When I passed this out of our Mass Transit Committee, they stated the reasons why and frankly speaking, what they said was they thought that the RTA was given more powers than they thought that they should have. And I respected their opinion on stating that, but frankly speaking, the RTA is the financial oversight entity over the CTA and the other two Service Boards. And so, I really didn't think that, if that was the reason for their opposition, that that really stood up. Also, you're absolutely right. Over the last year or so, Republican Spokesperson, Mike Tryon, who has been invaluable with all kinds of Bills in terms of bringing some regulation to the Service Boards, many of these, parts of this Bill came from him. We both, over the last year, have probably instituted about maybe 16 Bills dealing with these issues. Some of mine are in there and many of his are in there."

Sandack: "Well, thank you for that. And I... I remember the hearing when I asked the representative of the CTA. At the time, your Bill had not been filed and I was asking about the Tryon Bill,

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

what their objection was. And I got a completely vague answer, so I appreciate your frank response. I, too, do not really care if they have a problem with RTA oversight. That's the entire purpose of the RTA. So, thank you for the Bill. Thank you for your leadership. And if you wouldn't mind, adding me as a cosponsor as well. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Riley: "I certainly will do that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "I appreciate the comments of the previous speaker. Al, thanks for taking this up. I know we've had a lot of discussions on the... on all these Boards, so I think this is a step in the right direction. My concern is, I hope... I don't want anyone to think that this is somehow a panacea and that we're not going to go farther because this doesn't really deal with the structure of all these different agencies. This gives a little bit more oversight to RTA but it has nothing to do with the... the Boards, like on Metra or Pace or the others. Wouldn't you agree?"

Riley: "Oh, I'd agree. And you have to remember from the first time we started hearing a lot of the issues with some of the Service Boards, specifically when we had hearings dealing with the problems that Metra was having during the... the bad weather, we knew that we just had a short period of time to institute some kinds of control and as you know, the Governor had a task force that came up with the NEIL Report. And whereas, I respect the NEIL Report, I respect the Governor for at least trying to address some of those issues, it is

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

not a definitive report. The responsibility for exacting exactly how these Service Boards operate is up to us. And so, this is not exhaustive and this is not the end. I plan on having the Mass Transit Committee have other hearings going forward where we'll talk about issues of ethics in more detail and especially issues of finance and governance going forward."

Franks: "I think that's important. And I was helping on those earliest hearings when we learned of the severance agreement that Metra had given to its former executive director and then the result and fallout, where many of the board members were forced to resign. So, I think this is an important first step. But I don't want anyone to think that we're... we're anywhere near where we need to be 'cause I think, ultimately, we do need to change the structure because I don't think that anyone in their right mind would have ever created a system like the one we have now, because it isn't seamless. But this, I think, will help and I think it's a good start. And I do support it and I want to work with you to make this even better."

Riley: "Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Representative Riley's Bill and would ask if he would yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Riley: "Yield."

Tryon: "First, I'd like to thank Representative Riley, as chairman of the Mass Transit Committee, for working through some very

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

difficult issues, issues that we know we found in the press to be issues that we needed to do something about. And... and you know, when you look at the governance structure of the mass transit system, it's hard to determine is it a component unit of a government, is it a government unto itself, is it a hybrid, is it a part of State Government. And really, it's basically a quasi unit of government. And what this is doing, in part, is bringing them under State Laws when it comes to transparency, when it comes to some of the things that we intended for the RTA to be able to do, such as review and comment contracts, have real-time access to ... to spending and financial data. In the RTA... in the RTA Act, it says if the RTA wants to get information, financial information or any kind of information, the agencies have 30 days to respond. But FOIA says somebody can come off the street and they get a response in 10 days. So, for the oversight agency to have those limited powers, I think, is wrong. And in this day of technology that we can give them real-time auditing and I think that goes a long way. And when we look at the... at what we're able to get our hands around during this time period in this Legislative Session, this will go a long way, I think, to improve transparency, accountability, and get the systems working with the RTA and us as we move forward in the summer to look at some of the other issues. So, I think this is a good Bill, a great... a great way for us to pass some laws that, well, I think, will make significant differences in... in the relationship between the Service Boards, the RTA, and the General Assembly. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Drury, Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to Senate Bill 3000, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3000, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Thank you for coming back to me with that little technical glitch. This is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. What the legislation does is establish the Natural Resources Restoration Trust Fund. Essentially, what this is doing is creating that fund that right now doesn't exist. But this is codifying current practice, whereby when there's some sort of settlement or judgment where a bad-acting cooperation who has been engaged in some sort of pollution pays a settlement or some sort of fine, those moneys now will be specifically put into this trust fund to go out and do the restoration of the environment that needs to happen. So, I appreciate the support of the Body and can answer any questions. I know of no opposition."

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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes';

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

- Riley: "We usually don't do this, so I would ask for your indulgence, Members. But on that previous Bill, I wasn't given a chance to close. So, let me just simply say, Mike, the Republican Spokesperson for Mass Transit, great job, invaluable on helping with this Bill. My vice-chair, Elgie Sims, thank you so much. I don't know what I would do without the verve of Ron Sandack. But every Member of the committee, you know, we toiled, we worked, and you guys really care. So, I look forward to working with you going forward. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 221.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 221, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee schedule. At 1:00, the Revenue & Finance Committee is meeting in Room 114. At 2:00, the Restorative Justice and Higher Education Committee is meeting in Room 114. The following Appropriation working groups are meeting this afternoon. At 1 p.m., the Appropriations-Higher Education working group is meeting in Room 402, the

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

Appropriations-Higher... Human Services is meeting in Room 100, Appropriations-General Services working group is meeting in 115. At 3 p.m., the Appropriations-Public Safety working group is meeting in Room 115 and the Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education Committee working group is meeting in 100."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1129, offered by Representative William Davis. House Resolution 1131, offered by Representative Cabello. House Resolution 1132, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 1133, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 1135, offered by Representative Tracy. House Resolution 1136, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer. House Resolution 1137, offered by Representative Meier. House Resolution 1138, offered by Representative Unes. And House Resolution 1139, offered by Representative Soto."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock. Excuse me. Leader Currie moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like the record to reflect that I... my intention was to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 3071. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect your intention. Ladies and Gentlemen, aside from the committee announcements you heard, the Executive Committee will be meeting later this afternoon at a time unknown. So, those of you who are on the Executive

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

- Committee be available later this afternoon. The guess would be 3 or 4:00 for the Executive Committee. Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Not that Jack and I agree on much of anything, but regarding the schedule, do you have any insight, particularly for those of us who are in hotels and may need to check out today, looking toward the weekend, if that is the case. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "All we can tell you about the schedule at the present time is that when we adjourn today, we're going to adjourn till 8:30 tomorrow morning. Saturday's schedule is undecided. There will be no Session on Sunday and there will be Session on Monday. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 23 at the hour of 8:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 23 at the hour of 8:30 a.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6271, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 6272, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. First Reading of these House Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 345, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 395, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 396, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 397, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 398, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 399, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 399, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 400, a Bill for an Act

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

concerning revenue. House Bill 401, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 402, a Bill for Act concerning revenue. House Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 404, a Bill for Act concerning revenue. House Bill 408, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Second Reading of these House Bills. These Bills shall be held on the Order of Second Reading. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 121, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 452, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 636, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2590, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2644, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 2730, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2758, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2771, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2793, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2801, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2839, a Bill for an act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2966, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3044, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3113, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3125, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3222, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3275, a Bill for an Act concerning

136th Legislative Day

5/22/2014

criminal law. Senate Bill 3405, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3425, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3816. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 221. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."