59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1076, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1516. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 553, offered by Representative Williams. House Resolution 554, offered by Representative Kelly Burke. House Resolution 559, offered by Representative Wallace. House Resolution 560, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 561, offered by Representative Gabel. These are referred to the Rules Committee. House Joint Resolution 83, offered by Representative Martwick, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Members shall be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Doug Williams, who is with the Aldersgate United Methodist Church in Rockford, Illinois. Pastor Williams is the guest of Representative Wallace. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Williams: "God of many names, we thank You for this land with all its chartered liberties and for the wonder of our country's unfolding and continuing story. We thank You for the Leaders who serve this state and labor for the commonwealth for us all. Please grant them wisdom and strength as they discuss the matters before them, help them to stand firm for those things which they know to be important and also necessary for life within the borders of this state.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Grant them willing hearts to speak and to listen and to work together to accomplish what no one can accomplish on their own. Grant them courage for the challenges which lay before them as they are mindful of the responsibility with which they have been entrusted. And may the legacy of hope upon which our state was founded and faith that helps to encourage us all endwell them as they lead us forward this day and for all days up ahead, Amen."

- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative McSweeney."
- McSweeney et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Reggie Phillips is excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Monique Davis, Drury, and Lilly are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, with 113 Members present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1906, Senate Bill 1907; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 531. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation:

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution #11. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 78, House 79, Resolution House Joint Resolution Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution #82. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Economic Development & Housing reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution #80."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please add... please add Representative Evans to the list of the excused."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Members, we'll begin on page 7 of the Calendar, under House Bills on... no, Senate Bills on Third Reading. There are many Bills on the Calendar today. If we can, let's try to keep our remarks in debate as brief as possible so that everyone has a chance to present their Bill at some point today. Thank you, Members. First up, we have Senate Bill 33, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please move Senate Bill 33 back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 33, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we just adopt 3 and 4 and debate this on Third?"

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 33. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang. Same thing."

Lang: "Can we just move this to Third?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir. Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 33. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read... Senate Bill 455. Out of the record. Senate Bill 508, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 508, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 508 establishes an incentive program for municipally owned convention and sport centers in Illinois. It allows them to get reimbursed for incentives provided to entice new conventions, meetings, and trade shows to Illinois.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Reimbursements will be awarded once a municipality demonstrate that the incentive enabled them to bring in new business from out of state. It's funded by the Tourism Promotion Fund. And it's a pilot program that sunsets in five years. Happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "Morning, Speaker. And understanding the admonition you gave, I couldn't hear Representative Crespo. So, I'm happy to keep things tight, but I couldn't hear."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, please... please bring the noise level down. Shh. Thank you. Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "I just need the Representative to reintroduce his Bill.

  I couldn't hear one word, Fred. I'm sorry."
- Crespo: "Not a problem. Again, the… established an incentive program for municipally owned convention and sport centers in Illinois. It's a pilot program that sunsets after five years. And they get reimbursed once they demonstrate that the three incentive they're able to bring businesses from out of state or otherwise they wouldn't have been able to do."
- Sandack: "And where would they be reimbursed from? Their own proceeds. I..."
- Crespo: "The Tourism... Tourism Promotion Fund."
- Sandack: "All right. So, the idea here is that for five years see if this pilot program works and they would be reimbursed for the tax receipts they generated."
- Crespo: "Correct, provided that they can demonstrate that it, in fact, generated new receipts that otherwise they wouldn't have brought in."
- Sandack: "And who monitors that? Was it DCEO?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Crespo: "DCEO will be monitoring the program as well and they will be audited as well."

Sandack: "And is there a project or a... that kind of brought this whole thing on? Is there an idea that some project in Rosemont or Sandwich, Illinois, or something?"

Crespo: "No, there's actually a list of... I've got Tinley Park, the Peoria Civic Center, Gateway Center. So, there's various convention centers, midsize, municipally owned throughout the state."

Sandack: "Got it. Thank you."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Andersson: "Good morning, Fred."

Crespo: "Good morning."

Andersson: "Good morning. Couple of questions. Number 1 is, can you generally describe how this system will work? I understand it's an incentive that's being reimbursed. Can you describe what the incentive is?"

Crespo: "The incentive... number 1, the key thing here, Representative, is that the... the venues have to average the preceding five years in terms of receipts from the hotel taxes. There has to be a benchmark. They... when they issue their RFP's, they will be allowed to have some kind of incentives, compete with other states. I think we're the only state in the Midwest that doesn't offer incentives. And providing they can demonstrate that the new venue or the new

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

business generated taxes beyond that benchmark, then they'll get reimbursed at 80 percent of whatever they generated."

Andersson: "Okay. So, that's explaining what's being paid back, but what's actually being paid out to third parties is an incentive in the form of waivers of room fees, direct payments to third parties to attract conventions to the state, correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Andersson: "Okay. And so, this Bill authorizes reimbursement for those amounts, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Andersson: "Okay. But the Bill itself doesn't authorize incentives. That's already done, correct? People already do that, both public and private, they make incentives available to try to attract business, correct?"

Crespo: "They... I guess it's up to the venue, Representative, to do that. Unfortunately, I think... I don't think, we know we're the only state in the Midwest that... where the state doesn't provide or help or assist with the incentives. And that's what makes it a little bit tougher on these municipally owned convention centers to compete with other... other states."

Andersson: "I think it's fair to say that the state doesn't reimburse for it, but I think it's also fair to say that this statute doesn't specifically authorize it. In other words, they can do it now in the form of they're free to waive whatever fees they want to try to incent. Public businesses... public venues can do it, private venues can do it."

Crespo: "They can. The only difference and what this Bill adds is it puts them at a level playing field with other states. And

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- that's where they're having a very difficult time competing. Other states do it and do it because of the fact that the states assist them with the incentive program, ours does not."
- Andersson: "And I appreciate you making that comment. Want to make sure we're clear on this though. Only public venues can avail themselves of this program, correct?"
- Crespo: "Under this pilot program, right now, for five years, we needed to limit the scope. I think in the future if we can demonstrate that the model does work, it's revenue neutral, there's no reason why we can't even contemplate doing this afterwards for other venues outside of what we have in this Bill."
- Andersson: "Thank you. And I understand that the original version of the Bill contemplated about eight different convention venues. With the expansion of the definition, how many venues now qualify? Do we know?"
- Crespo: "I believe, Representative, we're looking around I think 9 or 10."
- Andersson: "Nine or ten. And each one could recoup about \$200 thousand at the maximum. Is that correct?"
- Crespo: "That's the maximum in statute. Actually, as we go through the process of figuring out, I don't... I think the cap is pretty high. It's... I don't see anyone going beyond."
- Andersson: "But the potential cap is then 1.8 million, 2 million dollars, something in that range?"
- Crespo: "I'm sorry. Speaker, I couldn't barely hear him.

  Representative."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Andersson: "So, the... I understand it may not reach it, but the maximum we're talking, if we've got 9 or 10..."

Crespo: "There's a cap under this pilot, yeah, 200 thousand."

Andersson: "...there's \$1.82 million. And the reimbursement comes from the Tourism Promotion Fund, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And that fund is made up of taxes that are paid by hotel stays throughout the state, correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Andersson: "And at present, those funds currently supply tourism promotion grants to conventions and visitors bureaus throughout the state, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And then with the existing constraints that...
that we have on our budget, this Bill would necessarily mean
then that there's less dollars available for the CVB grants,
correct?"

Crespo: "No."

Andersson: "No?"

Crespo: "I mean, actually, under the budget Bills that we've passed on this side, we fund tourism at the… the fiscal year '15 level. The only way that these convention and tourism bureaus or convention centers can get any money is if they demonstrate that they generated more than we would otherwise get if they didn't have the incentives. So, it's revenue neutral. It's not going to take from the system, GRF, or the Tourism Promotion Fund. They have to demonstrate… it's a pretty high threshold benchmark for them to demonstrate they've generated more revenue because of the incentives."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Andersson: "But the... the proof that they're showing is that there's been increased revenues. That's not directly tied to the Tourism Promotion Fund and what's received in that fund.

  And there's a lot of other pressures on that fund, are there not?"
- Crespo: "No. Under this model... yeah, they have to demonstrate they're generating additional revenue that otherwise wouldn't come in."
- Andersson: "Okay. And then, again, private venues, they do the same sort of thing. They have to compete for the same business, correct?"
- Crespo: "I'm pretty sure they all do."
- Andersson: "I'm pretty sure they do too. I appreciate you making the comment that you said that this creates a level playing field with others... other states. But again, private venues can't get reimbursed as presently drafted."
- Crespo: "I think... you know, Speaker... I mean, Representative, as we look at this model, again, it's a five-year pilot. I think the model does work. And we demonstrated they can generate additional revenue by allowing this to happen, there's no reason why we can't explore expanding this to privates later on. But as any pilot, you probably just contain it a little bit to see if the model works past the sign."
- Andersson: "Thank you for the answers. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

  I strongly oppose the Bill. This Bill purports to make it possible to allow public venues to attract out-of-state business or keep business from leaving the state. However, make no mistake, they can already do that. They're free to craft whatever incentives they want. They're free to

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

advertise those incentives. They just have to figure the incentives into their overall budget plan, just like private venues have to do. So, to suggest that this Bill is about attracting business to this state is false. What the Bill really does is create an unlevel playing field between public venues and private venues. It allows public venues to offer incentives and not worry about paying for them. Private venues, in order to attract this same business, will have to do the same thing, but they have to factor the expenses of doing so into their overall profit and loss. Not so with public venues who can now just be reimbursed. And what's more galling is that the money used to help unbalance the playing field will come directly from the pockets of people staying in hotels at the private venues. Money from venues like Pheasant Run in St. Charles in my district will now be publicly funding their competition. And the final insult is that since the money to fund local CVBs is being drained by this program, the local tourism boards now will have less ... less to promote their tourism that would... could otherwise attract out-of-state business. This Bill is bad for business in Illinois and sends the exact wrong message to our private businesses in Illinois. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Dunkin: "Representative... Mr. Speaker, I was trying to hear, listen. Thank you."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the noise level down? Thank you."

Dunkin: "I was trying to listen to my colleague, Representative Crespo, 'cause I thought Representative Andersson was asking some interesting questions. The Tourism Fund... can you explain what the typical amount is in it right now or over the last five years?"

Crespo: "Well, there's five Tourism Funds, Representative. So, because a little..."

Dunkin: "The Promotional... the Promotion Fund."

Crespo: "Yeah. The fee's around... the totals around \$250 million."

Dunkin: "I'm sorry."

Crespo: "Two hundred and fifty million dollars, Ken."

Dunkin: "Okay. Now, over the last five years, what would you say the average has been?"

Crespo: "I would imagine around \$250 million seems to be the average on a regular basis. Well, unless... I'd be more than happy to stand corrected when I'm wrong, Representative, you know, but..."

Dunkin: "I believe it's a little less than that. I think some years we have peaks, some years we have... so, that's a pretty... that's... I think that's with the overall fund. So, my question is, I'm trying to get a sense of so... well, let me back up. Where is most of the tourism fund moneys generated, would you say? Where's the lion's share of that hotel/motel money... where is it generated from?"

Crespo: "The hotel/motel tax."

Dunkin: "Right. But... so, from what? Is it out of Chicago? Is it across the state?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Crespo: "It's across the state."

Dunkin: "But the bulk of that money comes from the Chicago Metropolitan area."

Crespo: "I would imagine, sure."

Dunkin: "So, how would the Chicago Metropolitan area be impacted if we were to start giving special dollars to some of these convention centers across the state?"

Crespo: "Well, McCormick, right now, Representative, gets 15 million... \$15 million a year from that fund. It's a grant, no strings attached. There's no performance standards, so I think we're helping Chicago a whole lot right now. Unlike this particular model, there's some performance standards that's tied to it. They have to demonstrate that, in fact, they're generating additional revenue, unlike McCormick that gets \$15 million a year."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Crespo: "So, I think we recognize that Chicago does a good job and that's why they get the \$15 million grant from the state."

Dunkin: "Okay. I'm trying to... I'm telling you, for some reason, I'm trying to listen and hear. So, I mean, the coll... my colleague... my previous colleague asked a question regarding can you give us a sense of the incentive to trade shows? I... you know, I want to see if I understand that or other event centers and how this stuff would actually work. 'Cause I guess and part of my concern is us tapping into this Promotional Fund, which promotes Illinois, all of Illinois, even though the bulk of the money is generated up north and how it is that we're going... how this is going to work. Especially, when you... as was pointed out, there are a lot of private convention

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

centers that the state relies on because we just don't have the capacity to run it or to pay the taxes for or just to maintain it. And so, places like a Pheasant Run or... and some of the other facilities that we have throughout the state, they do a better job at running a convention center and we don't give them incentives. We don't give them any special moneys. And so, it seems... I don't want to put us in a situation where convention centers around the state are saying, oh, there's our money... an opportunity for some money and it sounds good and it takes away from the overall promotional portion of our state as a tourism attraction. You following what I'm saying?"

Crespo: "I follow you, Representative. Again, the key to this model, again, I repeat, the convention centers are going to have a benchmark. They... you look at the preceding five years to see what their average is in terms of hotel/motel tax. And they have to demonstrate that because of this, the ability to provide this incentive, they're going to generate additional revenue. So, it's a pretty high benchmark threshold that they have to jump over to demonstrate that this is actually new money coming into the state. That's the way the model has been designed. "

Dunkin: "Okay."

Crespo: "So, it's not taken from the current moneys that we have in that fund right now. Again, they have to... DCEO has to certify this, they have to be audited as well, and demonstrate that this is, in fact, new money coming in, otherwise they wouldn't get it."

Dunkin: "So, who brought this legislation?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Crespo: "Well, you know, we've been working with the folks at Tinley Park, Peoria, Schaumburg. So, we've had a couple municipalities that own midsize convention centers that are having a very, very difficult time competing with... with other states that actually currently have incentives that they get through their own states. I think we're the only state in the Midwest that doesn't have anything like this. And unlike the other states, this one is, again, drafted in such a way that they have to demonstrate that they're generating new money. Unlike some of the other states where they just get a grant from the state so they can use that as an incentive. If they don't... if they can't demonstrate there's new money coming in, new revenue, they're not going to get any."

Dunkin: "If they can't demonstrate what?"

Crespo: "That they're bringing in new revenue, new money into the Tourism Fund."

Dunkin: "So, now... are the private convention centers, they're actually our partners in promoting Illinois even though we give them zero dollars. They benefit from an overall Illinois promotion, but we don't give them any money. How would this disadvantage the private ones when they have private investors and they're... they're really sort of on their own with their own private investment."

Crespo: "Yeah."

Dunkin: "How would this impact them in the positive, if we're giving some of these public entities, additional public entities, extra moneys?"

Crespo: "I think, as many... as any pilot out there, Representative, we need to limit the scope. I would submit to you that,

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

currently, the state does provide incentives. As I mentioned before, McCormick gets \$15 million a year, Rosemont gets \$5 million a year. So, we've done this before. This one's nothing new. This is different in the sense that there's a certain benchmark or threshold that they have to exceed in order to get that benefit, unlike Rosemont or McCormick or some of the other ones, but we do that today."

"Right. But those... the McCormick Place is the... is the lar... one of the, actually, the largest in America close to... very close to Orlando, but we actually have 16 football... excuse me, 8 football fields of convention space and so they generate, for example, the National Restaurant Association, in over four days, three nights, they have 70 thousand people there. And them some of these conventions they have over a hundred and thirty-plus thousand people there. So, it's a different animal to compete and I'm fine with that. I really want to see promotion all across our... across our state. As the chair of Tourism, that's something that's very important to me and many Members here. But I'm trying to see how this extraction from the... this Tourism Fund would help or hurt our overall competition to bring in business here in our state. I... I guess I don't want to have a negative impact on the overall promotion of tourism in the State of Illinois. And quite frankly, cities can eas... oh, there's a... there's a... there's a state... yes, Sir. There's a state fund, let's try to get into it, and I don't want us to ... I think we want to compare apples to apples and just because the fund exists doesn't necessarily mean that everybody should have their

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

hand in it. And so, I'm just trying to get some real clarity in terms of is this legislation necessary right now?"

- Crespo: "For these, again, for these specific municipality owned convention centers, yes, it is. They're having a really difficult time competing with some other out of state."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber? It's being increasingly difficult to hear the debate."
- Dunkin: "So, in response to... and let me wrap this up. Representative Crespo, in response to Representative Andersson's statement of how this fund will create an unlevel playing field between public venues and private venues in allowing public venues to offer incentives and not worry about paying for them, I guess, I want to... I want to make sure that there's a healthy environment for our private venues as well, 'cause we... they really help make our state a fantastically diverse and unique experience for a tourist. I don't want us to create a situation where they're just tapping into fun... a fund just because it's there. And they really have not been as hungry as a private vender would be in being creative in their financing and promotion in their ac... the actual experience of that particular convention center. So, I'm just not certain that I can support this measure right now given where we are and the unlevel playing field for some of these... these... for public versus the private. So, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Goodmorning, Fred."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Crespo: "Hi."

Wheeler, K.: "Three quick questions. Number 1, did these conventions... or these facilities come to you with this legislation for their benefit?"

Crespo: "We... we talked to some of these municipalities, Keith, and I guess, about any or all municipalities in the state are concerned about the loss... potential loss of local distributive funds, property tax freezes. So, they're looking for other ways to make a persistence to help for other ways to generate revenue and this is one of the ideas that we came up with. The key for me as I talked to them was that it had to be revenue neutral. We can't tap into existing funds. So, the way we drafted this was they have to demonstrate they're generating new revenue to the state."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But they haven't lost those OGF funds or the other ones we're talking about. We're just speculating that those things are going to happen. At the same time, I want to make sure that all this... the hotel taxes come from private entities, correct?"

Crespo: "Well, those taxes come from hotel ta... hotels, yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "Which are generally privately owned not publicly owned facilities."

Crespo: "As far as I know, yeah."

Wheeler, K.: "But then the situation I think that one of the previous Representatives mentioned that a privately owned facility with a competing convention facility would be paying into something which they wouldn't be getting anything back from. I... Fred, I... I love the idea of incentives that are cost neutral like you've got together here. I wish they were

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

afforded to all of the different facilities in the state rather than just the publicly owned ones that are mentioned here. So, with that, I'll be opposing the Bill, but for that specific reason alone. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll try to be brief.

Representative, a couple of questions, if I may. The hotel occupancy tax brings in roughly 200... let's say \$250 million a year overall, correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Harris, D.: "How much of that goes to tourism, do you know, generally? I know that the formula is extremely complex in how that 250 million gets split up, but how much goes to various tourism funds, any idea?"

Crespo: "You know, Representative, I think we've discuss this in our Appropriations Committee. There's five funds, I don't have the numbers on me right now, but it's divvied up among the five funds."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And this... these moneys would come specifically from the Illinois Tourism Fund."

Crespo: "Right."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Which is... there are other funds as well unless they're changed by DCEO, such as the International Tourism Fund and choose Chicago and all that, but this goes... comes out of the Illinois Tourism Fund. You changed... in one of the Amendments, you changed the square footage as to the entities that could qualify from 40 thousand to 30 thousand..."

Crespo: "Right."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Harris, D.: "...square feet. Did that add a facility that might qualify?"
- Crespo: "That added Quincy Civic Center, which was part of the early discussions, Representative. When we drafted the original Bill, we had it at 40 thousand square feet. There we found out that Quincy, again, they were a part of these discussions over 30 thousand square feet."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. So, the total number of entities that might qualify is what, do you know?"
- Crespo: "I'll say anywhere from 9 to 10."
- Harris, D.: "So, let's say 10. They're limited to \$200 thousand each, so that would be a maximum of \$2 million, let's say, correct?"
- Crespo: "That's the cap. I mean, we... you know. It's going to be really, really hard for any of these to hit that... that cap."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. But potentially, if they did, that would be \$2 million that would be coming out of the Illinois Tourism Fund that would be used... could be used elsewhere, but it's still being used for tourism, it's just being used in a very specific way."
- Crespo: "The... the key here though is they, just for the sake of argument, if in fact that's the \$2 million that you referenced, that'll be new revenue coming into the state under this model that otherwise we wouldn't have, otherwise they wouldn't get anything."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. And let..."
- Crespo: "So, they have to demonstrate the fact \$2 million of new money is coming in, just for the sake of discussion."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Harris, D.: "Okay. Let's track on that for just a second. The legislation reads... the legislation reads that it's subject to appropriation. So, does that mean there has to be a line item in the Tourism Fund for these reimbursements?"

Crespo: "Yeah."

Harris, D.: "Is there one in there in the... in the spending Bill that we just passed?"

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

Harris, D.: "Is there a line item in the spending Bill that we just passed for this... this money?"

Crespo: "Again, it's new money coming in, so there isn't anything there. And again, they have to demonstrate that it's new money coming in..."

Harris, D.: "I understand, but..."

Crespo: "...and DCEO has to certify that, in fact, it is new revenue."

Harris, D.: "Got it, but it's subject to appropriation. There has to be a line item. I don't think the line item was in the... in the spending Bill we just passed, but it is subject to appropriation. And then the last question I have, in terms of the specificity of the Bill, it says that the... the grants awarded under this Section shall be based on the net proceeds received under the Hotel Operators Occupation Tax for the renting, leasing, et cetera, of rooms in the municipality for the month in which the convention, et cetera, took place. Let's talk about our own local area in meet Chicago Northwest. As an example, let's say a convention is held or a trade show is held at the facility in Schaumburg. There are a lot of hotels around Schaumburg. I mean, there are hotels in Hanover

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Park. There are hotels in Arlington Heights. There are hotels in Rolling Meadows. Does this... do these dollars have to come only from the hotels in Schaumburg?"

Crespo: "Correct, in Schaumburg. The hotels specific to that municipality or town."

Harris, D.: "So, even though... even though the..."

Crespo: "So, under Chicago Northwest, if it's..."

Harris, D.: "...even though the cen... even though the trade show might... they might rent rooms in other municipalities, it's only the hotels in that municipality."

Crespo: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Turner: "Shh, Members. We have 10 people seeking recognition on this Bill. Can we please keep the noise level down and try to keep our remarks as brief as possible? We have a long list of Bills that we have to move through today. Going to have to go to the timer soon. Chair recognizes Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there a way we can put a timer on, please, Sir?"

Speaker Turner: "At the request of Representative Phelps, we will go to the timer for the remainder of the debate.

Representative Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, tell me if I'm getting this right. We're trying to give reimbursements for incentives that public venues give to attract talent. Is that what this Bill does?"

Crespo: "Correct, provided that they can demonstrate that it allows them to generate new revenue to the state."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Franks: "Okay. But there's really no... the limit is \$200 thousand on this, but there's... but there's no other ramifica... there's no other real issues except showing that there's going to be some income to the state, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. To the Bill. And I appreciate what the Gentleman's trying to do and he's trying to represent his district well, but I think this is a poor piece of legislation for this reason. I think that every deal has to stand on its own. That's what every business person has to do every day when they make a decision on whether to enter into any agreement. Will this be profitable and if it's not going to be profitable, then you have to turn it down. What this Bill does is give a disincentive to public entities to get the best deal because they're going to get reimbursed for giving incentives for doing something that the individuals may or may not have done anyway. The second thing I don't like about this Bill is it puts those private venues who are paying taxes at a competitive disadvantage and subsidizing basically their competition. Understand what we're asking for is private industry to subsidize their public... their public competitors. I don't see how that benefits anyone. I think what they ought to do is make better I... better deals, not enter into deals that they'd give away the store and not make money on. I understand what the Gentleman's trying to do, but I suggest that it's ill advised. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sosnowski for two minutes."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of the Sponsor's Bill. And just in response to the Gentleman from McHenry, and also the Gentleman from DuPage on my side of the aisle who spoke to this Bill, you know, I guess I look at it in a different way. There's a couple things to look at that I think are very important. In my area, Winnebago, Boone County, Rockford, we're a border community and this creates an opportunity, especially for those convention centers that are trying to grab business from other states. And to the argument that, you know, we shouldn't be creating these incentives, I don't disagree. But as we look at structural reform in State Government and how we can do better business, in the meantime, I think it's important that we create these programs, these opportunities, so that we can bring business from other communities. I think, it's a.m. it's a good first step. I agree there are some concerns about leaving some private facilities out, but I think this is... one way to look at this is kind of a pilot program in which we can grow this, we can expand this. If it becomes successful and it works in a lot of communities, we can, you know, replicate this around the state if necessary. Again, if we reach some structural reform in government, as time goes on here, maybe these won't necessary, but in the meantime, I appreciate the colleague's willingness to work with my greater community and helping make this Bill a better Bill. And I'd ask everybody to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wallace for two minutes."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the Bill. I would like to echo the sentiments of my regional colleague, Sosnowski, as we look at how this particular Bill will benefit the Winnebago, Boone, Stephenson County areas. We are right in the Quad Cities. We're trying to attract tourism and bring those dollars into the State of Illinois. And we have a particularly unique program with public partner private partnership called the Indoor Sports Corps. And this particular Sports Corps will position itself to start to bring in income related to indoor sport tourism, which amounts to about \$15.25 million of income in our region and will put \$1.8 million into our general fund for tax revenue. For those reasons and because of the bipartisan effort of Representative Crespo, I strongly support this Bill and I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Batinick for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Batinick: "Representative Crespo, one quick question. Can you tell me the tax rate public entities pay in property taxes on their venues?"

Crespo: "Maybe you can educate us, Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "It's zero. So, we're subsidizing... we have a property tax issue. We're subsidizing public entities that pay zero in property taxes with money from private entities which pay their fair share of private taxes. To the Bill. It's bad enough when government picks winners and losers. It's even worse when we pick public entities over private ones. We need

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

private sector growth. This subsidizes the opposite. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia for two minutes."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. You look quite handsome today, Speaker." Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "Will the Sponsor yield? You weren't there earlier." Speaker Turner: "Indicates that he will."

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Crespo, is... would this go forward if someone wanted to create a convention center like in Aurora? Would this go forward?"

Crespo: "If it meets the requirements outlined in the legislation, yes, it will."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. You know, when you look at DCEO, what they're supposed to do in this state, one of them is to spark new growth and continued growth in the State of Illinois. I stand in strong support of this Gentleman's piece of legislation. Thank you."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Notwithstanding the side of the aisle on which I sit, I rise in strong support of this Bill. I think this is a probusiness Bill that both sides of the aisle can get behind. And the reason I'm saying that is that this is a Bill that sort of kick starts tourism in Illinois. By allowing these particular convention centers to give incentives, they can bring new business to Illinois and later on, if and only if they bring new business, they get only 80 percent of the incentive back. We know that even one

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

new convention will bring hundreds of thousands of new retail spending to the State of Illinois and at least \$60 thousand in new tax revenue. Ladies and Gentlemen, I strongly suggest that all of us get behind a probusiness Bill that will be great for all of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members, for the robust debate here. Again, the only way this model works is if these municipally owned convention centers can demonstrate that they're generating new revenue. Right now, as it is, we're having a very difficult time competing with other venues from out of state because they do get incentives. The threshold is pretty high. Is the model going to work? We don't know, but I would submit to you that if we do show that this model does work moving forward, there's no reason why we can't consider expanding it to the privates as well. We do municipalities that are at risk of losing funds from the state through local distributive funds or property tax freezes. Again, we've done this in the past. We currently give some of the larger convention centers in the state grants, anywhere from 5 million to 15 million dollars with no strings attached, and they actually sometimes compete with the smaller ones as

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

well. So, with that, I'll ask for... for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 508 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 76 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 508, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 33, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 33, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill does two things. First, it adds PTSD to the list of qualifying conditions for which you can purchase medical marijuana. I think you're all aware of what PTSD is. Many other states that have medical marijuana allow PTSD. The research is strong. We know how much this will support our veterans. We have many veterans coming back from the war, various wars, with PTSD and this will help them. The second thing the Bill does is straighten out an anomaly in the law. When we passed the original medical marijuana law, for some reason we had a provision in there that said that people that get medical marijuana cards lose their FOID cards. Now, you all know that I'm not a big fan of guns, but this is about fundamental fairness. These people don't want to go out and buy guns, they just don't want to lose their FOID cards. So, all this Bill says in this Section is that you don't lose your FOID

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- card if you have a medical marijuana card. It's a matter of fairness. I would ask your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 33 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 68 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', and 7 voting 'present', Senate Bill 33, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative David Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A quick point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "I would like the Members to recognize that my seatmate is celebrating his 28th wedding anniversary today and let's give him a round of... a round of applause."
- Speaker Turner: "Here, here. Congratulations, Representative.

  Representative Bryant, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Bryant: "Today, my sister's only daughter is getting married in Carrollton, Georgia. I was unable to attend today because I'm here doing what I'm supposed to be doing. So, I would ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating and offering best wishes to Mr. and Mrs. James and Kaitlyn Cooper."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Conroy, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Conroy: "I'd like the Body to help me congratulate my dear friend Laura Fine and her wonderful husband, Michael Fine, on their 22 wedding year anniversary."
- Speaker Turner: "All right. Congratulations, Representative.

  Senate Bill 1516, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read
  the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1516, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Amendment 1 embodies an agreement for the Bill.

  I would just ask that we adopt the Amendment and move it to Third."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1516. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 removes language from a previous Bill, Senate Bill 398 regarding the 100 foot issue, to address what some

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

other Members on the other side of the aisle were concerned with."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1516. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1516 for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1516, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's now constituted, this Bill deals with, at first, with the three tier system of liquor distribution in our state. There was an antiquated provision allowing for a certain exemption for the Hotel Nikko. The exemption has not been used since. This Bill does a few things. First, it removes that exemption from the law. Second, it grandfathers in anyone who has applied for that exemption before a certain date to allow a certain company to build a facility in Representative Feigenholtz's district. And of course, you just heard Representative Feigenholtz had discussed the hundred foot rule. That's all the Bill does. As far as I know, it's agreed and there are no opponents. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack for two minutes."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sandack: "Leader Lang, you addressed Leader Feigenholtz's comments. Could you elaborate a little bit? I wasn't understanding the hundred foot rule in application to your Bill means what?"

Lang: "So, yeah, I will yield to Representative Feigenholtz..."

Sandack: "That's fine. Thank you."

Lang: "...to answer that."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. Leader Sandack, to respond to your question, a few Members on the other side of the aisle... on your side of the aisle spoke with some concern that there was a conflict with what we were trying to do. The hundred foot exemption, as many Members of the House know, is an issue we... that people from our communities bring here. I was hoping to advance a probusiness opportunity for businesses who want to open their doors when the Legislature is not in Session to be able to go to their local governments. I'm going to re... I re..."

Sandack: "So… so, this empowers the local government to make decisions based on local circumstances and prevailing instances in their district."

Feigenholtz: "We are going to pull it out of the Bill, Representative Sandack, and you have my commitment. I wanted this as much as, I'm sure, many people do, but we're just going to move this along because we're running up against the clock. And you and I will work on revisiting it on... in a separate Bill."

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1516 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1516, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 455, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 455, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you can recall back some time when Representative Harris sponsored House Bill 3519, which basically has the same language, and in the 97th General Assembly, House Bill 5581, I also sponsored a similar Bill. It passed the Senate 58 to 0 and there's known opp... no know... no known opposition. The language amends the Pharmacy Practice Act to authorize pharmacists to substitute biologic products that have been approved by the U.S. Drug Enforce... Administration and is interchangeable with a referenced biologic product. This le... legislative authorization is needed to allow payers, including the Illinois Medicaid, to achieve savings through less expensive medications. I want to thank Leader Lou Lang and Representative Patti Bellock for cosponsoring the legislation. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack for two minutes."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. Leader Acevedo, for legislative intent, this legislation provides that entry into an electronic record system as described in this subsection is presumed to provide notice to the prescriber. Am I correct that this presumptive language means that the pharmacy or pharmacist does not have an obligation to determine the prescriber's accessibility to that system?"
- Acevedo: "Yes. A pharmacist or a pharmacist designee was entered the required information in the electronic records system as complied with the communication provision of the Bill."
- Sandack: "And with respect to a pharmacy that does not have one of the four electronic record systems described in the Bill, what would that pharmacy's obligation be to communicate under the Bill?"
- Acevedo: "A pharmacy that does not have one of the four electronic record systems described in the Bill must communicate with the prescriber through a telephone, electronic transmission, or other prevailing means. This obligation is found in a sentence beginning with the otherwise."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Leader. This is a good Bill. I urge everyone to vote 'yes'."

Acevedo: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm supporting this Bill and I think that everyone here will be hearing more and more in the next few years about bio similar products. They've already passed statutes like this in, I

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

think, 10 other states. And these Bills have been filed in 13 other states because this is something new in the medical field to address people with chronic conditions. And I also think it will provide a cost savings, especially to our Medicaid program down the road. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo to close."

Acevedo: "Oh, I just ask for an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 455 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 455, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 655, Representative Rita. Out of the record. Senate Bill 663, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 663, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 663 is a training Bill for coroners, deputy coroners, police, forensic pathologists, and pathologists. For a variety of reasons, it's being transferred from the local Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board. It sets up, by Governor appointment, a fivemember board; two coroners, one forensic pathologist of Cook County, and one from another county, and one citizen member

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

for a three-year term. This Bill is a good Bill with no opposition any longer and does not raise any fee. It simply will transfer out existing funding from the Death Certificate Surcharge Fund, which I enacted through legislation back in 2001. I ask for your 'yes' vote and stand ready to answer any of my colleagues' questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, how much on an average does that fund generate of the existing fee that's already there? You pointed out, this is not a new one, but it's funded by that and what does it do on the average annual basis?"

Brady: "On... on an average for the way there's a four-way split between Public Health, between the coroners. This would be roughly, depending on the number of death certificates for their 25 percent share, roughly close to \$400 thousand a year, on an average for their 25 percent."

Moffitt: "You see no problem with the revenue stream being adequate to fund this program?"

Brady: "Well, after years of being fund swept, we got the system up and going of electronic filing of death certificates. And it fluctuates between that 350 to 400 thousand dollars a year and it's based on the number of certified copies ordered at the time of a death."

Moffitt: "And this fund has been swept in the past or has not?"

Brady: "It has under different Governors and right now, though, we're hoping that it will be there in next year's budget and will be fully funded."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Moffitt: "Thank you. And thank you for all the work you did to make this possible."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Riley for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Riley: "Representative, what... what happened? Was it the Amendment that took all the opposition off the Bill?"

Brady: "Representative..."

Riley: "Or is there still opposition?"

Brady: "...the Training and Standards Board removed their opposition. I was advised of that through the Illinois Coroners and Medical Examiners Association from their lobbyist for the Training Board, a Mr. Mike Thompson. Therefore, then law enforcement removed their opposition to the Bill is my understanding. And for a variety of reasons, we would be here all day if I got into all that, but..."

Riley: "No, no. You don't have to go into the reasons."

Brady: "Yeah."

Riley: "It's just that there were so many local police departments including my own."

Brady: "Correct. And that... and you bring a very good point. But they were asked to do that from the police Training and Standards Board to slip against the Bill. And it... it's been... the Training and Standards Board has removed their opposition, which means those law enforcement agencies do not... are not against the Bill. I can't speak to every agency,

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

but I don't think most of your agencies, if you called them up, could tell you anything about this Bill."

Riley: "Thank you."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady to close."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. I simply want to thank our staff, the Democratic staff, Speaker Madigan, Leader Durkin, Representative Bob Rita, Leader Frank Mautino, those Reps who voted for this Bill twice in committee. And I ask for your 'yes' vote. And a special thank you to Mr. Brian Duffy of the Illinois Coroners and Medical Examiners Association and my fellow coroners across the State of Illinois. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 663 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Andrade, Mitchell, Reaves-Harris, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 663, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 691, Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 691, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 681... you know, my eyes are not good... 691 is similar to the House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 294 of the 99th General Assembly. And it

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

amends the Public Health Powers and Duties Law of the Civil Administration Code of Illinois. The Bill simply states that the health care facilities shall develop a policy to encourage participation of minority-owned, women-owned, veteran-owned, small business or capital projects owned undertaken by that of a health care facility. That's it."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 691 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 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 691, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 805, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. Senate Bill 838, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 838, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  Senate Bill 838 extends the sunset for both the Illinois

  Roofing Industry Licensure Act and the Illinois Athletic

  Trainers Sunset Act for 10 more years."
- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack for two minutes."
- Sandack: "Bob, thank you for that elaborative explanation. Why are... is the Roofing Industry Licensing Act combined with the Illinois Athletic Trainers Practice Act?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Rita: "Well, we had run both Bills separately in both different chambers, we got it all. So, we ended up just combining them together. And when we originally started working with the department on the Sunset Acts that were due, so we..."

Sandack: "This doesn't combine..."

Rita: "...we combined a couple of these Acts together in one Bill."

Sandack: "Oh, but for purposes of extending a sunset, not for combining them under the statute."

Rita: "No. For purpose... to just... purpose for extending them out.

It's all agreed language. Just combining a couple Bills with
the cross from the Senate and the House and the different
Bills where they were introduced."

Sandack: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "Should I just go on and on and talk about how I'd like the 'yes' vote? Be happy everybody to support these both, these industries, licensures, not extentions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 838 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 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 838, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1076, Representative Morrison. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1265, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Nekritz."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 is a gut and replace and the language that comes on is the language that's necessary to put us into compliance with Federal Election Law, so we can... for this upcoming Special Elections."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1265. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1265.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "I'll stand by the statement I made on the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack for two minutes."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Sandack: "Representative, this... basically, the Amendment you just adopted is a required language for us to get in compliance with a court order. Isn't that correct?"

Nekritz: "It is. And I think if we don't do this the Department of Justice will sue us."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sandack: "That's not a good thing, is it?"

Nekritz: "That... we'd like to avoid that."

Sandack: "Thank you. So, we're pretty much compelled to file this

Bill and get it signed into law."

Nekritz: "We... we'd love to do that."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1265 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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1265, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "...worse. Where are we? Senate Bill 1312,
Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill. Move the
Bill back to Second, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1312, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 3 is a gut and replace. Incorporates all the language of Amendment 2 and has a... it adds an additional requirement that is a trailer to

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

a Bill that was passed earlier this Session capping the fee for termination of electricity contract at \$50. Clarifies that the \$50 cap is for the termination of the electric service only and not any attendant contracts that have... for products that have nothing to do with the electricity service."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say... Mr. Franks.

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1312, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Have you already explained the Bill, Representative?"

Burke, D.: "I've explained the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "A question on the early termination fees."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. They say... you say it's capping at 50 for residential and 150 for small commercial?"

Burke, K.: "That was done in a previous Bill. This is a trailer to that previous Bill."

Franks: "And how does the trailer differ from the previous Bill?"

Burke, K.: "In that it clarified... so that it's still 50 and still 150, nothing with that changed. It just clarifies that the 50 and 150 caps are for the termination of electric service."

Franks: "Only?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Burke, K.: "Only."

Franks: "And that was the intent of the original Bill, I take it?"

Burke, K.: "Exactly."

Franks: "Okay. That's what I was just trying to find out. Thank you."

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? Bennett. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1334, Leader Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1334, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1334 is a negotiated Bill that makes changes to the Business Enterprise Program. As amended, Senate Bill 1334 has no opposition as amended, no opposition. A little bit about what the Bill does. First, the Bill broadens the definition of a 'state contract' to include contracts that are not entirely with state moneys. Second, the Bill includes community colleges districts in the BEP program. However, because community colleges are new to the program, we made some concessions and, based on a request that... out of committee and that the community colleges submitted, we... we changed some things. So, the community colleges are allowed to phase into the program and they are not required to report

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

data until 2017, fiscal year 2017. We also allow community colleges to provide an abbreviated report. We allow community colleges to aspire to a collective goal of 20 percent for insurance services, investment services, accounting, information tech, architectural, engineering, and services. Third, it raises the BEP goals for construction contracts from 10 percent to 20 percent. The Bill specifies that all goals are aspirational, which mirrors federal DBE language. It creates a specific BEP goals of 20 percent for all professional and artistic service contracts. It requires that the BEP Council to file a detailed annual report and describes the efforts made to expand the use of contractors. The Bill also allows agencies, universities, and community colleges to forego notice in the advertisement requirements of professional and artistic service contracts to the BEP Council if the entity has already issued \$40 million in such contracts to BEP contractors within a fiscal year. And it provides for a cure period of up to 10 days for prime contractors on construction projects who have been awarded the contract and have had trouble meeting BEP goals. I'm happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable vote from the Body. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Members, we're going to dispense with asking the Chair if you wish the Sponsor to yield. Just talk to the Sponsor. Mr. Sandack for two minutes."

Sandack: "I don't want to talk to the Sponsor. I'm speaking to the Bill. I want to commend the Sponsor, however, on working with the community colleges particularly. This was obviously a tough Bill to work. There was a lot of nuance, a lot of

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

people with interested perspectives. I thought he did a... he and Senator Clayborne did a great job of working this Bill. I strongly stand in support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for two minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to commend Representative Turner on the job that you've done on this Bill. It appeared as if it was going to be impossible to get through this Bill. You did an awesome job. Congratulations."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard for two minutes."

Pritchard: "Representative, have you removed all opposition in this Bill?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir. We have removed all opposition. We worked very hard on this Bill over the last couple weeks and Senator Clayborne and the Senate has worked on the Bill as well, but it's a negotiated Bill. All opposition is removed and all interested parties are either proponents or neutral on the Bill."

Pritchard: "If I heard you correctly though, you said that some of the provisions of reporting weren't going to kick in for a few years. So, there will be increased reporting required which might add to the workload, the staffing levels at our community colleges. Is that correct?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir, that's right. That phased in Section of the Bill applies specifically to community colleges because they're new to the program. They're allowed an abbreviated reporting scheme and with the Amendment that we made... with the fifth Amendment that we made, it drops the number of reports from, I believe, 72 for community colleges to about

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- 12. So, we really tried to work with the community colleges along this end and bring them into the fold."
- Pritchard: "Is there a threshold from which or below which a community college wouldn't have to report?"
- Turner: "I didn't catch the last part of your question, Representative."
- Pritchard: "Is there a threshold in the size of the project that the community college would have to report?"
- Turner: "No, Sir. If I'm understanding correctly, I don't believe
   so. We just set goals at 20 percent."
- Pritchard: "I was just thinking that one might be a way for smaller projects to avoid additional reporting, additional staff time that costs that might increase the operations of the community college."
- Turner: "We've tried to bring down the cost as much as possible that community colleges would incur from this additional reporting. I believe they're okay with what we're trying to do now."
- Pritchard: "Well, I just think we need to be cautious, even though the intent is good and you've done a good job of negotiating, that the cost of higher ed keeps rising and the red tape, the requirements the state puts on them, the unfunded mandates, are part of the reason."

Turner: "Point taken. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer for two minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "First, I want to thank you for all the work you've done on this. I know you've made it a lot more workable. But does this... this applies not only to construction projects but all to... also to services as well."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "What about community colleges in areas that don't have a minority population or minority... as many minority businesses that can provide those services?"

"You know, I'm glad you brought that point up, Turner: Representative. We're going to continue to work with community colleges and all affected parties after we move this Bill and into the near future. I've had a chance to discuss issues with minority contracting with many people on your side of the aisle, as well as on our side of the aisle on this end, and how we can increase MBE certified companies so that they're available and other areas are, you know, aware of them and we can get them included and then bring up minority numbers for those areas who have trouble finding minority contractors. It was expressed to me a lot throughout this process that... that the process for becoming certified itself has a lot of hurdles. And it's very difficult for a mem... for minority businesses to become certified as a MBE business. So, we want to work on those things going forward. I've pledged to continue to work with Members in the future around addressing that issue and bringing the number up so that there's more... more businesses that are readily available."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. 'Cause I know in the construction industry a lot of construction companies are having a hard time finding enough to get there and I think that those hoops they have to jump through just to get that status is a big issue."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Turner: "And Representative, it's not just minorities. This is women, disabilities, I mean, people with disabilities, every... everybody, yes, so."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. Correct, correct. And I know women business owners that actually dropped their certification because it was too hard to maintain."

Turner: "Sure."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I do have some concerns for the communities that don't have I... really the community college systems are supported by local businesses. And I want to make sure that we're not taking away opportunities for local businesses, but adding opportunity for local businesses to grow and get into the competition. So, I... my concern is we're bringing nonlocal businesses into these areas to provide the services because the local areas don't have the ability to provide them."

Turner: "Well, I..."

Speaker Lang: "Could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you."

Turner: "I... just to respond, I believe that there are minority contractors in these areas. They are hard to identify sometimes and that's something we want to work on going forward. Just making sure that minority bu... MBE businesses in the areas are certified or can get certified so that those who want to contract with them are aware. So, thank you, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "I look forward to working with you to find those..."

Turner: "Appreciate that."

Davidsmeyer: "...minority businesses."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to Nekritz: thank the Sponsor and congratulate him on some really good work on this Bill. And I would... as with regard to the community colleges, I just want to clarify that one of the things that the Sponsor negotiated with the community colleges was taking the number of annual reports from 72 to 12. And I think that's a really big concession on his part and was a... a really big accommodation for the community colleges. And as the Gentleman from DeKalb pointed out, you know, we do want to limit the amount of mandates that we're putting on our community colleges, but I think, again, that the Sponsor went a very long way in attempting to do that. And I would just add that I think, you know, this is a... this is a big diverse state. There are women, minorities, and disabled people in every corner of this state and we ought to be encouraging the development of entrepreneurs and offering those individuals every opportunity to participate in contracting throughout the state. And I think this is a really excellent piece of legislation. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis for two minutes."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much. To the Sponsor, just very quickly. Other Gentleman talked about areas of the state where there's a dearth of, I guess, ethnic minorities, maybe not women in that respect, but you're talking about African Americans, Latinos. So, my question would be, when we talk about construction, that may be the case, and I'm sure we're not ignorant enough not to recognize that there are places where, unfortunately, there are just no minorities and not

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

available to do work. But when it comes to professional services, that's an untapped area, but it's an area that doesn't always require physical participation. Would that be a correct statement, Representative?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir, that's correct."

Davis, W.: "So, when you're attorneys, when you're accountants, and you're financial managers, a lot of your transactional work can be done via fax or e-mail now, things of that nature. So, it doesn't necessarily require a physical presence in that community. Would that be correct?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "So, it does give us the opportunity to, if not in construction, on the professional services side, again, where we don't see a lot of minority participation, but it allows us to be able to still go after jobs and opportunities. If I'm in Chicago, it doesn't mean I can't work in southern Illinois. Again, through use of electronic technology, those opportunities exist. So, this is why we need to have this kind of legislation and we need to specifically include professional services so we're not leaving any opportunity off the table. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick for two minutes."

Batinick: "Thank you. A real quick question. Our analysis calls these goals not mandates. Is that the case?"

Turner: "Aspirational goals, Representative, yes."

Batinick: "Aspirational goals."

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "Thank you very much. What happens if you don't meet your goals?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Turner: "Well, we want to work... that's... that's a part of the... that's why the reporting part is so important. You know, we want to work to help people meet goals, but it's important just to highlight that they're just goals at this point."

Batinick: "Right."

Turner: "So, there's no mandates, anything like that put on here."

Batinick: "Thank you very much."

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente for two minutes."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the area of professional service goals..."

Turner: "Yes."

Sente: "...I want to understand what you were explaining that the Bill does. So, it says currently that there's 20 percent that... and it doesn't specify what type of business, so we've identified it several types of professional service business. Does now the Bill require 20 percent from each of those subcategories?"

Turner: "We're... we're setting goals for 20 percent in the categories of insurance services, investment services, accounting, information tech, architectural, engineering, and legal services."

Sente: "So, in each of those categories. So, in effect, the... the total percentage did increase. So, you need 20 percent in architectural and engineering services, 20 percent in... in financial services, et cetera. Each of the ones listed here in our analysis. Is that correct?"

Turner: "Yes."

Sente: "Thank you."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello for two minutes."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Turner, and I thank you for all your hard work, I know it's an agreed Bill. Can you tell me in reference to veterans why they wouldn't be listed here and if that's something that, you know, we would be able to work on later maybe as a trailer Bill."

Turner: "That's a great question, Representative. Veterans are addressed in different Sections of this, so that's why they're not included in this Bill that we're trying to do right now. But as you know, I support veterans wholeheartedly and I'd love to work with you on any legislation going forward to address veteran concerns."

Costello: "Thank you very much."

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Sente, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there's 103 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Report. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1281 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1717."

Speaker Lang: "Page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1455, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Again, I rise in support of Senate Bill 1455. It amends the School Code. Provides that the State Board of Education shall assess high school students using a college and career ready determination that shall be accepted by the state public institutions of higher education for the purpose of student application or admissions consideration. The SAT and the ACT are well understood by admissions and have proven ability to predict student success and persistence. The PARCC program, however, may well be effective in this regard, but to date there's not data to prove that. Institutions have not received information on how they may receive PARCC scores. Public universities in this great state should continue to have the opinion to utilize those measures that are proven and tested predictors of student success and persistence, not doing so can be an impediment to our students. Utilizing measures that have not been effectively analyzed with the proper data collections to substantiate its ability to predict student success in college could impact student's time to degree or their graduation rate. Other information. According to ACT, the average composite score is 20.7 in Illinois, the average English score is 20.3 in Illinois, the average math score is 20.7 in the State of Illinois, average reading score is 20.8, and the average science score is 20.5. What is important in this debate is the students and their ability to have access to those means that will enable them to undergo an effective

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

and equitable evaluation that will lead them towards attainment of a college degree. I'll be happy to answer any questions. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard for two minutes."

Pritchard: "Thank you. Representative, I know you've worked hard on this. You've had a series of Amendments and some people have tried to improve this. Have you received any word from the state board on whether they think they can implement this language in the assessments that we have in the state?"

Golar: "No, I have not, Representative."

Pritchard: "I think there are still some concerns on the state board whether we have an assessment that measures college and career readiness. But the dichotomy is we have universities that have been accepting the ACT for years. And what this Bill does is it'll allow us to continue using the practices that we have used so that it's easier for students to demonstrate that they're college ready. And if we need a trailer Bill on this, I think, Representative, you said you would work with us on trying to do that."

Golar: "Yes, I'm in the process of doing that."

Pritchard: "So, I certainly encourage the Body to support this measure."

Golar: "Thank you."

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

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, obviously, with Common Core being implemented in the PARCC test, is that why this Bill is necessary?"

Golar: "Could you repeat that, please?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sandack: "We now have Common Core curriculum and the PARCC test is a mandate. Is that why your legislation is necessary?"

Golar: "I believe... well, assessments are done and contracts are up. That's one reason why this legislation is necessary right now. In terms of PARCC, as I have stated earlier in my summary, is that we have no data as of yet..."

Sandack: "Right."

Golar: "...in regards to PARCC."

Sandack: "And so, we're going to have data eventually. And so, I guess my question is, is your legislation is... are we going to have redundant and/or... I mean, we have a lot of testing right now. And so, I guess, I want to understand how this fits in with what we're doing right now."

Golar: "Well, the testing right now is, as you say, with Common Core in Senate Bill 7. There's the Bill that brought about PARCC, Common Core, the para. We can go on and on in terms of this."

Sandack: "And so, Representative, is that because PARCC isn't..."

Golar: "So... so..."

Sandack: "...PARCC's not a..."

Golar: "Finish your question."

Sandack: "Yeah. So, PARCC's not accepted by the colleges and universities?"

Golar: "Not right now because we don't have the data."

Sandack: "And is it... is it..."

Golar: "And it is new and we had a lot of issues in regards to many schools not being prepared, Representative Sandack, in regards to PARCC."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sandack: "All right. I mean, obviously, given the circumstances surrounding some of the controversy of Common Core and PARCC, I'm just reticent to understand. I get it. We don't have standards now. We don't have experience from PARCC, but surprise, we knew that was going to happen. And what, I guess, I'm a little concerned about is this continuum of standardized testing. Whether the universities have something to use or not, I guess contracts are up. Okay."

Golar: "I think going forward, Representative, PARCC is something that the Illinois State Board of Education is looking at that they could use an assessment."

Sandack: "I would hope so."

Golar: "But right now, in the State of Illinois, all the universities are looking at ACT."

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis for two minutes."

Willis: "Thank you. To the Bill. From the committee and our discussions on it, the main idea behind this is we've... Illinois has been in the forefront in allowing high school students to take college readiness tests during their high school career. When they had the Prairie State Exams, that included a section of the ACT. So, that allowed other students that in the past might not have taken ACT or SATs to have those test results available and, perhaps, change their mind about going on to college. Currently, right now in our current environment, we have gone and adopted PARCC test and the colleges and universities are not at the point yet of whether they're going to accept that as a college readiness. As the Sponsor stated, once we get to gather this data our hope is

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

that the colleges and universities will accept PARCC as a... an entrance type exam as the ACT and SAT, and therefore, that's one of the reasons I believe that the Sponsor did not necessarily state that it has to be an ACT test that is taken by it. So, I commend the Sponsor on her wording on this Bill and I think this is a good thing because it does still keep that door open for many students on taking those college readiness tests. So, I do urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen for two minutes."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, can you explain why on our analysis it shows the Illinois State Board of Education, Advance Illinois, the Illinois Board of Higher Education are all opposed to this Amendment 3?"

Golar: "Well, this... this Bill has been in the making. There were many Amendments. The first... the Amendment that I am presenting is Amendment 3. That is a Bill... an Amendment that ISBE and those... Advance Illinois are against. So, I actually put in Amendment 4. I think, at that time, Beth Purvis, who is Secretary of Education, and the Governor was in approval of it. As I said in my comments yesterday on the Amendment, Amendment 5 is one that was written by the universities and it was accessible."

Breen: "Okay. And Representative, I'm sorry, I'm on the clock and you've... we've just taken up a minute of my time. But I see ACT as a proponent and I... are any of the community colleges proponents of this, 'cause I don't see them?"

Golar: "What's that again?"

Breen: "None of the community colleges have weighed in on this, have they?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Golar: "Well, we didn't... I don't think any of the community colleges..."

Breen: "Okay."

Golar: "...weighed in on it at all because we didn't speak of..."

Breen: "Right."

Golar: "...about the community..."

Breen: "Well, as best I can tell, it seems like we're... we are trying to enshrine or require the state to contract with ACT.

We're requiring at a continuation of the contract with ACT, as best I can tell, through this legislation."

Golar: "Well, we don't have PARCC data, Representative, right now."

Breen: "What..."

Golar: "And the only thing that the universities... as I have stated before, the universities are on board with this. The ACT is the exam that is being accepted."

Breen: "Right. But the ACT's already being accepted. We can contract it with them all we want."

Golar: "Yes."

Breen: "There's no need for this legislation, then."

Golar: "There is need because..."

Breen: "But we're already contracting with them."

Golar: "...we're requiring the state board to... they have..."

Breen: "Right."

Golar: "...to come in and promulgate rules. And so, this is what they're doing."

Breen: "Right. So, we are going to require the state to contact with ACT through this legislation? We are choosing to require them to do that."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Golar: "No, it's a test that's used for admission, Representative."

Breen: "The only two of which..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, your time has expired."

Breen: "...are the ACT or the SAT."

Speaker Lang: "Can you bring your comments..."

Golar: "Beg your pardon?"

Speaker Lang: "...to a close, Sir?"

Breen: "Yeah. Okay. Well, I believe I've got it. It... so, what the Bill does is requires the State of Illinois to contract with ACT or I guess they could contract with SAT, 'cause I think that's the other test."

Golar: "That is correct. But we're not requiring that."

Breen: "Right. So..."

Golar: "This is a test..."

Breen: "Okay."

Golar: "...that we had."

Breen: "But again, I'm trying to... let me finish. Let me just conclude my comments. I mean, the point of this Bill is to require the state, against the will of the Board of Higher Education, the State Board of Education, to contract with either Act or, I guess, possibly SAT. And I don't see the need for this Bill. If we're going to do something like this, then let's do it in comm... in collaboration with all the interested parties. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar to close."

Golar: "Yes, Members of the House. I'm asking for your support.

It is the responsibility of ISBE, as I said in my opening, to assess high school students using a college and career

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

readiness test. Right now, we are using ACT and SAT. And I would hope that the Members would weigh in on what we've discussed today and that I can receive a favorable vote on this. 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? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Fortner, Turner. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1470, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill basically looks at an Attorney General unofficial opinion that discussed municipalities that take advantage of a budget officer. This Bill basically codifies a current practice for those municipalities under 10 thousand individuals. This is a great, you know, opportunity for us to, you know, support cost savings at the local level. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "How do we save money with this Bill?"

Sosnowski: "Well, again, for municipalities under 10 thousand and I, you know, I have an instance of one municipality in my district that's operated this way for 20 years. The mayor has the opportunity to act as the budget officer. And so, for

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

those municipalities where that's not a full-time job, you know, that practice is fairly common. Again, this doesn't affect a lot of municipalities around the state, but there are quite a few that do operate in this manner. There was a Senate Amendment, I just want to point out, that was added to that to take care of the concern of receiving pay for both. That would not be allowed. You know, it... basically, it'd be them acting in their capacity as mayor, for instance, and still being, you know, the budget officer."

Franks: "So, there wouldn't be a second salary or a second amount of, you know, a pension cost or anything like that?"

Sosnowski: "No. It's explicitly prohibited in this legislation."

Franks: "Okay. So this is more for the smaller communities. Is this for Cherry Valley?"

Sosnowski: "That's one of the communities in my district, yep."

Franks: "Okay. Is there anyone who's opposed to it?"

Sosnowski: "I don't know of any opposition to this. Municipal League was in favor of it and was supportive. And again, there are several municipalities around the state under 10 thousand that operate this way and have for a long period of time."

Franks: "And I presume they can get around this anyway by just calling it something other than a budget officer, if they needed to?"

Sosnowski: "I don't know, explicitly, but I would assume that probably that could be the case."

Franks: "All right. I understand what you're trying to do. Thank you."

Sosnowski: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays for two minutes."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Hays: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for bringing this Bill. As someone who was a mayor of a smaller community, this is exactly how it works. And this really helps to clarify that that's acceptable. And I appreciate the legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "He does."

Riley: "Joe, you don't see any potential conflicts of interest regarding these sort of dual positions whether they're really enumerated or just... this is something that this person... a responsibility the person will just assume?"

Sosnowski: "Yes. And they're not mandated by any manner. You know, this... in these types of communities it's a very small part of workload, you know, very small amount of time. You know, if they didn't do this, they may have to contract out and have additional expenses. There's still a whole process of the budget approval going through council. There's also the position of Treasurer within municipalities, you know, that would be a safeguard in that realm. So, I don't... I don't foresee any concerns or issues, you know, coming out of this. And I think it's worked very well for those small municipalities over time."

Riley: "Does this address compensation for this particular duty?"

Sosnowski: "It does address that, but Senate Bill... or a Senate

Amendment that was made in the other chamber says that for
those communities that decide to allow this or they do allow
the mayor or another officer to serve in that role, they
cannot receive compensation for doing those extra duties."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Riley: "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? Gordon-Booth, Verschoore. Please take the record. There are 75 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1506, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1564, Representative Gabel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1590, Mr. Tryon handling for Mr. Phillips. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1590, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative of Illinois EPA. The Bill would require the Illinois EPA to evaluate a person's prior environmental management experience when it comes to the application for tire storage and tire recycling. Would require them to evaluate if they have a history of violating environmental laws or have shown gross incompetence or carelessness in the handling, storing, processing, or transporting, or disposing of used waste tires from previous facilities. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer them, otherwise, I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

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? Crespo, Gordon-Booth. Crespo. Please take the record. 113

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

'yes', 0 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1595, Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Music Therapists. This would create the Music Therapy Advisory Board. And the board would advise the department, the Governor, and the General Assembly on matters that impact the affective work of music therapists. And there'll be no compensation to this board. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "Why is the IDFPR opposed?"

McAuliffe: "They were opposed initially because they wanted... and then I took their Amendment. And their Amendment gave them more control. There'd be a minimal impact to the department, but there'd be no compensation."

Franks: "Are they still opposed?"

McAuliffe: "They're still opposed."

Franks: "When you say it'll be a minimum cost, I presume you're paying for the transportation costs and per diem?"

McAuliffe: "No, no. No compensation. It would just be cost to their staff."

Franks: "Now, what would the staff have... what would the costs be to their staff? Would they have to have one staffer on this continuously or what's the deal?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

McAuliffe: "Yes. It would just be an advisory board, so they would just probably would meet at... at the Thompson Center. So, they would have to attend a meeting and take notes."

Franks: "How many meetings a year do you anticipate?"

McAuliffe: "I would say maybe four to six a year."

Franks: "Okay. Is there a sunset on this... on this advisory panel or is it in perpetuity?"

McAuliffe: "I think after one year of the effective date they would give a report back to the... to the Governor, the General Assembly and then we would see if there'd be a need to have them be licensed."

Franks: "Okay. So, it's just for one year to do a study?"

McAuliffe: "Right."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you for answering that."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

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? Kifowit. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 'yes', 0 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Mitchell is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "Today, I would like to introduce Jack Dunscomb, who's from Forsyth. And he's going to be a freshman next year at St. Teresa High School in Decatur. And his folks are in the gallery. So, give them a big Illinois House welcome."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us today. Senate Bill 1645, Representative Wallace. Representative Wallace. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1657, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1657, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on the Senate Amendment 2 and 4. And Amendment 4 is some cleanup language that makes multiple technical changes to the federal transportation requirements. And re… respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Ammons, Breen, Franks, Gordon-Booth, Moeller, Sims. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1672, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1672, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to start off by thanking Leader Mautino for all of his work on this and making... really making this Bill happen. This legislation establishes a state-specific air permit program for large industrial projects in areas of the state that are currently

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

in compliance with air quality... federal air quality standards. It's essentially everywhere in the state, except Chicago and the collar counties in the Metro East area. Fortyone other states have a state process for these kinds of permits and this brings Illinois in line with those programs. This legislation sets standards for public involvement while the air quality permit is being considered by the Illinois EPA. It establishes who has the right to appeal the issuance of a permit if there are errors made by the EPA in issuing the permit. And finally, it provides specific guidelines for the issuance of a stay of the project during an appeal of the project. This Bill represents a negotiation between the Illinois Environmental Council, the Attorney General, the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, and the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino for two minutes."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise in support of the legislation, Senate Bill 1672. I'm also joined with Senator Rezin and Senator Koehler who were integral in the negotiations for this legislation which will allow for a streamlined permitting process. Business was at the table. Labor was at the table. I want to especially thank Representative Nekritz for her skills in negotiation. I want to thank the Sierra Club, Jack Darin, Jen Walling, the Attorney General's Office for the hours of negotiations they put in along with the Chamber of Commerce. I think this will go a long way to improving the timeliness and the structure of getting permits and new projects for economic development going in Illinois."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "Parliamentary inquiry. Has House Floor Amendment #2 been adopted?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted."

Franks: "Okay. But we tabled House Floor Amendment #1, correct?"

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Amendment #1 was tabled."

Franks: "Okay. Then a question, Elaine, I'm looking at House Amendment #2. Can you explain the standing issue? 'Cause that was part of House Amendment #1. Was that included in House Amendment #2?"

- Nekritz: "Yes. There was... there... we set forward some standing requirements in the... in this legislation for who can actually appeal the permit. And it has to be, essentially, it has to be an agreed party, someone who's affected by the issuance of the permit."
- Franks: "Now, I'm reading here in our analysis, and I have not seen the language though, but it said any person who participated in a public comment process. Do you necessarily have to have actually been part of a public comment process to be... to have standing?"
- Nekritz: "You do, but there's... but there's one other way that you can have standing is... and that's if some conditions arose after the issuance of the permit that materially affected it. So, essentially, the permit changed dramatically and then you could come forward as well."
- Franks: "'Cause I wouldn't want to preclude someone who couldn't be at a meeting and couldn't make a statement or maybe didn't know about a meeting. And I'm concerned..."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Nekritz: "You don't have to attend a meeting. You simply have to have submitted a co... a written comment."

Franks: "And what happens if you didn't do that? If you didn't know about the meeting or know how to comment? 'Cause I'd just hate to have someone excluded who might not know the process."

Nekritz: "So, this is all sort of... we just codified Federal Law in this regard. So, I mean, and there's... I be... I'm assuming there's notices that go out. And I'm... we were not, you know, the Attorney General and the environmentalists were not concerned about that particular portion of the standing thing because that's current law."

Franks: "Okay."

Nekritz: "And... and I don't think that there's been any issues about that that people have felt that they've been shut out of the process because of that particular requirement."

Franks: "All right. Thank you. That was my only concern."

Nekritz: "Okay. Thank you."

Franks: "Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. This legislation won't diminish any of our air quality regulations. Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "No. The project will still have to meet the standards set forth by the EPA."

Wheeler, K.: "Excellent. But this will definitely make it a more expedient process to get the permitting process complete, correct?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Nekritz: "That's... that's the hope. We'll see."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I want to say thank you to you and everyone who worked on this Bill. This is one of those opportunities where we're going to make Illinois a more competitive place to do business without diminishing any of the regulations that protect our quality of life here. I want to thank the Sponsor again an urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon for two minutes."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in the support of this Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Tryon: "Representative Nekritz, first of all, I would like to thank you for your efforts in working this. I know this wasn't an easy thing to negotiate, but this is a Bill that should come out of this chamber unanimously. We have a situation where a company may want to locate into Illinois or move to a different location in Illinois. These permits can take years to... to grant. It's a little difficult if you're working with somebody that you tell them, oh, we'd love to have you, but it's going to take a long time to get your permit. We can't tell you exactly when it is, but you know, we have that situation going on. So, this... this speeds that up. And... and I think having the ability to integrate and keep the appeals process that's already in place with the Federal Government for standing, I think was a good compromise for you to do. You did a good job and I'd like to thank you for that. So, I hope... I hope this gets 118 votes. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

voted who wish? Davis, Verschoore. Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Welch is recognized."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Welch: "I am honored today to introduce the House of Representatives to the first lady I ever fell in love with. Up in the gallery behind me, please welcome to Springfield all the way from St. Louis, even though she's a Cardinals fan and her son's a Cubs fan, please welcome my beautiful mom and my cousin, Pearlean Edmond, to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thanks for being with us today. Senate Bill 1679, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1679, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1678 simply is a...
79. It's a task force. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack for two minutes."

Sandack: "You're kidding right, Kenny? What's your Bill do?"

Dunkin: "The Bill... the Bill is pretty straightforward. It's a task force. It's simply... it creates a virtual... looks at a virtual education review committee. And so, this would... it was moved from the Senate with intention to amend the Bill a little later on. So, the committee shall consist of the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

following members appointed by the State Superintendent. One representative of the State Board of Education shall serve as a Chair, a parent, two educators representing the statewide professors... professional teachers association, an educator representing professional... yeah, I need glasses now, I'm seeing... a school district person, board member, one special education administrator, one representative of the school district, one school principal, one representative of an educational advocacy group that works with parents, one representative of an education public policy organization, an institution of higher education, a representative of a virtual school in Illinois. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. That's what the task force would consist of."

Sandack: "That was dynamite, Ken, dynamite. That's what usually you do on the front end. So, thank you for that elaborative explanation. Good reading. Get your glasses ready for later, okay."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor... excuse me. Representative Flowers for two minutes."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunkin, we're talking about a virtual school for what grade, please?"

Dunkin: "It's a committee to review and look at all of those areas."

Flowers: "So, a virtual school means what?"

Dunkin: "So, it can be off the line. It could be a choice. So, it's... it's really sort of a... a study course option for students. Just sort of look at... it's a task force that's going to look at these various levels of..."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Flowers: "I... but I thought we already..."

Dunkin: "...virtual schools."

Flowers: "I thought we have... we've done this already. And a lot of schools... it didn't turn out very well for the student. A lot of students didn't have the Internet they didn't have access. And then, sometimes it was off and on. So, why are we pursuing this? Because there's a difference in education when it comes down to being on the actual Internet being... versus being in the classroom. So, why is this necessary? Are we trying to cut costs with education and consider ourselves saving money?"

Dunkin: "Representative, answering the question, you absolutely correct. This is simply a task force to look at further options to see what is the best course of action and because it's not perfect right now where it is. So, as ... you know, you have... for example, if you live in the rural part of let's say, in Macoupin County, our state, just for arbitration, you know, sort of, and there is a high school requirement for coding and that class or course is not being offered in your respective school. The task force will look at if this'll be a part of that entire makeup. It'll assess what particular courses, you know, if that... how that course can possibly be administered online. And then it also looks at the various disparity levels of some of these courses or classes that we simply do not offer all across the State of Illinois."

Flowers: "You know..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, can you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Flowers: "I will. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, with all due respect, I remember a Bill that we had a couple years ago whereas that we wanted to eliminate education to four days a week in order to save money. And so, the problems that I have with your Resolution, again, is because we have done this already in the City of Chicago and it was a total failure for our children. And the only thing I'm asking you to do is to really take into consideration if this is really in the best interest for our children as well as our state. Because there's something about going to school and socializing and we already have the choice if we want to as far as homeschooling and school online. So, that's the reason why I'm kind of confused by this Resolution. So, I will be supporting Senate Bill 1679 as well as watching you and it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cavaletto: "I see here, Representative, that there has to be certain approval granted... certain approval granted for the policies and activities. Who are those people who are going to approve those policies and activities?"

Dunkin: "This isn't approving anything. This is merely creating a task force to make... to explore various options and to make a recommendation. It'll come back to us in the General Assembly and we can possibly make a decision or not. It's merely a task force."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Cavaletto: "Okay. So, I say there's a task force that's going to be the approval group. Is that true? There's... to make recommendations?"

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. Right now, in many of our communities where young people are not being able to go through their schools and get their education, recently for the State of Illinois and DCFS and young people that, for some reason or another, have some criminal history, this virtual learning is possibly one of the best education programs right now to help them get through and allow themselves to. And the numbers are phenomenal in terms of students that actually miss school because of medical reasons, but most of all, in our communities, many of our poor communities where there's some dysfunction, there's a lot of issues, many of the schools are not doing what they should do in regards to our children and the virtual learning has proven to be, right now in 2015, going forward will be a success model for our children. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "As I announced before, that... don't ask... you don't

have to ask the Chair that question. Just go right ahead."

Guzzardi: "Wonderful. Just a brief question for you,
Representative Dunkin. This is just a task force, right?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Guzzardi: "Do you think that we could convince this task force to study legalizing weed, while we're at it?"

Dunkin: "I don't know."

Guzzardi: "Okay. I just think... you know, just a task force is an argument that I love, as you well know. So..."

Dunkin: "Absolutely."

Guzzardi: "...I was hoping you might expand the notion of that task force."

Dunkin: "...And listen... and I would love to be on it. I think that's the next question for us to address."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer for two minutes."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my distinguished colleague from Chicago, I wanted to pass along a question, and maybe this applies more in districts like mine than districts like hers, but she… she's interested in… does… in areas of the state that don't have adequate access to Internet or consistent access to high-speed Internet, will this task force keep those things… those factors in mind?"

Dunkin: "It's not just a... I mean... first of all, that's an excellent question. It's not just alive. This is about looking at course access, as well as a virtual component. Far too often, a lot of our school districts are just isolated and they don't offer a very similar curriculum all the time across the state. And we simply want this task force to look, explore, review ways in which to help close those gaps at course access that we can really sort of create a level... a level playing field or parity for a lot of our kids across the State of Illinois."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley for two minutes."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunkin, did someone bring this Bill to you or how did this... what was the genesis of this Bill?"

Dunkin: "A very good question. There..."

Riley: "I know."

Dunkin: "That's true. You ask good questions all the time. Someone did... I don't recall exactly right now, off the top of my head."

Riley: "Okay."

Dunkin: "This came from Representative Lightford in the Senate."

Riley: "All right. One of the proponents... or the... the proponent that's listed on my analysis is Ed Choice Illinois. Do you know anything about that organization?"

Dunkin: "I'm not that familiar. I know ISBE is familiar with this... with this type of concept. And so, we agreed... they requested that we create a task force then legislation to move forward."

Riley: "ISBE asked that a task force be created?"

Dunkin: "If I recall, yes."

Riley: "Okay."

Dunkin: "Rather than the initial group that requested to have this."

Riley: "See, because one of the things that I would think, you know, we talk about, you know, school choice to me is a euphemism, there's always been choice, in my mind. I want to be sure and, you know, I don't know what's going to happen with regards to your Bill, but I want to be sure that we try

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

to improve every educational modality, every one of them. That's the important thing. We always lead off with, well, traditional schools don't have this and don't have that. Maybe they don't. Maybe they don't because we're not funding them adequately."

Dunkin: "Exactly."

Riley: "So, I just want to be sure that that's done and, you know,

I just had those basic questions about your Bill. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1741, Leader Currie. Out of the record. 1745, Representative Chapa LaVia. Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1745, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "You look marvelous today, Speaker. But can we take this out of the record?"

Speaker Lang: "Certainly."

Chapa LaVia: "Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be removed from the record. 1747, Mr. Sims. Out of the record. 1751, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. 1805, Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. You look marvelous."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Does that mean you're going to take your Bill out of the record too?"

Mautino: "Absolutely not."

Speaker Lang: "Okay."

Mautino: "And actually, this is an agreed Bill. It's an initiative of the Guaranty Fund and the Department of Insurance. And it places some protections and requires a surety bond or letter for some of the smaller companies with less than 200 million in assets. I know of no opposition. This is a good protection Bill and also helps to protect the Guaranty Fund. And I also wanted to thank my cosponsors. As I look up there, I notice that it looks like another offering from the Italian Caucus. Last year, as you remember, we had a Dead Animal Disposal Act. And so, in... in the true history of the caucus, I'd like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Rita, our emerging insurance expert."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita, who is emerging."

Rita: "Thank you, Leader Mautino. I know you believe that I'm the expert for the Italian Caucus in the insurance industry, but I am not. So, I'd like to yield my time to Representative DeLuca."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca, a much greater expert."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, that's correct. I'm not an expert. I do chair the Italian Caucus, but I'm not an

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

expert on this piece of legislation. So, I'll yield the remainder of my time to Representative D'Amico."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico, who clearly knows more than you do about this issue."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Chairman DeLuca, but I am definitely not an expert on legal insurance. So, I will yield my time to Representative Cavaletto."

Speaker Lang: "Clearly an expert on the legal. Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Well, I'm not too much of a person on insurance either, so I'll have to yield to Representative Guzzardi."

Speaker Lang: "Very helpful. Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Cavaletto. So, my analysis says that this is the Cannoli Licensing Bill. Is that correct, Mr. Mautino? Oh, I'm sorry. I've got the wrong Bill. I'm not an expert on this one either. I'm going to yield to the Gentleman whose pending application is under review, Mr. Sandack, he's an expert on this issue. So, I'm happy to lend the balance of my time to him."

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

Sandack: "Forget about it. I call the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "There being no one needing to speak, 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? Please take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1885, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1885, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I look marvelous today."

Speaker Lang: "We'll put that to a vote later, Sir."

Hoffman: "Thank you. No, let's not put that to a vote. Senate Bill 1885 does two things as it came over from the Senate. It is an initiative of Representative Manar where there was... where there was a problem in that there were cars overtaking... overtaking school buses in Bunker Hill, but there was a technical problem in that the judge said that it wasn't on a highway. So, this just says even if the road is on school property that you can still get a ticket. Secondly, it's a local initiative that indicates that if you are a farmer and you have a revoked license, currently you can farm and drive a tractor if you are going right next door to farm. This would let you go like across the road and not just to adjoining properties only... only when you're doing farming."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "Have you defined what farm operations are in this Bill?"

Hoffman: "It's currently defined under the current law."

Franks: "No?"

Hoffman: "No. I indicated it's already under current law."

Franks: "Oh, it is. Okay. 'Cause I wasn't sure because we like to drive our tractors and so it says anywhere as long as the person's conducting farm operations. Now, does it have to be contiguous land or what happens if someone has land at one end of town and then is renting land, you know, four miles away and has to be on the highway? Is that okay for the person to drive his..."

Hoffman: "Only when he's doing the farming."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Franks: "Okay. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had the farm operations defined. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis for two minutes."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Franks, this is the second time you've stood up with... as being an expert on farming. Representative Franks, I know farming. I am a farmer. You're no farmer."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay for two minutes."
- Kay: "So, Representative, just for the point of clarification. Would the farmer driving the tractor be a traveling employee?" Hoffman: "We may be addressing that issue later."
- 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? Gordon-Booth, Sullivan. Please take the record. There are 113 'yes', 0 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1899, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1899, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 1899 would codify the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard into Illinois State Law concerning low speed vehicles. I know of no opposition. This passed the Senate unanimously and passed committee on leave. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Zalewski. Zalewski. Please take the record. 113 'yes', 0 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1921, Representative Sente. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1921, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

- Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill provides that any license, certification, registration, or permit issued by an Executive Branch state agency has an online presence by January 1, 2017. There are numerous professional license applications that are not yet available online. These would create online access via PDF. Just helping community business members, workers to access an application in an easier method."
- 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? Winger. Please take record. There are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 224, Representative Sente. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 224, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sente, has been approved for consideration."

  Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we adopt House Floor Amendment 1 to the Bill."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 224, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Am I explaining the entire... or just the Amendment?"

Speaker Lang: "You're now on Third Reading, Representative."

Sente: "Okay. Thank you. So, this... this is a rather complicated Bill, but a very important Bill. So, when people say it's not simple... or it's simple, this is not. But the impetus for this Bill is that there was a court case in Lake County where a neighborhood wanted to be detached from a school district. And they went to the local regional board of trustees and the trustees denied the case. So, it went to court, up two levels, and the court ruling was that if your property value increases that is a valid reason to detach from your school district. So, that was... should be very disconcerting to all of us. So, what we did with this Bill is we created five criteria for detachment as well as a solution for the bond indebtedness. And I'll take that piece first. So, regarding the bond indebtedness, if the neighborhood that detaches would take with them their proportionate share of the existing school district's debt and they would be responsible for it, it would carry over on their tax bill. It was not be an SSA, a special

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

service scenario, it would just appear on their taxes and it would not be spread out to the remaining members or taxpayers in the new school district. It would just follow the neighborhood. In terms of the criteria for detachment, we would have five. One would say you cannot compare the scorecard of the two school districts unless the populations are similar. Two relates with a community of interest. So, if your kids go to a certain... out of the school district and they participate in a park district, et cetera, and you want to move to that school district because your kids play in a different area, the board cannot consider that unless there is a significant direct educational benefit to the student. Third is a 10-mile difference criteria. So, if the difference between the two school districts is not greater than 10 miles, that is something that cannot be considered. Property value, as I mentioned earlier, is not a valid criteria for detachment that your property value would go up. And the final point regards to a three percent shift in population. So, here we're protecting diversity within our schools and school districts and a detachment may not be considered if it'll increase the percentage of either the minority, low-income, or English learners by more than three percent of the existing school where the neighborhood is leaving. However, if the detachment under these circumstances may be considered if any one of those groups decreases at the school where they are leaving. Happy to take questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield for two minutes."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Mayfield: "Carol... Representative Sente, can you give more clarification on the minority and non-English speaking students? Because the way I'm reading this, this Bill would prohibit them from moving out of their district into a better district. So, can you provide clarification?"

Sente: "It does not, Representative Mayfield. What we want to do is we want to make sure that our schools do have diversity. We want to make sure that we are not creating segregation that we've worked so hard to eliminate. And so, what we're saying is if the population at the existing school would go down or be altered by more than three percent, that a group could... a group could not leave if it would change that mix of diversity. So, it's actually protecting, I believe, what you're... would be worried about."

Mayfield: "Okay. 'Cause I'm not sure if you've read the analysis on here. It says the regional board may not grant a petition if doing so will increase the percentage of minority, low-income, or non-English speaking students at the school or district from which the petitioning territory will be detached. So, I guess... or decrease it from the one that they're leaving. So, I guess that is my concern because if they're going to a new school, obviously, they're going to increase the number of minority and non-English speaking students at that particular district. So... did you read the analysis that we have there?"

Sente: "I read the analysis. I read the full text. I... I am aware of what it says."

Mayfield: "Okay. 'Cause there seems to be some confusion here." Sente: "It is not..."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Mayfield: "And I guess I am concerned because it... we have in one of my schools in my district was actually looking... the entire district, due to funding, was looking to move into one of your districts. And I know that school specifically stated they did not want low-income, minority, non-English speaking students in their school. And they were very adamant about that. So, I want to make sure that this Bill is not being set up to disallow those minority students an opportunity for a better education."
- Sente: "That is... that is not what it's lawing. It is referring to the area... the school district they're detaching from not the one they're going into."

Mayfield: "Okay. Thank you."

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. DeLuca. Please take the record. On this question, 103 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. In fact, I have two Motions. And the first is that we suspend the posting requirements so that House Joint Resolution 83 can be heard in the House Executive Committee. My understanding is there is no opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Can you have the Leader repeat the Motions, please? I didn't hear them."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Speaker Lang: "Representative, could you repeat your Motion? Mr. Sandack did not hear it."
- Currie: "Suspend the posting requirement so that House Joint Resolution 83, having to do with O'Hare noise, could be heard in the House Executive Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the posting requirement is waived. Your second Motion, Leader?"
- Currie: "I would move to suspend the posting requirements so that House Resolution 560 can be heard in the Revenue & Finance Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack..."

Sandack: "Yeah."

Speaker Lang: "...on the Motion."

- Sandack: "Yeah. I object to the Leader's Motion and ask for a Roll Call vote on that Motion, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion to waive posting will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mautino. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. The Lady's Motion prevails. And the posting requirement is waived. Senate Bill 1466, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1466, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1466, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1466 merely changes the title of the form that's used by the Illinois Public... Department of Public Health from the do-not-resuscitate advanced directive to the practitioner order for life-sustaining treatment form. The reason for this change is it has caused confusion in the past for patients and doctors. There will still be an opportunity for a patient to select a do-not-resuscitate order on the form; however, the form itself will take that title off of the... off the form to provide greater clarity. Be happy to answer any questions. There is no opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers for two minutes."

Flowers: "Thank you. I'm sorry, Representative. Will there be a choice or will it now be just the... the practitioner order for life-sustaining treatment?"

Moeller: "There will still be a choice. Patients can still choose to either have a DNR, a do-not-resuscitate order, or a resuscitate order..."

Flowers: "Thank..."

Moeller: "...on the form."

Flowers: "...thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The leader of the Farm Caucus, Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "Thank you. The Bill now has been shelled and then this is the new version, correct?"

Moeller: "Yes."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Franks: "Okay. Now, how does it add more clarity to take away the title 'do-not-resuscitate' when you change it to 'practitioner order for life-sustaining treatment'?"

Moeller: "The form, as it's written right now, the first line says do-not-resuscitate advanced directive, which in... in actuality is not the... is not just a do-not-resuscitate directive because there is an option to be resuscitated on that form. And there have been instances where a patient has completed the form, checked the box that they would like to be resuscitated if they're in a situation where they would need that, but a physician assumed that it was a DNR."

Franks: "Wow."

Moeller: "And because of ... because of that title."

Franks: "Thank you."

Moeller: "And so, this would..."

Franks: "Clarify it."

Moeller: "...eliminate that confusion."

Franks: "Well, thank you. That... thanks for explaining that. Then it makes sense. I'm sorry we have to pass laws to do that. You think they'd be able to..."

Moeller: "Yeah. You would think."

Franks: "...do that on their own, don't you think?"

Moeller: "You would think."

Franks: "You'd think. All right. Thank you."

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? Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- declared passed. On page 11, Senate Bill 563, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 563, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Phelps."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #1 and debate this on Third, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps, can... are you going to handle this?"
- Phelps: "Yes, I will. This is something that came to us yesterday.

  It's just trying to take care of people that have disabilities that are state workers. And I ask for its adoption, debate on Third Reading, please."
- 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. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 563, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Phelps: "Thank you very much. This is a combination of two Bills, just so the Members know. The first one, actually what happened was, there was an involuntary discharge at a veteran's home of one of our veterans and there was no appeals process. So, all I'm doing on this one is putting an appeals process in for our veterans at all the veteran's home 'cause I represent Anna with Representative Bryant. The other one is something that the department wanted for cleanup. And then there was a board called the Interagency Committee on Employees with Disabilities. I'm expanding that to include Constitutional Officers to the committee. That's it."
- 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? Anthony, Crespo. Take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 836, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 836, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "I'd... I'd like to do the same thing. Adopt Floor Amendment 1 and debate this on Third, please?"
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Phelps and has been approved for consideration."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 836, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the cleanup from two years ago for the concealed carry Bill. And before I get into this debate, I just want you to know that all four caucuses have worked on this. It may not be where all the caucus Members want to vote for this, but this was the stuff that we agreed to two years ago that got left out. There were many Members on both sides of the aisle that filed Bills to put this back in. And I... I hate to use Members in debate, but I'm going to thank them; Representative Cavaletto, Representative Anthony, Representative Sullivan, Representative Representative Costello. This is a combination of all those Bills into one."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Yesterday, I voted against this Bill in committee, primarily out of concern that it was being presented as something that was agreed to by all four caucuses. And that was not an accurate assertion on my part for me. And with your indulgence, I just want to talk a

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

little bit about how I came to be where I am today. When we went home before Memorial Day, I went directly to my son's baseball game and the other two kids wanted to run around and I didn't want to let them because... and they wanted to know why, and I didn't want to tell them why. The reason I didn't want to let them out of my sight was because there'd been so many shootings that week in my... in our neighborhood. What we've been doing isn't working. I got home from that baseball game to learn of a 17-year-old that had been murdered and a 4-year-old who was in an induced coma with a bullet lodged in her brain in another shooting nearby. We've been talking past each other for too long. We're not talking with each other; we're talking past each other. We're not doing something different. Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. It's not the lobbyist's job to find middle ground. It's our job as colleagues to find the middle ground. Today I'm going to vote 'yes' on this Bill and issue a challenge to each and every one of you in this forum to meet me in the middle. Meet me in that place where we respect those who are worthy of respect, we punish those who deserve punishment, and protect those who need our protection. This Bill contains nothing from that perspective. This contains nothing from a gun control perspective, but it also contains nothing deeply offensive to me as someone who believes in gun control. What you're asking for is reasonable. I believe we have reasonable asks and they're not included here and I object to that, but I don't blame you guys. I blame a lot of people and I blame our entire process. Meet me in the middle, please. Protect my community.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

I don't want your guns. I don't want your guns, I don't want your guns. But I don't want them showing up in my neighborhood anymore. I don't want to be afraid to send my children out to play and I don't want to hear about anymore 4-year-old babies with bullets in their brains. Help me."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I want to thank all of the folks that worked on this and they worked very hard to come up with a good piece of legislation that does address a lot of the issues that we have been talking about ever since concealed carry was passed in this state. I will make one comment that Chairman Sims took very good care of a couple of my Bills and nurtured them all through this Session. And it's my understanding that at one point one of them even made it to this Bill. And it was a good piece of legislation. It was for my constituents. Really would have helped to clarify another issue. However, it appears that the other chamber did not see fit for that piece of legislation to come into this chamber and into that Bill. And for that I am deeply regrettable, but regardless of that, I will congratulate my colleagues in this chamber, Representative Representative Sullivan, Representative Anthony, and Representative Cavaletto for your hard work on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And let me... I'm not trying to give a history lesson here, but remember this. We were the only state that did not have concealed carry. The Seventh Circuit of this state said Illinois has to

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

pass something and we worked with everybody we could. And I'm still willing to work with the previous speakers. I... I love you, Kelly and I'm willing to do that. We had to do something. This is cleanup, and again, let me say, I could never do this without some of our colleagues especially Representative Costello, Representative Sullivan. Eddie, you're the best. I appreciate it. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto, your name was mentioned in debate.

  Do you have a comment, Sir?"
- Cavaletto: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend Representative Phelps for the work that you've put on this. And I... I think it's the betterment for concealed carry in the State of Illinois and the people who have guns. They're going to be here forever. It's something that... that's been here for a long, long time. And I don't think that the sportsmen and people would relinquish their guns and I hope they're used for good reasons and I... sometimes it's bad and I'm sorry for that. But also, I think, that for the work you did on this Bill, Representative, I want to thank you."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Davis, Flowers, Golar, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1281, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate... Senate Bill 1717, Mr. Brown. Please read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1717, a Bill for an Act concerning the Prairie Wind Trail. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Brown, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #3 which will make affect as Senate Bill 1717 once all lawsuits are dismissed."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1717, a Bill for an Act concerning the Prairie Wind Trail. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1717 will relinquish land back to property owners throughout Coles and Douglas County. Previously, DNR attempted to create a recreational trail called the Prairie Wind Trail. However, that project was abandoned in 2002. I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "The land that they're purporting to give back to landowners, do they actually have to purchase that land?"

Brown: "They did. However, since 2002, because not enough land was gathered to create a contiguous trail, a lawsuit was filed by a number of property owners going after DNR for not

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

creating such a trail. The costs to the state have been over a quarter million dollars in legal fees alone."

Franks: "How much would they spend for the land that they had purchased that this legislation would give back?"

Brown: "Just over \$200 thousand."

Franks: "So, they..."

Brown: "So, they've actually spent more on legal fees than they did purchasing the land."

Franks: "Have they ever entertained the idea of just getting the money back from the people who they had purchased the land from and just said you can buy it back for what we gave it to you for?"

Brown: "I don't believe that's been proposed by the DNR. I know that the ongoing legislation... the ongoing lawsuits have been a big issue for DNR. Everybody's just happy to wash their hands of this issue and all parties are agreed at this point."

Franks: "Well, it just concerns me that we would waste taxpayer dollars like this. We spent money to buy land, and I understand they might not have been able to formul... get where they wanted to go, but to give land back that we purchased to the same... from the same folks seems to be a little shortsighted. Why wouldn't we just say give us back the money whatever we paid you and be done? Why would we give them the land back after paying for it?"

Brown: "I would argue that there was very poor foresight in the creation of this trail. This project began over 20 years ago. It was never finished. Less..."

Franks: "I agree with you. I agree. I just don't understand why we would pay for something, 'cause it must have had value,

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

and then give it back. That's my only issue here. And you wonder why we're in the state we're in now. I know it's not your fault. I know this happened a long time ago. It just concerns me that this is the kind of resolution that we have and you wonder why people laugh at us. You know, we spent almost a half a million dollars on a failed project and then give the land back that we purchased from the same people. It's almost... if it wasn't so sad, it'd be funny."

Brown: "At this point, we've spent more on legal fees than we did acquiring the land. And I think that's an embarrassment."

Franks: "I agree. I agree. It's poor planning and not well-thought-out. And it doesn't... it does not reflect well on that state agency. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto for two minutes."

Soto: "Mr. Speaker. I meant to vote... to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 3... I mean, 836. Can you change..."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention."

Soto: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Mr. Brown's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Brady, Harris, Sente. Take the record. There are 96 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1281, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know of no opposition to this Amendment. This Amendment is a gut and replace and is similar to a Bill that passed out of here 115 to 0, which would require that community water supplies as well as eligible bridges and IDOT and the IEPA put together a corrosion prevention project. There were some concerns of IEPA and IDOT and some people in the industry. Those were fixed and now I know of no known opposition. Once again, House Bill 3323 nearly mirrors this Amendment and that passed 115 to 0."

Speaker Lang: "Those that want to speak, can we just adopt the Amendment and then come back? 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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman, you already explained the Bill, correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

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

Sandack: "Jay, there's a... the companion piece, HB3323. What is the intent with respect to that that's already come out of the House and the Senate, for that ma..."

Hoffman: "It's just going to remain in the Senate."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sandack: "I'm sor..."

Hoffman: "It's going to remain in the Senate."

Sandack: "Okay. And help me out. Who's the Sponsor in the Senate?"

Hoffman: "Of 3323, I'm not sure. I'm sorry."

Sandack: "Yeah. Because is it on the Order of Concurrence here?"

Hoffman: "It may be."

Sandack: "All right. So..."

Hoffman: "Yeah. Okay. Here's a... I can't pull it up, but here's my understanding."

Sandack: "Assume that it is, Jay."

Hoffman: "Yeah. I think what happened was they sent it back here and it was... it didn't have some of the language that was agreed upon with IDOT and the IEPA and the others in the industry. So, rather than concur... or nonconcur and send it back, we took this as a vehicle and then we're going to send it back over."

Sandack: "And then... and then is this going to die?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Sandack: "You're just going to nonconcur on the House Bill?"

Hoffman: "Probably just sit on the Calendar and not be used."

Sandack: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

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? Fine. Please take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bryant in recognized."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was my intention, on Senate Bill 1717, to vote 'yes'."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. On page 9 of the Calendar appears a Bill... Senate Bill 1506, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley, 1506. Please... out of the record. How about 1562, Mr. Bradley? Do you wish to move that? Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1562, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."
- Bradley: "This came out of the Senament... or the Senate. I don't believe there was objection. It's some cleanup language with regards to oil and gas leases in the State of Illinois. It's particularly important given the possibility of increased petroleum activity within the state."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman takes the Bill from the record."
- Bradley: "Speaker, your peer pressure, I'd like to take this out of the record."
- Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir. Whatever you say, Sir. Senate Bill 1645, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1645, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a Bill for survivors. For survivors of domestic violence or intermit partner violence. This Bill will allow for individuals to have their utility deposits deferred for a number of 60 days so that they can establish themselves free of their predator. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Reis, Tryon. Mr. Tryon. Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1256, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1256, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1256 simply allows several grocery stores, several hotels to acquire a liquor license that are roughly within a hundred feet of a... of a school or a church. And I would ask for a favorable passage."

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

Sandack: "Thank you. Ken, in light of some previous legislation, why is this Bill necessary?"

Dunkin: "This Bill apparently was running simultaneously as the other legislation. Right now, we have two hotels online. We have several grocery stores, a restaurant, and a theater. We're simply trying to make sure that we don't become... government doesn't get in the way of the progress. Every... every..."

Sandack: "Well, but it's... it's which government should be regulating is really the goal, whether it's something we should be doing from Springfield or if we should be giving local authorities the right to maintain local control. So, I'm not sure who's who in the zoo here."

Dunkin: "Act... and I agree with you wholeheartedly. The challenge here is we have a State Law, Representative Sandack, that

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

states that if you're within so many feet, a hundred feet to be exact, of a school, a church..."

Sandack: "All right."

Dunkin: "...or day care that this... they have to come before us. So, that's... that's simply where we are. Hopefully, the legislation that was passed a few minutes ago can take precedent. But I don't want us to be a part of the problem."

Sandack: "And for purposes of what's before us right now, why...
obviously, why is coming within the hundred foot marker a
good thing?"

Dunkin: "Well, you know, in Chicago, given the density of people, the communities change often, more so than were you... some of your suburban or your rural areas. And so, when you have a... when you put a grocery store in, for example, in the Cabrini Green where I grew up. The projects are no longer there, but there happens to be a public school there that is... that's a magnet school and people come from all over. So, different dynamics like that. Also..."

Sandack: "And this isn't a liquor store. This is a grocery store, a really good grocery store..."

Dunkin: "Correct. Oh, yes."

Sandack: "...that happens to sell liquor."

Dunkin: "Absolutely. Sells, yes, but it's, you know..."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "...it's Mariano's. It's a great store."

Sandack: "It is."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

yourselves. Anthony, Davis, Pritchard, Stewart, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 777, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 777, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz on the Amendment."

Nekritz: "It's not my Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "I thought you were handling it."

Nekritz: "I can, if you'd like."

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor of the Amendment will be here shortly.

Leader Currie on the Amendment."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like us to adopt the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third Reading."

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. But a fiscal note, pension note, and states mandates note have been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves that the notes be held inapplicable. Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Chair... Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw those notes."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws the fiscal notes. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes are requested. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 777, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Who's handling this, please? Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Currie: measure that is intended to help smooth out pension payments for Chicago Police and Firefighters so that they will be on the same kind of schedule as are our downstate police and fire funds. What this measure does is not spend a penny of state money, but it helps the city by relieving them of some immediate obligations and extending the arc over a five-year period. The city would still be on the hook for many millions of dollars to fund both the police and the fire funds this year and for the next five years. And we do have the same kind of funding arc that applies in the downstate pensions. This is not a Bill about state money. It's not a Bill that raises any questions of constitutionality. The Bill we adopted a few years ago that set them on this particular funding course is one that makes it very difficult for the city to meet its obligations for other activities beyond those of the pension funds themselves. So, this changes the arc. It gives the city greater flexibility, will keep the city from having to spend all of its resources on pension funding, but at the same time will maintain funding for both of these funds

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

that today are underfunded but they will not be over time. And in addition, there are a couple of other changes in the Bill. For example, the funds would be able to go to court with a mandamus action should the city not meet its obligations. As well, we're bringing... making more modern the minimum benefit that would be available and pegging it in the future to the federal poverty level. So, if... and then finally, should it turn out that there is a Chicago casino, at some point down the road, then proceeds from whatever that brings in would be spent to add funding to both the Chicago Police and the Chicago Firefighter systems. I'd be happy to answer your questions. As I say, this is not a bailout, it's not a holiday. It is only to smooth payments to the police and fire funds in Chicago so that the city can also meet its other responsibilities."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison for two minutes."

Morrison: "I would ask, Mr. Speaker, could we... do we have to have this on Short Debate?"

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be off of Short Debate. Proceed, Sir, but let's try to all keep... We'll take the Bill off of Short Debate, but let's try to keep our comments as brief as possible. Please proceed."

Morrison: "Okay. Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Morrison: "Leader Currie, your use of the term 'smoothing' is an interesting choice of words. Because really what this does is this is underfunding the systems for the next five years."

Currie: "It does not meet the statutory requirement that we, I think, inappropriately imposed on the city with legislation

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

of a few years ago. That is true, but what it enables the city to do is smooth out the pension funding, putting the city police and fire pension on the same arc that applies to the downstate police and fire pension systems."

Morrison: "But I would ask, if the downstate pension systems are in trouble, why would we want to mimic what they're doing?"

Currie: "The point is, we know, everybody knows that the Chicago Pension Systems are underfunded. We agree. The question is, what do we do about it? And what this proposes to do is to say let's not take a holiday. We're not going to let them out of their obligations, but we will, for a five-year period, reduce the requirement that was inappropriately adopted by us in a Bill before this General Assembly a few years ago. So, we'll give them a little breathing room. And I think it's important that you know that failure to do this, I would say, means a certain tax increase for the people who live within the City of Chicago. And I didn't think you were a fan of imposing tax increases here in Springfield that's going to hit the local people in their property taxes or their sales taxes or whatever other kinds of taxes might be at stake."

Morrison: "Well, I would agree with you. I'm not in favor of tax increases as a... in general, but what I would say is that as we... as this Body has talked about pension reform for many, many years, we've known about problems in multiple funds over many, many years, we could all agree that we need to pay. If benefits are handed out, then those benefits need to be paid for, otherwise, they shouldn't have been handed out in the first place. And so, my question is, the city has known about

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

this... this problem for many, many years, why are they coming now? Why... why didn't they address this multiple years ago?"

- Currie: "Well, in fact, I think we did this to them five years ago and I'm surprised it took them this long to come back to us. But I think the reality is that the pension payments have been increasing over time, and although the economy has certainly done a good job of recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression, city proceeds are not so flush as to make it easy for them to meet the current responsibility. I'm glad they arrived today."
- Morrison: "I would... I would add though, you're right, the taxpayers in Chicago have been paying more. It has not been keeping up. Because those benefits, those that were promised, were unaffordable and isn't there a proposal in this Bill that would increase benefits even more?"
- Currie: "I believe I said that there would be an increase, a slight increase, in the minimum annuity that would then be pegged to 125 percent of the federal poverty level. I don't think that's going to be a costly provision. As I understand it, of the thousands of firefighters that Chicago has today, only about 300 people would be affected by this proposal and most of them are widows whose husbands had served many, many years as people... as firefighters for the city."
- Morrison: "And... and I understand that, but it's still... we're still increasing benefits. And you could use the word 'small', but when these..."

Currie: "I did and I will."

Morrison: "Right. Well, when these... when these funds are as badly funded as they are, I don't think we should be adding any

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

benefits at all. The ... those participants in those funds should be happy that they're getting the benefits that they have now rather than... than asking for more. We'll address more of that later. I... getting back to, again, the... the wording you used about 'smoothing'. Just about every report, analysis that has been done about this, the city's pension systems, have indicated that underfunding is a problem. Underfunding, underfunding, underfunding. And so, this is not a new concept, and yet we continue to go down this road. I just don't understand why you think that this would be a good idea. It'd be better to tell those participants in the systems and the taxpayers, let them know what the real obligations are, what they're being committed to rather than pushing this off even more. I have a question about mortality rates. We all know that... that individuals are living longer. What's ... what is the average life expectancy for a retired Chicago police officer or a firefighter?"

Currie: "Yeah. I don't have that information."

Morrison: "Do you think it's important to know that and discuss that?"

Currie: "Well, the actuaries do know that, Representative, and the proposal in this Bill is one that has been tested, has been evaluated by the actuaries and the new funding plan meets their requirements."

Morrison: "I'm... I'm glad you mentioned the actuaries know this.

Have they shared those findings, you know?"

Currie: "I... I have not myself seen them, but as you know, the actuaries update their plans on an annual basis."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Morrison: "Don't... don't you think it'd be important for this Body to see that report though before we vote on this?"
- Currie: "Yeah. The people whose pension systems these are, whether they're the employees or the employer, they have all of that data and I don't think we need to duplicate the work and the effort they've already invested in that issue."
- Morrison: "But you're asking us to vote on it, so I think we should know what we're committing to."
- Currie: "I'm telling you, the actuaries say this is a... a responsible, sensible way to go."
- Morrison: "All right. If by changing..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison, could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"
- Morrison: "I'm just going to ask for time from someone else, so...

  I have more that I want to get in the record, Mr. Speaker, if that's okay."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, just try to be as expeditious as you can, Sir."
- Morrison: "All right. Thank you. By making this change, Leader Currie, is this... is this to avoid an action by the Comptroller to withhold funds to the City of Chicago?"
- Currie: "No, it is not."
- Morrison: "'Cause my understanding is... is previous law..."
- Currie: "Yeah. In this Bill, the Comptroller would have the authority to do just that, but the Comptroller does not today have the authority to intercept."
- Morrison: "All right. I'll... I'll bring my remarks to a close for now. I may need more time later. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill and to... for the Body. I want to read from a portion of a news

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

release from Taxpayers United of America. This is a quote from Jim Tobin, who I suppose wrote this. 'We're paying cops and firefighters for more years of retirement than years of actual employment. This makes solvency of the pension system a mathematical impossibility'. The average retirement age, according to this, is 57. There... and then, again, quoting from this release. 'There are thousands of retired Chicago cops getting more in pension payments than currently employed police. The governments of Chicago and Illinois have failed us. Rank and file members would rally behind pension reform if their union bosses were honest with them about the bleak future of their pensions'. Again, quoting it. 'It's in everyone's best interest to solve the pension problem before the system completely collapses'. I don't think delaying payments, you could call it 'smoothing', but you're underfunding these systems. What you're going to do by pushing pay... or you know, the... the funding level of 90 percent out to 2055. All you're doing is just back-loading. Back-loading, back-loading, back-loading, 40 years from now. I'm 40 years old. Imagine what we are doing to future taxpayers in the City of Chicago. And here's something, you know, again, I have other things I want to get in the record, but I just came across this news report. 'Cause this should be a concern if you are a Representative from Chicago, if you have a family, your taxpayers, consider this, here's a report that says that there are now more Chicagoans who are renting homes than owning. According to this, 52 percent of Chicagoans are renting. That means it's easier for them now than ever to move, to move. So, I think the fact that this Bill is Senate

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Bill 777, Chicago is the home to Boeing, the Boeing Corporation, which has... is famous for its jetliners, the 777. Basically, we're winging it. We're winging it. And that's wrong for the taxpayers in the city, that's wrong for current retirees in the police and pension systems, it's wrong for current employees who are protecting us, protecting the residents, protecting the businesses in the city. It's just wrong all around. I'll conclude with this, Mr. Speaker. You know, in Proverbs 13:22 it says this; A good man leaves an inheritance to his children's children. Let that sink in for a second. A good man leaves an inheritance to his children's children. The inheritance that we're leaving to our children's children is an enormous amount of debt. And that's wrong, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request that Don Moffitt be excused for the rest of today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are still 12 speakers on this Bill. The Chair certainly will allow all of you to speak, but I would exercise restraint. Mr. Morrison did a fine job outlining the opposition. Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I appreciate the Lady's efforts, there's a couple of thing... well, there's many things wrong with this Bill and, as the previous speaker said, it's actually a step backwards. Lest there be any confusion, the ramp... the change in the ramp is essentially a cost to the taxpayers. The extension of the payment period to 90 percent funded by 2055 instead of 2040 is a cost to the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

taxpayers. But most importantly, with the creation of a new minimum retirement annuity provision, that's not only a cost to the taxpayers, it's a benefit improvement. So, when we're trying to reduce the expenses associated with pensions, trying to help taxpayers, we're actually making a benefit improvement. That's absolutely... it's ridiculous. But there's also a little hidden thing in the analysis. How are we going to pay for these pension improvements? And how are we going to pay for these terrible unfunded pension obligations? A Chicago casino. Yeah. That... that concept rears its ugly head prematurely to be sure. That concept is certainly legitimate discussion points, but talk about putting the cart before the horse. Folks, this is not a panacea. It's actually a step backwards. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Of course. Okay. Rep... Leader Currie, did you vote for the original legislation that allowed them to and knew that in five years later that they were going to have to start these accelerated payments? Did you vote for that?"

Currie: "I don't know."

Ives: "You don't know?"

Currie: "I don't have a copy of my..."

Ives: "Well, I'm told it's... I'm told it's the Bill that dealed
 with Tier II. That put in the Tier II system. Did you vote
 for that Bill?"

Currie: "I really don't have a copy of my vote record from five years ago with me today."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Ives: "Well, we'll try and get that Roll Call so we can refresh your memory. Do you know when you were here in the mid-1990s, did you vote for the pension ramp that the State of Illinois undertook for 50 years? Did you vote for that?"
- Currie: "You know, I might well have, but I'm not quite sure what relevance either of those votes has to today's discussion and today's Bill."
- Ives: "It has every bit of relevance because how well... can you
  tell me how well has the pension ramp worked out for the State
  of Illinois?"
- Currie: "Well, remember, we had a severe recession, stock markets were crashing and pension fund balances took a dive."
- Ives: "So, thank you for taking..."
- Currie: "No one expected that in 1994. That was not in the economic cards. So, the situation changes over time and our job, I would say, is when it turns out there was a mistake, whether because of what we did or because of external facts, we should try to fix it. And that's what Senate Bill 777 is all about."
- Ives: "And that's exactly what it doesn't do."
- Currie: "Let's fix a problem that is facing the people of Chicago.

  Let us help them sort out their issues, pay for their pensions, but not to the tune of a 600 million tax increase year after year after year."
- Ives: "I have got to tell you, you planned for this, you voted for this, and this is your problem that you helped create. And that is absolutely the truth. So, the other question I have for you is, is there a casino already... is there a Bill somewhere that allows for a Chicago casino?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Currie: "Yeah. I don't have any Bills of that ilk myself and I have no idea whether there will be a casino for Chicago. The casino language in this Bill doesn't mean anything is contingent upon whether there is or isn't a casino. All it says is should there be one, the proceeds will help fund the police and fire systems."
- Ives: "Well, you know, then how appropriate that this is SB777, 'cause you're... you... you are hoping for a string of lucky sevens and a casino that's never... that's a fantasy idea right now to make this work. I mean, it could have... it couldn't have been more perfect for you to pick this Bill number for this Bill."
- Currie: "They will have to make the payment whether or not they have the revenues from a casino, so that's just sort of like frosting on the cake."
- Ives: "Here's exactly what you told me in your previous response though. That you... you don't know the future. And you are essentially gambling on the future to pay for this pension thing rather than doing the hard work now to pay for it now. Now, another question I have for you. Has Chicago..."
- Currie: "We're...we're going to pay for it."
- Ives: "...has Chicago raised property taxes in the last five years knowing that this was coming due? Has Chicago... the City of Chicago..."
- Currie: "Chicago has not. They have raised significant other revenues, but they have not so far touched the property tax..."

Ives: "That's right."

Currie: "...but they will."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Ives: "That's right. And they knew all along that this was coming due in five years and they never planned for it, did they?"

Currie: "Of course they planned for it, but their revenues are not adequate..."

Ives: "They planned for you all to..."

Currie: "...to pay the extra 600 million."

Ives: "...still be in power so that you can actually kick the can down the road further. That's what they planned for. Nobody's being res... can I ask you one more question? I want to know whether or not there's also coming to this Body, either now or in the short future, a Bill that also allows CPS to take a partial holiday on their pension plan?"

Currie: "I haven't seen a Bill like that."

Ives: "It's a very conceivable possibility. We've seen pensions skip plans for CPS..."

Currie: "I have not seen..."

Ives: "...in the last year."

Currie: "I've not seen such a Bill and remember, our deadline's tomorrow."

Ives: "To the Bill. This is nothing other than the City of Chicago not wanting to take responsibility for its obligations and knowing full well and in full advance notice that they needed to do so. They are... they are counting on a casino that hasn't... we haven't even seen a Bill yet, that hasn't been built that it will take long years to implement and see revenue sources from. They are gambling the futures of these police and firefighter's pensions. They are gambling it away thinking that they can just kick the can down the road. We have already seen this before. The pension ramp didn't work. The

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

underfunding is a huge problem of the... of the unfunded liability that we have right now. And you guys want to continue the party so you can pay for things like street lamps and flowers, rather than paying for your obligations where... when the time comes due. You planned for this. You voted for this ramp. And you need to pay for it now."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to congratulate the previous speaker on finally stumbling upon a decent pun in what was otherwise characteristically breathless an inaccurate testimony. So, let's actually step back for a moment... let's step back for a moment and talk about what this Bill actually does, 'cause there's been a lot said here. So, the City of Chicago actually doubles contribution. I want to say that again for those who weren't listening and we're too busy taking in deep panic breaths. The City of Chicago will be doubling its contribution, number 1. Number 2, this Bill does not increase the unfunded liability. It, in fact, keeps it level and in the case of fire, actually decreases the unfunded liability. That is a good thing for those who are counting at home. Now, for a couple other aspects of the Bill. The slight increase to make sure that the widows of wives and husbands and children of our heroes that goes into this Bill is something we ought to be willing to pay for. That's something we ought to be willing to pay for because it just makes sense, unless, of course, the Gentleman from Palatine himself is going to be scrambling into burning buildings any time soon, they ought to have that kind of assurance. And finally, let's just be very clear, the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

alternative to this is a \$600 million payment next year. Now, I don't know if maybe in gratitude for the fact that their suburbs exist entirely because of the City of Chicago, the gentle Lady from Wheaton wants to send a check for \$600 million to the City of Chicago. If you're interested, Representative, I can get you the wire transfer information for that shortly when we're done. Now, what I would say is, if you're not supporting a massive tax increase, if you're supporting local control and the ability of a city to get out of an issue that was imposed upon it by the state, you should be in favor of this Bill. It's a good Bill. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr... To the... to the Bill. I would just also remind everyone that we were given a Supreme Court opinion now about a month ago and the court gave us very limited things that we can do to restructure our pension obligations. Reamortizing debt and agreeing with these workers on benefit changes is the only way we're going to be able to deal with this structural problem, certainly short of revenue, which I know a lot of us have challenges with. So, yes, this is the... this is not something that many of us would consider ideal, but given the ramifications and given the... the handcuffs we have been placed on us by the... by the Supreme Court, this is the most prudent approach to dealing with these issues and this is the platform for the future, at least as far as some of us see it. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Ford: "Thank you. Leader Currie, I just have a few questions about the Bill. Do you think the pension problem in the City of Chicago prevents the city from hiring more police? You may know the answer. I don't know, but..."
- Currie: "I don't have numbers, but there's no question the more resources we are required to put into unfunded liabilities, the less we're able to spend on schools, on more police on the streets, on adequate numbers of other emergency personnel."
- Ford: "Representative Currie, would you consider voting 'yes' for this Bill a vote of support for the Chicago Police Department?"
- Currie: "I think what this Bill is about is support for the taxpayers of Chicago and it is correcting an error that we made because we didn't know that a recession was coming. It was going to destroy our own pension systems. You know, in the... in the height of the recession, our pension funds lost 20 percent of their value because of the recession itself."
- Ford: "So, would this vote... a vote in favor of this Bill, would it support the City of Chicago?"
- Currie: "It will support the City of Chicago and I would say, it would support the police and the firefighters as well. They both support this Bill."
- Ford: "Okay. Yesterday... to the Bill. Thank you, Leader Currie. Yesterday, we passed a Bill to support the City of Chicago and to support the Chicago Police and I voted 'yes'. I want the record to reflect that I support the Chicago Police and the City of Chicago. And I urge the City of Chicago to support my communities and communities with quality, professional law

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

enforcement. So, once again, for the record, I support the Chicago Police, I support the City of Chicago, and I urge them to support my community that I represent. So, today, also, I filed Resolution... House Resolution 569, which calls for an audit of the Chicago response time in minority communities. I urge an 'aye' vote for House Bill... Senate Bill 777. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, do you know the long-term cost of this deferral?"

Currie: "There... there's always some additional cost because of higher interest payments. But I think that on balance this strikes a reasonable... a reasonable middle ground."

Hays: "Has... has there been a..."

Currie: "And the five years... the five-year ramp, there will be level payments. It will not be declining or increasing and then, as I say, we go to a 45-year ramp, which is what is the downstate fire and police program today."

Hays: "Has there been an actuarial analysis done?"

Currie: "Yes."

Hays: "And do you... so, but you can't ar... articulate what the long-term..."

Currie: "Somebody..."

Hays: "...costs will be to this?"

Currie: "The city may know, but I..."

Hays: "How's that possible?"

Currie: "...I don't have access to that information."

Hays: "Well, I..."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Currie: "I can tell you what the short-term costs will be if we do not adopt the provisions of Senate Bill 777 and that will be a \$600 million tax bill, new tax bill, for the citizens of Chicago."
- Hays: "I mean, you..."
- Currie: "If you want to make sure they move out of Chicago, that's one way to go."
- Hays: "I mean, you are a long-term learned, respected Member of this Body. You've been asked to carry this Bill and you're telling me you've been denied the access to the long-term actuarial analysis?"
- Currie: "They're... they're the local authority here. They're the employer. They have that information and I... I didn't ask for it. But I'm sure if you inquire they'll be happy to share it with you."
- Hays: "Well, there... I... is there a positive connotation that can possibly be taken away from the fact that they won't share the long-term actuarial analysis with you?"
- Currie: "They did not... I didn't believe I needed it, but if you do, please ask the city. I'm sure they'll share it with you."
- Hays: "I think everybody in this Body has to have it to make an
  informed decision, do they not?"
- Currie: "Yeah. Yeah. And clearly, the actuaries tell us we're not jeopardizing stability. The fund will remain on its way to health. It is not there today, but on its way to health. So, I don't think you need to know more than that, but if you would like the specific actuarial study, city people are here in the building. I'm sure you have but to ask and they will give you whatever information you'd like."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Hays: "I think it's a fair and reasonable request when we're debating a matter of this nature to know what the long-term actual... actuarial study suggests. I mean, it's absolutely germane to the conversation. To the Bill. The rhetorical question was asked by the Sponsor earlier, what are we going do about it? What are we going to do about the underfunding? And I would suggest that it's undeniable that the residential property owners in the City of Chicago pay a rate that is far less than anybody else in our state, perhaps anywhere else on planet Earth. In McHenry County, a \$235 thousand home, when you plug in the multiplier, the assessed valuation for purposes of taxing is about \$78 thousand and change. In Champaign County, it's in the same neighborhood. In the City of Chicago, that assessed valuation would be \$23,500. I think it is incumbent upon the local government to answer that question before we come to the State Legislature. What are we going to do about it? Well, one of the things you're going to have to do about it is look the citizenry right in the eyes and ask the question that other communities ask for better or for worse repeatedly. Make the case and ask for the additional revenue through property taxes. Chicago Public Schools came with a similar ask a couple of years ago in this chamber and said incredibly, in light of the pension situation here in the State of Illinois, can we take a two-year holiday? A holiday and not pay into our pensions at all. An absurd ask that, to the credit of this Body, they batted back across the net and said get real. Let me describe to you how a referendum usually works. Some brave souls will get together and they will go out and they will

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

ask for the increase and they will undoubtedly get their teeth kicked in because there's not a soul alive that has their hand in the air to pay prop... higher property taxes. And then, you'll have to do it again and it'll probably fail the second time. And on the third or fourth ask, it will probably pass. Ask anybody in Cook County, outside the city and the suburbs, a downstate community, for their own municipality or for their schools how difficult this is. It's very difficult. But when you don't do it for decades, decades, you end up in this situation. It is entirely appropriate to ask the local units of government to ask their own citizens to help themselves before you have the audacity to bring this kind of a scheme to the floor of the House of Representatives. For the same reason we knocked back an absurdly bad idea for a pension holiday for CPS two years ago, you got to knock this back which is essentially a holiday for five years in this case. The answer to the question, what are we going to do about it? You're going to go back home, you're going to look the good, honest citizens in the eye, and you're going to tell them the truth and ask them for the money."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's been suggested today that we should vote in favor of this Bill in order to avoid a massive tax increase. Let me suggest another way to avoid a massive tax increase. Don't vote for a budget that spends \$4 billion more than we're going to take in next year. Vote 'no' on unbalanced budgets and vote 'no' on kicking the can down the road."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "We still have eight people wishing to speak. Please restrain yourselves, Members. Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm sitting here oh so confused and befuddled, yet again, on how it is that we can sit here and even entertain the idea of the City of Chicago to go bankrupt, potentially. I'm sitting here scratching my head that we're talking about protecting widowers of firefighters and police officers. I'm sitting here scratching my head trying to figure out how is it that fire and police pensions are not of value to us. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the City of Chicago is clearly the key, our biggest economic driver here in the State of Illinois economy. But not for Chicago, the State of Illinois would have a real serious economic problem. The Chicagoland area alone accounts for over \$590 billion in its annual regional GDP... GRP. Eighty percent of our Illinois economy comes from the region of Chicago. Two point seven million residents create 21 percent of the state's population. Over three and a half... \$3.2 billion in individual income taxes that generate 1.5 billion in state sales taxes alone. So, can you imagine the City of Chicago having to make a bloated payment knowing well, fully well, that we would have to eliminate thousands and thousands of jobs, stop millions in dollars... millions of dollars of city services that we deliver to the state lion's share population. The other factor is the City of Chicago's city finances have really been improved. This Bill is pretty straightforward. It simply puts the City of Chicago at parity with other downstate places, cities, and counties from 25 to 40 years. That's all it does. It's a straightforward Bill. And it also, by the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

way, you know, this enhancement that Members over here talked about, now imagine yourself a widow and you make \$12 thousand in pension payments. You are well over... well below a hundred percent of the poverty level. You're going to go from 12 thousand to 14 thousand dollars. Wow, these widows of the fire and police, they're wealthy women I see. They're... they're Medicaid eligible already, so that's the problem that we have with this Bill? I'm telling you now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we cannot afford the City of Chicago to collapse financially. You would feel it in your district downstate, in central Illinois, western Illinois, northern Illinois. This is not doing anything buy saying I want to go from 25 to 40. It's a refinance. That's a fair and legitimate business decision. And the City of Chicago has made strong business decisions over the last four years. Over the last four years, the city has eliminated the use of nonrecurrent revenue such as significant cuts and achieving certain efficiencies. created a structural gap that still remains, not even accounting for pending pension payments, but that will occur in terms of cutting core services and high revenue. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need the City of Chicago to be strong financially. We need an extension of our pension payments. Nothing is perfect here in the state, but what's clear is that we need to make sure that we insulate our fire and our police in protecting their pension. Many of you are fire or police officers. Can you imagine... can you imagine our pension system collapsing in the City of Chicago? It's going to directly impact all of our districts. Let's not get philosophical on this particular issue. It's insane to sit

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

and allow our city in our state to run into financial calamity. It just doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense for, again, an impoverished Medicaid eligible widow or widower who... to go from 12 to 14 thousand dollars to not receive their cost of living adjustment. That's all this Bill does. So, I'm going to strongly encourage our Members here to help us modify our loan restructuring payment. It's not about derelicting or not doing what we're supposed to do. Let's be responsible stewards at... of the state level. Let's do what we're supposed to do and when we can for all the citizens of Chicago and the State of Illinois. There... all of us in my district are just as important to you and yours because we impact them from top to bottom in this state as it relates to doing the right thing for our city. We do the right thing for the State of Illinois. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There's been a lot of interesting things tossed over the aisle on this. Let's start with one very important piece. There's no state money involved in this. There's no... no state dollars paying for anything in this Bill. The folks over there who are talking about how bad this Bill is, they want our systems to fail. They want Chicagoans to be hit with a tax increase. They want the worst case scenario. To one of the earlier speakers who suggested we're not taking responsibility, the city absolutely has taken responsibility. They've been working on this for quite a while. They've been working with the people impacted by it. They came to an agreement with the people impacted by it. This is agreed to by the police and fire

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

because everyone took responsibility, everybody got on board. Let's remember, the taxpayers that we as Chicago Representatives, are here representing, are already paying into the pension funds for the teachers of the suburban and downstate teachers' funds. We pay twice. Two, two, two mints in one. Enough. This is a good Bill. It's a good solution. It is the responsible thing to do. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

"Thank you. To the Bill. I really disagree with the last Durkin: statements made by the Representative from Chicago. This caucus does not want the City of Chicago to fail, as evidenced in the last year. It was Republicans on this side who helped the City of Chicago out in two major pension Bills about a year ago. So, don't go down that road and suggest that this is all about destroying the City of Chicago. The fact is, I saw this Bill for the first time, it was brought to my attention within the last 48 hours. So, you know, let's not say that this is something that has been in the works for a long time. general There has been some discussion... discussions about it, but the fact is, I'm offended by anybody that suggests that this side of the aisle wants to see the City of Chicago fail. This Bill, right now, state that the payment will be due in January. We have time to work on this. We'll have plenty of time over the summer I think, quys, so ... but we are willing to negotiate. I've made it very clear in our Leaders meeting and also publicly that we are open to all major issues that is before the Legislature to continue discussions on, but to suggest for some reason that this

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

caucus wants to see the City of Chicago fail, is absolute rubbish."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the Feigenholtz: Minority Leader, Leader Durkin, for reminding the Body how the mayor of the City of Chicago, when he came down here to help us pass what was probably the most difficult Bill that we as a Body passed to try and fix the pension problem. A similar Bill to this was also on the board and it failed. And it failed because all of us had hope that we would prevail, that the courts would opine that we had to modify our pension laws, but that's... that's exactly why we're here right now because we really don't have any other choices. As you know, Moody's just did a downgrade, it puts the City of Chicago in great jeopardy... in great economic jeopardy. And one of the things that this Bill is going to help us do is predictability in the marketplace. This is what we need. So, this is a Bill that supports our first responders. And if you vote 'no' on this, you're basically voting against them and you're voting against widows who are living at 125 percent of the federal poverty level. That means they're on Medicaid. Okay? So... so, were we in a different space and we could do something else, which we all work toward, I would say let's do it, but we're not. And as the previous speaker said, this is not going to cost the State of Illinois a dime. I encourage an 'aye' vote. And I want to remind everybody that this is what the City of Chicago needs to remain vital. Eighty percent of the state's economy comes from the City of Chicago. We do not want to raise property taxes. We know you don't want to raise property

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

taxes. This is the Bill on the board we have to vote for. Please support it."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Kay: "Leader, I have some questions that are really purely business in nature. So, all I need is a number. What does the holiday that you propose cost?"

Currie: "There is no holiday, Representative, so it costs nothing."

Kay: "Well, is it a partial holiday?"

Currie: "No. It is just a means of stabilizing the system and changing the arc to match that of downstate police and fire. It's basically a kind of restructuring and I know you as a businessman are quite familiar with restructuring opportunities..."

Kay: "Well, I sure am."

Currie: "...and I'm sure you take advantage of them whenever they appear before you."

Kay: "Well, let me just say this. Since I am familiar, I know that you're… you're denying that there's a holiday, but it's going to cost somebody. And I'm assuming since it's Chicago, it's going to cost the people of Chicago 700 to 800 million dollars, again. Now, let me back up a minute. Since you didn't know that, let's go back and talk about previous holidays. How many previous pension holidays has Chicago gone through?"

Currie: "This is not a holiday. And I don't..."

Kay: "I know. I'm past that. I'm past that."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Currie: "I don't know whether Chicago has ever taken a pension holiday."

Kay: "Really?"

Currie: "Really."

Kay: "Okay. Then let me ask you this question. Between 2040 and 2055 what is, from your actuarial number, what is the cost of what you're trying to do today? Just one number."

Currie: "That... that's what the actuaries would tell us is the appropriate payments during that period of time, but there's no specific cost attached to it. This is just to make sure we are stable and actuarially sound."

Kay: "Well, what do we... what do we owe now under the current plan and what would we owe under the new plan?"

Currie: "What will happen is that the payments will be structured differently. It doesn't mean a totally different cost."

Kay: "Well, that's just what I'm asking you. What... what was the...
what under the structure today..."

Currie: "There... yeah."

Kay: "...what's the payment... what would it be tomorrow?"

Currie: "There isn't... there isn't a specific cost associated with it, Sir."

Kay: "Surely... surely, Leader, you are... you are a smart woman. You didn't come here today... you did not come to this chamber today without a number provided to you by somebody. What's the number?"

Currie: "What I know is that it is actuarially sound and that this measure will bring stability to the city and to the pension payments and to both the police and the fire retirement funds."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Kay: "I've heard all that. I'm just... I'm looking for a number."
Currie: "And that's the important information."

Kay: "I want a number. I want to know what it's going to cost.
That's not unreasonable. After all, we've spent an entire
week here, Leader..."

Currie: "Yeah. As I said..."

Kay: "...talking about things that are unreal."

Currie: "As I said to one of your colleagues, city people are in and around the building..."

Kay: "Well, why don't you send..."

Currie: "...and I'm sure if you ask for that information..."

Kav: "No."

Currie: "...they will provide it."

Kay: "No, I'm asking you because you have the Bill. Why don't you send somebody upstairs and get that actuarial information and I'll sit down and you can come back to me?"

Currie: "Everybody has looked at that information and the information I just gave you is accurate and I would say complete."

Kay: "You didn't give any information. But I'm going to... I'm going to move on. Isn't it in... in your Bill, indeed, is there not an increase for benefit plans?"

Currie: "There is a very small increase for the widows and widowers of police and fire. Today, the minimum annuity puts families below the federal poverty line, below the federal poverty line. Now, I don't think anybody in this chamber would think it appropriate to say that after someone's served as a firefighter or a policeman in the City of Chicago or

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

policewoman, that that family... the surviving family should have an annuity that is below poverty."

Kay: "Yeah. Yeah, but you're..."

Currie: "All this does it bring it slightly above the poverty

Kay: "Yeah, but you're talking about..."

Currie: "...and there will be very little cost to that very small but significant benefit increase."

Kay: "You're talking about the minimum. I'm talking about the maximum. What's the maximum benefit now? You increased it, right?"

Currie: "Yeah. This is the minimum. Nothing else changes."

Kay: "It in... it increases the minimum, though."

Currie: "But not the maximum. This is just..."

Kay: "Well, give me the min... tell me what the minimum is then."

Currie: "The minimum is \$12 thousand today, a little... a little more than that, 12,700 and it goes to 14,712."

Kay: "So, we're... so, I guess what we're saying is Chicago is
standing in a breadline, but they're asking for toast. Is
that right? Yeah. Well, yeah, yeah, yeah."

Currie: "What I'm telling you, the minimum benefit is below the federal poverty line. This measure will say that the minimum benefit is 125 percent of federal poverty. And as that changes, so, too, will the level of benefit. And again, if you want to... if you want to make sure that survivors are living below the poverty line, I welcome your 'no' vote."

Kay: "Oh, listen."

Currie: "But I thought that you were a person..."

Kay: "That's... that's kind of a worn out line."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Currie: "...of compassion and care."

Kay: "That's kind of a worn out line, Leader. Let... you know, let me... let me ask you this for one second. How is it... how is it that you can come to us with a benefit increase and yet ask us to bail out, through the smoothing process, the City of Chicago? How can you do that?"

Currie: "I don't understand how you're using the term 'bail out'.

There is not one penny of state money..."

Kay: "Well, no. That's the next step though. That's... that's..."

Currie: "...involved in passage of Senate Bill 777."

Kay: "That's the next step. That's the next step. Because what
you're doing here..."

Currie: "Could we get... could the Gentleman confine his remarks to the Bill that is on the board? The discussion today is Senate Bill 777, not fantasies."

Kay: "Well, I..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Kay: "To the... to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, excuse me, excuse me. Representative Kay."

Kay: "To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Okay. Thank you."

Kay: "Unfortunately, I don't know that I've gotten as much time as some of the speakers who are supporting the Bill, but that's okay. But let me just say this. This is the most cynical thing that's been done since Caligula appointed his horse consul in Rome. It's the most cynical thing I've ever seen. It's deceitful, it's untrue, and you haven't provided

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

one solid answer to me with respect to this Bill. And you want us to vote 'yes'? I suggest a strong, strong 'no'." Speaker Turner: "Members, there are many people seeking recognition on this Bill. Can we try to keep our remarks as brief as possible and to the point? Representative Nekritz." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I have to say, I find this debate just, frankly, I... it renders me almost speechless. But I will... I will say that there's a couple of things that have been said on the floor today that I would like to refute. First of all, to compare this to the 1995 law, which the general... the gentle Lady from Wheaton did, and I think it's an... really an... not... not relevant at all. This Bill actually doubles, as has been said, this Bill actually doubles the payment. In 1995, a Republican Governor crafted a Bill that actually reduced the pension payment for the State of Illinois. Reduced the pension payment, this one doubles it. The other thing that that Bill did was to make sure... was to assure that for decades to come the funding level in the state pension systems was going to decline. This Bill assures that the funding level will remain where it is today and then go up. Both of those are designed to make the pension systems secure, make sure it's there and that's not... that is exactly the opposite of what happened in the 1995 funding law. This ... and I feel like the ... that the Representatives on the other side of the aisle are finding a way to get to 'no'. Because I guarantee you if the Majority Leader brought a Bill here today that... that doubled the pension payment for the City of Chicago, everyone would be standing up and screaming about how we can't do that because it's a... a property tax increase,

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

and I can't possibly vote for a property tax increase. All we're trying to do is make sure that we are balancing the... the payments that are possible to be made, getting us on a ramp that, again, does not reduce the unfunded liability and makes it affordable for the City of Chicago, and get us to a point where these... where the city does not have to be subject to further downgrades that we can make sure that the City of Chicago remains a viable financial entity. This deserves an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Kelly Burke." Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Burke, K.: "Representative, we've had a lot of historionics and hyperbole over this, so I'd just like to address three basic salient points of this legislation. Number 1, it's my understanding that this legislation will double payments into the fund and it is not remotely kicking the can down the road?"

Currie: "That is absolutely accurate."

Burke, K.: "And it... it's my understanding that the fire pension fund in particular is at a very low funding level right now and this legislation will, in fact, provide immediate injection of funds into the fire pension fund stabilizing it somewhat?"

Currie: "That's exactly the point of the Bill."

Burke, K.: "And that this legislation would put the City of Chicago police and fire pensions on the exact same ramp or actuarial schedule as the downstate police and fire, 25 years instead of 40. So, put it..."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Currie: "Forty-five instead of twenty."

Burke, K.: "...in the exact same footing as all the other funds that everyone who has spoken so far in the towns that they represent. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Burke, K.: "I support this legislation. I will be voting 'yes'.

It's not a perfect Bill. We don't live in a perfect world.

But I think this strikes a balance between the police and fire, the police officers and firemen, the retirees, and the City of Chicago taxpayers. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I first heard of this Bill, my knee-jerk reaction was to say 'no', didn't want to do it. And then I... then I thought about it more, you know, and I wish we weren't debating this. I also thought, gee, I also wish that we didn't have a stock market crash. I also wish that we didn't have a recession. And well, I also wished we didn't have Pat Quinn for Governor, but that's a different issue on that... how that worked. But you have to think about where we are here. This will essentially make the ramp the same as ours. Think about that, Ladies and Gentlemen. With the recent Supreme Court decision, we may need to do something very similar. So, think about your vote today. If you're thinking about, we may have to reamortize, we may have to say we're going to do 80 percent instead of 100. We might need to take a little bit more time. We might have a very similar vote here, so understand that. The thing that I like about this Bill is that it makes the payments mandatory, not permissive. That is a huge issue that has not been discussed.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

This is going to require Chicago to make those payments. They did not have that requirement before. As a result, this should calm down our credit agencies and that is incredibly important. Let's face it, Ladies and Gentlemen, if Chicago gets a sniffle, the entire state catches cold. This is important to the entire state. This is the responsible vote. Chicago is not getting a holiday. As a matter of fact, they will be paying a hundred million dollars more than they paid this year, a hundred million dollars more. That does not sound like a holiday. This also demonstrates other things that we certainly need to talk about; education funding reform, but that's a different issue. But this is something that is incredibly important now. And we work together all the time here for the benefit of Illinoisans. It's the right thing to do. I wish Chicago had all the money, but they don't because of some of the issues we've talked about recently. We help our communities. We've seen many Bills this week helping individual communities. It's time to help another community that's also very important to the whole state. And I look at this as an analogy. Instead of losing the house to foreclosure, what the city is doing is simply refinancing and taking care of their obligations responsibly. It's not an ideal situation, but it's the best compromise we can get right now. And hopefully, it will help us spur to moving to better reforms, both with the pension and education funding. But Ladies and Gentlemen, the only responsible vote is an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We hear a lot about the...
the economy and the downturn in the economy. What was Chicago
Teacher... or not Teacher... Fire and Police Pension, what were
they funded at before the downturn in the economy? What
percentage?"

Currie: "I don't have those figures. I can tell you that for both systems together the funding level is around 25 percent..."

Davidsmeyer: "Twenty-five percent. We're..."

Currie: "...today. But I... I don't have numbers about before the recession. I expect they were looking better before the stock market tanked."

Davidsmeyer: "It may have been closer to 30 or something like that?"

Currie: "I don't have the number."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... I would argue. There was a Representative before that made a statement that said, if we don't support this, we're not supporting police and fire. And I would argue that my community has been sorting... supporting their police and fire by actually funding our pensions. It's... it's crazy for somebody to say that we don't care about that because of this Bill. In fact, there were... there's one thing that the lobbyist from the City of Chicago spoke with me about and that was putting it on the same 40-year cycle as the downstate pension systems. And I was okay with that. I thought that was fair, right, but then there were a number of other things in here, throwing in something about a Chicago casino, a partial holiday, which means..."

Currie: "Yeah."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Davidsmeyer: "And you say it's not, but we're lowering next year's payment, correct?"

Currie: "We are, but it still will mean a very substantial increase in the local contribution. We are refinancing. I think that Representative Franks' remarks about restructuring were precisely... precisely on the mark. We are establishing an arc that is very much like the downstate systems, very much like our own, but we're not saying you don't have to put in as much in the beginning as you do later on. That was one of the problems with the law of 1995. We said we're not going to put in much now, we'll put in a lot later. And that's part of the reason we had trouble as a state in meeting our pension obligations. We let ourselves immediately off the hook. This Bill does not do that. It says you're going to have a leveling during these first five years and then you will be on an arc that the actuaries tell us is sound and will bring stability and 90 percent funding to both systems."

Davidsmeyer: "So, the... the \$600 million payment that would be owed next year. What created that \$600 million payment?"

Currie: "Excuse me. Could you repeat that question?"

Davidsmeyer: "What created the \$600 million payment for next year?"

Currie: "I think that the... the fact that the pension... because we said five years ago this is your funding formula and the city is not in a good position to meet those requirements. And let me just say that the city has always paid the operational cost. They've always paid normal... normal costs. The question here, we're talking not about those at all, but about unfunded liabilities."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Davidsmeyer: "On another note, if... and you... there were implications, people implying that... that people over here want the City of Chicago to fail. And I think the City of Chicago is very important to the State of Illinois, so I don't think anybody on this side of the aisle would like the city to fail. We know it's important, correct? What happens if the City of Chicago were to go bankrupt?"

Currie: "As I understand, under State Law, they can't."

Davidsmeyer: "If they were allowed to, who would be responsible?"

Currie: "Well, in the first place, I don't think Chicago is in such dire financial shape that bankruptcy is an inappropriate discussion."

Davidsmeyer: "And one of the prior speakers said that the City of Chicago is doing what they need to, to become more fiscally sound, but just, what was it, last week they were downgraded to junk-bond status? So, what... what are they doing to make things better?"

Currie: "They... they were downgraded by one of the credit agencies, Moody's I believe, and part of the reason for the downgrade was the court's decision that Senate Bill 1 was not constitutional. So, to a degree, the city had hoped and the rating agencies had hoped that the adoption of Senate Bill 1 and a finding that it was constitutional would have helped upgrade the city's finances. But... and we're looking at the same problem ourselves since our pensions were part of Senate Bill 1 as well."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I'm a little bit... a little bit speechless on this. I... I still think that if you would have... if the City of Chicago would have made their payments the way they should

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

have been, the way they needed to, we... we wouldn't be here. Am I... am I correct?"

Currie: "They... I have to tell you, this city has always made payments to these systems as required by State Law. And let me tell you, Representative, I am really glad to know that your own district police and fire funds are in great shape. I have to tell you that there are a large number of downstate police and fire funds that are not."

Davidsmeyer: "I agree, yeah."

Currie: "So, I'm glad that your people have been willing to step up to the plate, but you have a lot of neighbors who have not done so."

Davidsmeyer: "And..."

Currie: "But our city... my city, Chicago has never failed to meet its obligations to the systems under State Law."

Davidsmeyer: "And my, not only have we been paying the minimum, we've been paying more than the minimum to ensure that our pension costs were covered."

Currie: "Good."

Davidsmeyer: "So, we actually pay more than is legally required by law, legally required by the actuarial services. So, I think that the City of Chicago needs to step up and do that themselves. My property taxes have gone up and theirs have not in... in longer than I've been alive. So, I think they need to step up and make that... make that case for themselves. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd really like to have a discussion today that's about policy and get off

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

the political talking points. I've heard nonstop criticism from the other side of the aisle for weeks now. Where's your solution? You know, let's look at this from a practical point of view. If you are making your mortgage payments and you can't afford it, what's your option? You quit making the payments, ruin your credit rating, or you can look at refinancing options. That's what we're doing here. It's just like refinancing your mortgage for a lower rate. Is it an ideal situation? No. But do we have other options? I don't know of any. Our firefighter and police officers make great sacrifices. Do you realize the firefighter pension fund is funded at 27 percent? That's just wrong. We need to give the City Council some tools to possibly mitigate what may be a massive tax increase if we don't do something about it right now. Jack Franks mentioned that ... oops ... the Gentleman from McHenry... the Gentleman from McHenry mentioned that the payments are going to be mandatory not permissive. That's a big deal. That's a big deal and it makes a big difference to how the credit agencies will look at Chicago. I don't get the criticism. I don't get why we don't have any alternative solutions coming from the other side of the aisle. This is not an ideal solution, but I will say, we're not in an ideal situation. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Speaker. So, I heard that we are... that currently there's more firefighters and more police officers that are living and we're paying more. Well, to me that is an incredible thing because that means that they have survived the fire. They have survived the bullets that is in Chicago.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

So, for me, that is actually a good thing and I am glad that I can support their pensions because that's what it... that... I was glad to hear that. 'Cause if it was lower, that means they would have died and they would have been died in the fire. So, I am in here. In our tax bills it shows how much we're an unfunded liability. To the... Leader Currie, if even the city would have raised their taxes every year, because the city portion is only 11 percent, they would have covered this in taxes, would have been... we'd been able to even cover the whole pension liability?"

Currie: "I'm not sure exactly your question."

Andrade: "Even if... here... I true... I know the answer to this. I've sat through 20 years of hearings in the City of Chicago and I've seen it every time they talk about it. Even if they would have increased the taxes, the portion of the city property is min... is very minimal. People... we... they were... and... and here, trust me. My property taxes have gone up every year. So, it's not that I haven't gone on my property tax bill. We have... our top prices have gone up there. But the cost of the property taxes, if they were to go up even now, if we had no levy limit, we still would not be able to cover the costs and our people would be hurt 'cause our rents would go up and everything would go up. So, I'm just here to say that I... I am supporting my police and fire and I'm glad they are living. And I hope they live a long life. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I heard our friends on the other side of the aisle say what are your solutions. Well, here's a solution. By comparison, a home with an EAV in

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Chicago of \$300 thousand pays about \$4900 in property taxes. Out in the collars, a home of about \$300 thousand EAV pays about \$7 thousand in property taxes. So, it's about paying for your obligations. What do you get for that delta in the difference between the two, between what you're paying in Chicago and what you're getting out in the suburbs? You get infrastructure that's well maintained. You get outstanding police and fire that, by the way, we've added more money to our public safety pensions over time to where they're actually pretty well funded out in my area. And you also get world class schools. So, not only are we talking about what solutions can we do for Chicago, but then partner this on top of the potential cost shift of pensions. Then you talk about the restructure of the funding on how we do education. You simply have to start paying for things that you're consuming. It's just that simple."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Hays, please."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of things have been mentioned as it relates to living up to responsibility. You know, in 1995 it is true that the General Assembly passed a Bill that allowed the City of Chicago to roll everything into one levy as it relates to education and then block grants that were not representative of the actual population. In other words, there was a request, and it passed here, that purposely said to assist the city we're going to give block grants to a formula that is inherently not... does not match up

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

with the population. And then after that, I don't think there's any question that there's been an underfunding of pensions for a long, long time. This notion that the... the city pays into the teachers' pension when the rest of the state doesn't, that is... that is true. However, when you look at the overall math, let's not be confused. When you look at these block grants, for example, there's a huge, huge disparity in terms of where this block grant money goes. Special education, for example, 19 percent of the special education students who attend public school in this state attended schools in the City of Chicago, yet they get 48 percent of the block grant money and there's category after category after category after category where that is true. So, this notion that somehow a fair share is being... or double is being paid in the city, you really have to look at all of the evidence and all of the calculations. And frankly, the notion that... there's no ... there can be no denial that the property tax rate for a residential property taxpayer in the City of Chicago is not less than it is, I think, maybe anywhere else in the country, but certainly in Illinois. This is not a close call. The comment had been made that there's been no pension holiday. I... I... one could make the argument that the residential property taxpayer has been on holiday in the city for decades. I mean, even Cousin Eddie in the RV is paying more than the good people that own residential property in Chicago. Should this Bill receive the prerequisite number of votes, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Hays. Chair recognizes Representative Tryon."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Ives."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

Ives: "So... so, we have been accused of being histrionic on our side of the aisle. We've been accused of lying by certain Members over there, but nothing could be further from the truth. We're here to tell you, maybe you guys don't read the headlines about Chicago, but we're here to tell you what they Chicago, junk-bond status by Moody's. Chicago, downgraded by Fitch. Chicago, downgraded by Standards and Poor's. Chicago, seven times the amount of revenue they collect in one year is what their debt and liabilities are. You could close down the entire City of Chicago, not fund one pothole being filled. You'd have to do that for seven years to pay off your debt and your unfunded liabilities. Each resident of Chicago owes over \$20 thousand in debt already. And all you want to do is make it worse. That's what this is about. You want to kick the can down the road one more time. You don't want to fight... fess up to your problems. And if the Gentleman from Cook County thinks that Chicago is so well run, or that Wheaton couldn't survive without them, I'll let you know, in Wheaton, we fund our police and fire. In Wheaton, we have a AAA rated bond rating. That's what we have in Wheaton. In DuPage County, same thing. We are AAA rated. Because we have the property taxes... we... we tax ourselves to pay for the things that we need to afford and you haven't done it. You want a couple suggestions? Let's talk about your 164 TIFs. A hundred and sixty-four TIFs in the City of Chicago including the very, very exclusive Loop area. Let's talk about

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

not adequately assessing your commercial property. For example, the Willis Tower sold for \$1.3 billion..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative..."

Ives: "...is on the books for \$534 million."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Can you keep your remarks on the merits of the Bill? We still have many Members speaking on..."

Ives: "Okay. The merits of the Bill is you have other solutions. And let's also talk about this because there's been misrepresentation on your side that this is simply putting you on the same track the downstate fire and police are on and that is factually not true. Downstate police and fire are required to be 90 percent funded by 2040. 2040, the same as we're requiring of the City of Chicago. It happened in the same Bill. And we are making our payments on time. You are taking a five-year pension holiday, partial pension holiday, and then you are moving that out 15 additional years. That is far different than downstate police and fire. So, you might as well get factual, you might as well get right about this and understand that we are requiring of Chicago the same thing as downstate police and fire. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Sponsor. Leader, this is not a holiday, correct?"

Currie: "This is not a holiday. Pension payments to these funds will double next year, double."

D'Amico: "And this also is being... this also is being supported by the police and fire, correct?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Currie: "It is supported by the police and by the fire."

D'Amico: "You know... To the Bill. Every day our police and fire go to work to protect every single one of us. They're down here today asking us to protect them, protect their widows, protect their pensions. So, I urge an 'aye' vote. Protect our police and fire and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Arroyo."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Arroyo: "Leader Currie, I have... honor you for bringing this Bill forward. I think this is a very good and important Bill. I'm a city Legislator and the police department do a wonderful job in my district. The fire department do a wonderful job in my district. The fire department goes in the fire when it's 200 degrees and they come out of there saving kids, saving families, so does the police department. The police department wear vests every day. They go to work to get shot at, to do all kinds of different things. Those are our heroes. Those are my heroes. Those are the people that keep me elected. Now, today, I am going to vote to make sure that their pension stays alive and they keep their pension. Thank you very much, Leader Currie."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been listening very intently to the debate and this is actually the third time I... well, twice I put on my light and then I turned it off. And I thought, you know, there've been enough comments, but I wanted to speak... and I really... I'm going to ask everybody, let's calm down. Right?

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

I mean, there's been an awful lot of rhetoric, a lot of very sharp barbs thrown across the aisle at each other. Let's deal with this in a reasoned fashion. Okay. Are the City of Chicago pension systems in bad shape? Yep, no doubt. Do we need to fix them? Absolutely. Now, this administration... Mayor Rahm Emanuel's administration did not create this problem, but he is charged with trying to find a solution to it. Now, I had a pension town hall in my district that was attended to by Representative D'Amico, Representative Representative Williams came to it, and I'm probably leaving somebody else out. And we sat there where we listened to the police and the fire first responders come and talk to us about their pension plan. And one of the things that they said to us, very strongly and repeatedly, was please don't let the city out of its obligation to fund our pensions. Please don't let this happen so that our funds... we know that our pensions are secure because they're afraid. They see the low levels of their pensions. And we heard that message and they asked all of us... they asked all of us, will you... will you commit to making sure our pensions our funded. We all said yes we would. But you know, this is the employer and the employee talking about retirement funds owed to the employee. And they're working together to find a solution. Now, in the last six weeks at least, there's been an awful lot of rhetoric about bipartisanship and not working across the aisle and not coming together to compromise and find solutions, but that's exactly what this Bill represents. We have to deal with all of these pension problems and I suggest to you that more of these pension problems would be solved if the employer and the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

employee came together and sat down and worked on the problems together and found solutions. Is it a perfect solution? No, but we've learned in Springfield that the best solutions never They're compromises. This is about protecting the security of the retirements of first responders. You heard Representative D'Amico and Representative Andrade talk so passionately about who these people are that they lay their li... lives on the line for us every day. We're asking you, who are not affected by this, to help us out. And I suggest that there will come a time and there has been a time when there have been situations in your districts where you've probably reached across the aisle and said, this really helps my district, can you please help us out? This is not perfect. None of us are jumping for joy and saying hurray this... that the problem has been solved and it's magically gone away. We don't have a magic wand. But... but let's think about this for a second. What... what is the plan that's on the table? We're going to take the city's LGDF funds. And you talk ... everyone I've heard so much about how low our property taxes are and how much they can be raised. I doubt that there are many residents in the City of Chicago who would agree with you, but that's irrelevant. But... but there's also part of the plan is to freeze the taxes, so we're going to stop LGDF... we're going to take LGDF funds. So, we're going to strip revenue away from the city. We're going to tie their hands to keep them from raising more revenue and what's the solution? We bankrupt the pension plans for first responders and the City of Chicago? That's not right, folks. Come on, you know that that's not right, right? I mean, we all come down here. Don't

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

we want to be fiscally responsible? Don't we want to be fiscally responsible? Fiscally responsible means finding an answer to the problems. Could it be more tax increases? Hey, the city's got a long way to go to out of its financial problems. Tax increases may be part of the... the plan if you don't tie their hands. That may be part of their solution. Could a casino be part of their solution? Maybe, but right now what we need to do is we need to give them time to live up to their commitments. This mayor didn't cause this problem. He's come up with a solution that the employer and the employee agree on. And we're asking you... we're asking you, help us solve our problem. Help us solve the financial crisis that the City of Chicago is going through. For the good of the City of Chicago, for the good of its first responders, for the good of the State of Illinois, and Ladies and Gentlemen, for the good of everyone is this Body, we're asking, do the right thing. Do the right thing, help us."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Morrison."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you. Will Leader Currie yield? Would... would the Leader..."

Speaker Turner: "The Leader will yield."

Morrison: "Leader, would you consider pulling this Bill out of the record until we're able to..."

Currie: "No."

Morrison: "Just thought I'd ask. Again, I think it's important for us to see what the costs are going to be over the long

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

haul by pushing... pushing this out even farther. I... I'll keep my... my comments brief, but there are a couple of points that came up that I think need to be addressed. Leader, what is the minimum amount of time required to qualify for a benefit? What is... what is the minimum amount of service time required? How many years?"

Currie: "What was your question?"

Morrison: "What is the minimum amount of service time required to qualify for it?"

Currie: "Twenty years."

Morrison: "What's that?"

Currie: "Twenty years. That's not in this Bill. That is the current program. I believe..."

Morrison: "No, no. That's for a maximum benement... benefit. I'm talking about for the minimum. Because you kept addressing the min..."

Currie: "You have to work 20 years for the benefit that is the subject of this Bill, which is the bringing the minimum annuity above the poverty line."

Morrison: "Okay. Thank you... thank you for clarifying that. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Regarding policemen and firemen, my brother's a police officer. I support the police. What I'm trying to address, and I think the Body needs to understand, is that we are, again, overpromising and underdelivering for our policemen, our firemen, and the city taxpayers. It... this Bill, if it's passed, again, it's going to make it more difficult for them to pay for needed infrastructure in the future. It's going to make it more difficult for us to hire policemen and firefighters in the future. Your aldermen, the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

aldermen in the City of Chicago, mayors over a period of decades, they have failed you. If you live in the city, they have failed you by overpromising and underdelivering. And I'll share with you something I... I addressed to the mayor. A few years ago, Mayor Emanuel was on the floor and I said, mayor, to fix this problem I think you need to change the pension system for the aldermen. You should start there. Put the aldermen on a 401(k) for their service going forward before you make fixes or changes to the pension systems for the workers. I think that's good advice. I think it's good advice for this Body, for the General Assembly, for the state's pension issues. Thank you for your time."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. What I've heard in this debate is a lot of Chicago is bad, our communities do it better, we're AAA bond rated. I even heard one Gentleman talk about school funding in this conversation. So, I just want you all to know that when we look at the transcript from this debate, all of you who are talking about how great your communities are and how well you do, I hope you're willing to support when we change the school funding formula and make it better for poor schools on this side. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an opportunity for all of us to help Chicago help itself. The systems for police and fire retirees in the City of Chicago are underfunded. This measure will do three important things.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

First, the mandatory payments will help the city's credit rating. Second, the significant increases in funding from the taxpayers of Chicago as well as the new actuarially sound payment schedule will stabilize the pension systems. And third, a 'yes' vote will avoid a major tax increase. So, I would invite you to join me in making sure that the City of Chicago can have a funding schedule just like the downstate police and fire people have. And as we continue as a local pension system to meet our obligations, we will meet those obligations. The only responsible vote is a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Hays. All Members are to be at their desk and vote their switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 777 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... Representative Scherer, Sims. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 65 voting 'yes', and 45 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. Representative Hays, would you like to proceed with your verification request? He does not wish to proceed. On a count of 65 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 777, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brown, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal show that Representative Andersson is excused."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 555, offered

by Representative Evans. House Resolution 556, offered by

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Representative Beiser. House Resolution 557, offered by Representative Verschoore. House Resolution 558, offered by Representative Poe. House Resolution 562, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 563, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 564, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 565, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 566, offered by Representative Bellock."

- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committees."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. The Executive Committee is meeting in Room 118.

  Business Occupational Licenses is meeting in Room 115.

  Revenue & Finance is meeting in Room 114."
- Speaker Turner: "You've all heard the committee schedule. Members will return to the chamber at 3:00."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1608, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1906. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3332.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution #83."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade has filed a written Motion with the Clerk, pursuant to House Rule 60(b) wishes to table House Bill 814. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the Gentleman's Motion is adopted and House Bill 814 is tabled. Mr. Clerk, under the Order of Resolutions, page 20 on the Calendar, appears House Joint Resolution 54. Mr. Kay."
- Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 54 encourages school districts for the 2014-'15 school year through the 2017-'18 school year to not use results of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers Test as a determining factor for making decisions about student's educational opportunities, the evaluation of educators, and the allocation of resources based on educational achievement on this assessment. Essentially, Speaker, we're just taking a step back or would like to take a step back and review what has become somewhat of a controversial test, which has been discussed a number of times on this floor."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 67, Mr. Hays. Please proceed, Sir."
- Hays: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 67 recognizes students from North Ridge Middle School, the Future Problem Solvers, who took it upon themselves, after a series of tragic drownings in our area, drownings of children

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

14 and under, to develop a water safety guideline. This is permissive. But this really recognizes those wonderful students for taking such a serious approach. Senator Scott Bennett and myself were able to... to witness their presentation. It's very, very thoughtful. And the House Joint Resolution seeks to honor those junior high school students who did such a beautiful job on such a serious subject."

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

Moving to Supplemental Calendar #2, under the Order of Resolutions, House Joint Resolution 83, Mr. Martwick. Please proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 83 is the memorialization of an agreement between the City of Chicago and Members of this Body to work to address noise issues at the O'Hare Airport surrounding areas due to the reconfiguration of the runways. This is something that was worked very hard between many Members including the present Speaker and the City of Chicago. And it's a good step forward to beginning to address the issues of the people who have been affected. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."

Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill... or to the Resolution. I would like to thank the Chief Sponsor for his work on this as well as the cosponsors of the Bill and all the people working on the O'Hare effort. And what this does is it really does attempt to clear up a lot of misunderstanding that some of the population may have. So, I

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

really look forward to the implementation and working together with the parties. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to commend the Sponsor and everybody involved. This was truly a team effort. And it just shows when you work a... work together what can get done. So, thank you, Rob, for bringing this forward."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'd like to thank Representative Martwick and all the fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle including you, Mr. Speaker, in trying to get a Resolution so our residents get a fair... a fair hearing. And I believe this Resolution will do that. So, I thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 68, Mr. Reis. Please proceed."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Effingham Sunrise Rotary is going to erect a memorial this summer in honor of State Policemen that were killed in the line of duty. So, I have two consecutive House Joint Resolutions. 68 will rename I-57 from the Tri-level south of Effingham to the Watson Exit as the 'Trooper Frank Doris Memorial Highway'. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Let's move through these, Representatives. Cavaletto. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 69, Mr. Reis. Please proceed."

Reis: "And I think we have a Floor Amendment to adopt?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Reis and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "The Floor Amendment simply changes the birthday and it changes spelling of a name."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Rei… And the Res… and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the second Resolution. And this will rename a section of I-57 from the Tri-level north of Effingham to the Shelby County line as the 'Trooper Layton T. Davis Memorial Highway'. Trooper Davis was killed in action in March of 1976."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Cavaletto is recognized."

Cavaletto: "Mr. Speaker, somebody turned my key off during the break. And I wish to vote 'present' on House Resolution 68 and 69, 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention."

Cavaletto: "'Yes' on both."

Speaker Lang: "'Yes' on both, Sir?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Cavaletto: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "House Joint Resolution 71, Mr. Anthony. Mr. Anthony. Please proceed when you get to your desk, Sir. Mr. Anthony on the Resolution."

Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pardon me. Someone has jokes."

Speaker Lang: "It's the last week of Session, Sir. Please proceed,
laugh later. We want to move along."

- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 71 will designate the portion of Illinois Route 47 over Interstate 80 from Romines Drive to Illinois Route 6 East as the Marshal Enoch T. Hopkins Memorial Road. This is an initiative of Morris... of Morris Police Department, specifically Chief Brent Dite. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. On this question, there's 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 72, Mr. Anthony. Please proceed."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's no tie tied around it this time. House Joint Resolution 72 will designate a portion of Illinois Route 47 over the Illinois River Bridge from Pine Bluff Road to Washington Street as the Patrolman Clarence Roseland Memorial Road. This, too, is an initiative of the Morris Police Department, specifically Chief Brent Dite. I ask for a favorable vote."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 74, Mr. Meier. Please proceed."
- Meier: "Yes. This Resolution designates new Route 50 between Germantown and Breese in memory of Staff Sergeant Joshua Allen Melton, who was 26 when he was killed in Kandahar, Afghanistan on June 19, 2009. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 75, Mr. Riley. Please proceed."
- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Joint Resolution 75 essentially designates the section of I-57 between Exit 250 and Route 136 in Rantoul and Exit 358 at Wentworth Avenue in Chicago as the Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Trail. Many of you remember years ago former State Representative Marlow Colvin established the Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Trail. Essentially, what we're doing is expanding it, maybe about 60 more miles to the south, to recognize the area around Chanute Air Force Base. Many people don't know... they, of course, know that these brave men trained at Tuskegee University, but they also trained at Chanute Field down in Rantoul in Chad Hays' area. Thank you, Representative Hays

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

and Representative Anthony for joining me on this Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, thank you so much for doing this. We appreciate it very, very much. Representative Riley, Represent... former Representative Colvin and I are working to actually bring an event to the former site of the Chanute Air Force Base to further honor the Tuskegee Airmen. So, I certainly appreciate the Representative's efforts and encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 76, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Resolution 6, Representative Flowers. Please proceed."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 6 creates the Return Illinois to Prosperity Commission. Provides that the commission shall review and evaluate the creation of an Illinois State Bank and specify the correct criteria to be used by the commission. It also provides for the membership in the commission and that members shall serve without... excuse me... without compensation. Provides that the commission shall report its findings to the General Assembly and the Governor on or before December 31, 2015. And I urge..."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? DeLuca, Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 135, Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Resolution 160, Mr. Harris. Please proceed."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution urges the State of Illinois to apply for some enhanced federal match on some behavioral health money that is becoming available from the Federal Government."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted.

  House Resolution 209, Representative Manley. Please proceed."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 209 is an effort for the State of Illinois to support House Resolution 787 brought by Congressman Bill Foster, which creates the Payer State Transparency Act of 2015. You've probably heard a lot of discussion about the payer and taker state issue that's going on. In Illinois, we pay \$1.36 to the Federal Government through our taxes and only receive the benefit of \$1. There's many states out there that re... are taker states. We hear a lot about how great other state's budgets are and I think this has a huge impact, like Indiana and Iowa who are taker states. This urges... it's our way of saying we'd like the Members of Congress to take a look at this. Lord knows Illinois could use the help. In the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

absence of anyone objecting, I ask that all House Members be added to the Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors. Is there leave? Leave is granted and all House Members are added on the Resolution. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 232, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there..."

Speaker Lang: "I understand there's an Amendment on this..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "...Representative? Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Flowers and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution as amended changes the composition of the Medicaid Managed Care Task Force. Instead of each of the Members of the task force being assigned by the Governor, the task force shall consist of the following members: three Members appointed by the Speaker, three Members appointed by the Minority Leader, and four Members by the Governor. And then the task force shall elect a chairperson. And other than that, there's no changes. And the Bill as amended would call for a review of the oversight to make sure, in particular, people with disabilities and the elderly are satisfied with their health care and have adequate access to health care. And I move for the adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Amendment is adopted. Representative, you've already explained the full Resolution?"

Flowers: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in... Representative Winger is recognized on this Resolution?"

Winger: "No, Sir, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "We'll get right back to you."

Winger: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hoffman, Wehrli. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Winger on a point of personal privilege."

Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to welcome Jordan Anderson. He has served the Wood Dale community at the police department for several years well. And he is here with the Elk Grove Village Boy Scout Pack 495. And they're here to learn about government. So, if you could give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Happy you're here with us. Thank you. House Resolution 240, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. House Resolution 240 states that behalf... on that... public and private postsecondary educational institutions and... will include a student veteran on its governing board. They don't have a vote, they just have a voice to be called veteran friendly. Ask for its adoption."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Turner on a point of personal privilege."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to take a moment to introduce my Page for the day. This is actually my little cousin Devin Johnson. I didn't get to do it this morning, but he's enjoying the process. And if he hasn't made it around to visit you yet, he should... he will be. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Welcome aboard, Devin.

  House Resolution 241, Representative Gordon-Booth.

  Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. House
  Resolution 270, Representative Flowers. Please proceed."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 270 urges the Chicago Public Schools to adhere to all the laws under the School Code including the training of personnel of the use of automated external defibrillators and the teaching of African-American history in the schools. Urges the Illinois State Board of Education to ensure that the Chicago Public Schools are in compliance with all applicable laws and to withhold General State Aid funds if it finds that the district is not in compliance. And I urge for its adoption. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 304, Mr. Thapedi. Please respond."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 304 relates to the Export-Import Bank, which was created by Congress in 1945 to serve as the official export credit agency of the United States. Its authorization expires on June 30, 2015. And House

59th Legislative Day

- Resolution 304 urges Congress to pass long-term reauthorization. There is no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 380, Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke. Out of the record. House Resolution 402, Mr. Phelps. Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. House Resolution 417, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 417 declares May 14, 2015 as Apraxia Awareness Day in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Chair recognizes Mr. Davis. Not yet. We'll get back to you, Mr. Davis. Page 24 of the Calendar, House Resolution 424, Representative Harris. Please proceed."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution recognizes 40-to-None-Day which is the day that urges community government and business leaders to address the issues of homeless youth and especially draws the attention to the 40 percent of homeless youth who identify as LGBT or Q."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Now, the Chair recognizes Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You see the ladies walking in the gallery that are coming in now. Those are those fine ladies that work in the Enrolling and Engrossing office,

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

which is right behind the door. And if everybody ever wonders where I get the Girl Scout cookies from, it's from that office every day. The reason that I asked them to come into the chamber today and I would respectfully ask that Linda waves so everybody sees Linda. Linda is retiring in June after 43 years of service here at the State of Illinois. Linda Pearson has spent 40 of those years in the Enrolling and Engrossing office. She has a daughter, Leighann, and one grandson, Ian, who both live in St. Louis. She plans to, obviously, enjoy herself by going to garage sales, plant flowers, travel in her Toyota, and bake. She's going to spend time with her grandson and family. She will continue to take her walks in Washington Park every day, travel with friends and family, and enjoy life to the fullest. And of course, she will continue to bring treats... well, I didn't write this, Linda... but bring treats to the ladies in E and E office. So, again, give Linda Pearson a round of applause on 43 years of service here in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Congratulations. Forty-three years, that's a lot of Girl Scout cookies. Representative Chapa LaVia is recognized."

Chapa LaVia: "Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Chapa LaVia: "And that's where you'll find Leader Davis all the time up there eating. The girls spoil him. I'd like to introduce my Page for the day, happens to be related to us through Craig Garrett. Where's Mr. Garrett? That's her grandfather over here. But this is Chalen; she's my Page for

59th Legislative Day

- the day. So, if you could welcome her and thank her for coming."
- Speaker Lang: "Hello, welcome. House Resolution 439, Representative Mussman. Please proceed."
- Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, House Resolution 439 it celebrates Women on Boards 2020, a national organization to increase membership to 20 percent for women on U.S. corporate boards. Judi Spaletto is a constituent of mine. She is heading up the Chicago chapter. Four separate studies cited in the... in the report indicate that the more women you have on the boards, the more successful your business is. And since our state wants our businesses to be successful, we encourage them to have more women on their boards. And I am proud to say that we have just about every woman in the House signed on as a supporter."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 442, Mr. McSweeney. Please proceed."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, this Resolution expresses strong support for the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which prohibits wage discrimination against women. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 451, Representative Manley. Please proceed."
- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 451 is something that I'm really proud of and anxious to work on going further. We've brought together several different groups of people including the Illinois Department of Revenue, the Illinois

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Chamber of Commerce, Taxpayers Federation of Illinois, and the Illinois Manufacturers Association. There's a problem within the Illinois Tax Code. And in certain situations, I'm a tax accountant and some of my clients are experiencing this under certain situations where they are not receiving credit on their Illinois tax return... this is riveting information, by the way... on their Illinois tax return. They don't get the credit for taxes paid in other states. That's in a nutshell what it is. This Resolution brings that situation to light and I'm looking forward to making the Illinois Tax Code so that it provides for fair treatment for all of us."

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

  Returning to House Resolution 429, Mr. Davis. Please proceed,
  Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This simply designates the month of November as COPD Awareness Month in the State of Illinois. We know that COPD stands for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. I ask for your favorable vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 455, Mr. Unes. Please proceed."
- Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This simply designates the month of May as Stroke Awareness and Prevention Month in the State of Illinois. This is already the month of May already National Stroke Awareness Month in the United States. And I ask for its adoption."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 457, Representative Williams. Please proceed."
- Williams: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. This just recognizes the contributions of the Illinois Tobacco Quitline. There's some fabulous metrics associated with the Quitline. And it provides a great cost benefit to the state's finances. Over 46 percent of people that call the Quitline, end up quitting smoking. How amazing? Huge percentage of those people are on Medicaid. Funds come from the Master Settlement Agreement so they're not even out of our normal state funding stream. Just urging your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 460, Representative Conroy. Please proceed."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. House Resolution 460 is in reaction to the unfortunate situation that has recently happened at the College of DuPage. We in DuPage County would like to restore College of DuPage to the pride of DuPage County again. And in that effort, we would like to urge them to report administrative expenses. We would also like to encourage the new board and the existing board members to receive professional board training to... and to also develop a... to create a... what is wrong with me... a finance committee, sorry. And I'm going to home and get on a budget. So, I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 471, Mr. Crespo. Please proceed."

59th Legislative Day

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Resolution 471 designates August 9, 2015 as Illinois Sepsis Day. On August 9, on that day, Presence Health will host its second annual Sepsis challenge 5k Run and Walk. It was prompted by the death of an 11-year-old Evansville boy in 2015 due to pneumonia. It was the primary source of sepsis. It's the third leading cause of death in the United States. It kills more kids than cancer in the United States and it's unknown over half of the adults in this country. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 477, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please proceed."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a Resolution. I tried to make it into a Bill, but it was too omnibus. And it encourages agencies participating in the Illinois Pathway Interagency Committee..."
- Speaker Lang: "No, but we're..."
- Chapa LaVia: "...among the State Board of Education, community colleges and higher ed to the Student Assistance Commission, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, the Department of Employment Security to study methods to better prepare high school graduates for success in college and career readiness. I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 479, Mr. Bradley. Please proceed."
- Bradley: "Thank you. This would name a highway or road after a friend of mine, Bruce Fasol. Bruce was an important member of the West Frankfort community. And this would be in front of

59th Legislative Day

- the high school where he was the voice of the Redbirds for many, many years. The family is supportive of it. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill... and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 485, Representative Feigenholtz. Please proceed."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Resolution designates May as Mental Health Awareness Month. We are making some strides but have a lot to do when it comes to making progress on discussing issues about stigma, access, behavioral health. Let's all stand together and try and fix this problem. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 497, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Resolution 498, Representative Flowers. Please proceed."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 498 urges the Governor... the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice and Sentencing Reform to study issues and permit, to the extent that such determination is appropriate, the mentioned numbers... members of the vulnerable population to have a chance to relieve themselves of the stigma of being convicted felons and to have a chance to obtain jobs by having their records sealed. And I would urge for the adoption."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 512, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley. Out of the record. House Resolution 526, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 526 designates September of 2015 as Infant Mortality Awareness Month in the State of Illinois. Illinois ranks 29th among 50 states in infant mortality rates. And infant mortality rates are triple that in the... that among African Americans compared to Caucasian women. It is a serious public health problem. And I would just like to honor EverThrive Illinois with the Department of Public Health. They are both working very hard in coalition to reduce this rate in Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 512, Mr. Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you. This is a Resolution to recognize the actions of the railroad industry and working with our local law enforcement officials to ensure the safety of our communities and to make sure that that continues. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 501, Leader Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution honors caregivers.

  We all know people who have really given up their lives and
  all sorts of things that they do to take care of people in
  their family. People who are sick, people who are disabled.

59th Legislative Day

- This would name November of 2015 Family Caregivers Month in Illinois."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 527, Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 527 urges President Obama and Congress to make federal funds available to the Illinois... Illinois Community College System. In 2014, the President released \$450 million of which Illinois got 9 million. The President has again announced a new initiative, so I would ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the… Representative Lang in the Chair. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 1, Mr. Butler. Please proceed."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SJR1 would designate Interstate 72, the Exit 122 overpass by Illiopolis, as the Trooper Brian McMillen Memorial Overpass. Trooper McMillen was killed in the line of duty responding to a call one evening when he was hit by a drunk driver. He was a native of Pana in Representative Bourne's district. And he was also a member of the Illinois Air National Guard. A great individual. I thank Senator McCann and Representative Cabello for their leadership on this. And I urge adopt... adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

59th Legislative Day

- all voted who wish? Turner. Please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 2, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please proceed."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this Bill actually gives re... or this Joint Resolution gives recognition to the Powell brothers of Greene County. Seven of them served in World War II in the European, Russian, and Japanese theaters. There is one Powell brother left. He's 90 years old and I think this designated... designating Route 67, as you come into Greene County and as you exit Greene County, is a very fitting tribute to all of those young men who went away. And I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. 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. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 3, Mr. Costello. Please proceed."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. House… or excuse me… Senate Joint Resolution 3 urges Congress to elevate the national status of Cahokia Mounds. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted.

  Senate Joint Resolution 7, Representative Scherer. Please proceed."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 7 urges the President of the United States, the Secretary of the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

United States Department of Labor, and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs and the members of Congress to update the regulations implementing Executive Order 11246, including the minority utilization goals. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

  Senate Joint Resolution 8, Mr. Yingling. Please go ah... please proceed."
- Yingling: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House... Senate Joint Resolution #8 designates a portion of Illinois Route 120 after Joey Dimock, who was killed in his third deployment to the Middle East. I kindly ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 9, Representative Conroy. Please proceed."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 9 designates the month of May in 2015 and '16 as Invasive Species Awareness Month. I appreciate a..."
- Speaker Lang: "I'm surprised... I'm surprised there were no questions. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 22, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I'm honored to be doing Senate Joint Resolution 22 because 20 percent of the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

children in the State of Illinois have dyslexia. And this is something that we need to raise that awareness of, especially with the State Board of Education. And I ask any of you that are interested in this to work on this issue with me next year. So, what this Resolution does is designates the last week of October in 2015 as Dyslexia Awareness Week in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

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

  Senate Joint Resolution 24, Mr. Brown. Please proceed, Sir."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SJR24 designates Illinois Route 45 between Pesotum and Tuscola as the Tommy K. Martin Memorial Highway. Chief Deputy Martin was killed in the line of duty in 2007. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sullivan. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 25, Representative Scherer. Please proceed."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I present Senate Joint Resolution 25. It designates July 13, 2015 as Ansar Shriners of Springfield Day in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

  And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 27,

  Leader Currie. Please proceed."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This Resolution would designate May 2015 as Cystic Fibrosis Month in the State of Illinois. This

59th Legislative Day

- is a disease that afflicts many children and adults. Early diagnosis is essential. We have 15 world-class centers... medical centers in Illinois that specialize in the early diagnosis and treatment of cystic fibrosis. I'd appreciate your support for the Resolution."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Supplemental Calendar #3, under the Order of Resolutions, there appears House Joint Resolution 78, Mr. Bennett. Please proceed, Sir."
- Bennett: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Chair. House Joint Resolution 78 designates the section of U.S. Route 45 as it runs through the Village of Loda as the Veterans of Loda Township Highway. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Burke, Gordon-Booth. Please take the record. There are 112 (sic-110) voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 79, Mr. Bradley. Please proceed, Sir."
- Bradley: "Yes. This would name a portion of 166 near the city of Creal Springs after one of its great citizens, Clyde Robertson. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Sosnowski. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted.

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

House Joint Resolution 80, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please proceed."

- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Joint Resolution 80 urges the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to create and distribute a survey for the purpose of identifying the main reasons which Illinois residents choose to leave our state. It urges the department to make a reasonable attempt to have former Illinois residents fill out the survey as we... to understand what made their decision on leaving our state so we have data and fact. I'll take any questions. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 81, Representative Bryant. Please proceed."
- Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 81 is to designate a portion of Illinois Route 149 east from U.S. Route 51 to the Jackson County line as Veterans Memorial Highway. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote for the adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mayfield. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 82, Mr. Ford. Please proceed."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Res... Joint Resolution 82 urges the Governor to approve appropriations that will fund the Urban Weatherization Initiative and to consider those appropriations as a priority

59th Legislative Day

- in the budget process. I move for the adoption of the Resolution."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 531, Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 531 urges the Members of the General Assembly to not implement any cuts to state aid to municipalities unless those cuts are matched by equally proportionate reductions in fees for financial services paid by our state agencies including fees for all financial services, including cash management, investment management, and debt management. It goes on to urge other things. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted.

  Senate Joint Resolution 11, Mr. Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Joint Resolution #11 creates the Electronic Driver's License Task Force to basically examine the feasibility of using and issuing driver's license electronically."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 1906, Representative Hurley. Please read the Bill."

59th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1906, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hurley, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Do I have to adopt the Amendment, Sir?"
- Speaker Lang: "Briefly explain the Amendment."
- Hurley: "It's a gut and replace for Senate Bill 1906 and it will add Special Olympics, Special Children Charities, the U.S.S. Illinois Commissioning Fund, and the Autism Care Fund to the Income Tax checkoff."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo on the Amendment. Apparently not. 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 1907, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1907, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1608, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1608, a Bill for an Act..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please move this back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1608, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

59th Legislative Day

- No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. This is an Amendment that is substantially similar to a Senate Bill that was not considered in the Revenue Committee. It provides that if there is a disparity of greater than five percent in the taxes in the case of... of a unit of local government, school districts in particular, that are in overlapping counties, if one county didn't pay its fair share by more than five percent, this sets up a mechanism so that the county treasurer can correct the property tax bills. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I'd be grateful for your support."
- 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. On Supplemental Calendar #4, under Concurrence, House Bill 2919, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment
  #1."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2919. Page 12 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1253, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1253, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

59th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1253 on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1253, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto. Representative Soto, Third Reading on your Bill."
- Soto: "Thank you. Okay. Senate Bill 1253 is identical to the House Floor Amendment #1 House... to House Bill 420 the 98th General Assembly. Senate Bill 1253 requires that Managed Care Entities, including Managed Care MCOs, to develop a written language access policy to ensure language appropriate services are provided for limited English proficiency population within the Medicaid program who are enrolled in the MCE."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gordon-Booth, Willis. Please take the record. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1608, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1608, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The measure does two things. That which I just described in Amendment #1 and that was the issue of overlapping taxing districts when one county doesn't pay its fair share of taxes. The other

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

comes from the Department of Revenue and it clarifies that if someone doesn't file a sales tax return, which now carries a hundred dollar penalty, they don't have to pay the penalty plus any liability that they might owe on that tax return. So, it becomes an either/or situation that may well be current practice in the department, but it certainly makes good sense for the taxpayer. I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Bennett. Please take the record. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 23 of the Calendar, House Resolution 380, Representative Burke. Please proceed, Sir."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very simply this Resolution would congratulate the celebration of Charter Schools Week in the nation and also, congratulate some of the schools that are doing a fine job administrating charter schools. I'd ask for the Body's favorable consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 402, Mr. Phelps. Please proceed."
- Phelps: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First off, let me say, I want to commend Senator Mark Kirk and Dick Durbin, working together. This Resolution urges Congress to pass the Fairness in Federal Disaster Declaration Act to ensure that Illinois residents

59th Legislative Day

- are who impacted by deadly and destructive tornadoes receive the level of assistance they require. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution... Mr... Excuse me. Mr. Hays on the Resolution."
- Hays: "Representative, thank you for bringing this. As you know, my area has been devastated as well and the current federal match really shortchanges most of our Illinois communities.

  And I can't thank you enough for bringing this."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 76, Mr. Ford. Please proceed."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Joint Resolution 76 supports and amends the U.S. Constitution to make sure that the U.S. Constitution explicitly guarantee an individual the right to vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 135, Mr. Ford. Please proceed."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 35(sic-135) urges the Board of Trustees of every public university in the State of Illinois to adopt a program that provides housing scholarships to college students that are registered as homeless and to include funding for this program in their appropriation request to the General Assembly. Thanks."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 760, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 760, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would ask that we adopt the Amendment, Floor Amendment #1 for Sen... Senate Bill 760."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 760, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate
Bill 760 is an agreed Bill that the Illinois Community College
Board believes in. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "You might want to tell us what's in the Bill, Sir."

Dunkin: "This Bill simply allows private business and vocational schools to come up with an articulation agreement with the Illinois Community College Board."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Is this a mandate, Ken?"

Dunkin: "No."

Sandack: "Are you sure?"

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Dunkin: "No, it's not a mandate. If you're... if you're a private business vocational school, you simply have... you simply have to adhere to the Community College Board academic or class structure curriculum base to the I... ICCB."

Sandack: "But it requires the community college to accept up to 30 credit hours from non-degree granting institutions, right? Isn't that a mandate?"

Dunkin: "No. This is a situation where you do not want to have the vocational or business schools..."

Sandack: "Oh, I like vocational schools."

Dunkin: "...on their own."

Sandack: "Sure sounds like a mandate to me, Ken."

Dunkin: "It's not a mandate. It's an agreed Bill, Representative It came out of..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Sandack: "Are you saying agreed Bills can't be mandates?"

Dunkin: "This is... this Bill left out on leave..."

Speaker Lang: "We're..."

Dunkin: "...per Representative Norine Hammond."

Speaker Lang: "...moving... we're moving on to Mr. Hays. Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, I know on... in the original version of this Bill there was some... there was some reservation that the entities that we're talking about would not receive credit hours in from other institutions, yet they wanted these credit hours to be approved automatically by the community college system. Can you... can you just quickly give me kind of what

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

changed in the Bill? 'Cause I know initially the community colleges were very, very hesitant about the Bill."

Dunkin: "Yes. And thank you for asking. Again, this is an agreed Bill that we... that they negotiated along with myself. And the Bill's known as the Career and Workforce Transition Act. So, there are many individuals who are... who attend vocational school right out of high school who just want to get some job skill training such as medical assistant or medical coding or HVAC or heat and ventilation and air conditioning and welding pharmaceutical technician. And sometimes individuals want to go back to college and often they end up in community college. And we simply want to have the individuals who attend these community colleges to have a... an agreed academic curriculum that can be transferrable once... for example, they want to get their associate's or their bachelor's degree. So, it's a Bill that really helps, a transitional piece curriculum wise, from a vocational school to a community college."

Hays: "And so, at this point, the community college board is fine
 with this concept..."

Dunkin: "Absolutely."

Hays: "...at this point. Thank..."

Dunkin: "And actually, when they put the Amendment on, they're in 100 percent agreeance."

Hays: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr... Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Wallace: "So, Representative Dunkin, are you stating that these would have to go into a specific degree program or would these credits just be... I don't know, like... I forget the term."

Dunkin: "This is a Bill... It's Saturday, right? We've never worked on..."

Wallace: "I know. I'm tired. I'm very tired."

Dunkin: "It's our first Saturday together. I'm excited that we're working on a Saturday afternoon."

Wallace: "Would these just be non-cred... I mean, no good."

Dunkin: "This... this Bill, really, Senate Bill 760 is an attempt to encourage adults currently who are in the workforce, but only have a certificate or in the five fields mentioned above, again, such as medical assistant, medical coding, dental assistant, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, welding, and pharmaceutical to have a smooth transition to a community college. And when I... we got all the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Community College Board, and some of the private business vocation schools together and they came up with an agreed process of an articulation agreement. So, that's pretty much where this Bill is. And it's high time that they really come a... come to a level of understanding. So, an individual who was in a private business vocational school can have a smooth transition if and when they go to a community college."

Wallace: "But would these just be elective credits or would these be credits that go toward a core curriculum?"

Dunkin: "Core curriculum such as English, social sciences, math, et cetera."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Wallace: "So, how do we evaluate the parity between vocational schools... an English class at a vocational school and an English class at a two-year or four-year institution?"

Dunkin: "That's an excellent question of Representative Dr. Wallace. That's why the Illinois Community College Board wants to play an active role with seeking a level of clarity and understanding of what high... and what organi... what English, what math, what science, what chemistry class makes sense for their respective curriculum so it will be a smooth transition."

Wallace: "But are you saying that that doesn't already exist?"

Dunkin: "No. I'm saying we're going to stream..."

Wallace: "And that this Bill would create that?"

Dunkin: "No, I'm saying it's going to come up with a statewide streamline system that would be oh so easy to articulate academically and curriculum wise. And that's why community colleges and some of these private business vocational schools are going to get in sync with one another. And that's why it's an agreed Bill with no opposition."

Wallace: "Okay. I don't... I wouldn't ever typically ask this, but you don't believe that maybe we should pull this Bill from the record and have greater understanding as to what will be electives and what would be courses that actually count toward degrees?"

Dunkin: "No."

Wallace: "So, no?"

Dunkin: "No."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Wallace: "So, you want to mandate community colleges to accept coursework that may not be comparable to what a two-year or four-year institution would offer as classwork?"

Dunkin: "Representative, it's only... only ICCB approved courses in schools."

Wallace: "Okay."

Dunkin: "So, they have to apply for approval..."

Wallace: "So, if they're ICCB approved courses then these are...

So, that's different from what you just said because you told

me before that these are not courses that are electives but
they would count toward core requirements."

Dunkin: "Representative, it's merely what ICCB is approving. So, it can't be some... some college... some rinky-dink proprietary school that comes up with a curriculum. If ICCB does not approve it, it's not accepted. So, it's only what the Illinois Community College Board approves. That's it. And so, if they approve it, the core curriculum is approved; if not, it's not. So, again, this is an agreed Bill by the Illinois Community College Board, Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the private schools. Because we don't want individuals spending a tremendous amount of their own money..."

Wallace: "Okay. I have a question still."

Dunkin: "...and not having at least a core curriculum validated by the Illinois Community College Board system."

Wallace: "So, then, how is that different from the process now?

Why do we need a piece of legislation to allow for colleges or institutions to accept credits or deny credits?"

Dunkin: "This simply clarifies it. This is a clarification Bill that private business vocational schools along with the

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Illinois Community College Board, the Illinois Board of Higher Education approves of and agrees with. So, all parties are excited about this Bill and you should be too."

Wallace: "I'm not very excited about this Bill. So, what if these vocational institutions are not accredited? So, you said it can't be just any for-profit institution seeking for this transfer ability. And that's something I worry about because we have lots of for-profit institutions out there that are basically taking advantage of students and accepting federal and state aid dollars, yet people don't end up in careers and don't end up with accredited degrees."

Dunkin: "Representative, another great question. Every single one of these private business vocational schools must be approved by the Illinois Community College Board, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the National Department of Education. So, if they're not accredited, they will not, I repeat, will not be approved or validated when it comes to the Illinois Community College Board approving them."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace, can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Wallace: "Yes. So, I need to understand how this law or this Bill would create a situation that's any different from what already exists?"

Dunkin: "What exists now..."

Wallace: "Community colleges and universities already decide which credits they will accept and won't accept. So, is this law really necessary?"

Dunkin: "Representative, it's... currently today, it's all over the place. It's too piecemeal. You may have, let's say, DeVry

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Institution or ICC Tech or West... Westwood College, they all have individual systems and approaches. What this legislation does is streamlines it and it gives the Illinois Community College Board the ability to approve only accredited vocational or business schools core curriculum. That's why it's an agreed Bill by the Illinois Community College Board and the Illinois Board of Higher Education along with the private business and vocational schools. They all agree..."

Wallace: "Okay."

Dunkin: "...on this Bill, Representative."

Wallace: "Well, to the Bill. I'm going to say that this doesn't really create anything very different from what already takes place in our two-year and four-year institutions. I won't encourage either way, but it doesn't really create anything different than what already exists. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Five speakers left on this agreed Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Hammond and the Chair is putting on the two-minute timer."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill, very quickly. I'll do less than 60 seconds on this. I believe this is a very good Bill. The reason why this is a good Bill is because me, as a student, who's already paid, whether it's a profit, forprofit, or non-for-profit school, I've already paid for those classes. And because I've paid for those classes, I should not have to retake and repay for the classes again when I want to transfer to a community college. And so, I encourage an 'aye' vote on this. This is a good Bill and we certainly should not be repeating more debt for students, especially adult students at this time."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, you and I generally are in complete agreement when it comes to the issue of higher education. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, just to... to clarify, and I know that you worked to come to this agreement on this Bill. To clarify, with the agreement, the final version of this Bill, the Illinois Community College Board will be making the determination across the board rather than piecemealing for what credits would be accepted including private and vocational schools. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "And the final version is a version that has been agreed to by all parties. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "And I would like to congratulate you on this piece of legislation. Good job, Representative."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Could you please tell me exactly what it means for a Bill to be agreed?"

Dunkin: "No."

Ford: "Oh well, to the Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin to very briefly close."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

- Dunkin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 67... 760 is a Bill that the State of Illinois finally has come up with that's going to be uniform that our Illinois Community College Board agrees on, that our Illinois Community... Board of Higher... excuse me... Illinois Board of Higher Education agrees on, and most of the Illinois private business vocational schools agree on. I am so proud to be a part of an agreed Bill that I'm excited on... on 20 on a Saturday afternoon. And I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote 'aye'."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Acevedo, Cabello, Davidsmeyer, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 102 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2015: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 175 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3497."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello is recognized."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Costello: "I would like to introduce my lovely wife, Lori, to the chamber. She's here with me today. And I would... I would also like to remind the chamber, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the

59th Legislative Day

- seventh game in the Blackhawks Stanley Cup series is tonight at 7:00. So, if we could curtail some of the debate and get to the point, that'd be terrific."
- Speaker Lang: "We're going to get some very good news very soon, Sir. Mr. Phelps is recognized."
- Phelps: "Mr. Speaker, did he say that was his wife, 'cause we thought it was his daughter."
- Speaker Lang: "Not going there. Mr. Frese."
- Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce my daughter, who's with me here today, Laura Frese."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Welcome to everybody's family. Returning to the Order of Resolutions, page 24 of the Calendar, House Resolution 435 to be handled by Representative Mayfield. Please proceed."
- Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. As many of you recall, on May 13 we had some very beautiful and distinguished women that graced the Capitol. And this Resolution is in honor of them. House Resolution 435 designates the date of May 13, 2015 as Alpha Kappa Alpha Day in the State of Illinois in honor of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, and its work. So, this is for the ladies in the green and pink. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 440, Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. This Resolution designates May 6, 2015 as 'Moms on a Mission Day' in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And now, Mr. Reis is recognized."

59th Legislative Day

5/30/2015

Reis: "I know how you feel now, Lou. Just for planning purposes, for those who stay in hotels, should we check out tomorrow meaning we might leave before 6 p.m.?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis?"

Reis: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Can we get back to you Monday on this? It is the intention of the Speaker that we not be working late tomorrow."

Reis: "Go, Blackhawks."

Speaker Lang: "And now... Anybody else? Leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Sunday, May 31 at the hour of noon. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned 'til Sunday, May 31 at the hour of 12 noon, high noon. Go, Blackhawks."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 21, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."