94th Legislative Day 3/22/2012

HB3129	Recalled	95
HB3129	Third Reading	97
HB3810	First Reading	93
HB3826	First Reading	93
HB4129	First Reading	93
HB4445	First Reading	93
HB4492	First Reading	93
HB4562	First Reading	94
HB4563	First Reading	94
HB4637	First Reading	94
HB4962	First Reading	94
HB4966	First Reading	94
HB4968	First Reading	94
HB5021	First Reading	94
HB5056	First Reading	94
HB5101	First Reading	94
HB5121	First Reading	94
HB5193	First Reading	94
HB5211	First Reading	94
HB5485	First Reading	94
HB5486	First Reading	94
HB5642	First Reading	95
SB2259	Out Of Record	101
SB2259	Third Reading	101
SB2488	Third Reading	101
SB2492	Third Reading	116
SB2493	Third Reading	118
SB2503	Third Reading	119
SB2520	Third Reading	120
SB2524	Third Reading	121
SB2528	Third Reading	122
SB2531	Third Reading	123
SB2536	Third Reading	124
SB2537	Third Reading	124
SB2539	Third Reading	125
SB2568	Third Reading	257
SB2574	Third Reading	126
SB2577	Third Reading	127
SB2579	Third Reading	258
SB2580	Third Reading	129
SB2581	Second Reading	77

3/22/2012

94th Legislative Day

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012	
GD0500			
SB2582	Second Reading	77	
SB2583	Second Reading	78	
SB2584	Second Reading	78	
SB2585	Second Reading	78	
SB2586	Second Reading	78	
SB2587	Second Reading	78	
SB2588	Second Reading	78	
SB2589	Second Reading	78	
SB2590	Second Reading	78	
SB2591	Second Reading	78	
SB2592	Second Reading	78	
SB2593	Second Reading	78	
SB2594	Second Reading	78	
SB2595	Second Reading	78	
SB2596	Second Reading	78	
SB2597	Second Reading	78	
SB2598	Second Reading	79	
SB2599	Second Reading	79	
SB2600	Second Reading	79	
SB2601	Second Reading	79	
SB2602	Second Reading	79	
SB2603	Second Reading	79	
SB2604	Second Reading	79	
SB2605	Second Reading	79	
SB2606	Second Reading	79	
SB2607	Second Reading	79	
SB2608	Second Reading	79	
SB2609	Second Reading	79	
SB2610	Second Reading	79	
SB2611	Second Reading	79	
SB2612	Second Reading	80	
SB2613	Second Reading	80	
SB2614	Second Reading	80	
SB2615	Second Reading	80	
SB2616	Second Reading	80	
SB2617	Second Reading	80	
SB2618	Second Reading	80	
SB2619	Second Reading	80	
SB2620	Second Reading	80	
SB2621	Second Reading	80	
SB2622	Second Reading	80	
SB2623	Second Reading	80	

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB2624	Second Reading	80
SB2625	Second Reading	80
SB2626	Second Reading	80
SB2627	Second Reading	81
SB2628	Second Reading	81
SB2629	Second Reading	81
SB2630	Second Reading	81
SB2631	Second Reading	81
SB2632	Second Reading	81
SB2633	Second Reading	81
SB2634	Second Reading	81
SB2635	Second Reading	81
SB2637	Second Reading	81
SB2638	Second Reading	81
SB2639	Second Reading	81
SB2640	Second Reading	81
SB2641	Second Reading	81
SB2642	Second Reading	82
SB2643	Second Reading	82
SB2644	Second Reading	82
SB2645	Second Reading	82
SB2646	Second Reading	82
SB2647	Second Reading	82
SB2648	Second Reading	82
SB2649	Second Reading	82
SB2650	Second Reading	82
SB2651	Second Reading	82
SB2652	Second Reading	82
SB2653	Second Reading	82
SB2654	Second Reading	82
SB2655	Second Reading	82
SB2656	Second Reading	82
SB2657	Second Reading	83
SB2658	Second Reading	83
SB2659	Second Reading	83
SB2660	Second Reading	83
SB2661	Second Reading	83
SB2662 SB2663	Second Reading	83
	Second Reading	83
SB2664	Second Reading	83
SB2665	Second Reading	83
SB2666	Second Reading	83

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB2667	Second Reading	83
SB2668	Second Reading	83
SB2669	Second Reading	83
SB2670	Second Reading	83
SB2671	Second Reading	84
SB2672	Second Reading	84
SB2673	Second Reading	84
SB2674	Second Reading	84
SB2675	Second Reading	84
SB2676	Second Reading	84
SB2677	Second Reading	84
SB2678	Second Reading	84
SB2679	Second Reading	84
SB2680	Second Reading	84
SB2681	Second Reading	84
SB2682	Second Reading	84
SB2683	Second Reading	84
SB2684	Second Reading	84
SB2685	Second Reading	84
SB2686	Second Reading	85
SB2687	Second Reading	85
SB2688	Second Reading	85
SB2689	Second Reading	85
SB2690	Second Reading	85
SB2691	Second Reading	85
SB2692	Second Reading	85
SB2693	Second Reading	85
SB2694	Second Reading	85 85
SB2695 SB2696	Second Reading Second Reading	85
SB2697	Second Reading	85
SB2698	Second Reading	85
SB2699	Second Reading	85
SB2700	Second Reading	86
SB2700 SB2701	Second Reading	86
SB2701 SB2702	Second Reading	86
SB2702 SB2703	Second Reading	86
SB2704	Second Reading	86
SB2705	Second Reading	86
SB2706	Second Reading	86
SB2707	Second Reading	86
SB2708	Second Reading	86
		0.0

3/22/2012

94th Legislative Day

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012	
GD2700	Command Donalina		0.0
SB2709	Second Reading		86
SB2710	Second Reading		86
SB2711	Second Reading		86
SB2712	Second Reading		86
SB2713	Second Reading		86
SB2714	Second Reading		86
SB2715	Second Reading		87
SB2716	Second Reading		87
SB2717	Second Reading		87
SB2718	Second Reading		87 87
SB2719 SB2720	Second Reading		87
SB2721	Second Reading Second Reading		87
SB2721	-		87
SB2723	Second Reading Second Reading		87
SB2724	Second Reading		87
SB2725	Second Reading		87
SB2726	-		87
SB2727	Second Reading Second Reading		87
SB2728	Second Reading		87
SB2729	Second Reading		88
SB2729 SB2730	Second Reading		88
SB2731	Second Reading		88
SB2731	Second Reading		88
SB2733	Second Reading		88
SB2734	Second Reading		88
SB2735	Second Reading		88
SB2736	Second Reading		88
SB2737	Second Reading		88
SB2738	Second Reading		88
SB2739	Second Reading		88
SB2740	Second Reading		88
SB2741	Second Reading		88
SB2742	Second Reading		88
SB2743	Second Reading		88
SB2744	Second Reading		89
SB2745	Second Reading		89
SB2746	Second Reading		89
SB2747	Second Reading		89
SB2748	Second Reading		89
SB2749	Second Reading		89
SB2750	Second Reading		89

94th Legislative Day	7	3/22/2012
SB2751	Second Reading	89
SB2752	Second Reading	89
SB2753	Second Reading	89
SB2754	Second Reading	89
SB2755	Second Reading	89
SB2756	Second Reading	89
SB2757	Second Reading	89
SB2758	Second Reading	90
SB2759	Second Reading	90
SB2760	Second Reading	90
SB2761	Second Reading	90
SB2762	Second Reading	90
SB2763	Second Reading	90
SB2764	Second Reading	90
SB2765	Second Reading	90
SB2766	Second Reading	90
SB2767	Second Reading	90
SB2768	Second Reading	90
SB2769	Second Reading	90
SB2770	Second Reading	90
SB2771	Second Reading	90
SB2772	Second Reading	90
SB2773	Second Reading	91
SB2774	Second Reading	91
SB2775	Second Reading	91
SB2776	Second Reading	91
SB2777	Second Reading	91
SB2778	Second Reading	91
SB2779	Second Reading	91
SB2780	Second Reading	91
SB2781	Second Reading	91
SB2782	Second Reading	91
SB2783	Second Reading	91
SB2784 SB2785	Second Reading Second Reading	91 91
SB2786	Second Reading	91
SB2787	Second Reading	92
SB2788	Second Reading	92
SB2789	Second Reading	92
SB2799	Second Reading	92
SB2790 SB2791	Second Reading	92
SB2791 SB2792	Second Reading	92
002/32	become Reading	92

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB2793	Second Reading	92
SB2794	Second Reading	92
SB2795	Second Reading	92
SB2818	Third Reading	130
SB2819	Third Reading	131
SB2820	Third Reading	132
SB2820	Vote Intention	135
SB2826	Third Reading	135
SB2844	Third Reading	136
SB2849	Third Reading	137
SB2850	Third Reading	139
SB2873	Third Reading	140
SB2875	Third Reading	140
SB2896	Third Reading	141
SB2937	Third Reading	143
SB2944	Third Reading	146
SB2946	Third Reading	148
SB2947	Third Reading	149
SB2948	Third Reading	149
SB2949	Third Reading	150
SB2950	Third Reading	151
SB2961	Recalled	153
SB2971	Third Reading	154
SB2972	Second Reading	64
SB2973	Second Reading	64
SB2974	Second Reading	65
SB2975	Second Reading	65
SB2976	Second Reading	65
SB2977	Second Reading	65
SB2979	Second Reading	65
SB2980	Second Reading	65
SB2981	Second Reading	65
SB2982	Second Reading	66
SB2983	Second Reading	66
SB2984	Second Reading	66 66
SB2985 SB2986	Second Reading Second Reading	66
	Second Reading Second Reading	66
SB2987 SB2988	Second Reading Second Reading	66
SB2988 SB2989	Second Reading Second Reading	66
SB2989 SB2990	Second Reading Second Reading	67
SB2990 SB2991	Second Reading Second Reading	67
202331	Second Reading	6 /

94th Legislative Day	7	3/22/2012
SB2992	Second Reading	67
SB2994	Second Reading	67
SB2995	Second Reading	67
SB2996	Second Reading	67
SB2997	Second Reading	67
SB2999	Second Reading	67
SB3000	Second Reading	67
SB3001	Second Reading	67
SB3002	Second Reading	67
SB3003	Second Reading	67
SB3004	Second Reading	67
SB3005	Second Reading	68
SB3006	Second Reading	68
SB3007	Second Reading	68
SB3008	Second Reading	68
SB3009	Second Reading	68
SB3010	Second Reading	68
SB3011	Second Reading	68
SB3012	Second Reading	68
SB3013	Second Reading	68
SB3014	Second Reading	68
SB3015	Second Reading	68
SB3016	Second Reading	68
SB3017	Second Reading	68
SB3018	Second Reading	68
SB3019	Second Reading	68
SB3020	Second Reading	69
SB3021	Second Reading	69
SB3023	Second Reading	69
SB3024	Second Reading	69
SB3025 SB3026	Second Reading	69 69
SB3026 SB3027	Second Reading Second Reading	69
SB3027 SB3028	Second Reading	69
SB3026 SB3029	Second Reading	69
SB3029 SB3030	Second Reading	69
SB3030	Second Reading	69
SB3031	Second Reading	69
SB3032 SB3033	Second Reading	69
SB3034	Second Reading	69
SB3034 SB3035	Second Reading	70
SB3036	Second Reading	70
223030	become Reading	70

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB3037	Second Reading	70
SB3038	Second Reading	70
SB3039	Second Reading	70
SB3040	Second Reading	70
SB3041	Second Reading	70
SB3042	Second Reading	70
SB3043	Second Reading	70
SB3044	Second Reading	70
SB3045	Second Reading	70
SB3046	Second Reading	70
SB3048	Second Reading	70
SB3049	Second Reading	70
SB3050	Second Reading	70
SB3051	Second Reading	71
SB3052	Second Reading	71
SB3053	Second Reading	71
SB3054	Second Reading	71
SB3055	Second Reading	71
SB3056	Second Reading	71
SB3057	Second Reading	71
SB3058	Second Reading	71
SB3059	Second Reading	71
SB3060	Second Reading	71
SB3062	Second Reading	71
SB3063	Second Reading	71
SB3064	Second Reading	71
SB3065	Second Reading	71
SB3067	Second Reading	72
SB3068	Second Reading	72
SB3069	Second Reading	72
SB3070	Second Reading	72
SB3071	Second Reading	72
SB3072	Second Reading	72
SB3073	Second Reading	72
SB3074	Second Reading	72
SB3075	Second Reading	72
SB3076	Second Reading	72
SB3077	Second Reading	72
SB3078	Second Reading	72
SB3079	Second Reading	72
SB3080	Second Reading	72
SB3081	Second Reading	72

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB3082	Second Reading	73
SB3083	Second Reading	73
SB3084	Second Reading	73
SB3085	Second Reading	73
SB3086	Second Reading	73
SB3087	Second Reading	73
SB3088	Second Reading	73
SB3089	Second Reading	73
SB3090	Second Reading	73
SB3091	Second Reading	73
SB3092	Second Reading	73
SB3093	Second Reading	73
SB3094	Second Reading	73
SB3095	Second Reading	73
SB3096	Second Reading	74
SB3097	Second Reading	74
SB3098	Second Reading	74
SB3099	Second Reading	74
SB3100	Second Reading	74
SB3102	Second Reading	74
SB3103	Second Reading	74
SB3104	Second Reading	74
SB3105	Second Reading	74
SB3106	Second Reading	74
SB3107	Second Reading	74
SB3108	Second Reading	74
SB3109	Second Reading	74
SB3110	Second Reading	74
SB3111	Second Reading	74
SB3112	Second Reading	75
SB3113	Second Reading	75 75
SB3114 SB3115	Second Reading Second Reading	75 75
SB3115 SB3116	Second Reading	75 75
SB3116 SB3117	Second Reading	75 75
SB3117 SB3118	Second Reading	75 75
SB3110 SB3119	Second Reading Second Reading	75 75
SB3119 SB3120	Second Reading	75 75
SB3120 SB3121	Second Reading	75 75
SB3121 SB3122	Second Reading	75 75
SB3123	Second Reading	75 75
SB3124	Second Reading	75 75
ODJIZI	become Reading	75

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB3125	Second Reading	75
SB3126	Second Reading	76
SB3127	Second Reading	76
SB3128	Second Reading	76
SB3129	Second Reading	76
SB3130	Second Reading	76
SB3131	Second Reading	76
SB3132	Second Reading	76
SB3133	Second Reading	76
SB3134	Second Reading	76
SB3135	Second Reading	76
SB3136	Second Reading	76
SB3137	Second Reading	76
SB3138	Second Reading	76
SB3139	Second Reading	76
SB3140	Second Reading	76
SB3141	Second Reading	77
SB3142	Second Reading	77
SB3143	Second Reading	77
SB3144	Second Reading	77
SB3145	Second Reading	77
SB3148	Third Reading	155
SB3151	Third Reading	156
SB3176	Third Reading	156
SB3178	Out Of Record	162
SB3178	Third Reading	157
SB3217	Third Reading	162
SB3233	Third Reading	164
SB3237	Third Reading	165
SB3242	Third Reading	168
SB3250	Third Reading	168
SB3257	Third Reading	169
SB3262	Third Reading	170
SB3270	Third Reading	171
SB3287	Third Reading	172
SB3292	Third Reading	259
SB3315	Third Reading	174
SB3320	Third Reading	174
SB3324	Third Reading	176
SB3358	Third Reading	177
SB3385	Third Reading	178
SB3386	Third Reading	179

94th Legislative Day		3/22/2012
SB3386	Vote Intention	181
SB3393	Third Reading	180
SB3397	Third Reading	181
SB3408	Third Reading	184
SB3409	Third Reading	193
SB3410	Third Reading	194
SB3423	Third Reading	197
SB3428	Third Reading	197
SB3428	Vote Intention	200
SB3433	Third Reading	199
SB3435	Third Reading	260
SB3437	Third Reading	200
SB3438	Third Reading	201
SB3452	Third Reading	202
SB3453	Third Reading	202
SB3457	Third Reading	203
SB3458	Third Reading	204
SB3484	Out Of Record	223
SB3484	Third Reading	222
SB3487	Third Reading	223
SB3489	Third Reading	224
SB3491	Third Reading	225
SB3508	Third Reading	226
SB3510	Third Reading	227
SB3533	Third Reading	228
SB3536	Third Reading	229
SB3552	Third Reading	230
SB3579	Third Reading	232
SB3592	Third Reading	233
SB3594	Third Reading	234
SB3607	Third Reading	234
SB3626	Third Reading	235
SB3629	Third Reading	237
SB3631	Third Reading	237
SB3635 SB3655	Third Reading Third Reading	238
SB3660	3	239
SB3663	Third Reading Out Of Record	240 248
SB3663	Third Reading	248
SB3670	Third Reading Third Reading	245
SB3670 SB3671	Third Reading Third Reading	248
SB3671 SB3673	Third Reading Third Reading	250
30 / 3	IIIII keadiiig	250

3/22/2012 94th Legislative Day Third Reading SB3685 252 SB3712 Third Reading 253 Third Reading SB3746 254 Out Of Record SB3780 256 SB3780 Third Reading 255 Third Reading SB3809 256 Resolution Offered 92 SR0678 Senate to Order-President Cullerton 1 Prayer-Father Stefano Belbove 1 Pledge of Allegiance 1 Journal-Postponed 1 Introduction of Guest-President Cullerton 2 2 Remarks by Consul General Alessandro Motta Committee of the Whole 3 Committee of the Whole Arises 62 Committee Reports 92 Messages from the House 93 Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes 261 Committee Reports 261 Messages from the House 263 Adjournment 263

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

The regular Session of the 97th General...(microphone cutoff)...will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Father Stefano Belbove, of Rome. He is the Assistant for Secretary General of Higher Education for the Jesuit order worldwide. Father.

FATHER STEFANO BELBOVE:

(Prayer by Father Stefano Belbove)

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Jacobs)

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

James Carder, from Blueroomstream.com, and Chris Brooks, from WICS, seeks leave to photograph or videotape the proceedings. Is there any objection? Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Journal of Wednesday, March 21st, 2012.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President, I move -- I move to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal just read by the Secretary, pending arrival of the printed transcript.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're pleased to have Mr. Alessandro Motta, the General -- the Consul General of Italy in Chicago. He has served in his post since August of 2007 and has built a very distinguished record on international affairs. In March of '92, he entered the Diplomatic Corps at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. then served in the Department for Military Affairs {sic} (Politics) of the Italian Joint Chief of Staff. From September 1996 to May of 2000, he served at the Italian Embassy in Mexico as the Chief of Economic -- Department. From June 2000 to June 2004, he was the Italian Consul in Brussels. And from 2004 to July of 2007, he served at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs as Chief of Staff of the Director for Human Resources. He has a -- a wife and a family. I believe he lives in my district, as a matter of fact, while he's here in Chicago. And he's preparing now for a couple small events, the G8 and the NATO Summit. And then, when he's finished with that, he'll come down here and help us with Medicaid and pension reform. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, please welcome the Consul General of --Alessandro Motta, the Consul General of Italy.

CONSUL GENERAL ALESSANDRO MOTTA:

(Remarks by Consul General Alessandro Motta)
PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

I would like to ask all of the Senators who might be in their office to please come to the Floor, because we are about to begin the Committee of the Whole. So I would please ask Senators who may be in their office to please come to the Floor

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

as soon as possible. Senator Trotter. Senator Crotty, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CROTTY:

On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

State your point.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Here today with me is a young man, Brandon. His mother has been a great friend of mine for about sixteen years, Marta. And Marta is up in the gallery. This is not Brandon's first time in Springfield; he is a student here. But he started his academics out in the south suburbs of Chicago. He has already graduated from high school and he's only seventeen. He's enrolled at Prairie State, taking college courses. And he is -- long list of very prestigious schools that are looking at Brandon. I can't begin to tell you how hard he has worked as a student and how bright and intelligent he is. I'm so proud to have him here. Please welcome him to the Senate Floor for the first time.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

I'd like to please ask all Members to come to the Floor for the purposes of beginning the Committee of the Whole. Please come to the Floor. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I move that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of testimony from representatives of the National Conference of State Legislatures on the issue of Illinois and other states' medical and -- assistance programs.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Senator Trotter moves that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of testimony from representatives of the National Conference of State Legislatures on the issue of Illinois and other states' medical assistance programs. Is there any discussion? There being none, all those in favor will say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. The Senate is resolved into the Committee of the Whole. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention, today's Committee of the Whole is very significant. The challenges that we face in this area are very complex. won't be resolved without a lot of hard work. So we're going to ask Republicans and Democrats, together, to work together to hope -- help solve this issue. But before we offer solutions, it's important, I think, that we all become aware of the subject So that -- NCSL's presentation will hopefully allow us to accomplish that. We can learn from what other states are doing to rein in Medicaid spending. We will learn what worked for them, what hasn't worked, and how we can move forward towards a solution. The -- I really have faith that we -- if we work together, we can solve this problem. We've already begun this work. I would like to compliment Senator Righter and Senator Steans, who last year took the first steps towards passing a Medicaid reform package, and now we must continue along the -- continue with that path of bipartisanship. So, for the purposes of this posted Committee of the Whole, I would appoint Senator Donne Trotter, Chair of the Committee of the Whole. The Chair would recognize Senator -- Republican Leader Senator Radogno.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would appoint Senator Dale Righter as the Minority Spokesman for the Committee as a Whole. PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

At this time, Senator Trotter in the Chair for the purpose of conducting this Committee of the Whole hearing. Senator Trotter in the Chair.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Thank -- thank you very much, Mr. President. It is my honor at this time to ask the Illinois Senate to welcome to -our guest to the -- our Senate, Joy Johnson Wilson, from the National Conference of State Legislature {sic} (Legislatures). NCSL is a bipartisan organization that serves legislators and staffs of the nation's fifty states. NCSL provides research and technical assistance on the most pressing state issues and is a respected advocate for state issues before Congress and federal agencies. Ms. Wilson is a federal -- Senior Federal Affairs Counsel and Health Policy Director at NCSL. As Federal Affairs Counsel, she assists with overall government relations and public affairs activities in the NCSL Washington Office. Director of Health Policy, she designs and implements lobbying strategy for the Conference on health care issues. also staffs the NCSL Task Force on Federal Health Reform Implementation. Ms. Wilson joined NCSL in 1978. She took a leave of absence in 1989 to serve on the staff of the U.S. Bipartisan Commission on Comprehensive Health Care, better known as the "Pepper Commission". She has recently served as a nonvoting member on the Medicaid Commission established by Secretary Leavitt of the U.S. Department of Health and Human

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Services during his tenure as Secretary. She also served on the Financing Working Group of the National Vaccine Advisory Committee, and was recently elected to be a member of the National Academy of Social Insurance, which is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization made up of experts on social insurance. Ms. Wilson received a Bachelor's of Science from the Keene State College in New Hampshire and a Master's of Regional Planning degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. At this time, I would like to bring forth, Ms. Joy Wilson. Members of the Illinois Senate, please welcome her to our Chamber.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Thank you so much. I feel very honored to be before you I have great admiration and respect for all of you, for the work that you do, and for the time that you expend and for the tough decisions that you make on a day-to-day basis in your jobs. So I am humbled and I hope that at the end of my time here that I have been helpful in some way to help you with the Medicaid budget issues that you're facing right now. Where we are: States continue to grapple with the lingering effects of the Great Recession on state revenues and Medicaid spending, although many states are beginning to see signs of economic improvement. While most states have avoided the need for additional midyear budget cuts, a few states have yet to close budget gaps in FY 2012. The outlook for FY 2013 and beyond remains difficult with continued pressure to find Medicaid cuts, although few options for additional savings remain. And that's It's very difficult to find new savings in the important. Medicaid program. Federal Medicaid policy - then and now: There have been some major changes in what states can do to find

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

savings in the Medicaid program over the last few years. Originally, there were always mandatory -- services that have to be provided and there have always been optional services. let me just say something about optional services: They are not like options on a car. When you get a option on a car, you're talking about the seventeen-inch wheels or now you can get twenty-inch. You can get stripes on the side and you can get leather seats. But that doesn't stop the car from going if you don't have those. Optional programs in Medicaid are not that kind of option. Prescription drugs is an optional program under Medicaid, although I think there's probably no one here that would argue that prescription drugs are not essential to health care anymore. So, basically, an optional program in Medicaid is an option simply because it wasn't mandatory in 1965 when the program was enacted. And since 1965, we have added a number of benefits, including prescription drug coverage, which are optional and the state does not have to have them, but many of the optional services are very critical to health care as we know it today. So I just think that's important to note. States have generally had the flexibility to set provider rates. At one point, there was something called the "Boren Amendment", which set some limits on how states could set rates for hospitals and nursing facilities. The Boren Amendment was repealed, and I can't remember what year yet -- now, but since that time, we have had, as states, substantial flexibility in setting rates. But that is changing also and we'll talk about that. And then we always have had the mandatory categories and we have added mandatory categories of individuals that have been eligible for the program. And we've always had optional

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

categories of individuals. And for the mandatory categories, you cannot cut them. Optional eligibility categories, you could change. But now, under current law, we cannot do anything on eliqibility standards, methodologies, and procedures. means, not only can you not change categories of people, you cannot change the applications that you use to -- for people to apply for the program, nor can you change any of the procedures attached to the eligibility process. And I know you have recently had some issues with the federal government about residency requirements and whether or not you could be more aggressive with that in your eligibility process. And they have argued that that would be a change in procedures and would be not allowed. And I know that that's still under discussion here. There is a federal regulation that's pending that would make it more complicated for states, particularly for the state legislature, to participate in changing rates - provider rates. This rule, which is not yet final, and -- and we'll talk about why it's not final in a few minutes, would set out a procedure where a state would have to do a study on the implications of the rate reduction and show -- and demonstrate that the rate reduction would not adversely impact service delivery. And so, before you could get a rate reduction approved, you would have to go through this process, which is not how we operate now and which would severely change the way state budgets would be able to respond if they needed to make a rate change. States, of course, are still able to eliminate or reduce optional benefits and services. And because this is the one area where you still have the most flexibility, it is the area where the most action occurs. And, of course, the biggest challenge that states have

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

faced over the last year is the replacement of the temporary enhanced match that we received as part of the Recovery Act. And every state has found a challenge in trying to replace those funds with state money, while their enrollment has substantially decreased. It's important to know some of the key financing mechanisms within Medicaid beyond the match. have disproportionate share hospital payments. These, every state has, and they're supplemental payments that are provided to -- to hospitals that provide a disproportionate share of care to low-income and uninsured individuals. States have tremendous flexibility in how they determine which hospitals get payments under this program. It is important to note that under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that disproportionate share payments to hospitals is scheduled to severely decrease. This is under the assumption that the number of uninsured people will commensurately decrease, and, therefore, the need for disproportionate share hospital payments would not be as -- as The upper payment limit is a complicated financing mechanism that provides additional supplemental funds also to hospitals. But there is a federal limit on what -- how much a state can -- can use for upper payment limits. And it attaches to fee-for-payment -- fee-for -- the fee-for-payment {sic} process, as opposed to managed care. So, as states move to managed care, the upper payment limit -- most states end up pushing up against the upper payment limit because of the formula that is used. So, as states expand managed care, they have to then make changes to the way they reimburse hospitals to make sure that they don't bump up against the upper payment limit. Any expenditures over the upper payment limit do not

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

receive federal match for Medicaid. So that's -- I know that's something that you're looking at as part of your overall Medicaid reform and it's part of your hospital payment reform. just thought I'd bring that up. There intergovernmental transfers and these are funds from local governments or local entities that are -- become part of the Medicaid match. So this is how a lot of states get local governments to help provide that Medicaid match, which is what everybody's trying to do - find ways to increase the Medicaid match. Provider taxes and donations: I know that Illinois has some provider taxes. The interesting thing about provider taxes and -- and all of these financing mechanisms, that at one time, HHS encouraged us to -- to do these things. The provider tax, which was really most active in the eighties -- we were encouraged to do provider taxes in order to expand access to more people under the Medicaid program. And what a provider tax is, is any tax on a health care provider. And it is important to note that the provider tax law that ultimately passed as a result of this activity affects all taxes that a state may impose on a health care provider, whether or not you use the proceeds from that tax as part of your Medicaid financing. this is a -- a intrusion in the area of taxing, which normally the federal government does not do, but in this case, it is a federal law that if you are going to impose a tax on a health care provider, you have to meet certain standards. And one of them, they have to be broad-based and uniform. You can't hold a provider harmless. So, in other words, if you tax a hospital for X, you can't give them back that same money through some other procedure under state law. And there are limited classes

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

of providers by which you can tax and use that money to effect a -- a match for Medicaid. So this law was put in place to kind of tamp down the amount of funds that were being raised through provider taxes back in the late eighties. Since that time, there have been some additional changes. The -- the -- in 2005 -- under the law, Medicaid managed care entities were considered a separate class from other HMOs. And so, states were able to tax Medicaid managed care entities and not tax the other managed care companies that were for-profit and that did not participate in Medicaid. In 2005, they changed that law. They eliminated the separate class for Medicaid managed care companies and said, now if you want to impose a provider tax, you would have to then tax all managed care entities. Again, this made it more difficult to impose that tax because it's a broader group and some of those HMOs that were not Medicaid-participating HMOs were not interested in -- in joining that party. Most recently, they have, through administrative rule, changed the way that they determine whether you are providing a hold harmless to a provider from a mathematical formula to a subjective process that would be done by HHS staff. So, in other words, they will look at your state laws. They will look at your administrative rules. They'll look in your hearing records. They'll look at the -- they'll look at the formula and then they will make a determination about whether or not that constitutes a hold harmless. So it's a very different process than was previously in place. And this is just a slide to talk a little bit -- more about the upper payment limit, since I knew this is something that is before you. Provider rates, we just talked about that. 1115 Waivers: Now, the 1115 Waiver process is extremely

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

important right now, because most of the innovation in Medicaid is occurring under the quise of an 1115 Waiver. This is a provision of the Social Security Act that allows the Secretary of HHS to waive key provisions in the Medicaid program to allow a state to innovate in that program. So, for instance, the State of Arizona, which was the last state to come into the Medicaid program, came into the program as an 1115 Waiver. They started their program with everyone in managed care. And this was before managed care was what it is today. So, this was a -a demonstration activity to see whether managed care could be a delivery system for the Medicaid population. So Arizona, every five years, renews their 1115 Waiver for Medicaid. So they are the only state that is in that position. But we do have a lot of other states now that are looking at the 1115 Waiver process to do other innovative activities, and I think, actually, the State of Illinois is looking to do some innovations under the 1115 Waiver authority as well. Now, there is a final rule that was issued that will make some changes to the 1115 Waiver Previously -- and most states had process. public participation process. So it's not like states were doing without some sort of public participation process. Congress's wisdom and as part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, they decided that the federal government needed to oversee that public participation piece. this rule does is set out some requirements about every state having a hearing, making the 1115 Waiver application public, having a -- a -- an official comment period. So all -- so there's some activities at the state level that are required under the rule. And then additionally, when the application is

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

sent to HHS, HHS will then put it on the Web on their webpage and seek comments nationally on your application. So this is a very different process. It extends the process to some extent, because you've got to make time for all these different steps. It's just important to know that the 1115 Waiver process is going to be very public, both in your state and nationally. I mentioned some key federal laws. These are very important, because any changes that you make to the Medicaid program, you have to take into -- you have to consider the requirements under the provider tax law, the Deficit Reduction Act, the Recovery and Investment {sic} (Reinvestment) Act, and the Patient -well, the Affordable Care Act. So, as part of the ARRA - which we'll call it for now - we accepted a maintenance of effort requirement so that we could get an enhanced match for Medicaid during the economic downturn. So, the thought was, we don't like maintenance of effort, but we're getting the enhanced match, which we desperately needed during the recession because we had so many more people coming onto the Medicaid program. We accepted the enhanced match maintenance of effort. There was a surprise provision that most of us missed, where the federal government changed the CHIP program, which is a block grant that provides funding for children and families with incomes above the Medicaid -- income level. They changed that from a voluntary block grant to a grant condition for receiving Medicaid. They only needed to change a couple of words in a phrase in the bill. It took a lot of people a long time to find Now, we still have maintenance of effort, but the enhanced match is gone. And that has left states in a very difficult situation, because it is very hard to get savings in

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

the Medicaid program in real time. It just is. And the one way that states were able to do that would be to make some changes to eligibility, to some of those optional areas where you might have expanded coverage either by income or create a mandatory -- an optional group of people who could receive coverage. You cannot make changes to eligibility now and you cannot make any changes to eligibility for the adult population until 2014. You cannot make any changes to the -- children's population until 2019. So, no eligibility changes, and that includes standards and procedures for conducting the eligibility The disproportionate share hospital payments are scheduled to begin decreasing, effective in 2014. So, again, this is another area of concern. There are some temporary increases for payments to primary care physicians which begins in 2013, and it's only for two years, which is a nice thing, except what do you do in 2015 when -- if you don't have the funds to support continuing that? You may lose some of those primary care physicians that come on for those two years. it's something to think about as you move forward, about what to do about that, 'cause that is in the mix. There are some federal budget proposals. And people pooh-pooh federal budget proposals, 'cause a lot of times they don't get to do a budget and they do a continuing resolution or do something else. But I have found, in my years of service at NCSL, that anything that's -- that's a proposal, at some point, usually becomes a law. I think it's really important to look at what they're proposing, because eventually somebody says, you know, "we've been looking at this and looking at this", and the next thing you know, it becomes law. So, one of the things they're looking at is

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

something called a "blended rate". This would take the Medicaid rate that you have currently, the CHIP rate, which is an enhancement on your Medicaid rate -- so, in every state the CHIP rate is greater than what you get for Medicaid. And then in the Affordable Care Act, there are provisions that provide a very large enhanced match - a hundred percent for three years - for newly eligible people and then it goes down to ninety percent over ten years for newly eligible people who come onto the Medicaid program as a result of the expansion that -- to primarily low-income adults in Medicaid. Under this blended match rate, it would be one rate for all of your members, which means that you're probably not going to get that hundred percent rate or the ninety percent. It's going to be probably something less than that while they -- but we don't know -- we don't have a formula on how they're going to come to that rate. I'm just saying it's something to watch, because it is a game changer in terms of how you figure out the cost of your program as you go out. One of the interesting things - there are two interesting aspects - they would leave the -- the match for administrative rates as it is. So it's fifty percent for most admin and there are enhanced matching rates for IT and for fraud and abuse and some other activities. Something that states have been fighting for for a long time is something that we call "countercyclical assistance". And what this is, is during an economic downturn, instead of states having to go to Congress and say, "Hey, you know, we're in a recession. We know our rolls are going to go up and we don't have financing to support people who are entitled to care under Medicaid during this economic downturn." We do this and they kind of pooh-pooh us for a while, and

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

eventually -- on two occasions, we have gotten enhanced match. What they are proposing is that under this blended matching rate, they would include a statutory countercyclical provision. So, that's something we've wanted for a long time. I'm not sure we want it tied to a blended rate. We'll have to see when there's actually a proposal before us. But I thought that was worth mentioning. There also is a -- a number of proposals, both -- and this is supported by both Republicans and Democrats, to limit how much you can -- the -- the amount of tax you can impose on any health care provider, moving it from six percent to three and a half percent over a span of years. course, there are some broad discussions about Medicaid block grants. There are no official proposals yet, but we expect that there will be some in the coming weeks. One of the reasons why the rule on provider rates is not yet final is that there is a Supreme Court case that was recently decided, and it asked the question of whether providers and beneficiaries can sue states over rate reductions, using the Supremacy Clause Constitution. The Supreme Court chose not to rule and sent it decide whether back to the lower court to there are administrative procedures that should have been done before this case got up to the Supreme Court. But it leaves open this question about whether or not there is a -- a right for providers and beneficiaries to sue over rates. And so this is still an ongoing issue. And the Supreme Court, in the discussion, they kept saying, "Well, this is just something that HHS could just do. They can say whether they accept the rate or not, and if they don't accept the rate, then that's that and the state can't do it." And what happened during -- in between the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

oral arguments and the -- the decision at the Supreme Court, HHS granted the State of California some of the rate reductions and grant them other ones. So they actually took administrative action, and I think that had some bearing on how the court came out. Now the question is, when it goes back before the lower court, whether they support keeping it at an administrative level or whether they're going to rule the same way they did before and kick it back up to the Supreme Court. So we don't know. But clearly, across the country, more providers are taking rate reductions to court, as opposed to addressing them through the administrative process at HHS. And so this is something that needs to be resolved and is something that states are paying a lot of attention to. And, of course, as you know, next week the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments on the constitutional challenges to the Affordable Care Act. One of the questions that they will -- that is before them is whether or not the Medicaid expansion in the Affordable Care Act exceeds Congress's powers under the Spending Clause. And so, we have twenty-six states that have filed, suggesting that they think it does, and we will see where that goes. you know, there'll be three days of oral arguments, which will be made public. They will not televise, but they will make the oral arguments available on the Web, so you can listen to them. And the decision will be rendered sometime before July 4th. that's kind of where that is. We'll see where that goes. what are states doing about state budgets? Well, the first thing that they look at are reimbursement rates, and so most states are -- are doing something around reimbursement rates. Now the thing is, if you did it one year, you either have to

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

pick other providers or it's hard to do it two years in a row. So, I mean, there are limits to what you can reimbursement, because you need to have providers participate in the program. And if you reduce the reimbursement rates, there is a tipping point where providers drop off and then you don't have network adequacy. So, that's a tough -- it's a tough area to get a balance. You can reduce scope and duration and restrictions on mandatory benefits. You can -- you can expand the use of copays. A number of states have closed institutions of -- mostly ICMF/MRs {sic} (ICFs/MR). Some are urging nursing facilities to condense. And -- and -- and, of course, the other thing is to move to home and community-based care and try to get people out of institutions, where the cost is high. Of -eliminating and reducing optional benefits is, of course, another very big area. But, again, once you've eliminated it once and you've done that list -- or you've done some reductions, it's hard to go back and do more. Most states are looking at expanding managed care to try to get economies through coordinated care. And something that, in my career, I have rarely seen, except in the last two to three years, is that states are making reductions in education, both in higher ed and in K through 12, which has always been a third rail, in order to find funds to cover Medicaid costs. And so -- that -- that is because education is one of your bigger areas where there's state money and -- and that's where it goes. It also happens in human services and sometimes in the corrections area. education has been severely hit by Medicaid costs. are states going? What are they looking at as they move forward on -- on Medicaid and looking to reform Medicaid? Integrated

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

and coordinated care for Medicaid and Medicare dual eligibles is of hottest topics. It's also of the one administration's priorities and they're -- they are making a lot of funding available for states to develop strategies to address issues around dual eligibles, which has always been one of our biggest struggles because the Medicare and the Medicaid program don't talk to each other, they don't coordinate with each other, and yet we have -- our most costly Medicaid clients also are on Medicare. And the fact that we don't coordinate their care between the two programs doesn't work for either program, but costs Medicaid a fortune. And so this is clearly a very important area. Medicaid managed care - most states are looking at expanding. I know that this has been a challenge in lot of states had carved out the disabled, Illinois. A behavioral issues, and they're your most costly clients. they carved out all the costly people and kept the -- the -- the least costly people in -- in managed care. So now there is a effort to try to lessen the number of carve-outs and to improve the way managed care manages the care for our most costly clients - a very big push to -- to make that happen. Global budgets and 1115 Waivers: So, what is a global budget? Some people say it's a block grant, and it kind of, sort of is. a five-year -- it's like any other 1115. It's five years. What it does, though -- what -- what states are doing now with their 1115 Waivers, which is kind of interesting, is they're saying we want to -- do a comprehensive Medicaid reform under our 1115 Waiver. We -- and all 1115 Waivers have to be what's called "budget neutral". And this is the hardest thing about getting an 1115 Waiver approved. Budget neutral means that at the end

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

of that five-year period, you can't have spent more under your demonstration than you would have spent under the regular Medicaid program that you have in place now. So, assuming that your demonstration is going to make significant cost savings, that gives you a little working room. States also say, well, as part of our demonstration, we want to show that some of these state programs that we've been funding should be folded in as part of our comprehensive reform, and therefore, we should be able to get Medicaid match for that, because at the end of the five-year period, we're still going to save money. So, that way you get to pick up some of the innovative state programs that you've been funding with state-only money and become matched for that. So it's -- it's a -- it is an -- a grand experiment that assumes that your savings will materialize in that five-year period and -- and make you budget neutral, but allows you to do things that you cannot do under current law. So you get to waive the fact that that was a state-only program and now it becomes part of your Medicaid program, part of your Medicaid reform. So, there are a number of states that are looking at that. And I -- I will talk a little bit about some of the states that are doing that. In concert with global budgets and -- and 1115 Waivers, almost intrinsically, you have to make some changes in how you reimburse your providers. And the administration is making a very big push on making sure that anything that you do to change your reimbursement should be about quality and outcomes. And so, all of the proposals that are coming out from the states that are in this global budget, coordinated care area have a great focus on quality and outcomes, which can't be a bad thing. There are also states

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

working on innovative strategies related to behavioral services, improving the management of pharmacy services. You may have seen recently how prescription drugs are becoming as problematic as -- as those illegal and recreational drugs in terms of people ending up in emergency rooms. So there -- there's a -- a feeling that there needs to be a little bit more done in terms of managing prescription drugs and -- to make sure that people are using them correctly and that doctors are being vigilant with their patients. And also an area that has been the subject of quite a bit of discussion lately is the area of durable medical equipment and fraud and abuse. There are federal efforts -- there are federal/state efforts to look at this And a number of states are tightening up on durable medical equipment and the providers to make sure that there is no fraud involved; in that, some of these things are very expensive and so it doesn't take long for the fraud to become a big money issue. And then, finally, just something that has been under discussion lately - it's been something that's been discussed over the last several years - but with the Medicaid expansion that is coming up in 2014, coverage of inmates has become an issue. And the question is, is there any such thing as Medicaid coverage for inmates? And as it turns out, there If you have an inmate who would be Medicaid-eligible by income and they need hospitalization for more than twenty-four hours, they would be eligible for Medicaid coverage. eligible currently for Medicaid coverage. And I understand Illinois is actually one of the few states that is actually utilizing that provision. This could be a big money issue in 2014 when a lot of the inmates that are currently incarcerated

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

would be Medicaid-eligible. So what this means is that, as people go into prison, you would need to do a Medicaid application, suspend their eligibility while incarcerated, but if they needed hospitalization, you would reactivate that Medicaid eligibility and they would be covered under Medicaid for services in a hospital beyond the first twenty-four hours. So, I just raise that because that's been a question. HHS has given different answers over the years, but I understand that the -- the answer is that, yes, there is some coverage. It is limited. And I thought I'd just share that. So, buzz words: What's hot right now? Transformation - when you're talking about some of these new Medicaid redos, you're transforming your Medicaid program. Coordinated care - very important. These are things that the administration is looking for when they're looking at these 1115 Waivers. They want to make sure that you're doing coordination, you're integrating and managing your care, you're looking at quality outcomes and effectiveness. Accountability is -- is key because of emphasis that both the Congress and the administration are putting on fraud and abuse - very big topics. And, in fact, one of the things that we struggle with is the overlapping of the -the numerous fraud and abuse programs that the Congress has enacted over the last several years. And even they've figured out that perhaps they need to take a second look and maybe streamline some of their fraud and abuse programs and make sure that they're coordinated. Because what we have found is that they have some things that are going on where they say you're fine and then some other group comes by and says, no, that's fraud or that doesn't meet the audit requirements. And so

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

there's a lot of activity going around, where states are having to do a lot of paperwork and -- and actually commit a lot of staff to defending your activities where one group says you're okay and another group says you're not. So, Congress is looking at that and hopefully they will make some changes. And the other thing that I -- I -- when I was looking at some of the waivers that have been approved and some that are pending, community-based systems is very hot. So that what they're asking is, both private and public sector in localities to come together and -- and work towards a coordinated effort to provide care under Medicaid that is both cost-effective and produces improved outcomes. And so that is where people seem to be moving and -- and clearly looking at coordinated, integrated care for long-term care, because that is where the cost centers are. So what do global waivers, 1115 Waivers do? They let your receive FMAP for services that don't usually qualify for It allows each state to build on where they've matching. already been going. So, you don't have to line up with what other states are doing, you can take the things that you've been doing over time and combine them into something that you think will work for the people in your state. And as part of the 1115 Waiver, every state has put in provisions for program growth; so that while you're getting savings on the one side, you can also put in factors for expansion. So, who's doing it? California and Texas are the most recent states to get a very large 1115 global waiver. New York has put in an application, as has Oregon. And Rhode Island has an ongoing -- they are halfway through their global waiver. And Vermont has a global waiver that I think they think is the precursor to their single-payer

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

system. And so I would say theirs is -- is so different that it's probably not as replicable as some of the provisions in some of the other ones. The Rhode Island Department of Health had an evaluation done of their global waiver, because there's been this question, does a global waiver work? Do you actually save money? Is it -- can it work or will it end up with the state needing money at the end? The evaluation is kind of -what it says is that they're saving some money, not as much as they thought, and that a lot of the savings actually came from policy decisions that were separate from the global budget; that because they were able to do some things that they weren't able to do under current Medicaid law, they were able to get some savings that they would not have been able to otherwise get, but it's not so much about the money. Now, I have to say that all of these global waivers assume that they are going to get an infusion of funding, either by being able to take state-funded programs and get matching for them, getting some other things put in. So you're not just getting what you get now. So it's not a block grant in the sense that you're frozen at where you are and get cost of living. There are other cash infusions and I think that's important to note. So, Rhode Island is happy with their global waiver, and we had their Secretary of Health come to our meeting last December and talk about their waiver and he said this: that every state that's going to do something like this has to be very careful to carefully plan, that you need to make sure that you're -- you get enough cash in the -the waiver to make it work, and that you plan every step, if you don't plan and if you don't have the infrastructure to support what you're going to do, it will not

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

work. And so his -- he said he thought that states should go forward, but that they should do it carefully, thoughtfully, and make sure that they plan for each step. So, you have a coordinated care plan; clearly, looking at some of the things that other states are looking at, a managed care expansion. You are addressing the issues that relate to managed care in rural areas, which is always a challenge. You're addressing your hospital reimbursement reform, primarily because, with your Medicaid expansion, you're going to hit your upper payment limit and then you would lose some federal matching funds. So you're looking at provider incentives, utilization controls, limiting eliminating some optional services, and moratoria admission to institutional settings, which are all things that other states are looking at as well. Your additional savings are State-funded health programs. And before I came, I was told that there was a lot of interest in where Illinois is compared to other states on -- in terms of optional benefits. I was not able to get that information, because the latest information is 2010 information, which is before states had to make changes because of the loss of the enhanced match under ARRA. I know a lot of states have made changes to their optional benefits since 2010 because of that, and so I don't know -- I can't make a -- a legitimate comparison. But, you do have a number of statefunded programs that are significant, and unfortunately you have to look at -- at cutting those because that's where the money is. And I think that that presents a special challenge because I think you have probably more of those programs than the average state. In terms of observations, always evaluate your downstream financial, legal and political impacts, 'cause you

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

have the long list of proposals, and every state does this, when -- when staff are asked to provide legislators with the information they need to make decisions on Medicaid cuts, they -- they have to find every cut that you can possibly make and they put it in a list. What they often don't do is tell you how they interact. And so it's very important that you make sure that you don't make cuts that actually cost you money, because then, at the end of the day, you're still in the hole. thing that we have found is that a lot of states that eliminated dental services put it back immediately hospitalizations went up. And so it actually cost them more when they eliminated the benefit than when they were actually paying for it. So, I throw that out there as an issue. State of Arizona eliminated adult transplantation services and took a national hit in terms of public opinion. They have since restored some, but not all, of the adult transplantation notice that there were a number services. And I of reductions/eliminations in -- on Illinois' list related to services that support home and community-based care. And if you're going to do something on the institutional side, then you've got to make sure that there is some supports for home and community-based services. And so I just observe that that might be something to take into consideration. And I also noted that you have some consent decrees related to the Americans with Disabilities Act, and I think there was one other one, and you have to be careful that anything that you change that would impact your consent decree will land you back in court. And -and oftentimes they will redo the consent decree and add more things to it. So I just throw that out as an observation.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

with that, I am happy to take your questions. I will do the best I can to answer you now or get back to you with the information when I can get it to you. So...

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Joy Wilson Johnson, thank you very, very much. There are questions. Right now, we have Casey Lund, from WAND-TV, has requested permission to shoot video. Permission is granted. Questions from Members. We have Jacqui Collins. Senator Collins.

SENATOR J. COLLINS:

Thank you, Ms. Wilson, for your very expansive and detailed overview of Medicaid. It's very complex. But I do have a question in reference to what restrictions do you see we face from the federal government when we weigh options in controlling the Medicaid cuts? For example, at what point do we jeopardize federal funding? I was told that for every dollar that we cut in State HFS, we lose three dollars in federal funding.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, every time you cut a service, because you have the federal match, you're -- you're going to lose the federal match that -- that attaches to that service. So -- so that happens automatically. You also have to make sure that you comport with all the federal restrictions related to the eligibility, which a number of states have had some problems with, Maine most recently. The governor made some recommendations that involved eliminating eligibility and HHS told him that he can't do that. And under current law, the eligibility restrictions are -- are very clear. So, that is something that -- that you have to take into consideration, as well as making sure that your provider

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

taxes are where they're supposed to be. So you have to make sure that all the restrictions that are under current law have to be met. And -- and that's why it's so difficult to actually get large savings in a current year. Most states have to get savings over a span of years. And your challenge is you don't have that time; that you really need to -- to get substantial savings in the current year. That's very hard to do. CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Welcome, and thank you for sharing your knowledge with us. Appreciate it. I'm just going to ask you two questions. One, I'm wondering a little bit about -- I know we've had a large, significant expansion in our Medicaid population, you know, almost twenty-nine percent over the last five years. I'm wondering if you can give us some context on how that may have compared to other states. Obviously, I know it's economy-driven, but we have been led to believe that there might be other things going on here too. Would like any observations you might have to share on that. And then also, as you know, we're new into -- moving into managed care, would like you to share any experience you have on how other states have -- what kind of savings they've achieved by going into care coordination kinds of programs with their Medicaid population.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

First, on -- on the increasing population, the economy has really been the driver for most states and -- and the numbers of people who have gone onto the Medicaid program is substantial, and I think, more importantly, the very slow recovery has

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

impacted differently than in -- in past recessions, where people have fallen off the rolls more quickly. So people are not leaving Medicaid as quickly as they have in previous economic downturns, which I think is really reflective of the slower recovery that we're having. That's what I hear is the -- the biggest issue, that people are not going off the rolls as fastly as we had all hoped, and that while state revenue is going up, it is -- is going up more slowly and states are not able to utilize that revenue in ways that they might -- would have wanted to do to stimulate more activity and that kind of thing. So states are kind of behind -- this -- this recovery is not doing for states what they had hoped it would and they are hoping that the recovery will become more invigorated over time and -- and address some of those issues. I'm not sure what other things that might be driving Medicaid rolls in Illinois, and -- and maybe you can share that with me and I can respond. And then, in terms of Medicaid managed care, a couple of things that I think -- the first round of Medicaid managed care, states got a huge savings up front, well over fifteen/twenty percent. We're not seeing that now because things are different and -and I think that you're not going to get those big savings right up front. And, in fact, it may actually cost something to expand Medicaid, you know, to get savings later on, because you have to make sure that your networks are adequate and that you do all of the education and outreach activities that necessary to get people in the system and teach them how to utilize managed care if they've been in fee-for-service for all their previous experience. And the other thing is that we are looking not at the moms and kids now, but we're looking at the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

elderly, the -- and the disabled and we're looking at behavioral and substance use issues in terms of managed care, which is more complicated and more difficult and there are some up-front costs associated with that as well. But, that being said, what I've heard from states that have been in the process, they all say that if you're going to do managed care for long-term care, that the critical piece is your assessment piece about who belongs in an institution and who doesn't, and that if you get that wrong, you will lose money - so that that's critical. And the same is true for looking at people with disabilities. Who can actually be taken care of -- can function in the community and who needs institutional care? You've got to make that -- you've got to figure that out correctly and then make sure that the supports are available. If -- if that doesn't happen, then it doesn't work. And so, the other thing is that in rural areas, it's tough and you have to have a real solid plan using community resources to make managed care work in the rural areas. And so it -- it takes more work, more planning in order to have an optimal experience with managed care. But there are a lot more providers now that have experience in the states in both rural and urban areas in managed care, and I think that that's a plus, that there are -- previously we had entities that had only done private coverage try to do managed care. Most of them got out pretty quickly because they just couldn't figure it out. So, we do have more companies that have experience working with Medicaid clients, that have experience working with the special populations that we're now talking about putting in managed care, and -- and I think that's helpful.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Excuse me. Leader Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. President {sic}. Ms. Wilson, thank you so much for being here to help us with this really enormous I want to follow up on a question Senator Steans had asked regarding trying to get our arms around the increase in our eligibility. And I noted at the beginning of your remarks and then in response to her, you had indicated that the recession in most states was the driver of that. But when you look at the numbers here in Illinois, as Senator Steans said, twenty-nine percent increase came after the recession started. But we're up a total of eighty-eight percent, going back to 2003. So we're actually one of those states that saw a larger increase in our Medicaid population before the -- in the -about five years before the recession than we have seen since the recession began. And I guess my first question would be is, are there any other states that sort of go against the grain, like Illinois does, in terms of having the recession be the driver, as opposed to here, where policy decisions made by the Governors and the General Assembly were the driver of the increase in enrollment?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I am not aware of any state that's had an eighty-eight percent increase that was before the economic downturn.

SENATOR MURPHY:

...the -- the total since 2003 here in Illinois. We've gone from 1.5 million to 2.9 million. About eight hundred thousand were before the recession. About six hundred thousand were after it started. So we've got more people joining Medicaid --

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

or, our growth was really more before the recession than it has been since. So I'm just wondering if any -- there -- no other state that you're aware of that has a similar experience?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, I mean, it's hard for me to say, because states have had -- so many have had -- so much of your increase that -- that's been public was after the recession. They -- they tell you the number. So I don't know what it was before. So I'm -- I'm not familiar with the timing in some of the other states. But I'm not familiar with other states that feel like their -- that the bulk of their increase came separate from the economic downturn.

SENATOR MURPHY:

We have -- here in Illinois, the Governor has indicated that we need to cut 2.7 billion dollars out of Medicaid just to keep the program flat. And I think those numbers are, frankly, undisputed. Is there any other state that you're aware of that is looking at having to cut that large a percentage of their Medicaid budget this -- this coming fiscal year?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

SENATOR MURPHY:

Not that I could find. I -- I know of some states that are looking at -- large numbers, in the -- over a billion dollars. Most of them are looking to make those reductions over a biennium, as opposed to in a single fiscal year. And not that they've found those savings, but they -- they are looking at 'em in a two-year framework, as opposed to a one-year. Over one year or over two years, those are hard numbers to -- to get out of the Medicaid program as it's currently constituted.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

I don't think there's any question about that. And it's -one of the other numbers we have seen is that if there are not
significant changes in our Medicaid program here, five years
from now we're going to have a twenty-one-billion-dollar
Medicaid bill backlog. Are you aware of any other state in the
country that is facing a crisis on that magnitude in their
Medicaid program?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

And this is -- you're talking about reimbursing providers that you're behind in -- in actually paying?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Correct.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Is that? There are other states that have that issue. I'm not sure of the magnitude. But, yes, that -- that has -- even though, under current law, I think there's some penalties for not paying on time, which also makes that a -- a bigger issue. SENATOR MURPHY:

And goes back to your broader point about crowding out other priorities like education. The -- the RAND Corporation had projected that, under the federal Affordable Care Act, Illinois is going to add seven hundred and twenty thousand people to Medicaid. And that's on top of the 1.4 million that we've added in the last decade in a system that, you know, maybe not in the technical term, but in all other ways, is essentially bankrupt. The federal government for a brief period of time is going to pay for some of those seven hundred and twenty. But it's my understanding they're not going to pay for people in that seven hundred and twenty thousand that are eligible for

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Medicaid before. So, how are we going to pay for that additional liability when we add those new people onto the rolls when the system we have right now is already essentially broken?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I certainly can't answer that. That is your challenge. SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

That is your challenge.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Thank you. To President Pro Tem Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Wilson, it seems to me that other than -- than cutting the amount of money we pay to providers, our choices are really only twofold: we either limit the number of services we provide or we reduce the number of people to whom we provide them. In your opinion, what's -- what is the better way to contain Medicaid costs? Is it through some sort of utilization control? Is it through curbing enrollment? Some combination of the two? Or -- or is there another alternative that I'm not thinking of?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, you can't do much on the eligibility side, not till 2014. 2014, you would be able to take any Medicaid clients over the hundred thirty-three percent of poverty and move them into the exchange, which would then shift them from Medicaid to the health benefit exchanges. There are some areas in terms of

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

utilization that you can -- there are some savings to be had, certainly around prescription drugs, around durable medical equipment. There is this feeling that there is a lot of savings to be had in fraud and abuse within the program. But, of course, one of the things I'll tell you right up front is that to do anything on fraud and abuse costs money, because you have to have staff to -- to do those investigations and things like that. But there is a feeling that in certain aspects of the program, both in terms of physicians overbilling, fraud and abuse in the durable medical equipment program, and some issues around prescription drugs, there's some savings to be had. Is it 2.7 billion worth? I don't think so, but those are -- are certainly some areas to look at. But you're right - you're very limited in what you can do to -- to get savings in the program. SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you for sharing your expertise with us today. CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Leader Righter.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Wilson, for joining us. I want to follow up on, actually, a question that Senator Harmon asked and a series of questions that Senator Murphy asked. There's been, I think, a fair degree of confusion on the notion of what exactly the Affordable Care Act prohibits and what exactly the states are left with that they are able to do. So, I -- I want you to -- to give me, in as exacting detail as you can muster, as long as that answer takes, what does the Affordable Care Act prohibit states from doing?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Okay. Now this is about Medicaid and what you can and cannot do? Okay. You cannot change your eligibility from -- I quess it was 2009, where you were. There are a couple of exceptions that are based on -- and -- and they were kind of individual to states, and I'm sure your staff covered those exceptions for Illinois yesterday in your briefing. But for the most part, you cannot change eligibility or the standards or procedures by which you conduct eligibility in the program. Affordable Care Act doesn't do anything to rates. there is pending rules that would substantially change the process by which states can reduce rates to Medicaid providers. They've not done anything in the Affordable Care Act that affects your ability to reduce or eliminate optional services. However, you have to look at your optional services and make some -- and figure out whether eliminating or reducing them may affect your program in other ways that may increase costs.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Well, I understand. And now that -- you've kind of drifted into the cost argument. To me, that's a policy issue that the...
MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

...people in this room and across the hall...

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

...and down on the second floor need to make. I want to know just what the federal government is telling us we cannot do. And what I think I heard you say was, any optional population,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

so -- or service that this State offers that the federal government's base Medicaid programs don't require can be reduced or eliminated without violating federal law. Is that correct?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. And that includes optional programs even if they receive a federal match. Correct?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. All right.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Because they're -- they're optional under Medicaid because they are receiving a federal match. So, those are Medicaid programs. You have state-funded programs that are -- it may augment Medicaid or may mirror Medicaid, but they're not Medicaid programs because they're fully state-funded.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Based on your study of what you've seen in other states, can you give me a -- a -- a state or two that, when you look at it, you would say, "that state has been the most aggressive in curbing liability growth", through whatever means?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Curbing liability growth?

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Correct.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

And what do you mean by liability growth?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. Since Medicaid's an entitlement program, I mean, we -- we get caught up here, understandably, in State government about -- talking about appropriations, but Medicaid's different, because the cost of Medicaid over the long term isn't driven by how many dollars you decide to appropriate in one fiscal year or The cost of the program long term is driven by the entitlements you choose to put in state law and the liabilities that those entitlements create. So -- and Illinois is a -unfortunately, a vivid example of the difference between appropriations and liability. In the last fiscal appropriations fell 1.6 billion dollars short of the liability in that year, and that's part of the reason we're talking about -- the Governor is committed to reducing liability growth by 2.7 billion dollars in this coming fiscal year.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Okay.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

So, going back to the question, the State that's been the most aggressive in curbing or bringing down liability growth, in your opinion.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Off the top of my head, and -- and, you know, I've not done the calculations, I would say Arizona has probably been the most aggressive. Yeah, I would say, probably Arizona has been the most aggressive.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Who -- which state?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Arizona.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. And what has Arizona done?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, as I mentioned, they eliminated adult transplantation. They -- I think they got rid of dental coverage. They -- they pretty much went through their optional coverages and eliminated a fair number of them. They have since restored some of those things. And so I'm not quite up to date on exactly where they are, but they certainly were very aggressive on their optional services and benefits.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Can you give me an idea, based on what Arizona did, how those actions affected their liability growth? Did it come down? Did -- did liability actually shrink? Did it go up by one percent, two percent, five percent, over a couple of years? Do you -- do you know that?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Oh, I do not know that. And I have to say, since they restored some of those that, you know, I don't know which things saved the most and how restoring them offset that. I -- I just don't know that. I would have to...

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. Fair enough.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yeah.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

In your presentation, there was a section there, and I apologize, I can't flip back through and I can't tell you what

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

page it was on because I don't think the pages are numbered. But you had a section in your presentation about states doing what you referred to as global budget/waivers - the section 1115.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Which there's -- there are proposals here in Illinois...

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

...to pursue the same. And you listed California, Illinois, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas and Vermont.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Now, I guess I was given the impression early in your presentation that when you're talking about a global waiver, what you're talking about is essentially block granting the program. But I don't think that's what...

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Kind of, sort of.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

...all of these states are doing. I'm sorry?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Kind of, sort of.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Kind of, sort of?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Uh-huh.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Can you elaborate on that for me?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Any 1115 Waiver is required to be budget neutral; so that during that five-year period, you can't spend more in the waiver than you would have spent under your underlying program, the program before the waiver. So...

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Okay. So, that's one piece. Under a global budget, what it does not require is that each year you have a capped budget. It's capped over the five-year period. So that's not exactly a block grant, in the sense of most block grant proposals, there is an annual cap. That's the difference. So under a global budget, your cap is over the five-year period, which is the same as how they do budget neutrality for an 1115 Waiver.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. And I understand that concept. I guess my curiosity is, the states that you've listed, I mean, are you -- do you mean, in your presentation, that they have -- that there's some legislation out there proposing that they go to the global budgeting or a global waiver or they're actually doing it? Because, I mean, there are -- there -- like I said, there's

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

legislation here in the General Assembly to seek that, but we're not doing that now. And so, in -- in what context are you naming these states?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

They self-identified themselves as -- now most of these did -- are the result of legislation at the state level. The Texas waiver, the California waiver, are all backed up with -- with legislation. Oregon. Yeah, I think they all have underlying legislation. So they're not administrative activities. These were actions by the legislature. They characterize them as having a global budget. And -- and they are done through the 1115 Waiver process.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

That's how they happen.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

I think a lot of what my answer -- my question was answered when you said they self-report. This isn't NCSL identifying them as that.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

No.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

This is the state saying, "Hey, we're doing this".

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Got it.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

If you look at their 1115 Waiver application - and these are all online - many of them reference a global budget as part of -- as a significant aspect of the overall application.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. Now, staying on that subject just for a moment, again, in your presentation, when it talked about global budgeting or waivers, you said that the reason why the states are doing this and one of 'em you listed - in fact, it was number three - was provide for program growth. And that made me scratch my head a little bit, because on one hand, we're --you're citing the federal rule that over five years you have to achieve budget neutrality, but then we're talking about program growth. Put those two together for me and explain how they go together.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

There is always going to be growth, because health care costs are -- are growing. And so you have to account for that in your budget. And so -- but you need to account for that in a way that you're still -- are managing to keep your global budget cap where it needs to be. So, they -- as part of the requirement, and what makes 1115 Waivers complicated, is the fact that you always have this budget neutrality issue to address. But because you are getting savings in other areas, you can then use some of that to account for some growth, whether it's health care costs or you may be under the waiver taking in another population.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

So, this -- those states are using the increased flexibility they get from the federal government to better

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

design their own program, bring their costs down, because they're doing it themselves rather than abiding by all the federal rules, and then plowing that money into something that's maybe a little bit bigger. Is that a fair characterization?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes. I think the -- the biggest difference is that, when you look at these waivers, they have a lot of the same objectives, but they are doing very different programs. So, you have a Texas and a California which are just very different in terms of their orientation and -- and the -- and they're underlying programs. They're both doing something that's global budget, 1115 Waiver, coordinated care. They're doing the same topic areas in a very different way, based on the -- their underlying programs.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. I want to flip to the Affordable Care Act for a second. As Senator Murphy talked about, in 2014, about -- over seven hundred thousand - that's the projection - over seven hundred thousand individuals are going to be added to Illinois' Medicaid program. And it's a little bit like people look -- seeing a light at the end of the tunnel. Some people view that as the end of the tunnel, when they'll exit the tunnel and be in the sunshine. Some of it -- view it as something that's heading very rapidly toward them and it's going to hit them well before they get to the end of the tunnel. The question I have is that some who view that in the -- in the former context see it because, well, the federal government's going to pay for it, so there's no additional cost to the states; we shouldn't be concerned. The term "blended rate" has surfaced in the - and

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

you've talked about this a little bit - in the last couple/three weeks has surfaced, and I think that's a complicated enough topic that those who are taking comfort from the federal government's former promise to pay for these people maybe haven't quite gotten their hands around what that means is that the states' taxpayers will pay more for people that the federal government is saying are going to be on their program. What --how -- do you have a feel for how the blended rate formula will be constructed and when will the states know what that formula looks like?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

No. I wish I did. We -- we don't. I -- I cannot find anyone who has seen a -- a proposal in writing. So we don't know what the factors would be.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay. Well, sometimes you have to pass the bill so -- to then learn what's in it, and I think this is an example of
that. One of -- and -- and I want to -- and I don't -- in
interest of time, Mr. Chairman, this is the last area I want to
ask about, and that is -- is, oftentimes, those who advocate for
aggressive reform or even eliminating optional services and
optional populations from the program, the counter to that is,
wait, wait, wait, wait, we'll lose federal support. We'll lose
federal match. In -- in -- to your knowledge, since the
Medicaid program was begun, has the federal government pulled
its funding from any state?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, you -- you lose the match, because when you have an optional program, it's part state and part federal. You lose

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

that federal match that was coming into the state for that particular program. That happens -- that -- that just happens.
MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Yeah, that's our choice. I understand that.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Right.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

That's not what I'm talking about.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

But they don't pull other money.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Well, but they have the ability to do that, don't they?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Because you eliminate a optional service? No.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

No, if you -- if you were to -- if a state were to come close to or violate the Affordable Care Act...

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Oh!

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

...the federal government technically has the ability to pull federal funding. Correct?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

And that's a threat that's -- or a concern that's...

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

So you're talking about on the eligibility side of things?
MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Absolutely.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Okay. All right.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

It's -- it's talked about on a regular basis, and what I'm asking you is, in all the states and the aggressive attempts that some have made in reforms, has any state ever had its federal funding pulled as a violation of federal law -- pursuant to a violation of federal law?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I'm not aware of any state that's actually eliminated an eligibility group to test that. So, I -- I -- so far that's -- that's not occurred. There -- there have been efforts to eliminate some eligibility that would be counter to the law and HHS has indicated that this would be a violation, and it's not occurred. So I don't -- I am not aware of any state that has gone forward with any of those efforts and -- and tested that. So, I -- I don't know what would happen.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

And I -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask one last question. And this follows up, again, on one of Senator Murphy's questions. In Illinois, our backlog of bills relative to the size of the program in terms of liability sits at about twenty-four percent. So, almost a quarter of our program sits in unpaid bills. Can you tell me what the next-highest state is in terms of that percentage and what -- and the neighborhood of what that percentage might be?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I have no idea. I have no idea which states are the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

highest in terms of -- of that type of liability.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Do you believe Illinois is the highest?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I -- I don't know, 'cause I have no way of -- that's not something I've ever looked at.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Okay.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

So, I -- I don't know.

MINORITY SPOKESMAN RIGHTER:

Thank -- thank you, Ms. Wilson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Thank you, Leader. Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President {sic}. Thank you, Ms. Wilson, for -- for being here with us today. A couple of questions: One regards the managed care issue. I mean, managed care has changed quite a bit since it was first made popular back in the -- the nineties and that. Do you see a -- a move to -- instead of the traditional managed care that sits -- that's kind of a -- a -- a party on the side looking at either the patient or the provider, do you see more of a move now that the -- the -- the new health care bill talks about accountable care organizations? And most -- most hospitals that I have -- have heard of are very quickly moving towards becoming ACOs in and of themselves. Does this fit with -- with kind of where we're going, with some new steps in looking at the ACOs as being able to -- to handle more of the managed care of our Medicaid population?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I don't know whether they're actually going to be ACOs, but there's certainly an effort to kind of bring the whole medical home aspect and to coordinate with all the physicians that touch a person, how -- however that gets to be organized, whether it's officially an accountable care organization, whether it's a medical home-type arrangement, whether you call it community care. But the notion is to try to replicate the -- the -- the notion of a medical home and having all of the providers that touch a person be in touch with each other and combine to effectuate a treatment plan so that you don't have -- it's -- it's really running away from the fee-for-service, where an individual has twenty providers of some source or another that have no contact with each other and have no idea what's going on with the patient.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Could you give me your opinion on this then? Would --would ACOs -- and -- and in many places in my community, in Peoria, we're seeing that ACOs are now incorporating our FQHC into that process, which makes a lot of sense.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Right.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Would -- wouldn't that be a -- a good system to look at, since really we're now moving from fee to service and not into a completely -- you know, a capitated rate, but that we're looking at at least more outcome -- you know, outcome payments in terms of what quality of -- of health care is? I mean, would that be a good step for us to -- to look at?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I think it is, and I -- I think that's where a lot of states are -- are spending their effort. Oregon is certainly, I think, a good example of taking that approach, where they -- they want community providers, which includes their FQHCs, their -- as well as, say, ambulatory care facilities, everybody that's in the community working as part of the system to provide care. And -- and so that's why I said whether it's a ACO or, you know, there's different names now that they're coming up for how you put that together. And I think the challenge is really the reimbursement, at the end of the day. It's how do you reimburse this group activity and keep everybody on board and happy? But -- but I don't think -- in terms of whether that's a better way to effectuate care and improve outcomes, I -- I think there is not a lot of people that don't think that that moves in the right direction. It's the details that get difficult.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Right. Yeah, I understand. Well, this is a new area and - and, like I say, certainly, if you talk to the -- the medical
community, they're quickly moving to establish in -- their own
ACOs within each hospital or each community unit. My final
question is that, you know, if -- if -- if health care were
something that we could make as a choice, you know, it'd be a
different issue, but health -- you know, bad health is something
that, you know, just happens to fall on people. And so we have
people, whether they're in a -- you know, under Medicaid or
whether they're just in the population as a whole, they get sick
and they have to somehow be cared for. And I guess that I want
to just have your opinion on this. You know, part of my concern

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

with this whole discussion with -- with Medicaid is that we forget the impact of all our decisions on our communities. And just as you had talked about the unintended consequences of, say, the State of Arizona cutting off one of its programs and then finally realizing that it caused something to happen in another area, I guess that's my concern as well, is that if we don't begin to -- to really create this -- this health safety net -- and -- and certainly where the Accountable Care Act is going is that we have better outcomes; we -- we try to do more preventative care; we try to really build a holistic health I mean, in Illinois, we spend probably between ninety billion and a hundred billion dollars a year on health care and that's public -- that's public and private dollars in total. That's my estimation. So I guess the question is that as we squeeze and, you know, reallocate some of our begin to priorities within Medicaid, doesn't that have a profound impact on our communities? Because as people get sick, if they're not Medicaid eligible, they become charity care and then they are paid for by somebody somewhere. If I -- if I could just have your opinion on that.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, you're right. And -- and I think that the difficult thing is that people don't see their -- the piece of their premium that is uncompensated care. And what you don't see, you don't know and kind of doesn't factor into your thinking. But you're right in that we require hospitals to treat and stabilize anybody who comes -- who presents to the emergency room. We have federal law that requires that and so, surely, those -- those dollars end up in -- in premium and -- and other costs

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

that go across the board. That is a fact. But I think most people don't see it. You -- you don't know what piece of your premium goes to that and so it kind of goes unnoticed. But that -- that is a fact.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Just -- just one final follow-up on that. And -- and, hence, isn't that the whole theory of the Accountable Care Act in itself, in -- is that as we begin to provide more coverage and -- and better holistic care for people, that we begin to reduce the waste in our health care dollars and that some of the programs that we see begin to ratchet down some of the traditional spending we've done because we have no system and that we see that there are diminishing reimbursements or what have you in the system down the road, just because we're now trying to regroup and build a system that makes sense from the start to the finish?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

It is true that the Affordable Care Act is trying to get everybody in the system so that you don't have outliers outside the system triggering the most expensive care. That's part of it. In that, when you have people who are uninsured and they present at the emergency room, they are getting the most expensive care that we have available for, a lot of times, indications that are not really that expensive had they been covered by insurance, which doesn't mean that in the beginning the Affordable Care Act is going to save a lot of money, because we're going to have pent-up demand from people who have not had coverage prior and are going to seek that coverage. We're also going to have people, who, under current law, at -- which will

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

then be previous law in 2014, who are unable to get coverage because of preexisting medical conditions. Those people are going to now be covered and come into the system. So there are going to be costs associated with covering some of the new people coming into the system, but, overall, it should eliminate a -- a couple of things. One is the costs associated with uncompensated care from people just not having coverage. And, secondly, for those people who have preexisting medical conditions, the only way they can get coverage is to work for a company -- a large company that doesn't have medical underwriting. To the extent that any of those people were going to be entrepreneurs, the fact that they can't get insurance coverage really kind of cuts that short. And so, it does open up some opportunities for people to be in the workforce, doing something that would likely be a small business or a small entrepreneurship, which they would not be able to do under current law because they would expose themselves to not having health care coverage. And so, I think there's some -- there is some things that would happen under the expansion of coverage that are -- are very good. It -- to say that it's going to not cost, would not be true. There are going to be costs associated with us covering people who are not covered. And people who have very, very low rates, probably they're going to have higher rates as a result of community ratings. So I think those are all things that are true about the expansion of access under the Affordable Care Act.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Ms. Wilson. You know, under the global budget waivers, I understand from what you've said that we can't spend more. But I think what gathers us together today is that we're trying to spend less. According to our own Governor's numbers, out -- five years from now, we have a bankrupting, if not already bankrupt, system in place, where, five years from now, the unpaid bills, as a -- a couple of former speakers -- previous speakers have said, it's going to be twenty-one billion dollars of unpaid bills - twenty-one To put that into perspective, the sixty-seven percent tax increase produced about six -- six and a half billion All of the angst that's gone into the reaction of a sixty-seven percent increase, this is three hundred percent, or three times the effect of that tax increase is what those unpaid bills are going to look like. So you just say, well, what's going to happen to the ability for people to pay their taxes, provide jobs? Following along Senator Righter's and Senator Harmon's thoughts, I think there may be three categories of solutions. You know, first of all, who's eligible; and then, what services are provided; and then, lowering the cost of services that are delivered to those who are eligible. Under the federal law, and what really peaked my interest earlier was, Ms. Wilson, when you mentioned that, well, you can't change the eligibility. I'm thinking, well, if we can't change one of the huge approaches, then, you know, it's all lost. But then you say, no, we can't bankrupt a state, so there must be a solution to that, and you think, well, that's when we started talking about those waivers. Haven't there been a number organizations that have gotten waivers? And wouldn't

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

wouldn't it be a pretty good approach in a situation where we have a -- a State going toward what would be a bankruptcy in any other context? Shouldn't we be going for a -- a waiver from these federal laws so that we can affect those three areas? I mean -- I mean, if we can't affect the eligibility, if we can't affect the services that are provided, and we can only jiggle around with what the -- lowering the cost of services, there's no solution here in the huge context of our problem. So, wouldn't the -- one of the first approaches be we've got to go after a big waiver?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Well, you're not going to be able to waive the -- the eligibility. I -- no one's trying to do that. So I -- I -- I don't think that works, and that's where your biggest bucks are, in -- in trying to -- if you have expanded beyond the Medicaid minimum requirements. But I -- I -- I don't think you're going to get that waived. So these waivers don't do that. They -- they waive other things.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Right. Right.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

So I -- I'm not sure...

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Well, I appreciate -- maybe -- maybe I should just make a suggestion for the folks who actually have a role in solving this massive problem. Two years ago in debate, when we were talking about Medicaid reform, the question was asked and answered, how much will this reform produce? And it was, over five years, it's going to be like eight hundred and fifty

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

million. That wasn't even how much the increase was for a single year. I would say that we're going to have to have a much wider perspective on solving this. When people say, "Oh, well, we can't do anything about the eligibility", when an adviser would say, "We can't do anything about the eligibility" - if you don't do something about eligibility, you will not solve this problem. And so I think that getting together a waiver, having our federal delegation of -- of -- of the U.S. Senators, the congressional group, and then a President, who served in this Chamber with us -- we need to get an answer on this or we won't have a solution to a problem this size.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. Ms. Wilson, thank you for being here. Appreciate your enlightenment. We learned yesterday that the pharmaceutical costs for our Illinois Medicaid program is about eight hundred million dollars, which seems like a -- a huge number. And I'm wondering how -- if you -- if you have looked at pharmaceutical costs in other states for Medicaid programs. And if so, is there any creative approach to reducing those costs and -- and bringing in copays and -- and, you know, taking care of this -- this -- you know, it's almost a billion dollars. So that's a significant amount of money.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

The -- the most common thing is to put a greater emphasis on generic drugs. A lot of states have done that. Increasingly, states are looking at prescriptions for

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

psychotropics in children as an area to be concerned about, as well as some other expensive drugs and how they're being prescribed. So, utilization review is becoming more common and -- and a -- an instrument that states are using to try to gain some control over their prescription drug costs. And, of course, the use of pharmacy benefit managers and things like that.

SENATOR GARRETT:

So, do you know of any state that has sort of a combination of all those programs where there's stopgap measures? And -- and I know that we do focus on the generic drugs, but we also have non-generic drugs, which, I've just been told, there is a copayment. I don't know what that copayment is. But every year, at least since I've been there {sic}, there have been waivers -- you know, requests from the pharmaceutical companies to not go with the generic, to go with their own brand, and that escalates the cost, as you know.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Right.

SENATOR GARRETT:

But I'm just wondering if there are going to be guidelines or if there are any type of guidelines in place to start to reduce those costs.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Separate from what's already -- you're talking about federal guidelines to...

SENATOR GARRETT:

Well, yeah, going forward in 2014, if there is something that will be part of the Affordable Care Act that will say to

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

the states, here's what you really need to do to -- to keep the cost down on the -- on the pharmaceutical drugs, or if there are states that have really been proactive and aggressive in trying to rein in those costs.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

I'm not aware of anything that the federal government is planning to do in that area. I would have to look at which states have done the most aggressive work in -- in pharmaceuticals and get back to you.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Okay. I -- I would appreciate that.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

If that would be...

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

'Cause I -- I just have not investigated that. But I'm happy to do that.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Ms. Wilson, for this very detailed presentation on a very complex topic. But as we're grappling with trying to make these reductions in our Medicaid budget, I think what I was hoping for is to sort of have more of a state-by-state comparison of what other states were doing. And it sounds like -- you had mentioned that a lot

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

of the data you have goes back to 2010, which doesn't really let us know what, currently, other states are doing. And I know a lot of the questions and examples you've used, you know, when we talk about Arizona and other states. Is there any time frame in which you might have that data or a way that we can get ahold of that data before we proceed with what we're looking at doing?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Right. Not really, 'cause there's not the -- it used to be that HHS actually collected that information and put it all together and they don't do it anymore. So, actually, right now, it's the Kaiser Family Foundation that has the most recent data and it's state by state. You can't compare the states and it -it's -- 2010 is their most recent data. I don't know any way to get that, short of surveying all the states. And -- and I guess the other thing I would say is that each state has its own book of optional programs that they've had. And so over the last several years, partly due to the recession and then the -- the big drop when the enhanced match ended, because that is the area where states can -- is the easiest, because there's no challenge to eliminating an optional benefit, that's where they've done the most work in the last year or so. And we just don't have the documentation for exactly what they did. I have a list of what they proposed, which typically is everything that they had that was optional.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Right.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

And so that's not terribly useful in -- in what you're doing. I don't know that we have data that's available, fifty

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

states or even regionally, on what states actually did. And the fact that this year a number of states came in and did some more on some of those areas, we just don't have that. If there were a state - one state or two states - we might be able to put that together, but we just don't have a -- a fifty-state view on that because it's too dynamic right now. We still have states that are in session and they're still -- some big ones. Oregon -- not Oregon, Washington state has a -- they're at a budget impasse. They're going to do some things. We don't know what. Pennsylvania. So there are still some states that are going to make some changes, probably in the next several weeks, and we just don't have that yet.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Okay. Thank you. But there is a possibility - say Arizona, which you say has made some -- some -- some strides - that we would be able to have you at least put together for that particular state?

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Yes. We can tell you what they eliminated or -- or reduced, and, you know, of course, that's based on what they already had. So -- and -- and I guess that's the -- the thing I would say, is that every state has their own set of optional Medicaid benefits, as well as their own set of state-funded programs that support or augment Medicaid, and that's where a lot of the focus is. And so they're oftentimes not comparable to something that you might have because they're -- it's just something the state did. It's some traditional program they might have had over a span of years. General assistance is something that only a few states -- and I think you might have

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

that. And Pennsylvania has that and they are proposing to eliminate general assistance. So that's a fully state-funded program. It is fairly significant in terms of funding for the State of Pennsylvania. It is getting a huge bit of opposition. And I'm not sure they'll be able to pass it. So, I -- I don't know what's going to happen with that. But, you know, in some of those areas, there's not -- they're not really comparable. And the other thing, of course, with the optional services is sometimes they don't eliminate but they reduce a number of services that you can achieve or they put a copay or things like that. So, a little harder to track some of that.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. JOY JOHNSON WILSON:

Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN TROTTER:

Thank you very much. Ms. Wilson, from me, I just want to thank you for one -- for that presentation that you shared with us, a trove of information. For the folks in here who wouldn't even have a clue, Joy and I have worked together for over twenty-two years, and I believe we have not missed a beat. And, believe me, I thank you for all the help you've given me and thank you today for the help you've given us as we start deliberating how we're going to make a -- a qualified and a -- a -- a measurable difference in the quality of life for the people that we serve. So, thank you very much. With that being said, Mr. President -- President Cullerton in the Chair. Please give her a hand, yes. President Cullerton in the Chair.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate arise from the Committee of the Whole.

PRESIDENT CULLERTON:

Senator Trotter moves that the Senate arise from the Committee of the Whole. All those in favor will say Aye. All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries. The Senate has arisen from the Committee of the Whole. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're now going to proceed to the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading in order to move my bills and -- and Leader Radogno's shell bills to 3rd Reading. After that, we'll proceed to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bomke, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bomke, your point of personal privilege.

SENATOR BOMKE:

I'd like to introduce to the Chamber, Cale Bergschneider, who is a Page with me today from Glenwood High School. He's fifteen years old and thoroughly enjoyed that last presentation. If you will help me welcome him, I would appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's welcome our guest to the Illinois Senate. Welcome. Good to have you here. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're just waiting on a little paperwork. We're going to be going to the -- moving the -- President Cullerton's

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

and Leader Radogno's vehicles -- bills here shortly. Senator Forby, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR FORBY:

Personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your personal privilege.

SENATOR FORBY:

I just want to tell everybody thanks. Everybody knows...
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Excuse me, Senator Forby, just one minute. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we have your attention for just a minute here? Senator Forby has a -- an important announcement. Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

You know, in my district, here two or three weeks ago, we had a tornado down there that hit. We had several people who died. Lot of people was in the hospital. We lost a lot of homes. And we -- hundred and fifty people was injured, that kind of stuff. And I -- just unbelievable the people that showed up with food, water - I mean, we had lines blocks long - from all over the State, Missouri, and every place. Said, "Where do you want me to help? Where do you want me to go?" It just was really fantastic. And another thing that's happened, too, is -- you know, FEMA had rejected us, so it don't look like we're going to get any federal money out that thing and I think it's wrong. I think the President of the United States should look at this again. And I think we deserve that money down there for the people. Another thing that I -- I want to thank the Operator Engineering {sic} (Operating Engineers) in the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

State of Illinois - donated twenty-five thousand dollars to give to Harrisburg and their people. Yesterday, Red Cross donated another fifteen thousand dollars to -- to the people down there in that district. And I just heard awhile ago that Sullivan Caucus, last night, collected two thousand dollars to take to Harrisburg. I just want to -- appreciate it and I want to thank everybody for what they done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Forby. Thank you for that announcement. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we have a large number of bills sponsored by President Cullerton and Leader Radogno that need to be moved from 2nd Reading to 3rd Reading. We will be moving these bills in the same manner we have used for the past three years for moving the President's or the -- Leader Radogno's vehicle bills. Leader Radogno, do you wish to have the following bills that appear on today's regular Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading read for the second time? Those Senate Bills are 2972 to 2977, 2979 to 2992, 2994 to 2997, 2999 to -- to 3021, 3023 to 3046, 3048 to 3060, 3062 to 3065, 3067 to 3100, and 3102 to 3145. Leader Radogno. Indicates, yes, that she does. Mr. Secretary, please read the bills.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2972.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2973.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

reported.

Senate Bill 2974.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2975.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2976.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2977.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2979.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2980.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2981.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2982.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2983.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2984.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2985.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2986.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2987.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2988.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2989.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments reported.

Senate Bill 2992.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2994.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2990.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2991.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2995.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2996.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2997.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2999.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 29 -- excuse me, Senate Bill 3000.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3001.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3002.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3003.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3004.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3005.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3006.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3007.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3008.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3009.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3010.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3011.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3012.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3013.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3014.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3015.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3016.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3017.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3018.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3019.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3020.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3021.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3023.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3024.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3025.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3026.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3027.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3028.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3029.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3030.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3031.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3032.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3033.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3034.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3035.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3036.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3037.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3038.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3039.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3040.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3041.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3042.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3043.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3044.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3045.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3046.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3048.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3049.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3050.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3051.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3052.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3053.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3054.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3055.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3056.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3057.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3058.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3059.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3060.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3062.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3063.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3064.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3065.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3067.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3068.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3069.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3070.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3071.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3072.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3073.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3074.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3075.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3076.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3077.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3078.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3079.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3080.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3081.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3082.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3083.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3084.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3085.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3086.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3087.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3088.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3089.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3090.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3091.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3092.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3093.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3094.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3095.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3096.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3097.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3098.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3099.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3100.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3102.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3103.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3104.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3105.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3106.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 37 -- excuse me, 3107.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3108.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3109.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3110.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3111.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3112.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3113.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3114.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3115.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3116.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3117.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3118.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3119.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3120.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3121.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3122.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3123.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3124.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3125.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3126.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3127.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3128.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3129.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3130.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3131.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3132.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3133.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3134.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3135.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3136.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3137.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3138.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3139.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3140.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3141.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3142.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3143.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 3144.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And Senate Bill 3145.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of these Senate bills. There are no committee or Floor amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Those bills just read by the Secretary shall be placed on the Order of 3rd Reading. President Cullerton, do you wish to have the following bills that appear on today's regular Calendar on the Order of 2nd Reading read for the second time? Those bills are Senate Bills 2581 to 2635 and 2637 to 2795. President Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, please read the bills.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2581.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2582.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2583.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2584.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2585.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2586.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2587.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2588.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2589.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2590.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2591.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2592.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2593.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2594.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2595.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2596.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2597.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2598.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2599.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2600.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2601.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2602.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2603.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2604.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2605.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2606.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2607.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2608.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2609.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2610.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2611.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2612.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2613.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2614.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2616.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

26 -- Senate Bill 2617.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2618.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2619.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2620.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2621.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2622.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2623.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2624.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2625.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2626.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2627.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2628.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2629.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2630.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2631.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2632.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2633.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate -- Senate Bill 2634.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2635.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2637.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2638.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2639.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2640.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2641.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2642.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2643.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2644.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2645.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2646.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2647.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2648.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2649.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2650.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2651.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2652.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2653.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2654.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2655.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2656.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2657.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2658.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2659.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2660.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2661.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2662.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2665.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2666.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2667.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2668.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2669.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2670.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2672.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2673.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2674.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2675.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2676.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2677.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2678.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2679.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2680.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2681.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2682.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2683.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2684.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2685.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2686.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2687.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2688.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2689.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2690.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2691.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2692.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2693.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2694.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2695.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2696.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2697.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2698.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2699.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2700.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2701.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2702.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill -- 2703.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2704.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2705.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2706.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate -- Senate Bill 2707.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2708.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2709.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2710.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2711.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2712.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2713.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2714.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2715.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2716.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2717.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2718.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2720.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2721.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2722.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2723.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2724.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2725.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2726.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2727.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate -- Senate Bill 2728.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2729.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2730.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2731.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2732.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2733.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2734.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2735.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2736.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2737.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2738.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2739.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2740.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2741.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2742.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2743.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2744.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2745.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2746.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2747.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2748.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2749.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2750.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2751.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2752.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2753.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2754.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2755.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2756.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2757.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2759.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2760.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2761.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2762.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2764.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2765.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2766.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill -- 2767.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2768.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2769.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2770.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2771.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2772.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2773.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2774.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2775.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2776.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2777.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2778.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2779.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2780.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2781.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2782.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2783.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2784.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2785.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2786.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 2787.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2788.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2789.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2790.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2791.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2792.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2793.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2794.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2795.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of these Senate bills. There are no committee or Floor amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Those bills just read by the Secretary shall be placed on the Order of 3rd Reading. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 678, offered by Senator Frerichs and all Members.

It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Lightford, Vice-Chairperson of the Committee on Education, reports Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 637 recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed bills of the following titles, in the language {sic} of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 4043.

We have received like Messages on House Bills 4445, 4492, 4562, 4563, 4670, 4901, 4962, 4968, 5021, 5101, 5121, 5145, 5151, 5193, 5207, 5630 and 5642. Passed the House, March 21st, 2012. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3810, offered by Senator Frerichs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3826, offered by Senator Koehler.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4129, offered by Senator Kotowski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4445, offered by Senator Righter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4492, offered by Senator Crotty.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4562, offered by Senator Crotty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4563, offered by Senator Steans.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4637, offered by Senator McGuire.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4962, offered by Senator Althoff.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4966, offered by Senator Righter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4968, offered by Senator Raoul.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5021, offered by Senator Muñoz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- 5056, offered by Senator Sandoval.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5101, offered by Senator Sandoval.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5121, offered by Senator Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5193, offered by Senator Trotter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5211, offered by Senator Koehler.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill -- 5485, offered by Senator Steans.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5486, offered by Senator McGuire.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

House Bill 5642, offered by Senator Frerichs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of these House bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen -- Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. Will all Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? We are going to be going to the Order of 3rd Readings shortly. All Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately. We are going to be going to the Order of 3rd Readings momentarily. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to -- we will be going to the Order of 3rd -- Senate Bills 3rd Reading. We're going to start on the middle of page 24, at the top of the Calendar with regard to Senate Bills 3rd Reading, shortly. Ladies and Gentlemen, a little change in plans here. actually going to go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. So if you'll turn to the top of page 37 of your printed Calendar - page 37, at the top, on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. First up is House Bill 506. Senator Muñoz. Out of the record. House Bill 735. Senator Muñoz. Out of the record. {sic} Bill 1084. Senator Forby. Out of the record. {sic} Bill 3129. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Harmon, do you -- Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3129 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3129. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Harmon.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon, to explain your amendment.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment is a one-sentence addition, clarifying the intent. I move for its adoption and would be happy to discuss the bill on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on the amendment? Any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon, on Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR HARMON:

I apologize, Mr. President and to the Members of the Senate. The first amendment was the -- the substantive amendment. This is the one-sentence clarifying amendment. I'd be happy to combine the two of them and discuss it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Harmon. Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments, Mr. Secretary? SECRETARY ANDERSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 3129. Senator Harmon, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3129.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Last year, after a fair amount of negotiation, we passed a bill to provide for a new collection scheme for the 9-1-1 wireless surcharge when it is collected on phones that are -cell phones that are purchased ahead of time and the minutes are purchased rather than as a part of a monthly plan. This is a -- a trailer bill, requested by the Department of Revenue, to streamline the implementation of the bill. I'm not aware of any opposition and I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator, does -- this bill, does this still include that item that requires that park districts do background checks on juveniles?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

No, Senator, that's been replaced by the -- the language relating only to the 9-1-1 wireless surcharge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Okay, I just want to make sure. The original bill there had the juvenile background checks for park districts. That's all gone, right? Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon. Any other -- further discussion? Ladies and Gentlemen, seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3129 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 3129, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Continuing on the Calendar, again on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, in the middle of page, now, of 37, is House Bill 3636. Senator Mulroe. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now go to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. If you'll turn to the middle of page 24 of your printed Calendar, page 24, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Reading. First up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 171. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 174. Senator Koehler. Senator Koehler, on Senate Bill 174. Out of the record. Senate Bill 179. Senator Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Bill 181 {sic} (180). President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 267. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. Senate Bill 275. President Cullerton. Out of the record. With leave of the Body, we will skip over -- if you'll turn to page 25. At the top of the page, we have Senate Bill 350. Senator Cullerton {sic} (Clayborne). Out of the record. Skip down to Senate Bill 408. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 409. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 538. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 546. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 547. President Pro Tem Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 548. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. Senate Bill 549. Senator Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Bill 636. Senator Lightford. Senator Lightford? Out of the record. Senate Bill 637. Senator Delgado, on Senate Bill 637. Out of the record. Senate Bill 638. Senator Steans. Senator Steans? Out of the record. Senate Bill 639. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 679. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 680. Senator Holmes. Out of the record. Senate Bill 681. Senator Luechtefeld, on 681. Out of the record. Senate Bill 758. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 774. Senator Schoenberg, on 774. Out of the record. Senate Bill 820. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 952. Senator Muñoz. Senator Muñoz, on 952. Out of the record. Senate Bill 963. Senator Haine, on

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

963. Out of the record. Senate Bill 966. Senator Clayborne. Out of the record. Senate Bill 967. Senator Harmon, on 967. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn to the top of page 26 of the Calendar. Still on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, we have Senate Bill 968. Senator -- President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Inquiry of the Chair, if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your inquiry.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I know, Mr. President, your background to be, in part, that of an auctioneer, and I'm curious, if after soliciting bids on items and you reach, I don't know, twenty-five or so in a row, items, where no one will bid on anything, do you just cancel the auction and say, you know what, we'll come back tomorrow when everyone's ready to spend a little money? Just curious.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

I don't think I've ever canceled an auction. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing on the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 11 -- and, again, we're on the top of page 26. But before we go there, let's go to Senator Murphy. For what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your announcement, Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Millner is back in the district due to a family illness. Just ask that that be noted and his absence be deemed excused.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The record will so reflect. Thank you, Senator Murphy. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 1132. Senator Jacobs. Senator Jacobs. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2124. Senator Garrett. Senator Susan Garrett, on Senate Bill 2124. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2259. Senator Jacobs, on 2259. On the Order of 3rd Readings, Mr. -- Mr. Secretary -- Senator Jacobs, did you wish to proceed? Yes. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2259.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, take that -- pull that out of the record, if you would, please. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2488. Senator Garrett. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2488.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2488 informs the driver of a lower speed limit with a highway construction or maintenance speed zone. It then allows -- local

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

police will now be able to enforce the restriction of cell phones in construction zones since a construction or maintenance zone does not have to include a reduced speed limit. And then, thirdly, it allows an individual to use a wireless telephone on {sic} one of these school speed zone or construction or maintenance zones. It does not have any opponents and it's supported by IDOT, General Motors, Laborers' Midwest Region, AFL-CIO, and the Illinois Road and Transit Builders. Be happy to answer question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Garrett. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And, Senator Garrett, I -- I apologize. I was trying to catch up with what you were saying that -- the three things in the bill. Can you just touch on them very briefly again, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

So, this bill stems from a -- municipalities who are having construction taking place. The speed limit is lower than a speed limit in a regular construction zone. So what we've done to make sure that those construction zones are safe is to redefine construction zone, not post signs saying the speed

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

limit's lower, but let people know that they're going through a construction zone and that cell phones are not to be used. However, the driver of a car can use a voice-operated or -activated cell phone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. So, I want to be clear and, I guess, I want my constituents to be clear on what State law will allow or not allow. It says they will not be able to use -- the bill says they will not be able to use a wireless telephone. Is that the phrase used in the bill? I am looking at the analysis. Is that the phrase used in the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

So, what I said was, for those who have a Bluetooth, as an example, you can do that. You cannot hold a cell phone and go through one of these zones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. So they can use a cellular phone; they can't have it up to their ear is what you're saying. What about having it on speakerphone? Could you have it sitting in your lap and having a conversation with someone that way? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Yes. You just cannot hold the cell phone and talk on it. You can speak to it through the speaker or Bluetooth, as an example.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Can we talk about the construction zone issue a little bit? Because my -- I guess my understanding is, is that the current ban applies to a place where there is a reduced speed limit because of construction. Is that -- is that correct? Or maybe I'm not clear on what the current law is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I'm sorry. Can you just repeat that? I was talking to staff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

The current ban on cell phone use in construction zones, it's my understanding that only applies in areas where there's a reduced speed limit because of the construction going on. Is that a -- is that an accurate statement of the current law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And we're going to change -- you want to change that to what exactly? I mean, what -- what will have to be posted on a sign so a motorist knows they can't be using a handheld cell phone in that marked area?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Hold on, let me just read it exactly to you so you know. The -- this amendment - it was an amendment that I added on to clarify it - "now defines a 'construction or maintenance speed zone' as an area in which a posted sign advising drivers that a construction or maintenance speed loan {sic} (zone) is being approached or informing the driver of a lower speed limit with a highway construction or maintenance speed zone".

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So the speed -- there will be a reduced speed zone in order for this to apply?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

"The amendment now defines a 'construction or maintenance speed zone' - and that's in quotation marks - as an area in which a posted sign advising drivers that a construction or maintenance speed zone is being approached".

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR RIGHTER:

"Being approached", so you're -- you're kind of broadening the section of road in which the -- the handheld cell phone use will be banned, because now you're approaching that zone. Is that -- is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I think, Senator, we're giving the driver notice that they are coming to a maintenance or construction zone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter. Further discussion? Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question to the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, one of the frustrations we're having, even with the speed zone issue, is the State - and the Tollway is very good at this - is putting up these speed zones and these construction barricades for twenty, thirty, forty miles, no work being done - no work ever being done - just having the pylons there and the signs that say, "reduced speed construction zone". And there's no construction going on. There hasn't been construction going on for weeks. But they're there and they're loving it because they're giving out tickets all day long to make money. If we have, literally, tens of miles of these pylons up, with this legislation, then a person cannot use that

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

phone at -- at any time. It's not about safety, because there's no construction going on, and they've been there forever. You know, this originally started with the reduced speeds when construction workers were on site and working. Now it's -- we're continuing to expand this. And I guess I'm concerned that -- how do we address that for those areas where we have literally tens of miles and no construction going on, just the reduced speed sign and having pylons going there?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Okay, the way I understand it is, if you're -- are you talking like I-55, as an example, where they do have those long stretches of ten miles? Okay. That's a different speed limit and that has a different requirement. What we're saying is that in -- if you're in the heart of a municipality and you're doing road construction, and most likely it's going to be three or four blocks, you cannot go through that road construction and talk on your cell phone unless it's through a voice-activated or -operated system. So, what applies to what happens with construction on I-55 will not apply to this particular proposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Is that spelled out in here? 'Cause I -- I thought in here I read it's talking about highways, tollway, other areas. Doesn't say inside municipality where they're doing some construction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

It -- it doesn't say inside municipalities, but I -- I -- so what this does is a municipality that has a current speed limit of, let's say, thirty-five or forty, which is under the construction speed limit, will be able to apply a lower -- apply the same - how can I say this? - requirement of not using a cell phone as if they were on I-55 and the speed limit was forty-five miles an hour. The problem is, in -- in municipalities, not -- where they are -- where there's road construction being done, the speed limit is lower, and so because of that lower speed limit, the cell phone ban does not apply. So we're just making sure that in these areas, where we're talking three or four blocks, where there's road construction being done, that people are not using their cell phones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Well, then, I would ask, if you don't mind, I -- I would -- I would take this out of the record and let's clarify and put an amendment on that would say that we're talking about municipalities, 'cause we -- on the highways, we're reducing the speed limit as well. And why don't we clarify that we're talking about if it's in municipalities and when construction workers are present. If you -- clarifying where that is, 'cause I don't -- unless there's some place in here that it says that it's only limited to municipalities and not highway or tollway. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR GARRETT:

Okay, I think that -- let me explain it again as best I can. I'm happy to take it out of the record to -- you know clarify it more for you. On I-55, you are not -- there are certain prohibitions that are enforced when you're going through a construction zone. In Deerfield, Illinois, the speed limit at a major intersection may be thirty-five miles an hour, so those prohibitions, such as not talking on your cell phone, do not apply. So IDOT wrote the language that allows for municipalities to apply the cell phone prohibition, albeit you can use the voice-activated cell phones -- voice-operated cell phone system to apply. So it doesn't change anything other than allowing municipalities to apply the no cell phone usage in speed zone areas that are under forty-five miles an hour.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. And I guess not to muddy it, but, too, is the - I guess my concern is how we define "construction". If we
have a pylon up there and a municipality is just doing a little
patch work, or are we doing -- are we talking about larger
construction? And is there -- how is there going to be
notification to the -- to the driver what that definition is?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Okay. So we spent a lot of time with IDOT. This is IDOT, actually, who helped draft this language to make it clear for everyone in committee. I will read this to you. It says - and

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

this is already in place - "As used in this Section, a 'construction or maintenance speed zone' is an area in which the Department, Toll Highway Authority, or local agency has" - and now here's what we're adding - "posted signage advising drivers that a construction or maintenance speed zone is being approached, or in which the Department, Authority, or local agency has posted a lower speed limit" -- "a lower speed limit with a highway construction or maintenance speed zone special speed limit sign after determining that the..." You know, it just goes on. So, what -- I don't know how else to say it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson, did you have other questions? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

No. I think I'm -- I'm -- I'm trying to grasp what -- what this is with the posted speed. So, this is only when they actually post the speed as reduced in that construction area? If they're doing construction and they're not reducing the speed, then the ban would not apply? So if they're -- if they're doing some repair work or work on there, but they're not posting a reduction of speed, would the ban still apply?

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

So -- okay, if the municipality believes that they -- they -- they want to follow through with IDOT to ensure that in this construction zone, in the middle of a local community, not on I-55 -- wants to ensure that people going through this maintenance or construction zone do not use their cell phones, they can post

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

a sign letting people know that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yeah, sorry, just -- I guess last one, just to wrap it up. They're going to post a sign that they -- that they can't use cell phones. But my -- if -- if the municipality is doing construction and they are not concerned enough from a -- from a safety standpoint -- they don't think it's a problem enough to reduce the speed limit, so the speed limit is the same where they're doing that construction, they must also believe then it's not going to be -- that the use of a cell phone is not going to be -- become problematic, 'cause the speed's going to be the same. So I guess the question is, if the speed is going to be the same and the municipality is just doing some work on the side or some area, but they're not reposting a lower speed, will this ban still apply and would they post a sign then that says, "cell phone is banned here", even though the speed limit is not going to be reduced?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Okay, the way I understand it, unless there's a sign, they -- and somebody's talking on the phone, they will not be in violation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Okay, last question. Just want to make sure I clarify it.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

So unless they put up a sign that says you can't use a cell phone, there is not going to be a violation in a municipality. If the speed limit is the same, you're still okay to use a cell phone unless they have posted a sign that says "can't use a cell phone". Or, if the speed is reduced, unless they post a sign, still it's okay to use a cell phone in the municipality. It's only if they post a sign. Is that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Okay, I'm -- I'm going to say yes. But I just want to be clear that they don't necessarily have to reduce the speed limit in these local municipalities because the speed limit is already low, so they're going to go twenty-five or thirty miles an hour. And so, the way I understand it, unless that sign is there alerting people that because of this maintenance zone they are not allowed to use their cell phones, they would not be in violation. It's a tricky situation because the way the original law was written. We're trying to ensure that local communities have control over how people use those maintenance zones when driving with a cell phone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Just try to be --quick question. Senator, I appreciate...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Lauzen.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I appreciate that what you're trying to do is protect the safety of people who are in the work zones working away, but if some of us among the fifty-nine who are concentrated on this right now are having a hard time figuring out, well, what is this really, won't it be really hard for twelve and a half million people of Illinois? And then, anybody who's visiting from out-of-town or out-of-state, won't it be hard for those folks to understand what it is that we're talking about here? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I don't think so, because they will have a sign that tells them they can't speak on their cell phone unless it's voice-operated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I would -- I would submit, just for your consideration, that I understand that the fine here is three hundred and seventy-five dollars for missing that sign, and if that's the case and the sign's not posted, then we have -- I -- if we're having this kind of complexity -- and you're -- you're shaking your head, so why don't I stop and why don't you correct my impression.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senate -- Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

The -- the three hundred plus violation is for speeding,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

not for not talking -- not for talking on your cell phone. For talking on your cell phone, it's a - hundred and twenty-five? -- hundred and twenty-five dollars -- hundred and twenty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Okay, reading the bill, in sections (d) and (e), it says, the first violation of this Section is a petty offense with a minimum -- a minimum fine of two hundred and fifty dollars. A second or subsequent violation of this Section, petty offense, minimum fine is seven hundred and fifty. But then section (e), if a fine for violation of this Section is two hundred and fifty or greater, the person who violated this Section shall be charged an additional one hundred and twenty-five dollars. -- and I see that the people who drafted this will have it submitted into their Transportation Safety Highway Hire-back Fund. Ah! So, do I miss -- see, I know that you're trying to do a nice thing for protecting people's safety, but, my God, are we not making all of our lives so much more complicated in trying to squeeze ourselves through this? And the people who are drafting this complexity, they get the fine money, once again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

You know, I don't know how to say it. What you just talked about is in reference to speeding only, and that has been in the law for years. We are not adding any additional fines to people who are going through these construction zones in

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

municipalities. We are actually alerting them that they're going through a maintenance or construction zone and they can't talk on their cell phone. I think you're making something more complicated than it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Well, Senator, respectfully, I -- I'm not sponsoring this bill, so I'm not making it complicated. I'm trying to understand what we're about to do. No, you may not be increasing what's currently in the law as far as the amount of fine, but you're expanding the net of who falls under those fines. So, it's -- it's certainly the -- what's going to happen if we vote Yes on this is that more people will fall into those fines that are already in the law. So I -- let me just -- so I don't make it anymore complicated, I would just suggest a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Seeing no further discussion, Senator Garrett, do you wish to close? Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes. To my colleagues in the Senate, this bill is not a complicated bill. It allows our local communities to ensure that when there's construction going on in their area and the speed limit is below forty-five miles an hour, that if they post a sign, they have the right to tell people not to speak on their cell phones unless it's voice-operated. The fine does not increase. And let me read to you from an article stating that drivers that -- "Speeding is a well-known violation, but

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Illinois State Police District 16 spokesman...warned drivers that using a cell phone in a construction zone results in a one hundred and twenty dollar fine." We're not changing that. Yes, more people may get fined, but what we're trying to do is make it safe, not only for the drivers, but for the construction workers. This is a commonsense piece of legislation and I really ask that all of you support it. There's no opposition whatsoever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2488 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 20 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2488, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate -- Senate Bill 2492. Senator Garrett. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2492.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

All right, this is the -- this is a bill you guys are all going to like a lot, because what -- what we're asking is that we -- that there are waivers. So, people that, you know, spend time on juries, they get reimbursed from the counties, and what

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

we're saying is that you can sign a waiver saying, "I don't want that reimbursement to come to me directly. I would rather it go back to my county", and there are millions of dollars that we can save. It's a decision of the juror who serves, so this should be a slam dunk.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator -- is there any discussion? Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAOUL:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Senator Garrett, I just have one question. Is there any opposition to this bill and can I take your word on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

There's no opposition. In fact, this actually came from my husband, who served on a jury -- served as a juror, and said it was strange, that he didn't need to accept the five dollars a day or whatever, and wouldn't it be nice to be able to give back. And it was a simple, easy to do thing, and there's no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is... Senator Mulroe, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Member of the -- Members of the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate. A question of the sponsor for purposes of legislative intent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Senator Garrett, this bill was heard by the Judiciary Committee. In committee, there was a question about how Senate Bill 2492 will affect certain employees - employees of the State, I believe - who are required by law to return any compensation they receive for jury duty to the State treasury. Can you tell me about that for purposes of legislative intent? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, thank you, Senator Mulroe. Employers who require employees to turn over jury pay should modify their rules to accommodate situations where an employee waives jury pay and not force the employee to take accrued time or personal leave for jury service. Specifically, CMS should modify their rule for State employees who are called to serve on a jury.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2492 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2492, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is 2493. Senator Bomke. Mr. Secretary,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2493.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is less complicated than, not the last one, but 2488. It's just a simple National Wild Turkey Federation license plate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2493 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 45 voting Aye, 6 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2493, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2503. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2503.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2503 amends the Property Tax Code, which permits, by ordinance, a county or municipality to grant a property tax abatement for the residence of the surviving spouse of a fallen soldier. We already do this in the State of Illinois for rescue workers. We'd like to expand this for fallen soldiers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2503 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2503, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2520. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2520.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the family -- oh, I'm sorry. This bill has to do with concealing or aiding a fugitive. It -- it leaves the family exemption. It provides that a person over the age of eighteen who -- who aids or assists or -- a person fleeing the jurisdiction shall be committing a Class 4 felony.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2520 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2520, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2524. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2524.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2524 is a trailer bill. It became Public Act 97-224, which was a bill that addressed insurance coverage for vehicles transporting children to school. The law became effective in June {sic} (July) of last year. This bill just allows the requirement to apply to policies writing -- written after {sic} July 2nd {sic} (1st), 2012, or renewals after that. It just gives the insured a little time to put this into place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2524 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2524, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2528. Senator Forby. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2528.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. This is a trailer bill. There was no opposition to this. Senate Bill 2528 is a trailer bill to House Bill 2860. And what it done, in the bill, it said, "a reasonable period of time"; we changed that to a hundred and twenty seconds. So, we made everybody happy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Senator Bivins, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BIVINS:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Yes, Senator, just one question. Who is the official timer?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

That guy that's got them little red lights on top of his car.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Seeing no further discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2528 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2528, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2531. Senator Silverstein. Please read the -- please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2531.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Criminal Code {sic} (Code of Criminal Procedure), which -- when a noncitizen is arrested for first degree murder or a violent crime, the judge must order the compensation {sic} (confiscation) of that person's passport or impose travel restrictions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2531 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2531, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2536. Senator Silverstein. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2536.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This provides, in Cook County, that the public administrator of an estate much retain his or her records of discharged cases in accordance with Local Record {sic} (Records) Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2536 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2536, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2537. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2537.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This -- the amendment, pursuant to some of the discussions on the committee, makes this a Class 4 felony to -- failure to report a disappearance of a child. A parent or a person with custody or control of the child is guilty of the offense if they fail to report the disappearance of a child thirteen years or younger to the law enforcement agency within twelve {sic} (twenty-four) hours.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2537 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2537, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2539. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2539.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a trailer bill. It's an initiative of the National Rifle Association. It allows someone to have an -- an exemption from the -- the requirement -- or the prohibition against short-barreled rifles. They can be either a legitimate historical reenactor or a holder of a federal Curios and Relics firearms license.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2539 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2539, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2545. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2559. Senator Haine, on Senate Bill 2559. Out of the record. We'll -- leave of the Body, we will return to 2568 later. Top of page 27 of the Calendar is -- is Senate Bill 2574. Senator Delgado. Please read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2574.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Delgado.

SENATOR DELGADO:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2574 is an initiative of the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. It removes many dated statute references that have resulted in numerous audit findings for the Medical Programs Division within the Department. We have no opposition. This is based on some audits that were done and to get some antiquated measures out. And I would ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2574 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2574, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2577. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2577.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is an initiative of the Department of Insurance. It -- it allows and -- and it authorizes the State of Illinois to come into compliance with the Wall Street Reform and Consumer

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Protection Act, which was written by the great vaudeville team of Dodd and Frank. And that's all it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I wonder, Senator Haine - I was, as I always do, listening closely to you, but you really didn't make me jump out of my seat until you mentioned the two members of the Congress who sponsored the -- the federal law that you referred to - can you tell me what the substantive change is going to be in Illinois law? How is that going to affect insurers in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Senator. It -- it allows the Director of Insurance to place a domestic insurer into rehabilitation or liquidation and expedite it according to the same procedures that are in the Dodd-Frank Act, the so-called Dodd-Frank Act. This is -- it's necessary to come in compliance with the federal Act. We don't have any issues now with insurance companies that are in -- in receivership. This just says that if one goes into receivership, the State of Illinois has to follow the same procedures as outlined in the Dodd-Frank Act.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2577 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2577, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar, with leave of the Body, we will skip over 2579 and go to Senate Bill 2580. Senator Delgado. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

Senate Bill 2580.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Delgado.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you for keeping this ballgame moving. Senate Bill 2580, as amended, is a recommendation of the Department of Children and Family Services. It deletes the mandate under the Child Care Act that the Department make a comprehensive list of unsafe children products available to child care facilities that do not have Internet access. Under the bill, the Department is mandated to adopt rules to maintain data on child care facilities without Internet access and make sure that facilities register with appropriate mailing lists for recalls of children's products. And this amendment came together with the help of Action for

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Children and I would ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2580 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2580, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up is Senate Bill 2818. Senator Hunter. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2818.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2818 basically is making this bill more fair by expanding the eligibility by changing the language in the Children and Family Services Act -- to correctly identify all eligible youth for the scholarship program. And it revises the language that would allow the kids to -- the youth who are homeschooled and the kids who -- the youth who age out of foster care at age of eighteen and over.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2818 pass. All those

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2818, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2819. Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2819.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This -- this bill amends several Department of Corrections reporting requirements. The bill requires that -- DOC file one comprehensive annual report instead of three separate reports currently required. DOC seeks to make these changes due to the fact that these reports overlap. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2819 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2819, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up is Senate

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Bill 2820. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2820.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2820 makes changes to how funds from the Public Assistance Emergency Revolving Fund may be used by authorizing the use of the revolving fund to pay child support process fees. Specifically, funds may now be used to pay fees to sheriffs and other officials serving administrative child support actions, county clerks and recorders for administering real property liens, and to State and local officials for the processing of Qualified Illinois Domestic Relations and others {sic} (Orders). This is an initiative of the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Martinez, I listened to what you said, but I didn't understand hardly any of it. Can you -- can you back up a

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

little bit and explain to me what it is the Department's trying to get done through this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Over the course of time, we have passed bills here regarding child support and fees and things like that, and the administrative things that are going on, and assisting sheriffs and other -- and now the -- the -- county clerks and everything -- and administering this fund and making sure that the parties are receiving their funds for this. This is just something that they needed in order to help -- be able to distribute those funds to where they need to go.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay, how are we going to help them? What -- what is it that this bill does that makes their job easier?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

There was an audit done and the -- there was petty cash -- a lot of petty cash around, so this just kinds of cleans that up and puts these funds now somewhere where it is closely watched. And it was -- it was part of an audit that was done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay, now we're getting somewhere. So, there was an audit

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

done by the Auditor General and we found a lot of money laying around. And so this bill attempts to rectify that situation by - and then I want you to fill in the rest of that, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

This was -- this was an internal audit that was done. And this is just something to clean up that -- that situation and making sure that these funds are very transparent as to where they're at, and there's just not petty cash laying around the office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Martinez, I believe in you. I will vote for this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2820 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2820, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Martinez, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Mr. President, I was so overwhelmed with the thought that Senator Righter is voting on a -- on a bill -- you know, one of my bills, so I just did not vote for my own bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The record...

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Please record me as voting Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

This -- the record will so reflect your intentions. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2826. Senator Luechtefeld. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2826.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Beginning in 2013, any municipally -- or any municipal police vehicle shall be exempt from any fee on the transfer of license plates from one vehicle to another. We did this last year for sheriffs' departments. I think it passed 59 to nothing and hopefully we can get an Aye vote on this. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2826 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2826, having received the required

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

constitutional majority, is declared passed. 2837 is next on the Calendar. Senator Althoff, on Senate Bill 2837. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2844. Senator Mulroe. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2844.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill actually addresses three situations. The first one is to redefine when an inmate is indigent for purposes of when they -- have -- provide co-payment for nonmedical {sic} services and -- and dental services. The second part is, when someone contracts with the Department of Corrections for medical services or food services, currently they have to get a bond from a AAA-rated company. Well, currently there are no AAA-rated companies unless they're -- backed by the government, so we -- we're going to reduce that rating to an investment grade. And the third part of this bill is to clean up language to reconcile two prior Public Acts. So I'd ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Mulroe, let's go back to your first point on the indigency issue. What change is the Department going to make to get a better feel for whether someone's indigent or not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Okay, it's my understanding they -- they're just trying to redefine it to what they initially intended when they passed the -- the prior bill. Currently, when they go to get this treatment or service, they have to have twenty dollar -- less than twenty dollars in their account on the day they request the services. What this is doing is extending that thirty days prior as well. So they can't have twenty dollars in their account for the day they request the services or the thirty days prior to. So it'll avoid someone taking their twenty and giving it to somebody else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2844 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2844, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2847. Senator Steans. Senator Steans. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2849. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2849.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a bill which is an initiative of the Department of Children and Family Services - it amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act - as the result of an Appellate Court case in which the court found that the necessary language did not support the authority of the agency to investigate and cite people for certain abusive situations where they found the child to be neglected due to an injurious environment. So we negotiated the bill and this creates language which supports the authority of the Department. It includes -- the term "neglected child" includes a child who's subjected to an environment injurious to his or her health and welfare insofar as, one, the environment creates a reasonable likelihood of harm to the health and physical well-being of the child and likely harm to the child, eighteen and under, is the result of a blatant disregard of parental or caretaker responsibilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2849 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2849, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2850. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2850.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld, on Senate Bill 2850.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Last year we passed a bill, unanimously, dealing with the first and last day of school, making it -- making those days full days. The bill was amendatorily vetoed by the Governor with the implementation of the -- of the date that it was to go into effect. We changed that now and I'm back with that same bill, making the first and last day of school a full day.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2850 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2850, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2867. Senator Haine. Out of the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

record. Senate Bill 2873. Senator Bivins. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2873.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator -- Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2873 is an initiative of the Department of Corrections. It adds information that the Department of Corrections must maintain in an individual inmate's master record file. The new information includes inmate grievances, criminal history, and administrative tickets to the list. I know of no opposition and I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2873 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted the -- take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2873, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2875. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2875.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. This is an initiative of the Regional Transportation Authority and it mandates that the Illinois Department of Public Health, every year {sic}, send to the RTA the list it has of people who have become deceased or died in the previous year. And the RTA then is to use the names of the deceased individuals and get 'em off of the Ride Free card list. The RTA estimates that there is a half a million dollars a year in fraud of people riding free on the RTA on dead individuals' cards. It saves a half a million dollars. And I'd be happy to answer any questions, but would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Dillard. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2875 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2875, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn to the top of page 28 of the printed Calendar, and we have Senate Bill 2876. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2882. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2891. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2896. Senator

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Frerichs. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2896.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill -- the Senate bill amends the School Code. Provides that a school board of any school district shall rely on the background check certificate issued by any regional superintendent to a substitute teacher, concurrent part-time teacher, or current {sic} educational support personnel employee if that substitute teacher, concurrent part-time teacher, or concurrent educational support personnel employee presents such certificate. Now, a school board may rely on such certificate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2896 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2896, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up is Senate Bill 2897. Senator Frerichs. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2899. Senator Steans. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2934. Senator Garrett. Out of the record. Senate Bill

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

2937. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2937.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2937 is an initiative of the McHenry County mayors and the McHenry County Council of Government {sic} (Governments). It creates the Northwest Metra Commuter Rail District, which is composed of every single municipality within McHenry County. It's an opportunity for them to pursue grant opportunities to expand Metra service in McHenry County. For those of you who have an aversion, the creation of this district does give them taxing authority. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing -- Senator Garrett, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GARRETT:

Senator Althoff, I'm just -- so they're doing this because...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Garrett. Senator Garrett, did you ask your question? Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

...I did. Senator Althoff, can you just explain a little bit more clearly why the McHenry County mayors and municipalities

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

want this to take place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. Yes. In many instances, as McHenry County has been developing, the mayors and city councils have obtained land dedicated for the purpose of extending public transportation. So they have available land for the purposes of station and rail yards, but they're having a lot of difficulty obtaining moneys from the State of Illinois or at the federal individually, to help them extend those services into other This is also part of the Northwest Line, which would then connect on to Belvidere and Rockford. And so what they're looking for is an opportunity to do this collaboratively. And the creation of a district will allow them to do it group, as opposed to individual cooperatively as a municipalities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

So, a while back, there was a land issue having to do -Metra was going to add a new station in your county and would
that new station -- would that cost of covering the land be
included in this - whatever it is - legal document?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I -- I can't answer that question. Honestly, I don't know what their intent is. That has never been part of this

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

discussion. Specifically, it is for land that has already been donated by developers, not for the purchase of additional lands. This would be more for the construction of the rail yards and the stations that would permit that. So it's for the use of land that has already been given to the county or to the municipality.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I just wanted to -- a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Just wanted -- could you put some meat on the bones of that issue of what the taxing powers of the new authority would be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you. Yes. Once you create a mass transit district, the board of trustees has the ability to levy a .05 percent property tax without a referendum. And there are districts of this nature that already exist in statute here in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2937 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

question, there are 30 voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2937, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2941. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2944. Senator Mulroe. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2944.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a cleanup bill. Prior to June 1, 2006, we had -- the Department of Corrections was made up of the Juvenile Division and an Adult Division. Since that date, we've separated them and we now have a Department of Juvenile Justice for juveniles and Department of Correction {sic} (Corrections) is for adults. This is just to clean up any language that's not consistent with both -- both of those departments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator, so what is it? Are they now two separate agencies, or what do we have?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Well, since -- it's actually been since 2006, the Department of Corrections handles adults; Department of Juvenile Justice handles juveniles. There was, actually, in the Department of Corrections -- that Code, it made reference to adults when it was unnecessary. That's basically what the bill does. Cleans up...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

So they're -- so they're still really under the Department of Corrections?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

By separate -- two separate departments. Two separate agencies, my understanding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Completely separate agencies?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

It is my understanding they are two separate agencies -

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Department of Corrections handles adults; Department of Juvenile Justice handles juveniles.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2944 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2944, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2945. Senator Duffy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2946. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2946.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2946 allows a forest preserve district under the Cook County Forest Preserve District Act to establish procedures regarding affirmative action and the use of small businesses owned by minorities and/or women in construction. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2946 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2946, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2947. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2947.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a recommendation from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, as amended, to make it clear that liability of a landfill operates -- operators {sic} extend to the owners of the waste sites and the facility, as well as the operators of the site and facilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2947 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2947, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2948.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Silverstein. Please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY KAISER:

Senate Bill 2948.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Safety Deposit {sic} (Safe Deposit Box Opening) Act. It adds a new provision authorizing the public administrator to gain access to a decedent's safety deposit box before the administrator has begun administrating the estate to determine if there's any contents or assets.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2948 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2948, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2949. Senator Silverstein. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2949.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Silverstein, again.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Good to see you, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the University Religious Observant {sic} (Observances) Act. It provides that a student in a institution of higher education, other than a religious institution, who is unable to take a class or participate in an exam, requirements {sic} must be made to make up for their exam or class. This was brought by a -- a constituent, a family member, my niece. I'll take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2949 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2949, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2950. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2950.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This creates the Toxic-Free {sic} (Toxin-Free) Toddler Act. Prohibits the manufacturing or

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

wholesale of -- selling or offering it to -- children's food containers containing BPA.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Silverstein, in just glancing through the materials on my laptop, I see that, at least as introduced, there was significant opposition to the legislation. Can you tell me what's transpired since the introduction and where we're at in terms of proponents and opponents?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I -- I think we cleared up all the opposition. I -- I don't think there was any...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator, the fact that you've stated that in the form of a question makes me a little nervous. I wonder if you could walk through -- give me a little -- something -- say something that gives me a little more confidence in that regard and maybe tell me a little bit about what the bill would do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Let -- good question, one lawyer to another. Again, it prohibits the containers containing the BPA. There was an amendment that we put on that cleared up opposition. It -- the bill will be repealed if the federal Food Administration Act {sic} issues a ruling modifying the food regulations to ban the BPA. So, we're really moot if the feds do this. So that cleared up the opposition. And they expect that shortly, too.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2950 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 47 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2950, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2961. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. Senator Haine seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 2961 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 2961. Mr. Secretary, are there any committee or Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, on Amendment 2.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate. This is a Floor amendment which merely -- it's a technical amendment making it clear that these exams must be accredited pursuant to the Conference for Food Protection organization.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The -- the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2971. Senator Jacqueline Collins. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2971.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR J. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2971 basically extends the sunset date for the Quality of Life scratch-off game started in 2007. It would move by five years the sunset, from 2012 -- 12/2012 to 12/2017.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2971 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 2971, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you will turn to the top of page 29 of your printed Calendar. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 3146. President Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3148. Senator Rezin. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3148.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President and Members. Senate Bill 3148 amends the Illinois Income Tax Act to return the Habitat for Humanity (Fund) checkoff to the individual income tax return form for the year 2012.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3148 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Present. Senate Bill 3148, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3151. Senator Bomke. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3151.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's an income tax checkoff for the Ronald McDonald House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3151 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3151, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3168. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- we'll skip 3171 with leave of the Body. We will go to Senate Bill 3176. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3176.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill allows customers of -natural gas utilities to become self-directing or exempt
customers between September 1st of this year to September 30th.
Under this bill, the applications that are received and approved
within the time period established would be considered SDC or
exempt customers for the third -- three-year planning cycle.
What happened - this was brought to me by Illinois Coin -- Corn
Processing, which is a company in my area - when the initial
legislation established this three-year exemption, there was a
very narrow application time period; they missed that. They
would like to be able to pick that up and process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3176 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3176, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3178. Senator Muñoz. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3178.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3178, basically, for a veteran that either has been honorably discharged and has been awarded the Afghan or Iraqi campaign medal by one of the United (States) Armed Forces or, two, an active member of the Illinois National Guard or a reserve component of the United (States) Armed Forces -- have been awarded the Afghan/Iraqi campaign medal as a result of the honorable service during deployment on active duty, deemed to have met the collegiate educational requirement needed to become a Conservation Police Officer. The bill is the same thing -- what we did for the State Police. They don't need to have the college requirement in order to take the exam, but in order to move up in rank, then they would have to get the college requirement, Bachelor Degree. I know of no opposition and I ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

On our analysis, it shows that the Veterans of Foreign War {sic} (Wars) are opposed, or were opposed. Could you shed some light on that?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

They're -- I -- I don't see that on the analysis. Veterans of Foreign Wars is the veterans who fought, such as they -- Vietnam, World War II. In order to be a Veteran of Foreign Wars, you would've had to have gone to the Middle East, whether it'd be in Afghanistan or in Iraq or in any part of the world where you're deployed for action and combat. So, the Afghan and Iraqi campaign medals, they are automatically to be a member of the Veterans of Foreign War {sic}. So I don't see why there would be an opposition for the Veteran {sic} of Foreign Wars. The American Legion -- a member of the Armed Force {sic} can join the American Legion, but for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, unless you've served in combat for your country, you cannot join the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

I don't -- I don't know how responsive that was, Senator, to the question. I have a copy of the witness slip from the committee and it has -- and -- and I don't understand, because it sounds generally like the thing that you're talking about is good, but I have a C. Victor Smith, Veterans of Foreign War {sic}, Department of Illinois, Legislative Director, and then an X on the box opposed to the legislation. I'm just -- not being able to be in that committee meeting. I mean, that's an important group.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Yes, they are a very important group. But I will tell you this, Senator, in committee - and the members that were in committee when I presented the bill - no one got up in opposition or requested to testify before the committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman {sic}. I was in committee and no one did present any testimony against the Senator's bill. But I -- I -- Senator Collins and I were talking. Does this include Desert Storm?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator -- Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

That's correct, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Maybe there's a misunderstanding of what it includes as to be the slip. But I'm not aware -- no veterans' group has contacted me against this bill. This bill has historic precedent. After World War II, the Illinois General Assembly gave a waiver to soldiers to take the bar exam, for example, called it a GI privilege, if they had one year of law school. And one of those GIs became a Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court from my area, Horace Calvo. So this has historic precedent and it's got the -- the safeguards involved for

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

training, as the GI privilege did for lawyers. But maybe the --Senator Lauzen's question can be answered by the fact that maybe they misunderstood and thought that some war was not included in this, because we thought Desert Storm was not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Muñoz, I -- I have a copy of the witness slip here, and clearly it is the VFW and they've clearly marked that they're opponents and actually checked the oral testimony box. And I -- I don't -- I think it's a little -- and -- and the fact they may not have testified, I mean, that could be for a hundred reasons, including the committee ran over, he stepped out to use the restroom, I mean -- he -- he took a call or whatever. I --I don't think we should assume that the VFW Director didn't get the legislation. I think it's a dangerous assumption and -- and maybe would be a little insulting. Since it's not deadline week, Senator, would you consider pulling the bill out of the record so we can have a conversation with an organization you recognize as very important in -- in -in representing veterans, just to make sure we have an understanding of why they may be opposed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Senator, first of all, I would never insult Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am a member of the Veteran {sic} of Foreign Wars. I'm a member of the American Legion. If they would have brought it to my attention, I would have clearly worked with them. But, out of respect for you, Senator Lauzen, and anybody that -- having a question regarding veterans - they're important to me - I will take it out of the record. I will have them -- I will -- want to address any problems that they might have with the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, pull the bill out of the record. Next up on the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 3181. Senator Muñoz. 3181. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3184. Senator Millner. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3202. Senator Maloney. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3204. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3214. Senator Garrett. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3216. Senator Steans. 3216. Senator Steans. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3217. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3217.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you. Senate Bill 3217 amends the Illinois Credit Union Act and it makes three changes, and this is based

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

upon Amendment No. 2. It's really a cleanup bill. It talks about the lapse in membership, about age requirement, elections, about continuation of the corporate entity. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3217 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 49 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3217, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Sandoval, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Mr. President, point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandoval, please state your point.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Illinois Senate. Today I'd like to welcome a couple of my constituents that have visited me this -- this morning. They have been long-withstanding {sic} community leaders who have been advocates of education, not only in my community, but throughout the entire State of Illinois. To my left is the Chief Executive Officer of UNO, Mr. Juan Rangel, and is accompanied by his COO, Mr. Phil Mullins. In addition to that, I'd like to welcome a young lady who spent the last eight months working the entire 21st House District. She's a woman who is a product of our neighborhoods,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

product of the Southwest Side, and she's worked tirelessly to serve the public. And she's also worked her way up through college at Columbia -- from -- graduating from Columbia College as a journalist to become Editor and Chief of EXTRA Newspaper over the last seven years. She's committed herself to public service. And just -- just a couple nights -- she was elected to be the next State Rep of the 21st House District. I'd like to give everyone a warm welcome, to not only Juan Rangel, Phil Mullins, but my State Rep for the 21st House District, Silvana Tabares.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's welcome our guests to the Illinois State Senate. We're back on page 29 of the Calendar. We have Senate Bill 3233. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3233.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill amends the Insurance Code Section on nonparticipating facility-based physicians. These are ER doctors. And it allows the prudent layperson standards to protect anyone - a doctor - in being paid from an in-network hospital at a network rate if they're out of network. It's an initiative of the College of Emergency Physicians, the Society

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

of Anesthesiologists and the State Medical Society. There's no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3233 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3233, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. At the bottom of the page is Senate Bill 3234. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary -- out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn to the top of page 30. And at the top of the page is Senate Bill 3237. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3237.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. What this bill does is it amends the Real Estate Appraisal {sic} (Appraiser) Licensing Act to allow a municipality to offer an appraisal for right-of-way and temporary easements. Currently, a municipality must hire only licensed appraisers, resulting in outside firms doing the work. The bill reduces the cost of obtaining right-of-way or temporary easement appraisals by

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

allowing for municipal employees to complete waivers for rightof-way or temporary easements with a value of under ten thousand dollars. This was brought to me by the Illinois Municipal League.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

First, Senator Koehler, where the figure ten thousand dollars comes from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Just that that would be a threshold, that the -- that if the easement is -- you know, if the -- if the value is under ten thousand dollars, that this would allow the municipality to go ahead and do this themselves. If it's over ten thousand dollars, then they would have to have a regular appraisal done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Koehler, who establishes that it's under -- or, not exceeding ten thousand dollars? Don't you need someone trained to be able to do that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

My understanding would be that that would be a determination by the municipality itself that that's what the value of it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So the municipality will make a judgment on the value of the property and therefore drive its own savings number by determining that something's ten thousand dollars or less, so they don't have to use someone who's licensed in appraisal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

I'm -- I'm assuming that they would go by what appraisals - what -- what valuations there are already existing on the
books for that property. But, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter. Any further discussion? Any further discussion on the legislation? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3237 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 voting Aye, 9 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3237, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3240. Senator Haine. Out of the record. Senate Bill --we'll skip 3241 with leave of the Body. We will go to Senate

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Bill 3242. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3242.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is an initiative of the Illinois Dental Society. And what it does simply is to prevent an insurance company from requiring a dentist, in order to become part of their insurance network, to set fees for noncovered services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3242 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3242, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3249. Senator Mulroe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3250. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 3250.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you, Mr. President. This legislation makes it clear that taxpayers actually have a full thirty days to pay their property taxes from the date the bill's mailed before the interest starts accruing. Before, it was just done by date. This says if the bills are sent out late, the homeowner still has a full thirty days. This was an initiative of the Illinois County Treasurers' Association.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Holmes. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3250 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3250, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3252. Senator Althoff. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3257. Senator Bivins. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3257.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you. This bill is an initiative of the Comptroller's Office and it's a continuation of the direct deposit bill that

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

we passed last year. It amends the State Comptroller Act. Provides that an itemized voucher for under five dollars that is presented to the Comptroller for payment shall not be paid except through electronic funds transfer. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3257 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3257, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3258. Senator Martinez, on 3258. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3261. Senator Steans. Senator Steans. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3262. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3262.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill simply is providing the ability for Raven Theatre to serve alcohol on the premise {sic}. It's near a school. The school has done a letter of support for it. The -- the theatre only

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

does shows after school hours. There's no issues here, and the community and the school are supportive of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3262 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 48 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3262, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3270. Senator Frerichs, on 3270. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3270.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3270 amends the Food and Agricultural {sic} (Agriculture) Research Act and the State Finance Act to create the Food and Agricultural Research Fund. The bill specifies that appropriations for the purposes of the Act be made to the Illinois Department of Agriculture, which will allocate funds for research to Illinois public and non-public institutions of higher education. The Illinois Council on Food and Agricultural Research is required to compose and distribute an annual report

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

providing a summary and detailed account of the research programs being supported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3270 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3270, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up is Senate Bill 3287. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3287.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3287, there -- there was three concerns that they had from different parties regarding the bill. What we want to do today is send the bill out. It's going to go to the House and they will make all the amendment changes there. The parties that were -- had the concerns, they told me that it was okay just to move it out of the Senate and that all the amendments would be made in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Muñoz, can you walk through with us briefly the areas of amendment? What kind of changes are going to be made, since obviously we're voting for a bill that we know is not going to be -- it's not going to -- it's not in its final form. Can you give us a little better picture of what it'll look like in its final form?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

If I'm not mistaken, Senator, the Department wanted to make some clarifications on a -- on a portion of the bill. And Stamp had a young lady -- that they had some concerns, so I had her ask Jack {sic} (Zack) Stamp if it was okay to send the bill out, to do it for the Department to make sure that we could address the two concerns, or three concerns, that they did have. I don't have the three of 'em in front of me, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3287 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 43 voting Aye, 4 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3287,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will skip over 3292 and go to 3314. Senate Bill 3314. Out of the record. Turn to the top of page 31, Ladies and Gentlemen, to 3315. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

Senate Bill 3315.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3315 is very similar to a bill we passed without opposition last year. It's a constituent initiative and it would provide that companies that provide computer forensic services do not need to be licensed as private detectives. I'm not aware of any opposition and I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3315 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3315, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3320. Senator Hutchinson. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3320.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 3320 would allow any income tax checkoff fund that received less than one hundred thousand dollars but more than ninety thousand dollars by October 1st, 2011, to be put back on the income tax form for the 2012 tax year. If anytime thereafter the fund raises less than a hundred thousand dollars, it will be removed from the form in subsequent years. Right now, the Hunger Relief Fund is the only fund that would currently qualify. They were actually the highest-producing fund on the income tax form, and so they were in the situation where they were the ones that actually -- they were shown a tremendous amount of support, but they fell just under the threshold. So this is for the 2012 year and I'd -- I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Just for information, this passed out of Revenue Committee 10 to 0, bipartisan, unanimous support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Lauzen. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

3320 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3320, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3324. Senator Bivins. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3324.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3324 amends the Township Code. Provides that compensation of township officers shall be for time served, and no officer may receive compensation for any future or anticipated days of duty. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3324 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3324, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3329. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3334. Senator Harmon. Out of the record.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3336. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3358. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3358.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Under current law, if you need to receive a new auto title and can't locate your old auto title, you have to post a large bond with the Secretary of State's Office. It's one and a half times the value of the car. I had a constituent who rebuilt a 1921 Model T Ford from a -- an old chassis that he inherited from his dad in the State of Ohio. The title had been lost. He would have had to have posted a bond of over twentytwo thousand dollars and had it tied up for three years. This bill would permit the Secretary of State -- or require the Secretary of State to waive the bonding requirement for autos manufactured more than fifty years before the title application is made. I think that adequately deals with the threat of stolen cars and whatnot, but allows for antique vehicle collectors and rebuilders to obtain a title when they're rebuilding it from a car that did not have a title. aware of any opposition. I think we worked out all the details with the Secretary's Office. And I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3358 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3358, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3359. Senator Haine. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3366. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3367. Senator Garrett, on 3367. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3374. Senator Holmes. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3385. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3385.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'm -- I'm taking very direct care of constituents today. This is another bill that came directly from a constituent. She's an electrologist. This would reopen the grandfathering provision for licensure of electrologists for five days and permit the folks who missed the last window to become properly licensed. Again, I -- I think that we've dealt with the -- the Department. I'm not aware of any opposition. I would ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3385 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3385, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar, Senate Bill 3386. Senator Harmon. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3386.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3386 is an initiative of the Cook County Board of Review. It would modernize their procedures and permit them to accept property tax complaints by electronic means and also to send out notices electronically. Again, I'm -- I'm not aware of any opposition and I would ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3386 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3386, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3393. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3393.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I learned from a constituent about an inadvertent consequence of the teacher certification bill we passed last year. Some of you may have heard from your nationally board certified teachers also that they missed -- they inadvertently did not get their teacher certificates renewed because they hadn't paid a renewal fee. This is fixing that problem and enables them to -- with a fee that they pay for missing it, but -- and only if a certified lapsed -- certification has been lapsed solely for the failure to pay a renewal fee. This creates a fix for this group of teachers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3393 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Present. Senate Bill 3393, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point, Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

On Senate Bill 3386, it was my intention to vote Yes and I ask that the record reflect that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you and the record will so reflect your intentions. Senate Bill 3396. Senator Noland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3397. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3397.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yes, thank you. This bill was brought to me by IMSA, which is the Illinois Math and Science Academy. And it provides that procurements for the Illinois Math and Science Academy shall be conduct {sic} through the higher education provision of the Procurement Code rather than through the provisions in general services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Lauzen, for

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Just a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

What are the provisions under the Board of Higher Education? What are the oversight provisions for procurement for these types of funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Basically, what this did was -- this is the way they used to be. They were under higher education and then it put them back under general services, and this actually has a detrimental effect, because what it's not allowing them to do is to spend their own funds that they raise. Similar to a college, they raise a lot of funds through private donations. And because of the way this is set up, they haven't been able to even access their own privately raised funds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

No, I -- I -- I don't think that that's an accurate statement, that they can't have access to their raised funds. It's what procurement regulations apply to it. I mean, it -- that's certainly true. And the question that I was asking is what oversight or what procurement rules would be put in, not what did it used to be or -- it's what are the safeguards. What

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

are the -- what set of procurement rules would these funds be obligated under?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Sorry, Mr. President. I'm completely baffled as to what the actual question is. I mean, are you looking to me to explain procurement rules to you? In -- in what context?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

All right. No, I'm trying to nicely act -- ask, when I know that the answer to the question is there are no procurement rules. So that is an insulting kind of answer to a legitimate question. The answer to my question is that there won't be any procurement laws on these privately raised funds. So, Senator, I think you should know your bill well enough.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Wish to close, Senator? Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

I will close. Like I said, this bill was brought to me by IMSA. They have experienced a great deal of procurement challenges in the past year because they were moved. So they wanted back under higher education, where there's a greater understanding of the work and the purchasing needs of educational institutions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. The question is, shall Senate Bill 3397 pass.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 49 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 3397, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill -- we're going to the top of page 32 of the Calendar. We have Senate Bill 3403. Senator Pankau. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3406. Senator Syverson, on 3406. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3408. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3408.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This just bill -- this bill amends the School Code to prevent -- prohibit school boards from making available to students any food or beverages that contain trans fat or use any food that contains trans fat for preparation of the food.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator McCarter.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR McCARTER:

I -- we -- we've all -- you know, when the word trans fat comes up, I guess I personally get -- I get offended at times, but, you know, I don't -- I don't know why we need to be deciding what other people are going to eat. Just -- I mean, let's just stay out of this. I -- I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any -- any other discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Silverstein, I'm -- I'm not an expert in trans fat. What I do know is, is that every year we come here to Springfield and by the time we leave in the Spring Session, one of the things that's -- that's left behind is usually a list of unfunded mandates for the schools to deal with. And I'm curious about your knowledge about how the school districts are going to comply with this mandate. What is the significance of this for them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I -- I believe they still have to follow these guidelines towards federal rules, Senator Righter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR RIGHTER:

The -- you believe that federal law already bans what you're seeking to ban in this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

You know, I -- I'm -- Senator Righter, I apologize. Can you just repeat the question? I was talking to staff. I deeply apologize.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I -- thank you, Mr. President. I understood you to just say, Senator Silverstein, that you believe that federal law or federal rule already -- places -- puts in place the ban that you are seeking now to put in place in State law. Is -- am I understanding you correctly when you say that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

There are some guidelines that will -- that will go into effect, but I'm just trying to reinforce this. If this is moot, it'll be moot in the House. But I'm just trying to reinforce and bring attention to this right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You -- I'm sorry, Senator. You're -- you're trying to reinforce or bring attention to what?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

To trans fat in schools.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Now, it's my understanding - and staff just advised me - that -- that there is federal -- there's a federal rule -- I'm sorry, federal policy, but that USDA programs are exempt from that. Now, I'm not sure, quite frankly, how that affects school districts, but I'm interested in what you know about that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

This food {sic} exempts food produced by the USDA.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. -- Mr. President. Okay, my information is, is that federal -- there's no -- there's no federal policy that bans this in local school districts. I've not had a conversation with any of my local school superintendents on this specific bill, Senator Silverstein. I have heard discussion before about the potential of banning trans fat in local school districts, which kind of leads me to believe that there's not a ban now. So, can you -- can you give me any more information on the source of the federal policy that bans trans fat in local school districts now?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I think it takes effect the 2012 and 2013 school year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And what is the effective date of the ban that's carried in Senate Bill 3408?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

One -- 1/1/13 {sic} (1/1/14). So they might coincide together.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, Senator -- and I'm -- I'm -- and I'm not trying to prolong this; I'm trying to get a better handle on this. I mean, are you -- is it your intention to put the ban in place as soon as possible, even if the State law would come into play before federal law, or is it more your intention to make sure that there's some attention paid to the -- to the use or utilization of trans fat in local school districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

So we can clear it up, the original bill went further than what the federal law -- regulation was going to do, so I scaled

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

it back. So it -- we're very similar to what the feds are doing. So I'm not arguing there may be some duplicity here, but I don't see the problem here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

What -- what -- now you said that it is very similar to -- that this -- that you amended Senate Bill 3408 to make it very similar to the federal policy that will go into place sometime in 2012 or 2013. If -- if there are differences, can you explain to me what those are, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Senator Righter, they're pretty much the same. Like I said, when the bill was introduced, I had a lot of opposition. We just scaled it down to building it in compliance with the federal statute -- regulation. So, is this a little duplicative? I'm not arguing, it is. But I'm just trying to bring attention. If the feds comes with regulations, then this is moot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, can you tell me, are the Illinois School Management Alliance and the Illinois Farm Bureau still opposed to the legislation as it stands here today? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

They're -- they're opposed to the federal guidelines also. So it's a no-win situation for them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm assuming, by your use of the term "also", the answer to the question is yes. Is that fair to say? To the bill, if I might, Mr. President. Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have here an unfunded mandate on schools that may or may not coincide with federal rules, that may or may not start at the same time as the federal rule does, and -- the major organization representing your school districts and the Farm Bureau stand opposed. It seems to me that if there is a time when a ban on trans fat comes, that this is premature and maybe a little unclear for us. I would urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Righter. Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

A question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you. Senator, I -- I, too, am concerned, as a former high school administrator, about the practical aspect of this. In the bill, from the analysis I read, it says, school boards may not make available these trans fats and industrially

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

produced products. Meaning: We're -- we're going to be regulating what goes into vending machines; we're going to be regulating the school cafeteria. And, quite honestly, it's been my experience that, you know, breakfast for a high school girl is Doritos and a Coke. And I don't know, if we get away from that, does this mean we take pizzas, hot dogs, all these types of things out of the -- out of the hands of the schools?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Well, Senator Maloney, unfortunately, it does. And it's going to either happen through this statute, if it becomes law, or through the federal regulation. There are exemptions for packaged foods for fundraisers, for foods brought in from parents or guardians. But, unfortunately, it's going to happen either way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

To the bill, Mr. President. I -- I -- I, too, am concerned about the practical aspect about this and the immediacy which we're attaching to this. I think we need a -- a longer period of time to get some more input from schools, from students for that matter, and -- before we move with legislation of this magnitude. There are many school boards, also, that have contracts with vending agencies; that I don't know what, in fact, that would do to the -- the condition of those contracts, given the fact if this law were passed. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President, while we got him on the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Senator, during this Session, of course Medicaid and pensions are the big issues being discussed, and one of the potential solutions with pensions is to cost shift down onto the locals. And one of the conversations in that context is relief from mandates. Would this mandate be one of the ones they would get relief from if the pension payment is put down onto taxpayers, or -- would relief from maybe the mandatory school to eighteen be one of the mandates that they would get relief from if you guys push the pension payment down onto the property tax bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

It's -- it's interesting how you're equating pension and trans fat, but -- I'd like to hear more about it. But, no. The answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Silverstein, do you wish to close? Senator -- no. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3408 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there -- are 11 voting Aye, 30 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3408, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared failed. Continuing on the Calendar, next up is Senate Bill 3409. Senator Silverstein, do you wish to try again? Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3409.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you very much. Just -- just for the record, on the last bill, Senator Righter - Senator Righter? Senator Righter? - kosher food does not have that much trans fat. A little. This is -- Senate Bill 3409 provides that that when a driver is involved in an accident resulting only in damage to the vehicle, they must move the vehicle as soon as possible off the highway to the nearest location or the exit ramp. Take any...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3409 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Present. Senate Bill 3409, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3410. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3410.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This just is going to codify a - a concussion policy of the Illinois High School Association.
It states that any athlete who exhibits signs, symptoms, or
behaviors consistent with a concussion shall be immediately
removed from the contest and shall be -- not return until a -he's been cleared by a licensed physician to -- that practices
medicine in the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is -- Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

One quick question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Does it -- does this -- Senator, does this specify who makes the call on the symptoms? Is it the coach? Is it the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I -- I think it -- it's got to be a -- by a medical physician that has to clear them to go back into play.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

But I -- I -- I thought you had mentioned that they would have to be removed from the contest. Who -- the -- the medical professional makes the call as to when they go back, but what about when they're removed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

The coach or the student, but we changed it so a physician would clear them, as opposed to a medical individual. We clarified it; we made it doctor -- give them the okay to go back.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Again, that's to return. But who makes the call as to whether they should come out of the contest?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

We -- we don't address it, but it would probably, more than likely, be the coach. But we don't address it in the legislation.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Not -- a question of the sponsor. Or, actually, not a question, just to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

To the bill. As you know, the Illinois High School Association has a policy on this which they have -- lately have come up with. And all this does is codify it. And to answer your question, Senator Maloney, it -- basically, whoever's -- whoever happens to be there at the time, whether it be the coach or many times there may be a -- some sort of a medical assistant there, but they would -- they would make the call whether to take them out of the ball game.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Luechtefeld. Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Silverstein, to close.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Coach.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indeed. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3410 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3410, having received the required

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 3414. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3415. Senator Garrett. Senator Garrett. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3423. Senator Tom Johnson. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3423.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This bill would permit a first-time offender charged or convicted with possession of less than fifteen grams of methamphetamine to qualify for treatment and alternative supervision. And there was no opposition to this in committee and I would ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3423 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 48 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill -- 3423, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3428. Senator Maloney. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3428.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3428 requires that one of the eleven members of the Illinois Community College Board that are appointed by the Governor be a president of one of the public community colleges. Currently, we have a college trustee and a college faculty person on the Board. There's a practical component to this in the sense that if the policy-making body - that is, the Board - is going to be making rules relative to the administration of community colleges, it makes sense that the -- a president is on there to tell how -- the viewpoint -- how the -- this would impact the day-to-day operation of the community colleges. I would be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3428 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3428, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3429. Senator Maloney, your light is on. Did you -- okay. Senate Bill 3429. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. Senate

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Bill 3433. Senator Tom Johnson. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3433.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill provides that criminal records that are sealed, and this is by the courts, by the --sealed and -- by the Department of State Police, they can continue to be disseminated by the Department to the arresting authority, the State's Attorney, and the court upon a later arrest for similar offense. And it strikes a provision that permitted dissemination of sealed information to other parties. And, again, there was no opposition to this in committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Johnson. Is there any discussion? Any discussion on the bill? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3433 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3433, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will skip over 3435 and go to Senate Bill 3436. But before we do that, Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to be recorded as a Yes on Senate Bill 3428, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The record will so reflect your intention. Senate Bill 3436. Senator Frerichs. Senator Frerichs. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3437. Senator Crotty. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3437.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3437 allows the State Fire Marshal's Office to be classified as a "local governmental agency" for purposes of the State Fire Protection Training Act. By allowing this classification, the bill would allow arson inspectors and fire prevention inspectors with the Office of the State Fire Marshals {sic} (Marshal) to receive the credentials necessary to obtain further training necessary for the position without being affiliated with a local fire department or a fire protection district that's currently under law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Crotty. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3437 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3437, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up is Senate Bill 3438. Senator Crotty. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3438.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Senate Bill 3438 amends the Metropolitan Water Reclamation Districts {sic} (District) Act to allow the executive director, with the advice and the consent of the District's board of commissioners, to appoint a public and intergovernmental affairs officer. That officer shall be under the direct supervision of the executive director and will not be included within the classified civil service of the District. In the event that -- a vacancy to this position, the executive director may appoint an acting public and intergovernmental affairs officer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Crotty. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3438 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3438, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3452. Senator Trotter. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3452.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I want to begin by thanking Senator Silverstein for taking the lowest vote of the year on his last trans fat bill, all-time low. 3452 is one of those rare bills that I have, dealing with motorcycles and the State Police. It is an agreed bill that is an initiative of the State Police and it amends the Vehicle Code in several Sections dealing with motorcycles, registration plates, covers, confiscation of certain driver documents, as well as addressing handlebar height.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Trotter. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3452 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3452, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3453. Senator Trotter. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3453.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

...very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 3453 is an initiative on the behalf of the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity which creates the Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standards Fund and various other small regulations.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3453 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3453, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you'll turn to the top of page 33, we have Senate Bill 3457. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3457.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3457 amends the Renter's Financial Responsibility and Protection Act. Provides that beginning January 1, 2013, and continuing every year after, the charge for a collision damage waiver for rental automobiles shall increase by the lesser of: Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the preceding calendar year as determined by the U.S. Department of Labor; or five percent. Currently, the charge for such a waiver is fixed at twelve dollars and fifty cents per day. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Muñoz. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3457 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 48 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3457, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up is Senate Bill 3458. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3458.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. The bill allows the Prisoner

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Review Board to grant a petition for certification of eligibility recommending that the court issue an order to seal the prisoner's -- seal the petitioner's record. Individuals who have been convicted of a Class 3 or 4 felony are eligible to petition to the Board, but must also meet the following requirements: five years have passed since the completion of their sentence; must not have had any other arrests or detentions; they must pass a drug test; must not have been convicted of a sex offense, DUI, or other violent crimes -aggravated assault, aggravated battery or domestic. If the Board denies a petitioner's application, the petitioner must wait another four years to apply again or request a pardon from the Governor. I know of no opposition to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Muñoz. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Muñoz, is there a -- is there any limits on what kind of crimes it could've been, other than the -- the grade felony? I understand it's Class 3 or Class 4 felonies. But any Class 3 or any Class 4 felony would qualify?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

It exempts DUIs or sex offenses, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So, deceptive practice, which is knowingly writing bad checks, forgery for someone who after -- serves their sentence and after five years applies to go to work for a bank, let's say, or an accounting firm, or something -- I mean, those would all fall within the parameters of this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Yes, the crimes that you just mentioned, they would definitely be able to go ahead and apply.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator, would you like him to repeat that? Senator Muñoz, Senator Righter would you like -- would like for you to repeat that statement. Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Yes, Senator. They are able to go ahead and apply for the crimes that you just mentioned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, let -- I mean, let's talk about that, Senator Muñoz. For a situation like I described or -- or several others - I mean, five years after they complete their sentence - and let's say that someone gets a -- a sentence for a Class 3 felony, the range of which, my recollection, is

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

two to five years. They get sentenced to two years. With good time, they're out in less than a year. Then five years passes. I mean, they're six years from having completed a Class 3 felony. I mean, does -- do you think that's enough time to justify hiding from an employer the fact that the person had been convicted of a Class 3 felony, particularly if the crime that they committed relates directly to the kind of work that they're applying for, like I said, deceptive practice or forgery in a banking situation? Do you think that -- that less than six years is enough time to pass?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Again, Senator, the Board has the discretion. We're just telling them - giving them the four categories - what they need before they can even apply for the petition for -- to seal this. And then, again, they have to go before the Board and the Board makes the final decision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And -- and that's a fair point, Senator, but the -- the Prisoner Review Board does not have this authority now, do they? I mean, we're giving them the opportunity to seal these records in a fashion that they don't have that authority now. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

They don't have that now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, if I -- to the bill, if I might, Mr. President. You know, I -- I -- Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I do think that this is an issue on which reasonable people can disagree and I just -- and I -- and I hope we all think about our employers back home. Because, you know, this isn't about, you know, either people who are against it or people who are for it in this Senate Chamber, necessarily. It's not about the lobbyists who are working for or against the bill, if there's any engaged in this at all. This is about the employers back home, who we are asking to invest more and create more jobs, and whether or not you think there's a measure of equity involved here in allowing for the opportunity for someone who's -- who's less than six years from committing a fairly serious crime - I mean, something for which we allow a sentence of up to five years in prison as a sentence - whether or not it's fair to them to provide the opportunity for someone to walk through the door of their business, put down an application, and not have to tell them that they were convicted of a Class 3 felony less than -or half a dozen years ago or so. I respectfully -- I appreciate what Senator Muñoz is trying to do here. I would urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Yes, thank you. Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LAUZEN:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

For questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the question, he indicates he will yield. Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Senator, I also -- I agree with Senator Righter, that I respect what you're trying to do. Can you respond to Senator Righter's -- like wrap up or summary {sic} about what's your thought about the exposure that employers back home in both -- all of our districts -- the exposure that they'll now have?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

I can see that you have a concern regarding for -deceptive practices with the employer, but I can tell you this,
this only lets them become eligible to apply. At the end of the
day, the court's got to make the ruling on it anyway, Senator.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator -- Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Okay. So what you're saying is that it allows the Prisoner Review Board to make the recommendation to a court and then a court makes the final determination to seal. Is that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

That's correct, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Okay. And then a clarification - and you may have mentioned it in your opening remarks. So all underlying crimes, you know, the crime that a person was convicted of, either a Class 3 or 4 felony, those must be nonviolent crimes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Yes. That's correct, sir - if you have the -- if you've been convicted of a Class 3 or 4 felony, but you have to meet the four criteria. They can't be DUR {sic}, violent crimes, such as aggravated assault, aggravated battery, or domestic battery. I -- I can tell you this, you know, being a policeman, you know, maybe an individual was young when they did the crime. I -- I can't give you that, but I will tell you this, if they did the crime, such as you just said, and they've done -- served their time, you're just giving them the opportunity for the petition to do this. Now, if you have a hard -- a hardened criminal, I'll tell you what, once they get out of jail, they're not going to wait no five years to commit a next felony. They're going to do it within -- once they get out or looking to get into trouble. So, again, I understand your concerns, but this is just a petition and the court has to approve it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Senator. Just one last question: Have you -- have you coupled protections for employers who now don't know

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

this background? Have you coupled protections in the tort law? That if, let's say, a person who's been convicted of forgery, serves the time, waits the five years, goes to work for a bank or an accounting firm, or something where they access to a client's funds, and they commit a crime again, is there any protection at all for the employer? Have you coupled tort reform of any type to this added risk that now Illinois employers are going to be taking?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Tom Johnson. Oh, I'm sorry. My -- there was a question there. Okay, Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

First of all, the courts right now can seal someone's record, Senator. The courts are doing it now, if they want. So this is just letting someone to make the petition to the Prisoner Review Board. As far as tort reform, I'm not an attorney, Senator. We did the bill based on that the courts would actually -- they would go ahead and approve it or not approve it. If someone has gotten a felony and they served their time and they come out and they try to work for a bank, the only way I think they can get that job with the bank is if they go ahead and use an alias name. I mean, your prints are on file. Once you're -- once you are locked up, you have an IR number, and the IR number will stay with you forever. So, the one who has the IR number, the federal -- FBI has that on record. You can never take away someone's IR number, even if it is a misdemeanor. You can go to court and get it -- taken off a misdemeanor, but they will always have your IR number. So if

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

you're going to go work for the bank, I bet you your IR number's going to pop like that. A bank will not, will not, hire anybody with a felony.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Okay. Let's see, the -- the question that I asked -- had asked would -- was, have you put -- have you coupled anything in, like tort reform, to protect. I don't think the answer -that was responsive, but if you wouldn't mind answering that. But then, in what you just said, I think to myself, in hiring someone in an accounting firm, I'm not sure that I would do like a criminal background check, and maybe -- maybe all of us are learning a lesson that when we employ anybody in Illinois, by golly, you better do a criminal background check with whatever that expense. And the thought process is, before you hire somebody, so that you can find that IR number, which -- so I quess it's -- if you can go back to the question of have you coupled any protection for the employer if they hire and they didn't know and then they somehow steal or -- commit forgery -commit a crime on one of their clients? Is there any coupling of protections now with this additional risk?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

No, Senator, there is not. An employer -- it'd be my understanding, when an employer has a deceptive practice and there's staff involved, you have insurance for that. That's what I would assume, Senator. But, to your question, the bill

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

does not have any of that in it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Tom Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Johnson.

SENATOR T. JOHNSON:

Yeah. Mr. President, Members, thank you for this opportunity. I rise in support of this piece of legislation. like to think I've come a long way in my thinking in terms of criminal justice, and I think all of us need to stop at some point and really think through what is criminal justice, the full picture of it. Up until many -- or not -- years ago, in fact, I did the truth-in-sentencing when I was in the House. did the automatic transfers of juvenile. Criminal justice has always been talked about through the arrest, conviction, and incarceration. That's what the public, that's what politicos think of criminal justice. That's the easy part of criminal The other half of criminal justice, which from a political standpoint has been divided many times, is what is now -- thought of as the social work side. That means the reentry. I submit that that's the hard part. And I've really learned that having been a member of the Prisoner Review Board. We have passed so many laws. Our sentences are very long. But we've passed so many laws, everybody do {sic} a background check. implication of that is nobody ever hires somebody who has been convicted of a felony. We make no distinction, in the public

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

and in our discourse often, as to what a felony is. We equate all felons as being the same, whether you got caught with ten grams of cocaine, whether you murdered somebody, whether you're a rapist. They're all placed into the same category. On the Prisoner Review Board, we received approximately two thousand petitions a year for clemency and pardon, which only the Governor can grant. We have a hundred -- or we have fifty thousand on parole at any given time in this State. We have fifty thousand incarcerated. That's a hundred thousand right there at any given time. When we turn around and say that after you have served your time, after you have successfully completed the conditions of parole, that even after all of that, you are going to be forever barred from reentering as a normal person in our society. I suggest that this piece of legislation is the first step that we can give some people an opportunity to reenter. Five years following the ending of parole is a long time. I can tell you, as we listened to the petitions for clemency and pardon for recommendations to the Governor, five years following, we were hearing cases ten years, twenty years, thirty years, forty years. At what point does somebody have a right to be back? None of us can predict the behavior. Some people are going to screw up. People who have been given clemency or pardon, at some point they might commit another crime. Does that mean that we should lock up another fifty thousand, hundreds of thousands, to never say you have a right to come back? This is just a first step. There are a lot of safequards in this. The Prisoner Review Board has to listen to these petitions, has to be a unanimous decision of the three, and these are not easy hearings. We put a lot of people through

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

a lot of -- lot of paces to make a judgment before we make a recommendation. And then it's only going to be up to the courts whether they accept the recommendation. But I do think this is a step in the right direction. And it's not perfect and nobody is going to be perfect. If -- if we could predict that way, then we would say -- we should be able to stop everybody before they commit the first offense. Everybody has a first offense. But we do need to move -- along and start paying a lot of attention. What are we doing when we have people incarcerated? What do we do as they leave? Give 'em fifty dollars, bus ticket, say "Behave yourself, and, oh, by the way, you can't ever go to work for an employer again. And by the way, don't ever commit another crime." We need to get further along in terms of who we are. So I do support this piece. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAOUL:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I couldn't of stated it any more eloquently than Senator Johnson. And Senator Johnson and I have had these conversations frequently. And two years ago I had the privilege of testifying before the Prisoner Review Board on behalf of a friend of mine, who is a felon. He's a felon because he had been twice the victim of a gun crime and decided to possess a weapon to protect himself because he had been shot, gone through

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

posttraumatic stress, hospitalized for several weeks. And we petitioned before the Prisoner Review Board in his case, which was much more than five years after. In his case -- you know, his case is distinguishable from a gangbanger who might have been convicted of the exact same crime. That's why we give a prisoner review board discretion and that's why we give the courts discretion to look at these on a case-by-case basis. For -- so, in some cases, five years may not be enough. It's merely a petition. And I'm sure Senator Johnson can share with you, a lot of these petitions for clemency are denied because the facts don't bear out granting them. In this case -- one of the things that we haven't mentioned is, because of our former Governor not having the political courage to deal with all of the petitions for clemency on his desk, there's a huge backlog. And our current Governor's been doing a decent job of trying to work his way through them, but there's a huge backlog. And so what -this gives an opportunity to -- to folks. And -- and you got to remember, for those who are incarcerated, we do call it the Department of Corrections, and there's something about that nomenclature that should mean something, that we're trying to correct a person in order to give them a second opportunity at being a productive member of society. We -- we either believe in that or -- or not. And we -- we either want to give people an opportunity to be productive members or we want to cut off all their opportunity and create a public safety hazard for all If you cut off the options, that's what you're dealing of us. with. You know, the notion that five years may not be enough, that might be true in some cases. But there's one level, which would be the Prisoner Review Board, they may decide that that

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

five years may not be enough and they make -- and they may decide that it is and they make a recommendation to the courts. Then you go to the court and the judge could decide that that five years is not enough. But allow them to look at it on a case-by-case basis. I can tell you in the case that I testified on behalf of my friend, I think three months would have been enough. He's no criminal. But our unwillingness to allow for -- the trust in the Prisoner Review Board, the trust in judges we -- we -- we continuously, year after year, try to take away discretion from our judges - and we create situations where a lot of good people who got caught up in a bad circumstance don't have an opportunity to have a second chance in life. not -- this is not a radical bill. This is not a radical departure of -- from -- from -- from what we should reasonably expect our public policy to be -- embrace with regards to our correctional system. I urge a Aye vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I don't like, often, to get involved with these weighty issues, but I do have to tell you, Senator Johnson, I've heard a lot of speeches and not many of 'em changed my mind, but your speech did. It was very eloquent. And I think if you -- if you -- if you're not going to provide resources for these people who get out of jail, if you're not going to provide a safety net, then we sure as heck should clear the way so they can go to work. I -- I urge a Aye yote for Senator Muñoz's solid bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I rise in support of this measure. I wanted to give my thanks to Senator Muñoz on a -- on a good piece of legislation and I wanted to also note Senator Tom Johnson's remarks on the That was an example of what we all need to see so many more times here on this Floor, especially when they are issues of import like this. I wanted to also add to the conversation that there is a piece of this that we haven't talked about, and that's housing. There are a lot of different housing ordinances across the State that say if you've been convicted of a felony, you can -- you can't rent here. So we are setting up a society where, when you get out, after parole is done, you still can't find some place to live, you still can't find a job. I don't know how in the world we can speak out of the same mouth and say that we want to reduce recidivism rates when we allow policies like that to continue. If it is true that someone who -- has served their time, then it -- we also must ask ourselves how often and how long, and then when will we actually say, is every sentence a life sentence? Is every sentence a life sentence? At what point has someone served their debt to the -- to the community? So I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Delgado, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DELGADO:

To the bill. Or actually...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill.

SENATOR DELGADO:

...a question of the sponsor first, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Delgado.

SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Muñoz, is it -- is it true that once upon release -- and by the way, we've heard from the police officer, we've heard from the lawyers, we've heard from a great lawyer on PRB, now let's hear from a former felony parole agent, which I'll play, which I was. Also, Officer Muñoz -- Senator Muñoz, when we do release them, aren't -- aren't they still on parole? And they're on parole for a certain period of time and they're assigned a parole agent, and that -- and they have a parole order, 'cause they've met their contract and now they're being released in society with a list of things they can and cannot do. And they're still under legal obligation in the community setting, called having to see their parole agent. I just wanted to also stand and support this, because at the end of the day, I, too, had to go in front of the Prisoner Review Board many years ago for a young man who had committed a dumb kid crime that falls in this category. And he was then eligible to become an investigator for the Public Defender's Office in Cook County, which and then, of course, he was able to. But I

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

had to argue the case for him to help the Prisoner Review Board understand, in those days, that he had done everything and that this young man was ready to move on, and he has continued to be a success case. But for us as parole agents on a felony level -I did not do my work here in Illinois - but it is a regular staple, and that is that we have to have a PSI, a post-sentence investigation, on the individual and have an understanding of their life coming out of that prison, what they've accomplished during their prison stay, who are their -- who are their collateral on -- in the communities, their relatives, all of their collateral, their possible employer coming out, which many times are already waiting for them, and then if not, were able to then bring this in. Because many of our companies have many folks that have sealed files right now, working for you or working for someone you know. It's never been an issue. This is being requested by the PRB and it's not something, I would think, that parole agents feel inhibited about. On the contrary, they're handcuffed themselves, not being able to turn their caseloads around, and the recidivism, the continues. And many of these folks have -- may not have had a large score, might have had one major -- that particular felony 3 and that's about it, other than socioeconomic problems. So, in essence, there are many, many mechanisms to make sure that this sees through. And knowing Senator Muñoz and knowing his role as a police officer, actually I'm very impressed that he's carrying this piece of legislation, in which I want to sign on to. But having all of these mechanisms is why this is a good piece of legislation and I, too, join in supporting it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HUNTER:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Many of you know that for the past several years, I've been passing legislation to create task force and various kinds of commissions dealing with disproportionality, racial ethics studies, as it relates to the criminal justice population. I simply would like to commend the sponsor of this -- this bill, as well as Senator Johnson for speaking to the bill, because these people do deserve a second chance. When I worked in the drug treatment field, some of the populations I worked with were court-mandated clients, and just by providing counseling to these guys, many of them are -- are very sorry and very embarrassed that they've committed whatever crimes committed. And many of them do deserve a second and a third chance. And then, again, you have some of 'em who are just criminals and they'll always be criminals. But, for the ones who would like to turn their lives around, let's not put our foot on their neck to say, "No, you've had your chance and you have no -- no other options. You must stay down." I mean, we're -- you know, one person represents a family and then it represents a community, and so let's open up our hearts and stop being so punitive all the time. And if these people want help, let's give them the help that they need. I ask for a favorable vote.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Hunter. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Muñoz, to close.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. First of all, I'd like to thank all my colleagues who got up and spoke on behalf of the bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, all of you know me. All the years that I've been here, I've always carried tough crime bills that would keep people locked up for serving drugs to our kids in school; helping police officers, giving them what they need to battle the streets. As a police officer, I worked on the Chicago streets. I've locked up killers, gangbangers, drug dealers. So all of you know how I feel about that situation. When this bill was brought to me, yes, it's a different bill for me, but you know what, this is just a petition for some hope. And at the end of the day, if they meet all the facts and met all the requirements, it still has to go before the court. So I leave you with that and I ask you for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3458 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 36 voting Aye, 15 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3458, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up on the Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, is Senate Bill 3461. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3484. Senator

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Delgado, on 3484. Yes. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3484.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Delgado.

SENATOR DELGADO:

We're trying to bring it up on the computer, Mr. President, if you'd give me one moment here, and here it is. Senate Bill 3484 increases the State Board of -- I'm sorry. This -- no -- this -- I'm sorry, we have to pull this out of the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, take the bill out of the record. Next up is Senate Bill 3487. Senator Crotty. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3487.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Crotty.

SENATOR CROTTY:

Senate Bill 3487 allows, in grades nine through twelve, a multi-function activity school bus to be used to transport students for any curriculum-related activity, not for transportation on regular bus routes from home to school or from school to home. The bill requires that a -- multi-function school activity bus drivers must have school bus driver permits

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

and is subject to provisions of the Vehicle Code.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion on the bill? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3487 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3487, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3489. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3489.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3489 amends the State Appellate Defender Act, removing provisions related to the recently abolished death penalty and adding provisions codifying the Office of the State Appellate Defender's role in assisting Illinois public defenders, specifically adding the discretionary duty to provide training, assistance of expert witnesses, and investigators to public defenders from funds appropriated for that purpose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

3489 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3489, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3491. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3491.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill is an initiative of our distinguished Secretary of State, Jesse White, and it -- it -- pursuant to recent Public Acts which allowed disabled veterans to be recognized with fifty percent -- with less than one hundred percent VA disability, he wants to establish two types of plates, one of which would be for those with a -- a disability which would render them nonambulatory and the -- the second would be disabled according to the recent standard. The first standard would have a decal allowing them to park in these specially designated -- it reduces the -- the -- the confusion for local police and everybody else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

3491 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3491, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3499. Senator Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 3505. Senator John O. Jones. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3508. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3508.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senate Bill - I'm going to look - 3508 - thank you very much - 3508 is an initiative of the -- Comptroller's Office and is a local government transparency bill. It requires units of government to file their audit report electronically, which currently there is no legislation that allows them to do that, to the -- the Comptroller. Comptroller is required to post those reports on the Internet within forty-five days after receiving the report. It also permits the Comptroller to waive electronic filing requirements in the event these municipalities or units of local government cannot file electronically. Requires the Comptroller to post a list of municipalities not in compliance and also

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

permits the Comptroller's Office to fine units of government that do not file the reports. Be happy to answer...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Althoff. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3508 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3508, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3510. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3510.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, again, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3510 is an initiative of the Cook County State's Attorney and is supported not only by that office, but also by the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. This bill provides that in a criminal prosecution in which the defendant is accused of first or second degree murder when the commission of the offense involves domestic violence, the evidence of the defendant's commission of another offense or offenses of domestic violence may be admissible. The evidence, however, must be otherwise admissible under the rules of evidence. In addition, the court must weigh

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

the probative value of the evidence against the prejudice to the defendant. The judge still has authority to not allow the evidence to come in. The defense must be given advance notice before trial of the State's Attorney's intent to use the evidence. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3510 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3510, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next on the Calendar is Senate Bill 3518. Senator Mulroe. Senator Mulroe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3522. Jacqueline Collins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3523. Senator Jacqueline Collins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3529. Senator Hutchinson. Senator Hutchinson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3533. Senator John O. Jones. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3533.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3533 amends the Wildlife Code. Changes the definition of "case" to mean any

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

case, firearm carrying box, shipping box, or container acceptable under the specified provisions of the Criminal Code of 1961.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3533 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3533, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn to the top of page 34 of your printed Calendar. We have Senate Bill 3536. Senator Sandack. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3536.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

Good afternoon, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3536 is an initiative of the Illinois Municipal League. It is a cleanup trailer bill from Public Act 97-109. Basically, it is a clear-up -- a cleanup of the language with respect to home rule municipalities. Nothing in the previous bill that we put forward was intended to limit the powers of home rule. This simply cleans that up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3536 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3536, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3549. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3552. Senator Sandack. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3552.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

Thank you, again, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3552 is a constituent-driven bill. It's an attorney in my district who practices in probate and estates. Basically, this bill amends the Code of Civil Procedure. It exempts certain personal property - in this instance, revocable and irrevocable trusts which names the wife or husband of the insured or a child, parent, or other person dependent upon an insured as the primary beneficiary. It essentially exempts revocable and irrevocable trusts from collection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

none, the question is, shall -- excuse me. Senator Silverstein, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

A question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

If I -- this would exempt them from collection. Is that what you're saying?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

Thank you, Senator. It would exempt those beneficiaries from collecting -- if a revocable and irrevocable trust, that would be property exempt from a judgment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I -- I just want to make sure. We asked this question in committee and -- about the spendthrift clause. Can you just -- so we get -- it's clear, 'cause I don't want any confusion, if there's a spendthrift clause in the trust?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3552 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3552, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3555. Senator Trotter. Senator Trotter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3557. Senator Muñoz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3572. Senator Haine. Senator Bill Haine, on 3572. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3573. Senator Haine. Out of the record. Senate Bill... We'll skip -- leave of the Body, we will skip 3576 and go to 3579. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3579.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a cleanup of a statute that we passed a number of years ago dealing with convicted sex offenders who wear costumes on Halloween, maybe a Santa Claus at Christmastime, or dress up as the Easter Bunny. It is -- stems from an incident that was brought to our attention by WAND-TV in Decatur. It's a cleaned up form, now that it's been on the books for a number of years, to make it more workable. For example, it makes sure that somebody can do something with their own immediate family and it backs out what we refer to in the Judiciary Committee or the Criminal Law Committee as "Romeo and Juliet" situations, those

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

types of sex offenders. I'd be happy to answer any questions, but this is already on the books. This makes the statute more workable in the -- in the real world.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3579 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, and 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3579, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3584. Senator Frerichs. 3584. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3592. Senator Silverstein. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3592.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Probate Act. This is regarding an appeal that is taken from a plenary or limited guardian does not affect the order, unless it is stayed by the Supreme Court governing appeals. Just cleaning up the Probate Act with that aspect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? There any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3592 pass. All

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3592, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3593. Senator Silverstein. Out of the record. 3594. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3594.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Again, this is a probate bill that provides in an adjudication of a disabled person, the public guardian is the petitioner, the public guardian is not required to pay the respondent's appointed attorney's or guardian ad litem's fees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3594 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3594, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3597. Senator Martinez. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3602. Senator Steans. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3607. Senator Althoff. Mr. Secretary,

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3607.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3607 is an initiative of the Township Assessors. It amends the Property Tax Code and changes the deadline for filing of assessment complaints to thirty calendar days after the date of publication of the assessment list, as opposed to current law which specifies either August 10th or August -- or, excuse me, September 10th.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3607 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3607, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3618. Senator Frerichs. 3618. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn to the top of page 35. We have Senate Bill 3626. Senator Muñoz. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3626.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The bill creates a new provision in the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act allowing a court, on its own motion, to order the parties and any minor children to integrative family therapy. However, the court may only do so if the court finds that: one, the parties' conflict -- conflict is substantial or ongoing and related to a -- custody or visitation; in the absence of intervention, the minor children have or are at the risk of developing pathological condition or conditions, including but not limited to depression, anxiety, and personality disorder; integrative family therapy would be in the best interests of the minor children. Fees and costs of the therapy shall be assessed to the parties as the court deems equitable. And this is a proponent {sic} of the Illinois Children {sic} (Children's) Rights Council. I know of no opposition.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3626 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Present. Senate Bill 3626, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3629. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3629.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3629 puts the Chicago Park District pension fund on a January to December fiscal year as of January 1, 2013.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3629 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3629, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3631. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3631.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3631 is a -- a cleanup trailer bill for Senate Bill -- 1918, which was enacted into law under the 97th General Assembly. It simply removes a reference to the Department -- of Commerce and Economic Opportunity which was inadvertently left in the original legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3631 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3631, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3635. Senator Maloney. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3635.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this bill will do, it amends the Public Community College Act, requiring that the award of a contract to the lowest bidder does not prevent the community college from complying with the terms or the conditions of the grant. This was brought to us by City Colleges. They had a -- an opportunity to hold a fundraiser by

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

a grant given by the Hilton Foundation. Had they put that out to bid, it would be possible that another corporation, say the Marriott, could under bid them and then they would forfeit the grant. It really amounts to a technical change in the Procurement Code -- this will now allow City Colleges to be part of that exception. There was one initial concern at the outset by organized labor, but an amendment that says that it will not impair any collective bargaining agreement in -- the community college may have with labor organizations satisfied their concerns. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3635 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3635, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3638. Senator Raoul. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3655. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a motion on -- a motion has been filed, a letter on record to change... We have a letter on file to allow Senator Syverson to sponsor the bill. And so, Senator Syverson, on Senate Bill 3655. Do you wish to proceed? Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill -- 3655.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm carrying this on behalf of Senator Millner. And many of you have probably heard from constituents back home. This is kind of like the "Drano" cleanup bill. And this was based on legislation that was passed last year and this follow-up legislation is -- further clarifies what was meant to be, or what products would be covered by this list. This now will exempt household products from that caustic substance registry list. This has been agreed to by the Retailers, the Hardware Association, the Food Retailers Association. I know of no objection and be happy to answer any questions you might have on this as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Syverson, for handling Senator Millner's bill. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3655 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3655, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3660. Senator Hunter. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3660.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3660 amends the Youth and Young Adult Employment Act of 1986 by moving the (Community) Youth Employment Program from the Department of -- from DCEO to Department of Natural Resources. And -- the program provides competitive grants for up to five thousand low-income youth each summer. The recipients are given a stipend or wages and trained to do age-appropriate work. This bill is subject to appropriation and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator McCarter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McCARTER:

Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield. Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, is there -- I -- I did notice a few things. One thing you said {sic}, subject to appropriation. So, just to confirm, we -- we don't know of any money available for this program right now. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

At this time, no. But I've been working with the Director

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

of DNR and we're looking at some federal dollars coming in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

And if you did find those dollars, how much -- how much do you think you might find?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

I have no idea, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

You don't even have any kind of a range whatsoever?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Last year, Senator, this program cost 8.9 million dollars, and so that's our starting point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Why is it that you want it under DNR now? 'Cause it hasn't -- it hasn't ever been under DNR, has it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

This program was run by DNR last year and they did such a wonderful job at it. Hold -- one minute. I'm told that they

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

had a similar program, not this program, last year, and DNR had -- had -- had provided such excellent work in managing the program and -- and getting the kids involved in very constructive, environmentally friendly projects that I thought it would be a great idea that they could manage the program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

How -- how much was spent in DNR under their program last year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

I'm not sure, Senator. I made a mistake; it was DCEO who spent 8.9 million dollars last year, and not DNR. So I'm assuming it will probably cost the same amount of dollars, but I have no -- no numbers on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Okay, so 8.9 million dollars was spent in DCEO and now we're going to go to DNR to develop some kind of a program for we don't know how much, right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Senator, it's going to cost the same amount of dollars.

DNR had a program, as I've -- indicated earlier, quite -- similar to this program, and I don't see why it would cost any

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

additional dollars as it did from last year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill: You know, we -- we haven't even started with the budget, have we? And if every one of us found something for 8.9 million dollars that we thought might be a good thing, that'd just put us in more of a spot, wouldn't it? I just think, you know, premium programs like this without any appropriation, just because we think they're great, and I -- and it probably -- probably are great. It probably is a great program, but we could all come up with millions of dollars of great programs in every one of our districts. I -- I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Hunter, you wish to close? Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This would be a great, great program for our youth. It's a -- statewide, five -- five thousand jobs for our kids, paying them seven dollars and fifty cents an hour. And I participated in some of DNR summer programs last year, where this program was encouraging neighborhood farms and teaching kids how to prepare ground for a farm, how to manage it, and how -- and just -- you know, urban kids do not have that opportunity and I'd like to commend DNR for the wonderful job that they did last year in -- in managing the program. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3660 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 28 voting Aye, 18 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3660, having not received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed {sic}. Senator Hunter, for what purpose do you rise?

I ask to put this bill -- bill on Postponed Consideration, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 3663. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Yes, Mr. President, Senate Bill 3663 is a prohibition. We already have a prohibition in the law - you know, we -- I can't believe -- and I -- I can't remember the name of the bill; it was after an officer who was killed - to have people move away from the scene of an accident. This prohibits using cell phones -- or, cell phone cameras within five hundred feet of an accident. There were two near misses in St. Clair County, Illinois. A fire chief brought this in. People calling or

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

taking pictures, calling radio stations about the accident, that's what this prohibits.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Syverson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Senator, I've not had a chance to review this yet, but just a couple questions. Using the cell phone within five hundred feet of a accident - there are many times you -- you may be in traffic and you don't even know that there is an accident that's in front of you. How do we determine if that's what -- if I'm reading this right, is it five hundred feet within the emergency scene? Would that be an accident?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Senator. I appreciate that. It defines it as - I think the State Police were part of this - within five hundred feet of an emergency scene where an authorized emergency vehicle is present and making use of an audible or visual signal. So I believe it's -- it's -- that would define it as something that you would have to observe. If -- if you can't observe it, it's -- if it's not audible or visual, I don't believe having a -- using a cell phone will violate the Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yeah, I guess I'm still concerned with if you're five hundred feet behind it, with the way traffic -- may be -- may be flowing, you may not hear or see or know that if you're -- if you're coming up to that. So I'm not -- I guess I'm not sure -- I'm not clear what you're referring to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Senator Syverson, I'll be happy to take it out of the record and amend it to narrow the thing to the point where you - what you're saying. I -- we want -- we don't -- I don't think we want to entrap anybody or to cause somebody to do this unwittingly. This merely says, if you're coming upon a scene of an accident and you clearly see the lights, hear the sirens, don't get on the cell phone, don't take a picture of the accident scene. That's the intent, the gist of the bill. If there's some way to narrow it further, I'm open to that. I don't want to have anyone given a ticket for unwittingly being on a cell phone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Yeah, I guess my concern is, many times on the -especially on the highway, where you're behind a semi and then
all of a sudden you come right up to it and there's a -- there's
an accident or there's a vehicle right there; you've not seen
that, but you're certainly within five hundred feet - you're

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

within a hundred feet. You don't even realize that there's an accident or there's emergency vehicles there. And -- and so, I think, having that much distance, I -- I think would become a -- a problem. So, if we can just figure out how we can clarify something to address your concerns, but -- that would be wonderful.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

So I'll take it out of the record, see if we can craft an amendment lowering the number of feet. If -- if one's behind -- just as a notice, if one's behind a semi, for example, and you don't observe the -- the lights or -- or signals, I don't think it would be proper to give that person a ticket. I really don't. But if there's a way to craft that, I'll be happy to do it. I'll talk to the State...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

So -- so, Senator Haine, do you wish to take it out of the record? Mr. Secretary, pull the bill out of the record. Next up on the Calendar is Senate Bill 3665. Senator Jacqueline Collins. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3670. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3670.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3670 changes the name of the Illinois National Guard Armory Construction Fund to the Illinois National Guard Construction Fund. It also authorizes the Adjutant General to sell National Guard facilities, instead of armories, under this jurisdiction. Some of the actual facilities that are owned are called facilities, rather than armories, which is the purpose of this. This was brought to me by the Department of Military Affairs. And in addition, the bill also deletes language that states no officer, warrant officer, or enlisted personnel shall receive less that seventy-five per day for each day's service performed in emergency services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3670 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3670, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3671. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill was actually an initiative of the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs and it deletes the requirement that the Department conduct an annual review comparing benefits received by Illinois veterans with benefits received by veterans in other states and U.S. territories - with the reason being, is that they're never able to get that information from the federal government. This legislation also says that the agency shall, to the extent that funds are available, implement the Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Outpatient Counseling Program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3671 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3671, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3672. Senator Rezin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3673. Senator Righter. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3673.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Chamber. Senate Bill 3673 basically has two parts. First, it clarifies the elements, the offense of criminal transmission of HIV, to make clear that the offender must have -- must know that he has the -- or she has the HIV virus; two, that that person had sexual -- activity with the alleged victim; and, three, that that was done without -- without use of a condom. part of the bill is a portion that comes from, actually, Whiteside County. It allows for the subpoena of materials or an individual pursuant to an investigation for transmission of HIV. Those records or that testimony, pursuant to that subpoena, would have to be subject to an in camera review by a court and only if a court found that the information was relevant could it be then given to a prosecutor. The reason to allow for this is that there was a case that originated out of Whiteside County recently, where an individual who was infected with HIV had unprotected sex with approximately twenty individuals, two of which were found to have HIV later. brought a criminal charge against the individual under what is currently the law. The case had to be dismissed because the prosecutor couldn't prove that the person knew that they had HIV. Obviously, if this subpoena mechanism was in place, that problem could have been resolved. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3673 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3673, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3685. Senator McCarter. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3685.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

3685 simply adds to the list that we made last year with the martial arts bill Jujutsu. It's one of the things that we left out. We found out that we lost a lot of the amateur tournaments in Chicago and a lot of money related to those tournaments because we left it out. So, Senator Martinez and I have put this back in as a trailer to the bill. I appreciate your support. Ask -- I'll answer any questions, if you have them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3685 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3685, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise?

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR HAINE:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point, Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President, I just want to tell you, you haven't approached warp speed of Senator Hendon, but you're almost there. I congratulate you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. I've never been compared to Senator Hendon before - could be the first. Senate -- Senate Bill 3693. Senator Haine. 3693. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3694. Senator Silverstein. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3697. Senator Millner. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, turn to the top of page 36 of the printed Calendar. We have Senate Bill 3712. Senator Martinez. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3712.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This bill, Senate Bill 3712, amends the Title Insurance Act by requiring that every application for registration by a title insurance agent include a signed and notarized affidavit of the applicant's title insurance agent affirming that the applicant

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

and that every controlling person of the applicant within the company has never been convicted of or pled guilty to a crime of theft or dishonesty. It also prohibits a person convicted of a crime of theft or dishonesty from being registered by a title insurance company, and such a person is prohibited as serving as an owner, officer, or other controlling position of any registered title insurance agent. It also describes the acts of theft or dishonesty, where the Secretary may refuse to grant, suspend, or revoke any certificate of authority, registration, or license under the Act or impose a fine for the violation of the Act. It -- this is an initiative of the Division of Financial Institutions and the title insurance companies are also on board with this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3712 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3712, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3718. Senator Harmon. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3726. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3727. Out of the record. 37 -- Senate Bill 3744. Senator Christine Johnson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3746. Senator McCann. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3746.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCann.

SENATOR McCANN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber. Senate Bill 3746 establishes the third Thursday in May of each year as Volunteer Emergency Responder Appreciation Day throughout the State. It creates a volunteer emergency responder license plate under the Vehicle Code and establishes a fund for which all proceeds from the plates shall be placed. It directs IEMA to hold an annual meeting to bring volunteer emergency responders together for the formation of a statewide organization. This is done in association with Senator Forby's Senate Joint Resolution 56. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3746 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 47 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3746, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3764. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3767. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3780. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Senate Bill 3780.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

This bill provides that mental health records may be disclosed in a court proceeding involving sexual assault or sexual abuse. Oh, there's an amendment. I'm sorry. We have to pull the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Very well, you bet. Mr. Secretary, pull it out of the record, please. Senate Bill 3789. Senator Trotter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3796. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3800. Senator Maloney, on 3800. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3802. Senator Link. Senator Link. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3809. Senator Mulroe. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3809.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Currently, the Park District Code provides that adults who apply for a job with the part district must give the district authority to -- to do a background check to determine if the

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

person was committed {sic} (convicted) of certain enumerated offenses, such as murder, attempt {sic} (attempted) murder, Class X felonies, sexual offenses, and so on. It's enumerated in the -- in the Code. What this bill would do, would -- would add three offenses to it. Those being cyberstalking, stalking, and aggravated stalking. But this would also allow the park district to -- to do the same background checks for juveniles convicted of the same type of offenses.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3809 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Secretary, take the --take the record, rather. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate Bill 3809, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3811. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3813. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. And on the top of page 37, with leave of the Body, we'll come back to 3823 later. Senator Crotty in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Now, with leave of the Body, we'll turn to page 26. On the bottom of page 26 is Senate Bill 2568. Senator Sullivan. Do you wish to proceed? He says he does. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2568.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2568 allows for charitable organizations deemed eligible by the Secretary of State to -- to design decals to be affixed on plates issued to retired members of the United States Armed -- Armed Forces. The decal shall designate the applicant's branch of service, theater of action, or both.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2568 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 45 voting Aye, none voting Nay -- 46 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2568, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On page 27, Senate Bill 2579. Senator Sullivan. Senator Sullivan wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 2579.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen. It

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

amends the Illinois Vehicle Code and it removes the length limits for the distance between the kingpin, which is where a -- the -- a trailer hooks on to a tractor, a road tracker, a semi, and the center of the rear axle of the semitrailers. That certain -- currently, there is a distance in statute that it -- it can only be a certain distance, but because of the -- and this is only with regard to livestock trailers, because there's -- livestock trailers, the only body -- the only company that manufactures them, they're actually longer than that. So this removes that length provision. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2579 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2579, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 30. On the top of page 30 is Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 3241. Senator Sullivan. Out of the record. On Senate Bill 3292, Senator Sullivan. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3292.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Sullivan.

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President. The legislation amends the Animal Disease Laboratories Act by stating that the Department of Ag may establish and collect a reasonable fee for services performed by such animal disease laboratories. Currently, the Department is only receiving fees for diagnostic services at these labs. The fees would be deposited into the Illinois Department of Ag Lab Services Revolving Fund. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3292 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 3292, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go to page 32. Senate Bill 3435. Senator Sullivan. Senator Sullivan wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Bill 3435.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen. It simply -- the legislation simply states that ice or snow removed

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

from a residential driveway may not be deposited on a -- upon a public highway if it creates a traffic safety hazard and, also, only if it's determined by the local or State police.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3435 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 48 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 3435, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. The Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet. The members of the Committee on Assignments will come to the President's Anteroom immediately. The Senate will stand at ease. (at ease) Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Harmon, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Criminal Law Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3349, Committee Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3814; refer to Energy Committee - Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 2526; refer to Environment Committee - Committee Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3788; refer to Executive Committee - Committee Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2943, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3399 and Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3456; refer to Financial Institutions Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3177, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3522, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3523 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3583;

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

refer to Human Services Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1351; refer to Insurance Committee - Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 2877; refer to Judiciary Committee - Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2545, Committee Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2894, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3234, Committee Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3778, Committee Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3778, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3810, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3810; refer to Licensed Activities Committee -Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3171, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3513, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3529; refer to Local Government Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 547, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 548, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 549, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3184 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3373; refer to Pensions and Investments Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3396, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3396; refer to Procurement Committee - Committee Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3297; refer to Public Health Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 174, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Resolution 546; refer to Revenue Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 409, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3664; refer to State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 3694; refer to Transportation Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 963, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3318, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3384 and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3504; re-refer from Labor Committee to Executive Committee - Senate Bill 2521, Senate Bill 2540, Senate Bill 2541, Senate Bill 2542, Senate Bill 2543, Senate Bill 2544, Senate Bill 2551, Senate Bill 2880, Senate Bill 2881, Senate Bill 2943, Committee

94th Legislative Day

3/22/2012

Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2943, Senate Bill 3155, Senate Bill 3427, Senate Bill 3520, Senate Bill 3610, Senate Bill 3611, Senate Bill 3627, Senate Bill 3739, Senate Bill 3807, Senate Bill 3808, Senate Bill 3825; Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Bills 1064, 1135, and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 3518.

Signed Don Harmon, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

A Message from the House by Mr. Mapes, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 1473.

We received like Messages on House Bills 3985, 3986, 4029, 4148, 4468, 4523, 4568, 4577, 4606, 4615, 4622, 4674, 4682, 4715, 4748, 4940, 4988, 4991, 5180, 5236, 5250, 5263, 5264, 5265, 5283, 5315, 5321, 5353, 5359, 5440, 5493, 5548, 5549, 5592, 5791 and 5899. Passed the House, March 22nd, 2012. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 11 a.m. on the 23rd day of March, 2012. The Senate stands adjourned.