121st Legislative Day 5/27/2016

| НВ0813 | Recalled       | 72  |
|--------|----------------|-----|
| НВ0813 | Third Reading  | 73  |
| НВ0813 | Vote Intention | 88  |
| HB1380 | Recalled       | 56  |
| HB1380 | Third Reading  | 57  |
| НВ3190 | Recalled       | 10  |
| НВ3190 | Third Reading  | 11  |
| НВ3554 | Third Reading  | 130 |
| НВ4257 | Second Reading | 5   |
| НВ4377 | Recalled       | 59  |
| НВ4377 | Third Reading  | 60  |
| HB4517 | Recalled       | 62  |
| HB4517 | Third Reading  | 63  |
| нв4633 | Third Reading  | 64  |
| НВ5603 | Second Reading | 6   |
| НВ5902 | Third Reading  | 88  |
| НВ5930 | Recalled       | 89  |
| НВ5930 | Third Reading  | 90  |
| НВ5945 | Third Reading  | 91  |
| НВ5948 | Recalled       | 92  |
| НВ5948 | Third Reading  | 93  |
| НВ5973 | Recalled       | 128 |
| НВ5973 | Third Reading  | 129 |
| НВ6010 | Third Reading  | 94  |
| НВ6030 | Recalled       | 95  |
| нв6030 | Third Reading  | 95  |
| НВ6041 | Third Reading  | 96  |
| нв6083 | Third Reading  | 97  |
| НВ6084 | Third Reading  | 98  |
| НВ6123 | Third Reading  | 99  |
| НВ6125 | Third Reading  | 100 |
| НВ6167 | Third Reading  | 101 |
| НВ6200 | Recalled       | 102 |
| НВ6200 | Third Reading  | 103 |
| НВ6213 | Third Reading  | 104 |
| НВ6252 | Third Reading  | 105 |
| НВ6292 | Recalled       | 110 |
| НВ6292 | Third Reading  | 111 |
| НВ6298 | Recalled       | 123 |
| НВ6298 | Third Reading  | 124 |
| НВ6303 | Third Reading  | 125 |

| 121st Legislative Day   |   | 5/27/2016   |
|---|---|---|
| IID 6220  | Cogond Dooding  | 1 2 /   |
| НВ6328<br>НВ6332  | Second Reading Second Reading                                       | 134   |
| НВ6333  | Third Reading   | 127   |
| SB0389  | Vote Intention  | 2   |
| SB0777  | Veto Message  | 140   |
| SR0957  | Adopted   | 137   |
| SR1364  | Adopted   | 138   |
| SR1781  | Adopted   | 138   |
| SR1939  | Resolution Offered  | 4   |
| SR1940  | Resolution Offered  | 4   |
| SR1941  | Resolution Offered  | 52  |
| HJR0124   | Adopted   | 139   |
| SJR0058   | Adopted   | 134   |
| AM990216  | Appointment Confirmed   | 131   |
| AM990217  | Appointment Confirmed   | 132   |
| AM990218  | Appointment Confirmed   | 133   |
| Senate to Order-Senate Prayer-Pastor Ryan Ne Pledge of Allegiance Journal-Postponed Messages from the House Senate Stands in Rece Messages from the House Senate Stands at Ease Committee Reports Senate Stands in Rece Messages from the House Committee Reports Executive Session Executive Session Arm Messages from the House Communications from | eal  use ess/Reconvenes use e/Reconvenes ess/Reconvenes use use use | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>4<br>4<br>9<br>9<br>51<br>52<br>52<br>131<br>133<br>140 |
| Communications from t<br>Resolutions Consent (<br>Adjournment   | the Secretary of State<br>Calendar-Adopted                          | 140<br>140<br>141   |

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

The regular Session of the 99th General Assembly will please come to order. Will our Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor Ryan Neal, Relationship Church, St. Louis, Missouri.

## PASTOR RYAN NEAL:

(Prayer by Pastor Ryan Neal)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Please remain standing for the Pledge Allegiance. Senator Cunningham.

## SENATOR CUNNINGHAM:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Cunningham)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Mr. Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Journal of Thursday, May 26th, 2016.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hunter.

## SENATOR HUNTER:

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

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcript. There being no objection, so ordered. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 2610.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2610.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2746, with House Amendment 1; and Senate Bill 2797, with House Amendment 1. Passed the House, as amended, May 26th, 2016. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Lisa Yuscius, Blueroomstream.com, seeks permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Senator McGuire, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your point.

SENATOR McGUIRE:

Thank you, Mr. President. On April 21st of this year, on SB 389's 3rd Reading, it was my intention to vote Yes and I would like to be recorded as having done so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Record will reflect your intention. Sherrie Phipps of WICS seeks permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, permission granted. Leader Silverstein, for what purpose do you rise?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

## SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

For the purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your announcement.

## SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

There'll be a Democratic Caucus for approximately one hour upon recess.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Silverstein moves to -- that the Senate recess for the... Senator Rose, for what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR ROSE:

Thank you, Mr. President, for your indulgence. We wish to caucus, as well, on our side of the aisle, immediately upon recess, for an hour. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you rise?

## SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. For purposes of an introduction.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

State your introduction.

## SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have a very, very special quest today, Whitney Wilson. Whitney is the daughter of a former staff member of ours, who currently works for the Illinois Chamber, Staci Wilson. Whitney is in fifth grade, here in Springfield. And one fun fact that most people don't know about Whitney is that she's a gymnast. So we would like a warm Springfield welcome for Whitney today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LINK)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Senators Silverstein and Rose move that the Senate recess for the purposes of a Democratic and Republican Caucus, each lasting one hour. Seeing no objection, the motion is granted. The Senate now stands in recess to the call of the Chair. After the Democratic and Republican Caucus, the Senate will reconvene for Floor action. The Senate stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolutions 1939 and 1940, offered by Senator McGuire and all Members.

They are both death resolutions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. 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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 2300.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of -- instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2300.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 2585, with House

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Amendments 1 and 2; Senate Bill 2820, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 2861, with House Amendment 2. Passed the House, as amended, May 27th, 2016. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, can I have your attention for an announcement? Will all Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? All Members, to the Senate Floor. We're ready to go to final action. Going to be doing House Bills 3rd Reading shortly. All Members, please come to the Senate Floor. Ladies and Gentlemen, kind of while we're waiting for Members to come to the Floor, we're going to run through the House Bills 2nd Reading. We're going to do House Bills 2nd Reading. If you'll turn to page 21 of the regular Calendar on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, we have House Bill 4257. Senator Holmes. Senator Holmes. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4257.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. House Bill 6261. Senator Connelly. Mr. Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen, let's go to House Bill 6285. Senator Bush. Excuse me, Mr. Secretary, disregard that last... Let's go to House Bill 4486. Senator Connelly. Did I already ask him that? House Bill 4501. Senator Tom Cullerton, on 4501. Mr. Secretary, let's go to House Bill 4645. Senator Brady. Senator Brady. Mr. Secretary, with leave of the Body, let's go to 5704. House Bill 5-7-0-4. Senator McConnaughay. 5-7-0-4. Would you

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

like to move that to 3rd? Indicates she does not. Mr. Secretary, let's go to 6328. Senator Jacqueline Collins. Senator Collins, would you like to move that bill to 3rd? Mr. Secretary, let's go to 6332. 6-3-3-2. Senator Cunningham. Senator Cunningham. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6332.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 3rd Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave of the Body, we're going to go back to -- we're still on page 22 of the regular Calendar on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. We got House Bill 5603. Senator Link, on 5603. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5603.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 3rd Reading. And, Senator Link, how about 5628? Indicates he does not wish to move forward with that bill. Senator Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR ROSE:

Point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point, Senator Rose.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

## SENATOR ROSE:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm very honored to have with me today, Johnny Wanninger. Johnny lives three doors down from us in Mahomet and he just finished the sixth grade on Tuesday. He'll be going to seventh grade next year. His favorite subject is math. He was involved in drama - he worked on the lighting crew, he was in the choir, he plays baritone, and likes tennis. He's got a lot of ideas about what he wants to do when -- when he grows up - photographer, like his mom, Heather, in the gallery; veterinarian; canine police officer; stay-at-home dad; but right now becoming a teacher is at the top of the list. So if we could welcome John Wanninger to Springfield. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's welcome Johnny to the Illinois Capitol and the Illinois State Senate. Thanks for joining us. Senator Connelly. Senator Connelly, just one second, please. Hold on just one second. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate will stand at ease for a few minutes to allow the Committee on Assignments to meet. Will all members of the Committee on Assignments please come to the President's Anteroom? Committee on Assignments. Senator Connelly, now, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR CONNELLY:

For purposes of an introduction, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please make your introduction, Senator Connelly.

## SENATOR CONNELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I'd like to introduce my Page for today, Jared English. Jared is a junior at Dundee-Crown High School, National Honor Society, honor roll

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

every year. He's in AP history and AP government. He's going to be studying aerospace engineering at the great Purdue University in Lafayette -- West Lafayette. He's accompanied by his parents here today. He is the great-grandson of State Senator Walter Hoffelder. Coach may have been around when he was around. Coach isn't here to answer that, but please give him a warm Senate welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Jared, welcome to the Illinois Senate, you and your family. Thanks for joining us. Senate will stand at ease while the Committee on Assignments meets. All members of the Committee on Assignments, please come to the President's Anteroom. Senator Anderson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR ANDERSON:

Purposes of an introduction, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please make your introduction, Senator Anderson. SENATOR ANDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Today I have Andrew Florence with me. He is actually from Senator Nybo's district and he is my Page today. He is fifteen years old. He attends Saint Ignatius College Prep. He'll be in ninth grade here. He is -- he is part of mock trial, has interests in golf, lacrosse, DuPagePads program, and church youth group. When he grows up, he wants to be an -- a -- a lawyer, which I'm going to talk to him about after I -- I sit down here. And one thing that was pretty interesting to me, as -- as a guy that tries to golf, this -- this young man shot a seventy-six last year, which I don't think I've ever shot. So if we -- if we as the Senate could give him a warm

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

welcome. And his parents are in the gallery right behind the Republican side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's welcome Andrew and his family here to the Illinois Senate. Thanks for joining us today. Good luck with that golf game. (at ease) The Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned:

Refer to Executive Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 813.

Signed, Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have a committee announcement if you'll listen up. We have one committee scheduled. Executive Committee will meet at 1:20 this afternoon in Room 212. The Senate Executive Committee, at 1:20 this afternoon in Room 212. Thank you. Senator McCann, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

## SENATOR McCANN:

On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point, Senator McCann.

### SENATOR McCANN:

Mr. President, I would like to introduce my Page for today. I have standing here with me, Dylan Ross, who is nine years old, and he's from a community that you're somewhat familiar with, Barry, Illinois. Dylan is going into the fourth grade. His

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

favorite subject is reading. And, Mr. President, I know you'll agree with me that leaders are indeed readers. And so I am proud of the fact that reading is his favorite subject. He enjoys soccer and golf, but his favorite sport, by far, is dance. As a matter of fact, about two months ago, Dylan was tapped as one of four young people to dance alongside Justin Bieber at -- at his St. Louis leg of his tour. Now there were applicants, thousands of applicants from all over the world, to perform with Justin, and this young man from Barry, Illinois, a community in west central Illinois of only fourteen hundred, was one of those four people. So, we're very proud of Justin {sic} and I'm also -- I'm proud to introduce his mom, who is in the President's Gallery, Jennifer Ross, who many of you know from her work around the Capitol here. So I hope you'll join me, Mr. President, in welcoming Justin and his mom -- or Dylan and his mom, Jennifer - no, Justin's not here today. I know, I -- I heard everybody gasp. I -- I think everybody was getting excited - Dylan and his mom, Jennifer, to the Capitol today.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's welcome Dylan and his mom to the Illinois State Capitol. Congratulations, Dylan. Good job! Ladies and Gentlemen, just momentarily, we're going to go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Just waiting on a little paperwork. We'll be ready to go here momentarily. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. And if you'll turn to page 14 of the regular Calendar - page 14 - House Bills 3rd Reading, we have House Bill 3190. Sponsorship has been changed to Senator Lightford. Leader Lightford, are you ready to proceed? Leader Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3190

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3190. Mr. Secretary, are there any committee or Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford, to present Floor Amendment 1.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Am I moving for the adoption and discussing it on 3rd? I would like to move for its adoption and I'll discuss it on 3rd. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, all those -- all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. 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. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3190. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3190.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 3190 is the answer to our current school funding formula that must be changed. The current formula is inadequate as it disregards even EFAB's recommendations and it exasperates {sic} the problem through ongoing proration that causes schools in need to fall further behind. The current formula is also inequitable as it does not address unique student's need or regional labor cost differences. In the end, it is simply relying on property taxes to pay for a quality education and does not compensate effectively for districts with little local ability. The current formula's authors have also recommended that the formula be discontinued. So what we decided to do is to develop a new funding formula for Illinois - that presents many challenges. Our State features a wide variety of student demographics, regional economics, and types of school districts. So the new formula would address these challenges. Dr. Allan Odden, a Professor Emeritus from the University of Wisconsin, and Dr. Lawrence Picus, from the University of Southern California, created the evidence-based funding model. This model currently is being used in states such as Maryland, Vermont, and Wyoming. It was studied and vetted in 2010 by the Illinois School Finance Adequacy Task Force. That's the bipartisan group here in Illinois of educators, legislators, business persons, education advocates, and taxpayers. So this year -- earlier this year in 2016, a broad-based coalition of representatives got together - they were from all the groups that we're quite familiar with: ED-RED, LEND, LUDA, SCOPE, PMA, Forecasts {sic} (Forecast5) Analytics, IASBO, IASA, IASB, CTBA, and Concordia University of Chicago - have taken the next steps to refine the 2010 model and develop a funding formula. Evidence-

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

based approach is what we're missing here in the State of Illinois. This would identify how much money per pupil is needed to educate students to ensure their success. It's steeped in research and evidence-based practices that, when implemented, support increased student proficiency of State standards and correlates to success in higher education or careers and the evidence-based approach model supports each resource recommendation with research, and if students do not exist in specific areas, then professional judgment panels identifying best practices. The key benefits of the proposed GSA funding allocation will be number one: That it utilizes an evidence-based adequacy model. It will incorporate a hold harmless in State funding for all districts. It would eliminate all State block grants. It would eliminate the PTELL adjustment. It would eliminate the use of tax rates in the State funding formula. It allows flexibility based on availability of State funds. Districts with the greatest need receives the most Tier 1 is the highest priority and identifies State funding. districts with the most urgent needs within the State. We will be moving to a four-tier system based on the adequacy level of spending. Tier 2 is the next funding level and is equitable and flexible. Tier 3 and 4 allows the State to provide maintenance funds to districts close to or above adequacy. It maintains flexibility and control for non-formula State funding and it would develop an accountability measure that is highly recommended. The district's Adequacy Target times the Comparable Wage Index, minus the Local Capacity Target, minus the CPRT {sic} (CPPRT), would equal the net State's contribution. That would be the new funding formula that is used in the evidence-based model. Evidence-based model will include six -- twenty-seven elements. Those elements

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

are categorized by State resources for staff, core programs, per student resources, central office functions, and resources for challenged learners. Every five years, the Professional Judgment Panel will oversee the continual recalculations regarding the different elements. It's appointed by the State Superintendent and the Illinois State Board of Education will have a huge responsibility. So moving forward, we know that there's a base funding guarantee and all of the school districts that were considered losers will all be considered winners. There would be a fair based minimum that no one would fall up under the fiscal '17 numbers. With that, Mr. President, I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Questions for the sponsor, please. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield for questions. Senator Rezin. SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. Leader Lightford, we have -- so this bill came to committee yesterday -- to Education Committee yesterday. And I'll be honest with you, this bill, which is about five hundred pages, was -- was dropped on our desk about two hours before the actual committee. So bear with us, as we were trying to analyze what was in a very comprehensive...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin, excuse...

SENATOR REZIN:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

...school funding bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin, excuse me just one second. Ladies and Gentlemen, shh! We're on the Order of 3rd Reading. Please hold the visiting down. Senator Rezin, please continue.

### SENATOR REZIN:

Thank -- thank you. My first question is -- so this bill actually contains two separate education funding formulas. The first year would be essentially Senate Bill 231, which we've already voted on, and that is a particular type of education funding bill that we've talked about, that we have discussed, we've debated numerous times. And in that bill, does the -- does that particular part of this bill still include the pension payment for Chicago Public Schools?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

## SENATOR REZIN:

So in -- and, again, in the first education funding component, so the first year of this massive -- or of this school funding formula, do the grants that we've talked about for the block grant, poverty grant, special Ed grant still -- which is -- and, again, you know, this is the tough debate, as we're debating school dollars. One pot of money. But, you know, the problem that we've had with that particular bill is thirty percent are going up to CPS, which has a declining school population, and that's been money

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

that we feel has been taken from downstate. Do the block grants still -- are they still contained in the first education funding component of this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Right. It's not considered block grants, but I -- I guess I could best describe it as -- think of categoricals that suburban schools have. All of our schools divide up categoricals, which is the same area of support that we're wanting to send to CPS. And then when you mentioned the pension costs, we pay nine hundred and ninety-three million into TRS. So that means all of our teachers' pensions are be pay -- being paid by the State for every suburban and downstate school district. CPS is a stand-alone. For whatever reason, we do not support them in their pension payment of 2-0-5. So, yes, it's in the bill. We would like to help them out. Pay their pension payment for one year of 2-0-5 and keep everything intact the way it is. Going forward, we would like to not have to acquire that cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

## SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you for that. But it's fair to say when we talk about the grants that it is thirty percent off the top, which goes to Chicago, as opposed to then we have to apply for -- or be reimbursed for the remaining amount of money in those grants, just for that year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

It depends on which category that you're asking. They're all treated slightly different. I would just note that CPS has over two hundred thousand students. It is the largest school district in the State of Illinois and so there will be some differences based on population.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

## SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you and I appreciate that. So when we asked -- and we had a nice panel that testified on behalf of this bill that we -- that was debated yesterday in Exec Committee. I asked the question, does -- has the State Board of Education - which is typically the entity that runs numbers for the education funding bills to see if we feel it's fair for our district and will work for our district and the entire State - has the State Board of Education run the numbers to show the impact of this piece of legislation on our school districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator, I think it'd be safe to say that the State Board of Ed is in support of this measure and waiting for us to give them the fiscal year '17 numbers. So if they were to give us numbers, they would be inadequate because we don't know what our spend number will be for fiscal year '17, which establishes our base minimum requirement for moving beyond 2017.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

### SENATOR REZIN:

It was my understanding in committee that the State Board of Education had no position on this bill because they have not had a chance to gather the numbers, which will take a couple months. Is that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

State Board of Ed is not opposed of {sic} the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

### SENATOR REZIN:

...bill -- to the bill. Thank you. Again, I always appreciate any time we try to figure out a very difficult topic in this State of Illinois. It -- school funding, this is an issue that I've talked about as well in my district, the impact of the six years of proration and the effect that it has on school districts with a low EAV, who rely very heavily on State funding. So as we try to figure out this very delicate topic, it's important to note that before we move forward with any kind of education funding bill that will -- that will change a funding formula that has been in place for twenty years, it's important, first of all, to get the numbers and to see the impact, because we know just a change in a -- a decimal, the change in a percentage, can dramatically change what a school district receives. I think it's very important and prudent for us to wait for those numbers to come in before we can assess whether this is a good bill or not. And I do appreciate Leader Lightford including the Vision 20/20, as -- as she spoke about as well. That -- that's a particular education

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

funding concept that has been led by my colleague to the right and supported by our caucus. In general, we do support the concept, but when you look at this bill in totality, we do feel that it's a bill that needs -- we need to make sure that it's -- when we get the numbers back, that it's a good fit for the entire State. Because of that, I will be a No, waiting for the funding -- or excuse me, waiting for the numbers to come back from the State Board of Education. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield for questions. Senator Luechtefeld. SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, would you agree that this is sort of almost monumental legislation? I mean, something we haven't done for twenty years. It's very complicated. I -- would you agree with that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

It -- is -- isn't it sort of a -- a real stretch for the people in this room to -- to vote one way or another on -- on an

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

issue that, first of all, they don't exactly know how this is going to help their district? I -- I -- I -- isn't that a -- explain that to me, that we're willing to do that or that you're willing to ask the people in this room to vote for something that they -- they don't really know how it's going to -- how it's going to impact their district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I -- I appreciate the question because here's what I do know, and what I want all of you to know, is that some of the challenges that you indicated that were in -- earlier in the bill, the Senate Bill 231 that we passed on, that created these winners and losers. So what we do know is that there will be no losers, number one. So your school districts, who you received, on the list that had losers, that goes away with this bill. So after year one, moving on into this model, fiscal year '17 will be the base minimum for all of our school districts. So that's what you do know and that's the reasons why your superintendents are in support of this measure, because there are no losers. They know exactly the lowest amount of money that they could possibly receive moving forward will be flat at FY '17. We can't tell you what that number is yet because we don't know how much money we're going to actually appropriate into our education pot for fiscal year '17. But we do know, whatever that number is, that your school districts would not drop below that number. Then based on where you fit in the tier system - there is four tiers - that will indicate the total adequacy spend of each student. So depending on where your school districts are - if they're in Tier 1, that's because they have the

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

greatest needs and they're the furthest from meeting adequacy spend per pupil. Tier 2 is the next stage, on up to Tier 3 and 4. So that is what we do know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator -- Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, I -- I -- I -- I can't -- I certainly don't know and I'm not real sure why they would know, because just to hold them harmless would cost, I think, some figures, around four hundred and forty million dollars, just to hold schools harmless that they wouldn't be a loser. Now how can you say, when we don't have a budget, and -- and it doesn't appear we're going to have one, that there's going to be that kind of money in that budget, because there will -- there will be other money that -- that's also in this bill. You know, the two hundred and some million for the pension in -- in Chicago. There's another a hundred and ten, I think, million also for Chicago. That -- it -- finally, we're up over the seven hundred million mark that this is going to cost. Is there any, any way that you know there's going to be that kind of money just for education in this -- in this next budget? And if it's not there -- originally, I think, four hundred and forty million hold harmless for Senate Bill 231 was simply if it's appropriated. And that's if it's appropriated. Tell me how you know that's going to be there, and -- and -- and you seem to be certain of that. How -- how do you know that's going to be there? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator, I -- I don't know for sure anything around here. I

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

don't think any of us do. But what I believe is that we have a belief system, and it's a shared belief system, that education is the priority and that we're going to fund education at the highest rate that we possibly can attain, and I believe the Governor shares in that same belief as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld.

## SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

...think -- I think most of us in here have always had that belief; yet it -- we all know that it doesn't happen every year, as far as that kind of money. That's a -- that's -- that's big money to a State that's bankrupt and doesn't have a budget. And I -- and I think it's really going out on a limb to say to these superintendents and to say to people in this room, your school's not going to lose. It won't -- it -- they will lose if that -- if there isn't that kind of money in the budget. Am I wrong about that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I would hate to say you're wrong, but I think I would have to agree with you in this regard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Luechtefeld.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Would you -- now from what I understand, we're -- we're going to -- we -- we're under one formula this year. Next year, we're going to be under 231, and then the following year, we're going to be under Vision 20/20. All of those are three different types of

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

funding programs. Isn't that a -- a real stretch to -- for instance, I -- I doubt seriously if -- if anyone in this room really understands what Vision 20/20 is. I think we -- not too many people understand what 231 is. And keep in mind what you're doing today is you're trying to -- you're going to vote on something that you don't know what it is and you certainly don't know how it's going to help your district. It -- it just makes sense to me that if -- if we want to change the formula - and most people seem to believe that it should be changed to help the poorer schools - but if we want to change the formula, tell me why we are simply on a formula this year -- this bill says we're going to be on -- with the -- Senate Bill 231 next year, and the following year Vision 20/20. Why are we going through that process? Why wouldn't we, for instance -- maybe if we can't get Vision 20/20 up and running by next year, why wouldn't we just stay with what we are? If you're going to put that kind of money into it, seven hundred million dollars, put it in to help some of the -- the poorer schools, and I guarantee you, you put seven hundred million dollars into the present formula and try to help some of the poor schools that really need it, I guarantee you most every -- every superintendent in the State would really be happy with seven hundred million new dollars. And in the -- and maybe if -- if -if, after that, give us time to understand what Vision 20/20 is and go to that the following year. Why are we -- why are we in this step process where we do the -- the funding we have this year, next year we're going to do 231, and the following year we're going to do Vision 20/20? Why -- why -- why is that -- that middle year of 231? Why wouldn't we go straight to -- if -- if you're so sure that Vision 20/20 is a good program - and I don't

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

disagree that it is - why -- why are we taking that middle step? Would -- just to -- it seems just to be very confusing for people. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you. You know, Senator, what I do know is that we have a flawed system right now. Our current formula is flawed. In my opinion, Senate Bill 231 gives us a floor, if you will. establish a strong foundation for building the -- adequacy model And so, I think that there's nothing wrong with us implementing Senate Bill 231 for one year. It will sunset and then thereafter this will be our new funding formula. We're pretty much through this fiscal year, so schools are being let out. So this is -- this year's been the same broken formula since 1997, so I would totally discredit that formula. It isn't working; it hasn't performed for our students. The academic achievement gap is as wide as it was, even wider since 1997, and our kids just simply aren't learning if they're in a poor district. So what this would do is put money into a better formula than what we have been funding for the last twenty years and establish that basement floor for us to build upon with the evidence-based model.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Before I go back to Senator Luechtefeld, Ladies and Gentlemen, shh, please. Please hold the visiting down. Senator Luechtefeld. SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Again, Senator, I -- I don't quite understand why it is necessary to do the two -- and -- and -- and I have said many times, 231 was moving in -- in the right direction. But why -- why must we do that? Is it to get the base up? Is that the reason

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

you want to do the 231 to get the base up where -- where you think it ought to be, especially in Chicago, and then work off of that base in the future? What -- what is the real reason for this? I just don't get it and -- and then to ask the people in this room -- and you -- you're -- people, you don't understand what you're -- what you're buying here today. You are -- you are taking someone's word, really, and I -- and I know Senator Lightford is sincere about what she's talking about. But you're saying to -to -- they are saying to you as Members of this General Assembly that this is going to be good for you two years down the road if you will vote for this right now. I -- we -- we -- all we would need to do is simply take the formula we have, put the kind of money you're talking about, if you can come up with that - I doubt seriously if you can come up with seven, eight hundred million dollars in next year's budget. We can't even come up with a budget the way it is - and -- and put that in the budget. People know how that's going to affect them. The State Board could run off numbers very quickly on that. But right now, the State Board cannot give you numbers on Vision 20/20, because they don't know what the base is going to be. It just doesn't make sense for me to sit here or for anybody in this Chamber, Republican or Democrat, to vote on something that is so monumental. This is difficult to do, it truly is. And I'm just amazed that people are sitting there saying, I'm going to vote for this and hope that it's going to help my district. So, again, I -- I -- I don't think we're moving in -- in a bad direction, but I -- I think it could be -- be done a lot better and I still don't understand how you're going to vote for something that you don't know what it's going to do for your district. Thank you.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Barickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield for questions, Senator Barickman. SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator -- you know, Senator, when you -- when you picked up this bill, recently, I viewed your sponsorship as a meaningful step that hopefully could allow us to reach a bipartisan agreement here. Here's why: In my -- in my years here in the Senate, I've worked with you, we've worked together on the Education Committee, I've come to find you to be a sincere advocate on issues of education and elsewhere, but on issues of education, a sincere advocate who, even though you and I may not always agree, your sincerity in improving our educational system has impressed me. And I -- I want to ask of you here a very simple and direct question. You and I have talked about how we might move forward on an education funding overhaul that I believe could reach broad-based bipartisan support and that could generate support from the Governor and actually put something into law, something that I think could be extremely beneficial for students in your district, in mine and all the -- of our colleagues sitting here today. I've had conversations with you, have had conversations with the sponsor on Senate Bill 231, I've had conversations with the Senate President, and laid out very succinctly how I think we could come together on that. frustrating to think that my attempts to negotiate with you have

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

-- have again landed with a thud, and instead of negotiating, I find us here today on the Floor being presented with a bill that has some highly controversial provisions still within it. And so I -- so I ask of you, Senator, you know, let's -- let's not do what they're doing next door in the House. Let's not play these political games. Let's not play the "gotcha" games. Let's -- let's acknowledge that it's May 27th and that we've got a serious issue in this State which requires this Body and the one next door to present serious answers and solutions. We've got a couple days. And so -- so my question to you, Senator, is -- and I've been very clear - I think you have a choice - will you remove the highly controversial provisions or will you continue the negotiations that have been going around this building for weeks now on this issue and the many others, or do you just want to end those negotiations and move your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator, I want to first thank you for acknowledging my advocacy on education over the years. It is my top priority. I've always stated it. I live it. I walk it. I breathe it. This doesn't change how I feel about education. In fact, I believe this helps build upon the arguments that I've given for years of a flawed system. So, first, I'm going to thank you for acknowledging that and then I'd like to thank you for extending yourself to the President and to Senator Manar and -- and sending a letter out to the whole General Assembly about your thoughts on education. But what I clearly, clearly recall in a non-sanctioned meeting, you stated, no one else - you brought this up - that you

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

would support Senate Bill 231 with this combined. You said that. So I did what you asked for. I present you now with House Bill 3190, which is a provision of Senate Bill 231 and the adequacy model. You came back and asked me to further negotiate, which I'm always happy to do because I love the process of negotiation. But the acts that you asked for is something that I can't deliver on. I cannot tie collective bargaining issues with education. That is a separate issue that we're meeting on and we're addressing. Third-party contracting, waivers for physical ed and drivers ed - I would love to continue negotiating those topics with you, but they do not have a place in this discussion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Does your willingness to pull out the very -- specific language which directs as much as half a billion dollars to the Chicago Public School System in this first year - that language exists in this bill, and I've asked you to remove it. Why are you not willing to remove that very specific provision from the bill? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I -- I explained that to the previous speaker. I believe that that is the measure that establishes our floor and it would be a great position for us to build on the adequacy model moving forward and beyond that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Gotta appreciate the honesty. The floor being set by this bill is a floor that is raised for a school district, one school district, to the tune of half a billion dollars. So to be clear -- and, Senator, your presentation on the evidence-based model is appreciated. That is a component of this legislation that you propose go in effect one year from now. But what you failed to address to the Body - and I want to make sure that we're all clear about what your bill does include - your bill includes all those provisions that we debated just a few weeks ago here in Senate Bill 231. It includes the Chicago block grant - admittedly, you removed some of the language of the Chicago block grant and then reinserted it back in other sections of the law. It includes a pension pick-up for Chicago Public Schools to the tune of two hundred and five million dollars, and it comes with a -- a total benefit of roughly half a billion dollars to Chicago Public School systems, all before your suggestions of an evidence-based model go into effect, thereby raising the floor for Chicago Public Schools in a way that has been characterized as a bailout. All true? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

No, not true. It's not a -- it -- it's not a pension payoff; it's pension parity. I also mentioned before that we pay TRS nine hundred and ninety-three million dollars, meaning that all of our suburban schools and all of our downstate schools, we pay their pension. This is giving parity to the City of Chicago for one year. We give them zero State support in their pension obligation, yet we spend nine hundred and ninety-three million a year for suburban and downstate Illinois. So, in my mind, this is creating

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

pension parity to assist them for one year. Your statement about us -- me establishing a floor, giving CPS five hundred million more, is also incorrect. Minus the two hundred five on the one year to help the pension parity for the City of Chicago, the other four hundred and forty million would be to hold harmless those school districts so that there are no losers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Unfortunately, all of those components, which have a cost to them, are the exact poison pill, which is totally unrelated to any good faith effort to rewrite a broken formula. That poison pill poisons the well. Let's talk about -- you referenced, under the evidence-based model, the notion that there would be Tier 1 school -- or there would be a number of tiers - Tier 1, Tier 2, 3, and 4 and that school districts would fall into those tiers based on their ability to provide adequately for their students. Can you tell me where -- which tier does Chicago Public Schools fall into? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman. Excuse me, Senator Lightford. SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

From my understanding, CPS falls into Tier 2, which is a surprise. One would think perhaps they'd be in Tier 1 because they're the most -- one of the most neediest school districts. But because they have to pay their own pension obligation, that pushes them into a Tier 2, because their local contribution is actually higher because they pay this two hundred and five million and it's calculated into their local distribution. So while we're talking about the tiers, there's a district Adequacy Target that

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

is created based on a formula. The formula is by using the Comparable Wage Index times the district Adequacy Target, minus the Local Capacity Target, minus the CPRT {sic} (CPPRT), which gives you your net State contribution. So we do have these four tiers, and this isn't about just CPS alone, which we're narrowly focusing this debate on. There is three hundred and fifty-eight school districts in need of resources that fall in Tier 1. CPS is one school district. There are three hundred and fifty-eight school districts across this State that falls in Tier 1. Tier 2 has two hundred and eighty-one school districts, which means CPS is one. There's another two hundred and eighty school districts in Tier 2. Tier 3 has a hundred and thirty-four school districts and Tier 4 has seventy-three school districts. This is not an argument -- debate only about the Chicago Public School system and I would hope that we would not narrowly focus the discussion onto that one school district. We all have a number of school districts that we're advocating on behalf.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

### SENATOR BARICKMAN:

So let's -- let's understand these tiers though, right? I mean, in -- in, you know, in terms that we can all understand. These tiers, Tier 1 means you're a school of need and the -- the threshold increases till Tier 4, evidently, under the evidence model, suggests districts not in that situation of need. Tier 2, obviously slightly higher than Tier 1. Do you -- do you -- do you agree with my characterization of the tiers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I'll go a step further, I'll define it for you. appropriations are increased in a given year, the plan directs additional dollars used in a four-tiered system that distributes ninety-nine percent of any increase to the two tiers of districts with the lowest percentage of adequate funding. The four tiers are determined by percentage of funding adequacy. In the event K through 12 appropriations are reduced, a similar formula favoring the districts with the most need would determine funding reductions. So Tier 1: The districts able to fund at least sixty percent of adequacy, those are the districts -- fall within Tier 1. That means they're only sixty percent of what would be adequate to fund their school - sixty percent. They would receive thirtythree percent of all new State funding, allocated based on need. All Tier 1 districts would also receive part of the Tier 2 funding. Tier 2: The districts are able to fund above the sixty-percent of the target number, but they're below ninety percent of adequacy. So that means these are the school districts, they're between sixty and ninety percent of what would be adequate to fund per pupil spending. They would receive sixty-six percent of all new State funding, which is also allocated based on need. Tier 3: That's the school districts who are able to fund above ninety percent, but below full adequacy. They will receive nine-tenths of one percent of all new State funding. So they're between ninety percent to a hundred percent of meeting that Adequacy Target. This tier would receive funding to get them to that adequate number. And then the final tier, Tier 4: These are the districts that are able to fund above adequate. They're -- they're -- they're exceeding adequacy by far. They, too, would still receive some

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

funding so that they can maintain maintenance. So there would be one-tenth of one percent of all new State funding to go to this school district, not based on need because the need isn't there. It's based on maintenance to keep them where they're at. So there's no desire at all to bring any of our schools that are performing at this level down. The goal is to lift those school districts up and get all of our school districts in a Tier 3/Tier 4 range. That's the goal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Okay, those Tier 1 schools - again, the Tier 1 schools, the schools that are in the most need, the schools who today are only able to provide some amount less than sixty-percent of the dollars necessary to educate their children - those Tier 1 schools, you said, Senator, three hundred and fifty-eight of those schools, three hundred and fifty-eight schools in that Tier 1. Where are those schools? Can you give us some of the examples of school districts in Tier 1?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

That's the list that we don't have yet because we don't know what our fiscal year '17 number will be, so it's no need in taking numbers that are inadequate. I think all of us here, as legislators, if you go back and look on your list that you received from Senate Bill 231, that pretty much gives you an idea of where your districts sit, as far as 'em being a wealthy district or not. And then if you're actually legislating in your district and you're

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

knowing your communities and schools, you know if they're a wealthy district or not, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Here -- here's what I don't understand. You can tell us today, Senator, that there's three hundred and fifty-eight school districts in Tier 1; three hundred and fifty-eight of our roughly eight hundred and fifty school districts are the most neediest districts in the State. And you want to help them, but you can't tell me who one of those -- school districts are?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

No, I don't have the list and I would not take on an opportunity here to give you misinformation. I like to stand accurate in what I'm sharing with you in this debate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

And to be accurate, your numbers here, three hundred and fifty-eight schools are in Tier 1, you can't name any of 'em. Two hundred and eighty schools are in Tier 2. That's -- that is six hundred and fifty of our eight hundred and fifty school districts, which -- which are in those two tiers. You can't name one of the three hundred and fifty-eight that is our most neediest, but you can name one of the two hundred and eighty in Tier 2, that being CPS. That's the only school district that you know anything about related to this bill and those tiers, right?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

### SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Well, I only know about that district because you keep asking about them and I heard that answer in a question that was asked by you guys. So, in all honesty, the Vision 20/20, who shares much information with you, they're all the groups that you rely on, they shared this information with me on the total districts. The same handout that you and I received on Monday night is the same information that I'm sharing with you today. You have no information different than I do, Senator. We share the same information. So you, too, know that that's how many school districts was shared to you by the Vision 20/20. So if you believe in any of those organizations that were part of putting that component together, then perhaps you can trust their judgement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill.

## SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Let's pay attention here to what's going on. And I think this is a very critical and important part of this bill that we all need to understand. If we study the evidence, the evidence that the education community would tell you creates an environment where our children, all of our children, could be successful and obtain a high quality education that prepares them for this global economy that they need to compete in, if we study the data and we

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

study the evidence, what we know today is that we have three hundred and fifty-eight school districts in this State, who can only provide by themselves and with the support they receive today, from the State of Illinois and elsewhere, they can only provide sixty percent of the resources they need to prepare their children. Those districts, those districts, those school districts, those three hundred and fifty-eight school districts that include thousands and thousands of Illinois schoolchildren, where do they live? They live in each and every one of our school -- or of our Senate districts. Three hundred and fifty-eight school districts today who are wholly unable to prepare their children for the world economy that they need to compete in. Three hundred and fiftyeight school districts who deserve our help. So why are we here? We're here because one of those school districts that is not even one of those most in the need - by your own bill, Senator - one of those districts is looking for a bailout. They're looking for a bailout, and in fact the reason you've got to do a one-year bridge to this is why? To bail 'em out, because you don't like where they fit when you study the evidence. They're a Tier 2 school. There's three hundred and fifty-eight schools who need more help, but are you willing to help them this year? No! You don't want to help them, you want to help CPS. And don't be fooled, don't be fooled by the notion that this is just about pension parity, because still in the bill today the Chicago block grant. No block grant for Harvey, no block grant for Calumet City, no lift for them, no bailout. What this is, is a repeat of what we saw just a couple weeks ago, a massive bailout. A half a billion dollars to one school district, who we all heard is down here clamoring for help. Guess what? The Senate Democrats are ready to help -

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

signed, sealed, and delivered. Bipartisan compromise, no way. Your interest, bailing out the City of Chicago, bailing out the students of the Chicago -- City of Chicago at the expense of every student in every other school district in this State. Urge an Aye -- a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Matt Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR M. MURPHY:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Murphy.

### SENATOR M. MURPHY:

This is a very interesting debate and you can really get dragged down into the weeds on this subject pretty -- pretty quickly. They're important weeds, but sometimes I think it's good to take a thirty-thousand-foot view at some of these deeper issues as well. And so I've kind of broken this in my own mind into what we know and what we don't know. And what we know about this bill is it locks in a Chicago bailout for the near term -- for the long term. There are three different options that could have been put underneath the Vision 20/20 evidence-based model beginning next year, but Senate Bill 231 was chosen, and why? Because Senate Bill 231 funnels the most money to CPS, provides the largest bailout of Chicago of the three options. That's why it's used, because as the sponsor just said, that sets the floor on which the new permanent formula will be based. That's why we say this bill creates, preserves, and locks in, indefinitely, a Chicago bailout. We know that about this bill. What else do we know about this bill? It doesn't require Chicago Public Schools to reform in any

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

way, shape, or form. There's no one in this room who can dispute that that school district is in serious, serious financial distress. They have been poorly managed for years. When they took over -- when they asked for and were given authority to run themselves, their pension system was better funded than the State's. But when they took years of not paying into the system, now it's in a crisis. By the way, we have proven time and again -- Chicago Public Schools last year - we also know this - got five hundred and sixty-five million dollars more proportional share, based on the percentage of students they teach, than they were supposed to from State government. taking into account the fact that they pay their own pensions. this bill locks in a Chicago bailout indefinitely, a large one, at least half a billion dollars, it doesn't ask CPS to reform itself in any way, shape, or form for the money it's getting to bail itself out. That's what we know. You know what we don't know? We don't know what it does for districts outside of the City of Chicago. I actually do genuinely respect the sponsor's commitment to the issue of education. And I can understand why she would carry and support this bill, given where she represents. What I can't understand is why any of the rest of us would support this education funding Trojan horse to Chicago without knowing what it does to our property taxpayers, without knowing what sort of pressure it puts on the people we hear from when we go door-todoor, who are telling us they're getting property taxed out of their homes. You're writing a blank check because you don't know what kind of pressure this bill is going to put on those property taxpayers that you swear up and down you're here to defend. You don't know what this is going to do, but if you vote Yes, you're

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

telling 'em it doesn't matter, 'cause this is more important. Doesn't matter if it takes money out of your schools in the longer term, doesn't matter if it takes more money from them and gives it to Chicago without any reforms. None of that matters — that's what you're saying with your Yes vote here today. Stand up for your property taxpayers, stand up for your schools, say no to a major overhaul that's rushed and cobbled together in the last few days of the Session. If you want to do this with a formula, take time and do it right. This isn't the way. Please vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Questions for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates she will yield for questions. Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Leader Lightford, can you tell me, does the Illinois Association of Superintendents support this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Does the Illinois Association of School Boards support this legislation?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

Does the Illinois Association of Chief Business Officials

support this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Bertino-Tarrant.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill.

SENATOR BERTINO-TARRANT:

And I understand, as a suburbanite, I should be outraged by this legislation, by Senate Bill 231; however, I continue to support equitable funding for our students here in Illinois. There is no guarantee right now, with our current formula, that no school district will lose money next year. There is no guarantee right now. The Governor spoke about adding more dollars into our current formula and we received a list of winners and losers. There is no guarantee, if we keep the current formula and add more money, school districts will not lose money. And people who have studied

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

this, and people who understand that, will understand that is Seven hundred million dollars into our school system -into our education fund right now cannot be just guaranteed to go to low-income schools, 'cause that is not how our school district formula works. We need a new system. We need an equitable system. And I will tell you this, I think Senate Bill 231 is a more pure system, where it addresses low income, where it addresses our English learners, where it addresses our special education learners, the most needed population, where our money should be going. And it's our State's responsibility, not our -- not our --- not our property taxes responsibility. Where our State's responsibility should be funding these services. Now let's add on top of this the twenty-seven components that - Vision 20/20 - that administrators all over the State have been working on for two years, coupling it with the work that Senator Manar has been working on for two years, and we've just improved it even more, because we're looking at components that deal with performance. So now we have the equitable piece, now we have the adequate piece, and we're putting it all together to look at all schools preforming better. I -- maybe I'm ignorant that I -- the -- the bailout to CPS doesn't concern me that we're -- we're trying to balance --'cause I guess I just don't believe it. There are four hundred thousand students in the Chicago Public School system. The next highest district is forty thousand. You go dollar for dollar, CPS is always going to get more money. There is nothing we are going to do about it, because the -- the quantity of students they have. And we -- we were here yesterday -- or, I'm sorry, we were here Wednesday debating a bill that talked about giving people second chances and my friend from Palatine stood up in support of giving

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

-- giving young adults second chances, however our system right now isn't giving our kids a first chance. These kids throughout the State are not getting the same education. I am very fortunate -- I am very fortunate where I live where I do and my kids get excellent education and I wouldn't change it for the world. But it makes me sad, as a Body, that we can't want that for our entire State, for all our kids, so I support Senate Bill 231, I support Vision 20/20, and I hope you will join me, whether you're a downstate, Chicago, or a suburbanite, in doing what's right for the students of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR ROSE:

To the bill, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Rose.

### SENATOR ROSE:

First of all, let me state on the outset that I cannot, nor should anyone, question the commitment of the sponsor to this — to the — to the issue of funding our children's future. To the bill, however, I got real problems. I appreciate the sponsor's integrity and honesty in — in acknowledging the fact that, at the outset, this bill does two things. One, it puts more money into the base for CPS; and two, after that, it gives more money to CPS to bailout their pension system. What do the rest of us know? Despite the immediate — my immediate predecessor's — or the speaker's comment that many of the superintendents' associations have supported this, they also admitted in testimony yesterday that they have no numbers, they have no idea how this impacts

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

anyone else's districts in Illinois. We have no tear sheets from the State Board of Education. We have vague concepts and a feeling that it might help this or it might hurt that, but we have no actual data for how it helps anybody else. We have two knowns - Chicago Public Schools get more money and Chicago Public Schools get more money. For everybody else, what happens? I don't know. Frankly, it was malpractice for the heads of those associations to testify on behalf of their members without having a clue how their members are impacted. And, quite frankly, it would be legislative malpractice for any of us to vote for this without knowing that same information. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RAOUL:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Raoul.

## SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I appreciate the last speaker acknowledging the sponsor's integrity, and I think integrity is important. I think integrity is important. There was -- I listened carefully during this dialogue and I was not going to speak to this issue because, quite frankly, I haven't been engaged as deeply on this issue as other Members of this Chamber. But I have been engaged in other negotiations and I've been engaged in working groups. And I think if we are going to do good bipartisan work, keeping our integrity is important and that means not moving the line. I listened carefully and I heard that there was communication in one of the

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

working groups that if you do this, I will be supportive. Not that if you do this, well, I'll come a little bit along and -- and add some more things on and then I'll be supportive. So if we are going to achieve that bipartisanship and achieve some things down here, we have to keep our word. I did not hear a denial from the gentleman from Bloomington - there was no denial. And if we're going to get anything done here, we have to keep our word. This is about two things. This is not about a bailout, Chicago bailout. Those are talking points, those are assigned talking points, and it's getting old. If we're going to get something done down here, we've got to care about all of the kids in Illinois, whether they come from Chicago or any other district. Yeah, you can clap, Mr. Bloomington. You did not deny that you did not keep your word, and so -- and so if you respect her integrity, show some on your part.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Our last speaker seeking recognition, Senator Manar. For what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Manar.

#### SENATOR MANAR:

Before I get into sifting through some of the remarks from the previous speakers, I want to first commend the sponsor for her work over many years, not just on this issue, but on education funding in general. And I don't want it to go unsaid the work that was done by organizations and superintendents around this State for a very long period of time putting this legislation

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

together. That is careful and painstaking work. They should be recognized, and they know who they are. It's tough work and committing those things and those ideas to legislation isn't the easiest thing to do. I -- I feel like I need to make a few points to bring some levity to the conversation. There was several references to the bill that's before us, sponsored by Senator Lightford, specific to the first Section of the bill, which is a bill that I sponsored and this Chamber passed a couple weeks ago. The figure five hundred million dollars to the Chicago Public Schools -- I would amend my remarks - funneled five hundred million dollars to the Chicago Public Schools, that is not true. The first Section of this bill, and correspondingly Senate Bill 231, does not result in five hundred million additional dollars to the Chicago Public Schools. That is a fact, doesn't do it. Number two, the block grant, we've spent all this time talking about the block grant. What is it? Where is it? What's in? What's out? So let me give you -- let me give you kind of three takes on this. Senate Bill 231 removes the block grants that are incorporated into the primary State aid formula, which would happen in this legislation, too, in year one. So it's a partial removal, pursuant to a bipartisan report called EFAC - so it's a partial removal. Under Senator Lightford's bill, there's a complete removal of the block grant, absolute complete removal of the block grant. That would happen in year two of this legislation. So, again, 231 is a partial removal, pursuant to a bipartisan report. Senator Lightford's bill would be a complete removal of the block grant. Governor Rauner's proposal is absolute preservation of the block grant. I think that's an important point in this debate. If you want to get rid of the block grant, pick up the phone and call the

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Governor and tell him to change his proposal, because his proposal puts more money into the block grant, it doesn't get rid of it. There was focus on CPS when it comes to its attributes as a district, high poverty. Previous speaker said there are three hundred and fifty-eight other districts in the State and we need to know how they're impacted. Well, the plain terms of it, they're impacted the same way, this bill drives resources to those three hundred and fifty-eight districts just like CPS. So I -- I appreciate this ongoing obsession with the Chicago Public School system. And -- and I live in a town of eighteen hundred people, eighteen hundred and nine last time I checked. But it's an obsession and it's clouding the debate on the issue, and if we were to rewind the clock twenty years ago, when this Chamber debated in the Senate Revenue Committee a proposal from then Republican Governor Jim Edgar that would have erased these concerns had it been passed by this Chamber, controlled by not my party at the time, that was the debate twenty years ago. It was an obsession with Chicago, which injected politics into the conversation, which prevented reform from happening. This bill in its first year would benefit a hundred and five school districts to a greater extent than the Chicago Public Schools. Fifty-eight are in the suburbs, forty-six are downstate. So, when we talk about property taxes and, you know, taking money from the suburbs, let's be clear, there are suburban districts that benefit from this bill that Senator Lightford is carrying today and those districts have the highest property tax rates in the State and the highest rates of -poverty, excuse me. The idea that this locks in a Chicago bailout, that's not true either, because in year two - first of all, it's not a bailout - in year two, it's a statewide system that

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

incorporates the same attributes in a formula that every other school district in the State has to live by. So, finally, I -- I -- maybe I should've asked this point when we debated 231 a couple of weeks ago. I'm -- I'm waiting for a bill from the other side of the aisle. Where's your bill? Where is your bill to fix the system? And I don't say that with anything other than absolute and complete respect for everyone in this Chamber. Where is your bill? If this isn't it, if 231 wasn't it, if Senate Bill 1 wasn't it, if Senate Bill 16 wasn't it, if Governor Edgar's proposal wasn't it, if Reverend Meeks' proposal wasn't it, what is it? Where is your proposal to fix the system? School districts with the highest property tax rates in the State spend the least amount per pupil. That's a fact today. If we don't change it, that's going to get worse. We have the most regressive system in the country today. If we don't change it, it's going to get worse. Students that live in poverty have twenty-five hundred dollars per year spent less on their education than others. That's going to get worse. Children of color have a thousand less per year spent on their education. That's going to get worse without change. We have winners and losers today. That's going to continue without change. The sponsor has put forward a bill that enacts permanent change on a system that is rotten. I would urge an Aye vote and I commend her for her work. Thank you.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

And a late light come on. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will -- I just -- to the bill, if I might.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. And I appreciate the moans and groans and I don't blame you a bit. We are in the stretch run here, the last few days. This is not the last difficult or contentious issue with which we will deal. I -- I'm going to stand very guickly in defense of my friend and colleague, the Senator, as he was referred to on the Floor, from Bloomington. I have not been directly engaged in the discussions about this issue. I have monitored them very closely, which means more than anything else, monitoring what Senator Barickman has been saying and doing very, very closely. He has been clear with everyone from the outset about the framework with which he believes we should work within in order to find an answer to this exceedingly, exceedingly difficult and challenging problem that also is the -- maybe the most important issue with which we deal. I'm proud of the work that Senator Barickman has done and hope that all of us can reserve ourselves when it comes to attacks, personal attacks, on credibility. That doesn't get us anywhere on this issue or any other. Thank you very much for your indulgence, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Lightford, to close.

## SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, for such a -- a well-discussed issue, a debate that was definitely welcomed. I'd like to thank the -- my colleagues who applauded me for my efforts over the years. I think that was generous for you to say, and I appreciate those comments. I think one of the things

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

that I want to make loud and clear is that this is not a CPS bailout. But I still don't see a reason why we wouldn't want to help. There is no reason why we will want that school system to close, to layoff three thousand teachers, to be put in a predicament when we have the ability to help. Why wouldn't we want to do so? That's the first point I'd like to make. Secondly, we have a system where we've taken and welcomed East St. Louis School Districts {sic} (District), districts in North Chicago, school districts that could not make it on their own. has stepped in and helped over the years. I want to bring up a couple accountability measures that we should all feel good about that is implemented in this -- in this measure. Superintendent of Education shall develop a five-year strategic plan for all school districts to help them in planning for adequacy funding under this particular Section. The State Superintendent shall submit the plan to the Governor and to who? The General Assembly. So we will receive - in addition to the numbers - we will receive a five-year plan that the Superintendent of the State Board of Ed is implementing by the statute. In addition to that, a Professional Judgment Panel will be created to support the State Board's implementation and they will be charged with an annual basis of reviewing what we have now on our books - unlike what we have now. We've had a system for over twenty years that no one went back to look at. No one's gone back to say it should be changed here, it should be fixed here. But, yet, we will by implementing a Professional Judgment Panel. So I guess I could just leave you with the fact that this creates smaller classrooms, smaller classes of no more than fifteen students in kindergarten through third grade and no more than twenty-five in grades four

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

through twelve. I just want to bring you back to the substance, not the political argument, but the substance. It would help us with extending learning strategies, such as tutoring, extending school days, academic summer school, ESL help for ELL students, special education. Full-day kindergarten would be implemented; technology for schools; gifted and talented programs; intensive teacher training, including instructional coaches; elective teachers; substitute teachers; and Tier 2 intervention teachers. It would help ensure that guidance counselors and nurses are all in our schools, supervisory aides, librarians, media specialists, things that a lot of these low school districts, poor school districts, just simply do not have. And it would also create critical pupil support and parent outreach. So at a time when educational attainment is more closely correlated to economic viability and capacity to engage fully in civic life than ever before, shortchanging the education of our children, shortchanges Education gaps between at-risk and non-at-risk our future. students manifest early and compound over the course of a child's academic career. These gaps follow that child into adulthood and the workplace. And they affect economic opportunity, income, standard of living, and their overall quality of Unfortunately, too many students in Illinois, particularly lowand middle-income children, children of color, and children who live downstate attend schools relying on State-based funding, which simply has not been sufficient to deliver a quality So I want to leave you with, this is the biggest education. This right here will be the biggest benefit in implementing not only House Bill 3190 in its first year, but moving forward to an evidence-based funding model that would assist over

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

2.1 million children that we have the responsibility to educate. With clearly outlined education objectives, transparency, and the funding process and an equitable approach, the playing field would finally be much more leveled and a child's opportunity would not depend nearly on their zip code. I ask for an Aye vote and hope that you would help move our children into prosperity for many years to come. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 3190 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 31 voting Aye, 18 voting Nay, 8 voting House Bill 3190, having received the required Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. Erik Arendt with WGN-TV requests permission to videotape. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate will stand at ease until approximately 2:15 p.m., after Executive Committee. The Senate will reconvene for further Floor action. So, again, after Executive Committee or approximately 2:15, the Senate will Will all Members of the Committee -- Executive reconvene. Committee please report to that Committee as soon as possible so that we can come back to the Floor? Also, the Committee on Assignments will meet immediately upon recess. All Members of the Committee on Assignments will meet immediately upon recess - that's before Executive Committee. The Senate stands in recess.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/ SENATE RECONVENES)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senate will come to order. Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1941, offered by Senator Morrison.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 2882.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2882.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 3071, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 3095, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 3162, with House Amendment 3; Senate Bill 3163, with House Amendment 4; Senate Bill 3335, with House Amendment 1. Passed the House, as amended, May 27th, 2016. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Will all Members within the sound of my voice please come to the Senate Floor immediately? We're ready to take up final action. We're going to go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. All Members within the sound of my voice, please come to the Senate Floor. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 813 Recommend Do Adopt.

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Executive Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 4036 and Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2797; refer to Human Services Committee - Motion to Concur on House Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 420, and Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2306, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2610; refer to Judiciary Committee -Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 5539, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2186; refer to Licensed Activities and Pensions Committee - Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 42, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 440; refer to Revenue Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3760, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2746; refer to State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee -Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 325; refer to Transportation Committee - House Joint Resolution 119 and Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 805; Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 584, House Bill 3126, House Bill 4675, Floor Amendment 3 to House Bill 6292, and Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Resolution 1753. Pursuant to Senate Rule 3-8 (b-1), the following amendments will remain in the Committee on Assignments: Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 3136 and Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 3262.

Signed, Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, as I announced earlier, all Members within the sound of my voice, please come to the Senate Floor immediately. We're going to go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Just so that you know that we will be taking up --we'll be jumping around on the Calendar a little bit. We'll --because we'll be taking up House bills that have been amended before we proceed to the regular House bills that are on 3rd. So, we're going to be going down through a list here; these are amended House bills on 3rd Reading. We'll be taking those up first. Senator Haine. Oh, wait. Senator Mulroe, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please make your point, Senator Mulroe.

## SENATOR MULROE:

All right. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I do appreciate the reference. I'll -- I -- my desire is to be as good a Senator as Senator Haine. So, I'm getting there, hopefully. So, I have two -- two very special guests with me, Alex Hanns and Andrea Carro. Alex is a -- a second-year DePaul graduate -- or student in Chicago. He's also my communication director in the district office. And, also, Andrea Carro, who's going to intern with us this summer. She's a first-year Loyola University student. So I'd ask -- or she just actually finished her first year and I ask that we give her a warm Springfield welcome.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's welcome our guests here to the Senate Floor. Thanks for joining us today. Good to have you here.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Senator Haine, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR HAINE:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President, while the ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point, Senator Haine.

#### SENATOR HAINE:

...Members are coming to the Floor. It'd be remiss of me not to remind them that seventy-five years ago today, 27th of May 1941, the Royal Navy sank the Bismarck, the pride of the Nazi Navy. If you want further information on that, google "Johnny Horton". Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

#### SENATOR WEAVER:

A point of personal privilege, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Please state your point, Senator Weaver.

## SENATOR WEAVER:

Great. Thank you, Mr. President. I am really honored today to have two special young ladies. If you're from our community, you would know them as the Tavares twins, because everybody speaks highly of them. But, these two young ladies are going to be juniors this year. I'm going to have 'em as interns, but I've had a chance to work with 'em on a couple other things. They moved to this country from Brazil when they were six years old. They are — Julia, right here, plans to go to the University of Chicago to study business and economics, currently volunteering at OSF Hospital, and she tutors younger kids. And Bruna plans on going

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to Bentley University to study law, economics and communication, and she's currently a State officer for Illinois Future Business Leaders of America. Her father came to Caterpillar, is why they moved to Peoria. He's since taken a job on the East Coast. They're staying in Peoria. And I want a round of applause, because I want these two girls to know how important it is we keep 'em in our State because of the brain power they bring to our State. So, please welcome them to the State Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's show our appreciation and welcome to our special quests. Thanks for joining us. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, as I said earlier, we're going to be working on House Bills 3rd Reading, those that have amendments, just because of the sake of time and getting 'em passed. So we're going to -- we have a list here. We'll be jumping around a little bit on the regular Calendar, but it will be the -- on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Mr. Secretary, let's start with House Bill 1646. Senator Koehler. Senator Koehler. Mr. Secretary, let's go to House Bill 3262. Senator Raoul. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, House Bill 3554. Leader Harmon. Mr. Secretary, let's go back up to House Bill 1380. 1380. Senator Manar. you wish to proceed? Senator Manar seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1380 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 1380. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Manar. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Senator Manar, on Floor Amendment 1.

### SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment removes opposition to the underlying bill from the Municipal League. I'd be happy to -- to debate the bill on 3rd Reading and would ask for the amendment's adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 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. Mr. Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading is House Bill 1380. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 1380.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Manar.

#### SENATOR MANAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an initiative of the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. It deals with arbitration awards. It would simply require that a party who fails to comply with an arbitration award or fails to promptly submit grievances to arbitration to pay court fees and costs, including attorneys' fees, if the non-compliant party receives a final adverse court

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

ruling. The amendment that was just adopted would apply those standards to both management and to the union in these types of cases. I think we had a pretty robust debate on this bill in the Labor Committee and I'd be happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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

SENATOR McCARTER:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield for a question. Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Senator, we -- we all know the phrase "loser pays", right? And in a lot of other settings, I think people like myself and others think that's a good thing. How similar is that to what you're proposing?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

I -- I would say it's very similar to what's -- what you
described to what's -- what's in this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Explain how that's going to happen, however, say in a setting of a municipality.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Manar.

SENATOR MANAR:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

So, one of the -- you know, this bill came about because of a -- an instance in a municipal government and arbitration awards had been given out, but things continue to go forward without those awards being followed and, along the way, legal fees were being racked up. And this bill would simply say that before things proceed from both the union side and the management side, there would have to be some understanding that the losing or the losing side of an arbitration would have to incur the legal expenses associated with that process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McCarter. Further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Manar, do you wish to close? Senator Manar. Nope. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 1380 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 38 voting Aye, 8 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 1380, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Mr. Secretary, with leave of the Body, let's go to House Bill 4377. Senator Link, on 4377. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Senator Link seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 4377 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, we have House Bill 4377. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link, to present Floor Amendment 2.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

#### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a small technical change. Be more than happy -- after its adoption, more than happy to deal with it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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 approved for consideration?

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Link.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link, to present Floor Amendment 3.

### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This, again, is a technical change. Be more than happy to discuss it upon its acceptance.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion on Amendment 3? 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 approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 4377. Please read the bill.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4377.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. As amended, this prohibits used car dealer's ability to modify or disclaim the -- impartial {sic} (implied) warranty before, one, fifteen days after delivery of a used vehicle or five hundred miles has been driven after delivery of used vehicles, whichever is earlier. After all the negotiations and the changes in the amendments, we have an agreed-upon bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR REZIN:

...sponsor -- question for the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield for a question. Senator Rezin.

## SENATOR REZIN:

Has the third amendment been adopted?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Yes, we just adopted that amendment.

## SENATOR REZIN:

The third amendment dealt with all of the opposition. So, the third amendment -- amendment has been adopted?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

That's correct. We just adopted Amendment 3.

### SENATOR REZIN:

My question to the sponsor is, does the third amendment...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Indicates he will yield for ...

### SENATOR REZIN:

Excuse me. Does the third amendment take away the opposition? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin. Seeing no further discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 4377 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 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4377, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up, we have House Bill 4517. Senator Harris. Senator Harris, on 4517. Senator -- Senator Harris seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 4517 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, we have House Bill 4517. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harris, to present Floor Amendment 1.

#### SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This amendment just combines 4517 and 4518 bills. That was an amendment drafted by the Health Facilities and I'll explain on 3rd.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 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 approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 4517. Please read the bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4517.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harris.

### SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment is a recommendation of the Health Facilities and Services Review Board. It just eliminated some language pertaining to the Center for Comprehension {sic} (Comprehensive) Health Planning and Comprehensive Health Plan. And I request an Aye vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 4517 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.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

House Bill 4517, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 4589. Leader Muñoz. House Bill 4603. Senator Barickman. 4603. House Bill 4633. Senator Haine. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 4633.

(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 amendment creates the Unclaimed Life Insurance Benefit {sic}

(Benefits) Act.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, apparently the amendment's already been adopted, so this is the bill.

## SENATOR HAINE:

All righty. Can I go back to the Bismarck story? This would require -- it's a major change in the law, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would require life insurance companies to match policyholders' information with information on the -- from the Social Security Administration's Death Master File quarterly in order to provide unclaimed benefits to surviving beneficiaries. If a surviving beneficiary cannot be found after a good faith effort on the part of the insurance company, the proceeds would escheat to the Treasurer's Office and the Treasurer then make efforts, further efforts, to find the person entitled to the

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

unclaimed property. Fail {sic} to meet the requirements would be classified as an unfair or deceptive act. We have numerous amendments to this. The insurance companies worked with myself, Senator Mulroe, Representative Martwick, and the Department of Insurance, and above all Treasurer Michael Frerichs to achieve a bill that has only one opponent, Kemper Insurance, who's relying upon the traditional sanctity of the contract law. This also has a policy locator, established by the Department of Insurance, which will enable people to inquire further through the Department as to any policy in force in the United States by any insurance carrier as to their unclaimed benefits. And I want to say for the legislative intent, part of it, the intent of this bill is not to increase, nor decrease, the regulatory authority of the Treasurer or the Director of Insurance regarding unclaimed property examinations, nor to increase or decrease the authority of the Department of Insurance regarding the regulation of insurance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Mulroe, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Mulroe.

### SENATOR MULROE:

This is for purposes of legislative intent. Senator Haine, does the legislation directly alter the operation of any conditions precedent for coverage under existing insurance contracts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

#### SENATOR HAINE:

...does not change the requirements under existing insurance contracts that beneficiaries must satisfy before an insurance company is required to pay on a claim. The Act is intended to require insurance companies to take reasonable steps to provide notice to potential beneficiaries. It does not directly alter the operation of any conditions precedent for coverage under existing insurance contracts.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

### SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you. Under this Act, will an insurer be required to pay more than it's already contractually obligated to pay -- what it's contractually obligated to pay, and will any beneficiary receive more in proceeds than what was provided for in the contract?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

## SENATOR HAINE:

No. Under this Act, no insurer will be required to pay more than it is already contractually obligated to pay, and no beneficiary will receive more in proceeds than what was provided for in the contract. Rather, beneficiaries will obtain the funds to which they are entitled in a more timely fashion. This Act is narrowly tailored to serve the purpose of ensuring that beneficiaries who are lawfully entitled to these funds receive their money in due course.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

#### SENATOR MULROE:

Is it generally true that under existing life insurance contracts, beneficiaries have the ability to submit a claim, along with any proof of death required by the contract, at any time after the death of the insured?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

### SENATOR HAINE:

That is correct. Beneficiaries generally have the ability to -- to submit a claim any time after the death of the insured.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

## SENATOR MULROE:

So, then, how would you respond to the argument that insurers have a vested right to hold out -- on to insurance proceeds for years or even decades after the insured has passed away?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

## SENATOR HAINE:

Because policies generally allow beneficiaries to file a claim at any time after the insured passes away, there is no reasonable basis for the insurer to have an expectation that rises to the level of a vested contractual right that they will be able to hold on to, or profit from, these unclaimed insurance benefits for years or even decades, until the insured would have reached the limiting age.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

## SENATOR MULROE:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Senator, as Chairman of the State Senate Insurance Committee, would you agree that the life insurance industry is a regulated industry?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

#### SENATOR HAINE:

Yes. There are few industries more highly regulated than the insurance industry. The insurance industry pays tens of millions into the insurance -- into the State treasury of Illinois and billions into the pockets of those who have whole life and term policies every day. They're -- they're -- this industry affects banking, the law, real estate development, and everything else. That's why it has its own committee in the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

## SENATOR MULROE:

Would you say that all insurance companies have notice that the State may impose requirements on their operations to provide for the protection of policyholders and beneficiaries?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

## SENATOR HAINE:

Absolutely. The Department of Insurance and the Illinois General Assembly are constantly tweaking the regulations and statutes to accommodate developments in the law, changes in technology to assist consumers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

## SENATOR MULROE:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

And, would you agree that this legislation seeks to remedy a broad social or economic problem?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

### SENATOR HAINE:

Yes. Giving the -- the longevity of people these days, we have many people with insurance policies that are -- that lose them and their next of kin, the heirs and beneficiaries, do not claim them because they are unaware of them. This came up at an NCOIL, National Conference of Insurance Legislators, meeting, 2011, and I took a position in favor of doing something about this unclaimed -- these unclaimed policy {sic}. And I commend Treasurer Frerichs for his leadership on this issue now, as I have been advocating for it for several years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

### SENATOR MULROE:

Speaking of our State Treasurer, what has he and other unclaimed property administrators found through the examination of the records of life insurance companies in recent years?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

### SENATOR HAINE:

The State Treasurer's Office and representatives from the insurance industry have entered into agreements including twenty-two life insurance companies representing over seventy percent of the market. They've entered into Global Resolution Agreements with the State Treasurer. Under these agreements, unclaimed property examiners hired by the Treasurer have utilized the Death

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Master File to identify insurers who are likely deceased. Then, these leading life insurance companies have conducted a thorough search, and if they're -- if they cannot find beneficiaries, this property escheats to the State through the State Treasurer. This has been going on all over the United States.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

### SENATOR MULROE:

But, did this rise to the level of a broad social or economic problem?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

## SENATOR HAINE:

Over a half a billion dollars in insurance proceeds have been identified where the insured is deceased and the proceeds remained unclaimed, and many of the beneficiaries were residents of Nationwide, seven billions dollars of insurance Illinois. proceeds have been identified under these agreements where the insured is deceased and the insurance proceeds remained unclaimed. Utilizing the procedures in these agreements and this bill, the majority of these previously unclaimed process {sic} (proceeds) have -- have been claimed by beneficiaries or their heirs; a significant, but smaller, portion has been reported and delivered to the State Treasurer. And this is consistent with insurance companies' practice. They have paid eighty billion or more to -proceeds under normal conditions. In other words, through the use of the Death Master File literally billions of dollars have been paid to beneficiaries who may -- might otherwise never know they are entitled. Here in Illinois, several hundred million has been

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

paid and many -- many millions more have been turned over to the State Treasurer as unclaimed property by these same industry leaders.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

#### SENATOR MULROE:

Does this bill impact the powers of the Treasurer in any way? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

### SENATOR HAINE:

No. The intent of this bill is not to increase or decrease the regulatory authority of the Treasurer or the Director of Insurance regarding unclaimed property examinations, nor to increase or decrease the authority of the Insurance Department regarding the regulation of insurance. And I wish to thank the Department of Insurance for its work on this, also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

### SENATOR MULROE:

Last question or comment. Chairman Haine, thank you for your leadership. This is a great bill and I also want to thank the —the Senate for their indulgence to our question and answers. I just want to commend you for your work on the issue and for your thorough answers today. Thank you.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 4633 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 4633, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave of the Body, if you'll turn to page 14 of the regular Calendar. We're on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. We have House Bill 813. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, we will be using the timer — the timer during debate. Each speaker will have five minutes. We will be using the timer. Senate President Cullerton, do you wish to proceed? President Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 813 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, we have House Bill 813. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by President Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton, on Amendment 2.

### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Mr. President, I'd like to adopt Amendment No. 2 and then discuss the bill on 3rd Reading.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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 approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

813. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 813.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

## SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill has three major provisions. The first is that -- would allow the Chicago City Council to be given the authority to pass an ordinance creating a new property tax levy of not more than 0.26 percent specifically for teacher pensions. So, if they did that, the amount that could be raised would be as much as a hundred and seventy-five million dollars. The second provision of the bill is something that we've passed out of this Chamber a couple of times - we've certainly debated it - that is pension parity for CPS. So that beginning in fiscal year '17, the State would pay the normal costs to the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund. It's two hundred and five million approximately in '17; thereafter, it would be certified. Identical to the other State pension systems on an annual basis. And then finally, we would have a funding -- school funding changes. We would have a three-year freeze, which would be applied to the current school funding formula, and provide school districts with the following: the same level of funding that they received in fiscal year '16. That means that no one would lose any money under a fiscal year '17 proposal that the Governor made. The Governor made a proposal to fully fund the foundation level, but as a result, there was something like thirty-

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

six school -- thirty-six percent of the school districts were losers. We want to freeze it at '16 so that they would not lose. Secondly, if -- if there's an additional equity grant that would - the -- the House has passed an appropriation for of seven hundred million - but whatever that amount might be, this new equity grant would be distributed in a way, described in this bill, so that the district's low-income population and available local resources would be taken into account in order to provide -- additional funds to districts with higher concentrations of lower economic -- lower income students. This is different than the poverty grant, in that the poverty grant does not take into account available local This is something that is supported by Advance Illinois, and this is if we decide to spend additional money for lower income students to affect the worst in the nation's school funding formula that we're trying to correct, this is the method by which it would be distributed. And finally, the Governor did increase the, in his budget, the appropriation for -- for schools in an effort to fully fund the foundation level, and as a result, we want to make sure that all of the winners in that proposal -gets at least that much money, and that's something which would also be provided by this formula. Be happy to answer any questions. Had a good committee hearing, a lot of questions were raised. I think -- hope I answered them. Be happy to do so again on the Floor if anyone has any. Thank you. Ask for an Aye vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Leader Radogno, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

#### SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I guess to the bill. This -- we

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

saw this...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Leader Radogno.

#### SENATOR RADOGNO:

...very recently in committee. It's the second funding formula change we've seen in a couple days, in addition to a bill that we saw a couple months ago. And, apparently, there's another funding formula included in the House budget bill that was somewhat controversially passed in the House the other day, and this is tied to that bill. So, as you can see, this whole thing is getting very complicated and difficult to follow. So, there was some discussion in committee and these are questions that -- that the Senate President attempted to answer, but I'm not at all satisfied that we have the answers to these questions. One of the issues that was raised is there's language in the bill that suggests that the local property tax that the City would levy would count dollar for dollar against the local available resources for -- as the formula's considered, which would then drive up the number of dollars going into the City. Secondly, there is the two-hundredand-fifty-million-dollar pension pickup. It's been characterized as a matter of parity. I think that's still a matter of debate. It does change the school funding formula for everyone. It freezes everybody at '16 rates, which were prorated. I don't know why we wouldn't freeze them at their actual levels. And when we talk about just winners and losers, this is done by district again. One of the criticisms that's consistently been leveled at the school aid formula is that ought to be -- consider the number of students. So, a district that has lost a lot of students, such as Chicago, gets frozen at a level that doesn't account for the fact

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

that -- that they're losing students. We always have losers; students move around. And if they move, the money should go with them. That does not do this. Stand -- Stand for Children was in committee. They also were blindsided by this. Apparently we were told that Advance Illinois had run numbers, but nobody has seen them. The State Board has not analyzed this bill. The State Board has not verified any of the numbers. So it's really hard for me to see this as anything else but one last flailing attempt to drive a lot of money into the City of Chicago while people can barely figure out what a bill says. And I just -- this is the wrong way to do business. We've all agreed we ought to take a look at the formula, but there are other, more fair and simple ways to do this, and I would certainly urge a No vote on this.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

#### SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question for the sponsor, please. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Rezin.

#### SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. Thank you, President Cullerton. Again, we were trying to -- we had a robust discussion today in Exec regarding this bill, as we were trying to figure out what was in this bill. We were just seeing it for the first time and our -- our staff was trying to analyze it very quickly. But, again, we have another education funding bill, which we all agree that we need to take a look at. We -- and as much as we talk about our districts versus everybody else's district, I do think at the end of the day,

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

generally we need to figure out what works for everyone and move forward. However, when the bills are dropping on us at the last minute, without any ability to analyze it from our staff, that provides a challenge. Having said that, one of the questions we did have in this bill was, first of all, do the -- do -- the poverty grants, are they still included in this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

#### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

This bill would change the formula for the equity grant. If there's an -- if there's an equity grant, this -- similar to what was contained in the House's budget, this would determine how that money would be -- would be distributed. The poverty grant that's in the school aid formula remains the same.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

#### SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. So, the poverty grant still is included in the bill and we've added a new grant, the equity grant, and that's what -- that was the purpose of all of our discussion in -- in committee. We were trying to figure out exactly what the equity grant was which was contained in the House bill. Can you explain and break down the formula for the equity grant, please? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

#### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Okay, well, just to clarify, this doesn't change the school aid formula as it relates to the poverty grant. That -- it's not in this bill. There's no change to the current existing poverty

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

grant. Okay?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

#### SENATOR REZIN:

I understand that. But, again, the poverty grant is in -this -- so the poverty grant's the same. In this bill, for new
funds, we've added a new grant, which is called the equity grant.
Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

#### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes. I think I can -- I understand your question. The House had a provision in an appropriation bill creating an equity grant and they had seven hundred million dollars in it. It was going to be distributed through the poverty grant. It's my intention with this bill to use a different formula, and you heard the witness in the committee describe it. It's different than the poverty grant in that it takes into account available local resources. It has the effect, for example, of adversely affecting Chicago. Chicago would do better with the bill that passed the House. This provision -- this change, Chicago, for example - I happen to know this number - would lose about seven million dollars, because they have a higher concentration of taxable income. So -- taxable -- property tax -- of assessed evaluation. So, as a result, they would actually lose money compared to the provision that the House passed, but we think it's more equitable.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

But, again, as you can see, our confusion is that this is -you're talking about new money. So in the House bill that was passed - correct me if I'm wrong - there was seven hundred million dollars of new money. The equity grant is a new grant and the way that the equity grant -- we had asked for how the equity grant would be applied - what is that formula? And in our analysis -and -- and again, I apologize, because we are trying to figure out a bill that literally we were asked to debate in committee an hour In our analysis, if the equity grant was included and disbursed, in the seven hundred million dollars of new money that you're talking about, that CPS would receive two hundred and eighty-seven million dollars of the equity grant, or forty-one percent. That's according to our very quick analysis as we are trying to figure out what a equity grant is, how the equity grant formula is implemented, because with all of these school funding formulas that we've talked about, the equity grant has never been proposed...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin, just so you know, you have thirty seconds left. Just wanted you to be aware of time.

#### SENATOR REZIN:

...has - thank you - has never been proposed in any of the school funding formulas in the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

#### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Senator, I'll try to answer the -- in the House's budget, they created this equity grant and I do recall that Chicago, under that provision, using the poverty grant formula, would get about

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

two hundred and eighty-six million dollars. Under this bill, they would get seven million less than that, because it's a different formula. Now, obviously, I'm doing the best I can to describe the formula to -- to you. The -- the witness in the committee said it was complicated, because the poverty grant is complicated, right? But this is a -- just for -- I think for the purposes of being informed about what the bill does, it's a -- it's a -- it's a more -- it's a different formula to direct new money, if we even appropriate it, in a more equitable way, driving it to areas that also may not have as much local resources. And -- and therefore, I think it's a fairer way of doing it, even though Chicago loses seven million dollars under the provision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Rezin, your time's expired. I'm going to give you thirty seconds to close.

### SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill. In conclusion, again, we're trying to figure out -- we've been presented another bill - very complicated. We did have Jessica testify from Stand for Children. We all know Jessica and respect her, but again, at the end of the day, we're trying to figure out what the equity grant component is in this bill. I still think we have a lot of unanswered questions before we can put a Yes on this bill. For that reason, I ask for a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Anderson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR ANDERSON:

Question to the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Indicates he will yield. Senator Anderson. SENATOR ANDERSON:

Mr. President, I -- I -- my question for you -- I was in committee today, although I'm -- I'm not on the Executive Committee, but I -- I listened to it and I -- I'm a little concerned at -- of some of the questions that were raised. And my biggest concern is that we were given this bill just an hour ago, and I don't want to vote No on it because in theory, from your explanation, it sounds like pretty good policy. But the questions were -- raised during that committee were -- were not clearly answered. And in -- in the light of -- of good government and -and good policy, I -- I guess my ask to you, Mr. President, is can -- can we please just hold this bill until later this weekend, just so I can digest the language, talk to staff, be able to interpret it, and be able to tell my constituents that I voted Yes for this bill because this or I voted No for this bill because of this. Because, right now, I'm going to be forced to vote No on a bill that could very well be good policy, but I'm only given an hour to digest it and I'm -- I -- I can't do that. I'm not a lawyer. I'm not an attorney. So, Mr. President, my only ask to you is, can we please table this bill till later this weekend? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Well, Senator, I'm not going to be able to do that, but I appreciate your concerns, because we -- we are getting close to the end of the -- of the Session and we have a -- a limited amount of time. This a bill that has to go over to the House. So let me just briefly tell you that -- it -- the pension parity is something

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

we've already passed out of this -- this Chamber months ago. you know what that is. You -- your school district gets the State paying their normal costs, Chicago doesn't. This allows Chicago to get their normal cost. That's one provision. Second part, we are telling the City of Chicago they have the authority to raise their own property taxes and give the money to the Pension Fund of the school district. That's pretty straightforward. Okay? Now, the third thing is, we want to make sure that nobody loses any money in this year's school aid formula. So, whether it's the Governor's proposal, whether it's under the old formula, whether it's the money that your school districts are getting this year, nobody's going to get any less, and if we are lucky enough to have the ability to have an equity grant, it's being distributed to the poorer school districts at an even better way, a fairer way, to the existing poverty grant. So, if you want to vote Present because you're worried that, you know, you don't have enough information, believe me, in the old days, under previous Presidents of the Senate, there was a lot less time to be doing these things. So we're trying to give people as much time as we can. But that's the most straightforward answer I can give you to your inquiry about what's in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further -- further discussion? Senator Barickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Thanks for your bill, Mr. President. You know, I think and I hope that -- I hope that you and Members on that side of the aisle appreciate the very difficult position you're placing a lot of these Members in, introducing a bill so quickly that has such a dramatic effect. You know, we just -- we just had a -- a very significant debate where, admittedly, there's a difference of opinions, but at least we took the time -- a long time has been put in on -- on those issues that we just finished with, respecting the fact that such dramatic changes need to be made right. Mr. President, you know, there's just some very obvious confusion as to what this does. My colleague just asked you to take it out of the record; I respect you're not going to do that. Can you, you know, tell us -- can you tell us, you know, has -- has ISBE run the numbers? Where -- you know, what are the effects this is going to have on our districts? Can you enlighten us some?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

## SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Yes. Senator Barickman, doesn't affect your district in any property tax increase. Property tax increase is for Chicago. You're getting to vote to tell Chicago they got to raise their own property taxes. That's in here. The pension parity, we've debated many times before. So that doesn't come as a surprise. Okay? And the third thing is that basically we're saying we ought to have a hold harmless for the school districts based on what they have now, and if we're lucky enough to have enough money to put into an equity grant, there's going to be more money spent throughout the State. And the question is, how do we distribute that money? It's all good for your school district. If you want

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to vote Present because you don't want to look like you were against more money for your district, I would recommend it. But that's a pretty straightforward bill. It's pretty straightforward: Raise the property taxes in Chicago for their district - doesn't affect you; pension parity is pension parity whether -- however you try to twist and turn it, it's not a bailout, it's pension parity, just like you're getting; and then if we decide to appropriate more money -- by the way, if we don't appropriate more money into the equity fund, then there's nothing to distribute, nothing to worry about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

### SENATOR BARICKMAN:

But to the -- my question, you know, have you requested -- data from ISBE? Can we expect to see before Tuesday when we adjourn, even if you move this bill out of the Senate today, we going to see some numbers for our districts for whatever? You say it's great, fine enough. Can we see some numbers so that we can see the actual effect on -- on our districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Cullerton.

### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

Actually, we're not going to have printouts. We're not going to be able to vote on printouts for how the seven hundred million dollars would be distributed. All I know is, it would be new money that's not being spent now; your district would get a lot of it, that's for sure, just like everybody's district would; and it would be in a fairer way than the existing poverty grant operates. So, that's the best answer I can give to you.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

#### SENATOR BARICKMAN:

The new money, would you care to address where the new money comes from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

President Cullerton.

#### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

I actually said that. The House appropriated seven hundred million. We haven't done that yet here. There may not be any new money. We may not have enough money to even pay for basic services of the State, we know that. We're in deep, deep debt. But we're setting priorities by deciding how much money we want to spend on education. If we don't have the money to fund this fund, it's all moot - your concerns are all moot. But Chicago would still be able to raise their property taxes and they'd still be entitled to their pension parity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Barickman.

SENATOR BARICKMAN:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Seeing no further -- oh! Senator Harmon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HARMON:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of the measure and I want to speak to just one issue that's been talked about on the Floor. It was talked about in committee as well. The -- the Republican Leader raised it. This issue of the available local resources. I want folks to understand what it is that we're doing. We are, by statute, reestablishing a property tax line item that a -- a past General Assembly abolished by statute. Specifically, we're giving the City of Chicago the authority and the directive to establish a new property tax line item, to collect that money and remit it directly to the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund. It's money that never goes through the Chicago Board of Education, through the Chicago Public Schools. It is wholly separate and apart from that. It should never be counted as an available local resource, because it is not available to the school district. The language in here that was highlighted about being sure that the levy of taxes is not counted as an available local resource, I would argue is superfluous. It's belts and suspenders. It would be akin to having a provision in here saying that the payment that the State makes each year to the Teachers' Retirement System shall not be counted as an available local resource to the other eight hundred school districts in this State. This is a red herring. It is -- it is in no way a reduction in the accounting for the available local resources for the Chicago Public Schools. It will not result in a -- an inflow of -- of revenue to -- to the Chicago Public Schools as a result of that. It is just not the -- the way the language is drafted. And I wanted to assure folks, from our conversation in committee, that you don't have to worry about that. Thank you, Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

President Cullerton, to close.

### SENATOR J. CULLERTON:

I would simply ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 813 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's 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 31 voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, 3 voting Present. House Bill -- 813, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would seek a verification of the roll call on that most recent vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter has requested a verification. Will all Members please be in their seats? Mr. Secretary, ring the bell. The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Those Members voting in the affirmative: Bennett, Biss, Clayborne, Collins, Cunningham, Forby, Haine, Harmon, Hastings, Holmes, Hunter, Hutchinson, Jones, Koehler, Landek, Lightford, Link, Manar, Martinez, McCann, McGuire, Mulroe, Muñoz, Raoul, Sandoval, Stadelman, Steans, Sullivan, Trotter, Van Pelt, President Cullerton.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter, do you question the presence of any Member voting in the affirmative?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

I do not, Mr. President. Thank you for your indulgence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

On a verified roll -- roll call, there are 31 Aye, 19 Nay, 3 Present. Senate -- or House Bill 813, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

#### SENATOR HARRIS:

For clarification. Please report me as an Aye on House Bill 813.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is that on the previous bill? The record will so indicate that that was your intent to vote Aye on the previous legislation. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave of the Body, we're going to go to House Bill 5539. Leader Harmon. Indicates he does not -- does not wish to proceed. House Bill 5902. Senator Biss, on 5902. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5902.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

## SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 5902 creates the Speech Rights of Student Journalists Act. The idea is simply to create an Illinois law standard that was, for nearly two decades, the law of the land pursuant to a Supreme Court decision, Tinker v. Des Moines, so as to create certain

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

amount of free speech rights for high school student journalists. It retains, of course, the role for adult advisors to have editorial input and it does certainly, explicitly fail to protect speech that is libelous, slanderous, constitutes an unwarranted invasion of privacy, violates State or federal law, or incites students to create a -- not only clear and present danger of a commission of an unlawful act, but also violation of policies of the school district. I see this as important, first of all, in a general way, so as to create an appropriate protection, but also, in this contemporary world, it enables the life of a student journalist to be something that's consistent with available opportunities with current technology and I think we'll create better pedagogical opportunity. Happy to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 5902 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 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting House Bill 5902, having received the required Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. Mr. Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to go to House Bill 5910. Senator Noland, on 5910. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, let's go to 5930. Senator McConnaughay. 5930. McConnaughay, would you like to move 5930? Believe -- I believe Senator McConnaughay seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 5930 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 5930. Are

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator McConnaughay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McConnaughay, on Floor Amendment 1.

SENATOR McCONNAUGHAY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to explain on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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 approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 5930. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5930.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator McConnaughay.

SENATOR McCONNAUGHAY:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment on this bill is -moves the reporting from annual to biennial. What this legislation
does is it provides that instead of the Department of Labor that
the Department of Employment Security accept the responsibility
for monitoring the employment progress of women and minorities in

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

the workforce and compile a report of those findings and provide those to the General Assembly. And as I said, the amendment changes that from annually to biennially. And I know of no objections to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5930 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. House Bill 5930, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5945. Senator Sandoval. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5945.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Sandoval.

### SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 5945 is similar to Senate Bill 3021 that was widely debated here on the Floor of the Senate. I'd ask a favorable vote.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5945 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Mr. Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 49 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5945, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5948. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, I believe Senator Haine seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 5948 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 5948. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, on Floor Amendment 3.

#### SENATOR HAINE:

Senate Floor Amendment 3, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, is the trailer bill to House Bill 500, which was passed last year, and it was agreed upon by the dental hygienists and the dentists to further improve the Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 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 approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine, on Floor Amendment 4.

### SENATOR HAINE:

Yes, this is a technical amendment that corrects a drafting error, which caused a cavity in the bill.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on Amendment 4? 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 approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 5948. Please read the bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5948.

(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. The long-time discussions with the dentists and the dental hygienists have been crowned with the success of this agreement and I would ask the Senate to extract this from this Body, send it to the House for concurrence.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 5948 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, 1 voting Present. House Bill 5948,

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Lee Milner with the <u>Illinois Times</u> requests permission to take photographs. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're up to House Bill 5973. Senator Raoul. 5973. Senator Raoul. Mr. Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll go to House Bill 6010. Senator Mulroe, on 6010. Please read the bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6010.

(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. House Bill 6010 expands the crime of vehicular endangerment by adding that a person commits vehicular endangerment when he or she strikes a motor vehicle by causing an object that is likely to cause great bodily harm to an occupant of the car to fall from an overpass "or other elevated location" - that's the addition to the definition - in the direction of a motor vehicle traveling on a highway with the intent to strike the moving vehicle. I know of no opposition. I'd ask your Aye votes.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6010 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. House Bill

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

6010, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6030. Senator Cullerton. Tom Cullerton, on 6030. Senator Cullerton seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 6030 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 6030. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Tom Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Cullerton, on Floor Amendment 1.

#### SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Do I move for the adoption now? Let's move for the adoption on Amendment 1 and I'll explain it on 3rd.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 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 approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 6030. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6030.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR T. CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The bill provides that a pension system may obtain vital records from the Department of Public Health at no cost for the purpose of identifying deceased annuitants. The amendment provides that the system may obtain these vital records at no cost.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6030 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. House Bill 6030, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6041. Senator Haine. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6041.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Haine.

#### SENATOR HAINE:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this bill defines "serious injury" with regards to transferring territory between fire protection districts as, quote, a loss of real estate tax revenues by the district from which the transfer

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

is sought of twenty-five percent or more by reason of disconnection. This is to meet the objections of His Excellency the Governor. And we would hope for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6041 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. House Bill 6041, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6083. Leader Radogno, on 6083. Mr. Secretary, please read the Leader's bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6083.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Radogno.

### SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill is another piece of Molly's Law, which has been spearheaded by Representative Terri Bryant. The legislation comes in response to a situation in her district and is crafted to prevent other families from finding themselves in a similar situation. House Bill 6083 changes the statute of limitations for interested parties to file a wrongful death lawsuit on behalf of their loved one from two years to five years after the discovery of evidence that supports the assertion that the violent act led

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to the death of the individual. To address concerns that were raised in this Chamber, the extension applies only to the violent actor in these suits. Representative Bryant and her constituents in the area have worked tirelessly on this legislation and I hope you'll vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6083 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. House Bill 6083, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're just doing the House bills that have the amendments because of the time frame to get 'em over to the House. So we'll come back and get the ones without amendments later. House Bill 6084. Senator Holmes, on 6084. Please read the lady's bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6084.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Holmes.

SENATOR HOLMES:

On the amendment or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The amendment's already been adopted.

SENATOR HOLMES:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

The amendment's already been adopted. This is, of course, an animal bill, which I did specifically because I knew it would make Mr. President so happy. Basically what this does is it streamlines the protocol that owners and the county administrator must take after an animal bites a person. The bill also provides that a veterinarian immunizing a dog, cat, or ferret against rabies must provide the county administrator with a certificate of immunization. There are no opponents on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6084 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, 0 voting Present. House Bill 6084, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6123. Senator Koehler, on 6123. Please read the gentleman's bill, Mr. Secretary.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6123.

(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. This bill is an agreement between HCCI, the Health Care Council of Illinois, which represents nursing homes, managed care organizations and the Department of HFS. And I want to thank specifically Senator

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Syverson for his help in getting this to an agreed-bill status, but it -- it really outlines the procedure when filing claims and -- and problem-solving techniques. I do have to read one thing for legislative intent. It says, this legislation requires that policy changes be shared electronically. This should not be interpreted as prohibiting a health care plan from sending a hard copy notifying providers of policy changes when appropriate. Be happy to answer any questions, but I'm very pleased that this came together.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6123 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. House Bill 6123, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6125. Senator Steans. Mr. Secretary, please read the lady's bill.

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6125.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Steans.

#### SENATOR STEANS:

Yeah -- yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate.

This bill provides -- permits the City of Chicago to issue liquor licenses at a number of establishments which are in the one hundred

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

feet of prohibited locations. We had gotten the needed requirements and letters of agreement from those affected as well. 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 House Bill 6125 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, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 6125, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6167. Senator Link. Mr. Secretary, please read the gentleman's bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6167.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Link.

### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just want to check, has the amendment been adopted? Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

The amendments {sic} have been adopted, Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

Okay, this just -- the -- the -- it allows seventeen-year-olds who will be eighteen by the next consolidated election to vote in the corresponding caucus or consolidated primary election. It allows seventeen-year-olds who will be eighteen in the next

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

election to circulate petitions. It also allows seventeen-yearolds who are registered voters to serve as deputy registrars. And I see of no opposition to the bill and I would ask for its passage. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6167 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. House Bill 6167, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6200. Senator Collins. Senator Collins seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 6200 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 6200. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Collins, on Floor Amendment 1.

### SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move for the adoption. Be discussed on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 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 approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 6200. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6200.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Collins.

#### SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, as the bill has been amended with Floor Amendment No. 1, it deletes every -- of the previous bill and becomes the bill. It deletes the former and becomes the bill. And I just want to say, this Floor Amendment No. 1 represents an agreement between the parties and I want to thank right now the Governor's representative, Tyler Clark, as well as the House sponsor, Representative Ammons, for moving this initiative forward. Basically, what it does, it provides that beginning on January 1st, 2018, the Department of Central Management Services must contract with the qualified vendor who proposes the lowest per minute rate, not to exceed seven cents per minute, and who does not -- who does not charge additional service fees. The contracted telephone services must include international calls, subject to reasonable rates, but must not exceed twenty-three cents per minute. I know of no opposition and I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6200 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. House Bill 6200, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6213. Senator Biss. Mr. Secretary, please read Senator Biss's bill.

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6213.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

#### SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 6213 exists to decrease the information gap that exists for consumers in the Medicaid managed care system and to overall increase the transparency of the system. It was meticulously negotiated with all the stakeholders, who provided very, very helpful input. And at this point, there's no opposition. I'd appreciate your support.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 6213 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. House Bill

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

6213, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6252. Senator Harmon. Leader Harmon. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

#### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6252.

(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. House Bill 6252 is an initiative of School District 89 that serves my Senate district and Senator Lightford's Senate district. district is a member of a special education cooperative called PAEC, but the district would like to extract itself and serve the students, or at least as many of them as they -- as they can, within the school's special ed program. Under normal circumstances, a school district in this position would petition its fellow members of the cooperative and ask to be released. That is not often granted because it has an impact on the cooperative, understandably, but then in the normal course, the school district would be able to appeal that decision to the Regional Office of Education. In suburban Cook County, as you know, we've abolished the Regional Office of Education, so we've left this school district and others similarly situated without any recourse, without a third party to whom to appeal that decision. So this bill would, by statute, allow this one school district to extricate itself from the special education cooperative. I do not think it is the best path for all school districts who -- or a -- a path

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

going forward and so I have committed to all the stakeholders to work with them to design a new and better appeals process for school districts in suburban Cook County. But in the interim, this has been going on for several years; I don't think it's a relationship that can be repaired and this legislation is tailored narrowly to allow one school district to extract itself and no others. Glad -- I -- I understand there may be some questions about this and I look forward to entertaining them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Discussion? Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Harmon, can you tell me what happened in the special education district in terms of the effort of your school district to extract itself? In -- in other words, what happened locally to try to accomplish this, but -- before you brought this legislation to the General Assembly to do this by State statute?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

#### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Righter, for the question. The school district first petitioned the cooperative, the members of the cooperative or the other school districts engaged in the cooperative, and they went and followed

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

the normal course and asked to be -- asked permission to extract itself from the cooperative. That, not surprisingly, was denied. The other school districts worried about losing resources and voted to keep District 89 in -- in PAEC. Then, because there was no Regional Office of Education to appeal this decision, they did something unusual and I'm -- I -- I confess, I don't know how they arrived at this determination, but they essentially asked for a rehearing, but asked the other members of PAEC, the cooperative, to take off their hats as members of the district and think about it as if they were the Regional Office of Education, or -- or to -- to take a look at it from a different perspective. Not surprising to me, they again voted No to not let the district out, leaving it with no recourse.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Harmon. Do you -- in these discussions that were had and the votes - I mean, I'm sure there was a lot of debate - do you have any idea what the cost to the remaining school districts will be? How much more are they going to have to put in to serve these special education students?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. There have been numbers thrown around by both sides. I -- I don't know if any of them are particularly reliable. I -- I think it might be helpful to -- to talk about the number of students that could be impacted by this.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

I -- I apologize if my numbers are off, but the orders of magnitude are correct. If I recall the numbers off the top of my head, there are between sixty and eighty students from District 89 being served by the special ed district. Of those, I believe twenty-two are graduating this year and moving on to the high school district, to District 209, where those students would continue to be served by the special ed cooperative, paid for by another school district. There are also a handful of severely needy children from District 89 who would stay in the cooperative as contract students and District 89 would pay - I think -- I think there are twelve children - fifty thousand dollars a child -- or, no, I'm sorry, it may be -- I believe six hundred thousand may be going from District 89 to the cooperative on a contract basis to handle those students. If I remember correctly, there are nineteen students who would actually leave the cooperative and return to receiving special ed services in District 89, joining the hundred-plus students that are getting special ed services within that district today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Harmon, I -- and I take this from the comments that you've already made, but I -- just to reaffirm, you have an appreciation, I am sure, for the danger of leaving this process as it is, where more and more districts in suburban Cook -- Cook County, excuse me, could find themselves in arrangements such as your school district is and one by one they start deciding - and I'm not suggesting there'd be an avalanche of these - but one by one more of them start deciding - and it's going to be the wealthier ones - that, you know, I'm losing money here so I'm going to make

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

some kind of other arrangement. The cumulative effect would be to leave the special education students, who tend to be in the poorer areas, I don't want to say without sufficient educational services, but it's going to be more expensive for everyone else. Would you -- I mean, would you agree with that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harmon.

### SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I don't know that I do. I don't know that I don't. I think that the circumstances surrounding these cooperatives are unique to each cooperative. And remember that these districts, at least in -- in this part of the world, are not radically different from one another in terms of their -- their wealth profile. So, this District 89 is certainly not a wealthy district. It has the resources and the capacity to provide special ed within its district, but I don't think it's, in this case, it's a -- a rich versus poor scenario. I think it's just a question of adequate resources versus -- and -- and responsible management for the taxpayers. Can they provide these services more efficiently within the district? I do, to your first point, though, agree wholeheartedly - this is not the optimal solution, and if this were two years ago, I would be advocating for everyone sit down, we'll create a -- an appeal process that works and let the chips fall where they may. This particular relationship has just, in my view, gone beyond repair and it's appropriate to allow us to -- to -- to allow one district to extricate itself. But that said, I do commit that we should work together on a better appeals process and this should not be a precedential piece of legislation. This should be the exception

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to the rule.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill, briefly, if I might, Mr. President. I rise in support of Senator Harmon's bill. I appreciate very much what he's had to say during this entire discussion, but particularly at the end, that we shouldn't view this as a precedent for others to do this, but rather something that needed to happen because there is not a different process in place now. And also greatly appreciate his commitment to help creating a process so we don't see this happen time and time again down the road. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 6252 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 49 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 6252, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6292. Senator Biss, on 6292. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Biss seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 6292 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 6292. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Biss.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss, to present and ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2.

### SENATOR BISS:

I would ask to table Floor Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, Senator Biss asks to table Floor Amendment 2. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the Amendment 2 is tabled. Mr. Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Biss.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss, to present Floor Amendment 3 and ask for its adoption.

## SENATOR BISS:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 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 approved for consideration?

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd -- 3rd Reading. Now on 3rd Reading, House Bill 6292. Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

House Bill 6292.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

### SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 6292 exists to address a situation that many people, frankly, are pretty surprised when they learn about. We're used to a high degree of transparency when it comes to government spending. If you were to look at this microphone that I speak into or the salary of any State employee or any number of other expenditures made by public bodies, those expenditures are entirely transparent. They're disclosed. They're usually on a website. In fact, very frequently, the entire procurement process that led to those expenditures is also subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Shh! Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Excuse me, Mr. -- Senator Biss. Please continue.

## SENATOR BISS:

Thank you. This bill addresses a situation that's kind of the opposite of that and that is for alternative investments, which is to say, private equity and hedge fund investments made by pension funds, where there is a startling lack of transparency. In fact, just this morning, I saw an article in GOVERNING magazine about a recent estimate that there are at least twenty billion dollars in undisclosed fees paid by public pension funds in America to private equity and hedge fund managers. It's really, really remarkable and -- and pretty stunning. To be clear, the public

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

has basically no idea what fees are being paid. The pension systems know a lot more than the public, but they don't know everything. Let me say that again. The pension systems today are not aware and cannot be aware, would have no mechanism of finding out about all the fees they are paying to private equity companies. House Bill 6292 seeks to address that. So I'm going to explain it in a couple parts. What the -- the meat of the bill does is two things: It requires clear disclosure of four types of fees paid - that's management fees, management fee waiver agreement payments, carried interest payments, and portfolio company fees. And then it also addresses a second issue, which is that the contracts that the pension funds enter into, the limited partnership agreements that obligate them to pay these fees, are also secret. It requires the disclosure of four narrowly construed parts of those agreements that expose the taxpayer to tremendous potential liability that we're not currently aware of. what the bulk of the bill does. When we presented the bill in the Executive Committee, pension funds said, "Hey, basically, Daniel, look, we -- we think you're trying to do a really good thing here, but we're concerned that you're doing it a little hastily and that it might result in adverse effects if not done properly." And so in response to that set of concerns, what I did was I said, everything I just described, the transparency provisions I just described, go into effect in several years, but they only go in -- into effect under the following circumstances: Between now and then, a task force will be created with all the pension funds represented on it, as well as some other members; the task force would have an opportunity to create transparency policies around these issues and the pension funds would have the opportunity to

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

adopt those policies; and then the 100th General Assembly - that's the next General Assembly - would have the opportunity, if we didn't like those policies, to reject them. If they adopt such policies and we don't reject them, the rest of the bill goes away and they found their own way to handle transparency, but if that doesn't happen, in other words, if they don't adopt a policy or if we reject the policy they adopt, then the original provisions go into effect. It's a way of saying, hey, I've written transparency provisions that I think make some sense, but if the pension funds can do it in a better way, that's totally fine with me. Sorry for the long explanation, but it's a bit of a complicated issue. I appreciate your attention. Would be happy to answer any questions and would certainly appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Biss, the component that you've added with regards to the task force is interesting to me. I mean, we create task forces and commissions around here like a movie theater pops popcorn. But this one is different in that you say the -- I've -- we've charged the task force with these responsibilities to come back to us and inform us, but if you don't do it within a certain time, my idea becomes law. Help me with that, as opposed to the traditional idea of, let's see what the task force has to say and then craft legislation as a result of that.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

### SENATOR BISS:

Well, Senator, this has been a slow-moving debate and I think that the underlying bill without the task force was a pretty good idea. So I -- to me, if we wind up in that situation, that's okay. But what the task force allows us to do is it gives us a number of years - right? - until 2019 to come up with something even better. In my view, it's a win-win outcome for the people of Illinois. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

The kinds of disclosures that you would -- or this legislation would mandate were it to become law, do you know whether this kind -- these kinds of disclosures are mandated in any other state?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

## SENATOR BISS:

There — there are two categories of disclosure here — one is the limited partnership agreement disclosure and one is the fee disclosure. The limited partnership agreement disclosure is novel, but I think very defensible. In fact, I think it's flabbergasting that our pension funds enter into agreements that expose the taxpayer to extraordinary levels of liability and those agreements themselves are utterly secret from the public. The other portion regarding the fee disclosure, a number of states are and a number of individual pension systems are dealing with this question in different ways. There's not a state that has precisely this language, but there are a number of jurisdictions that are

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

experimenting with, I would say, similar or in some cases significantly more aggressive fee disclosure approaches. For instance, the Institutional Limited Partners Association has a template that goes well beyond what's in our fee disclosure Section and that template has been adopted by pension systems, for instance, the California Public Employee {sic} (Employees') Retirement System.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Biss, the information that we've received from the pension funds indicates that in -- that in terms of disclosure, this would mostly impact those entities with which the pension funds contract that actually give us the highest return on investment. And more than the suggestion that has been made is that pushing the envelope this far with regards to disclosure could ultimately mitigate the return on investment in the pension funds. What's your response to that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

### SENATOR BISS:

Well, to be clear, I think what the pension funds would say is that private equity in particular is higher return. In fact, many of our pension funds are moving away from hedge funds, specifically, because they've been unimpressed with the returns and concerned about the fees. I will agree that for some of our pension systems, the private equity asset classes had good returns, and I think that's an important fact to acknowledge. Regarding the specific claim that -- that -- that there's a risk of pushing

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

the best managers away and therefore lowering returns, I would say two things: First of all - well, maybe more than two, we'll see - one thing I would say is that I take that concern seriously. I think we need to acknowledge that there's always a balance to be struck between, on the one hand, pushing hard, and on the other hand -- on the one hand, pushing hard on behalf of the beneficiaries of the system and the taxpayers, and on the other hand, trying to have as strong returns as possible, which might require not pushing as hard sometimes. But I'll add this, number one, the history of this industry, the private equity industry, is pretty interesting. The industry is not that old and twenty-five years ago the whole thing was just extraordinarily opaque, extraordinarily opaque. So, for instance, it was not, I think, even twenty years ago when it was standard for pension funds to be prohibited from disclosing which private equity companies managed their money, just a list of which ones. And then when that change began to happen so that pension funds began disclosing this, there were threats from the industry, oh, we're going to walk away, and that didn't happen. Then there was a time when the individual funds were disclosed, but their individual returns weren't disclosed, and in fact, in the early 2000s, the San Jose Mercury Sun {sic} (Mercury News) had a giant fight with the California Public Employee {sic} (Employees') Retirement System around the disclosure of this question. As that fight was progressing, industry said, hey, if this kind of information is disclosed, we'll walk away. Now it's -- now disclosure is an industry standard and that walking away hasn't happened. Now we're in a fight about fee disclosure. It's a national fight. In fact, it's a global fight and we hear a lot of the same threats. I think we have to weigh

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

those threats against the history, which has shown that those threats have typically wound up hollow. However, I do take them seriously and that's why I said to the pension systems, who have these anxieties, let's push this back a couple years. Let's give you a chance, create this task force, even have an industry representative on the task force, and try to work things out, try to work with colleague pension funds and other institutional investors around the globe to find the best policy and try to ensure that we're pushing hard, but not pushing too hard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Righter, your time is up, but some of the previous answers were a little longer than normal, so I'm going to let you have a little time to close. Senator Righter.

## SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, I appreciate your recognition that the red light above your head is about ready to burn a hole through the wall up there. Thank you. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, and thank you, Senator Biss. According to TRS, the definitions in this bill would affect about thirty percent of their funds, including those assets that are the highest return on investment, and that should be the first and most important thing that we think about here, unless there are those of us who feel like the unfunded liability in our pension systems isn't quite high enough. The private equity system or industry to which the Senator refers is newer than some, but it is still federally regulated. This is a complicated issue. I think the Senator's idea of a task force is a great idea and I think that we should let that happen and then see what they have to say before jumping into seeking disclosure from our highest returning assets that are

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

not asked of any other -- of the managers or investors in any of the states. I would urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you for your indulgence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Matt Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Matt Murphy.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

Senator, how are you today? Hang on, don't -- we do -- we don't do this like the House. Give me that answer after -- I'll give you the same question. What is the makeup of this task force? Who is -- who are the appointing authorities and what's the -- what's the makeup of this task force you're creating here?

Senator Biss.

## SENATOR BISS:

To answer your previous question, I'm doing great. Thank you for asking. The task force has one member representing each of the affected pension systems - that's a lot of people. It has one member appointed by each of the four legislative leaders, and then it has the Treasurer and three of his appointees - one representing industry, one representing the beneficiaries of the pension systems, and one representing the taxpayer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

So, is -- is -- am I to deduce that the fact that there is an overrepresentation on the part of the Treasurer -- to -- to -- to characterize this maybe as your and the Treasurer's collective effort to get out of your defensive crouch as progressives here in Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

### SENATOR BISS:

I didn't understand that question, but I'll answer it anyway. I think it's important to have those three constituencies - consumers -- the -- the taxpayer, the beneficiaries, and industry - on the task force. They have an important voice to play. And the question was, who appoints them? I thought there's one person elected statewide to do investments. I felt that that would be the right person, so I called him and kind of begged, and because he's a very nice man, he said yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Murphy.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Murphy.

## SENATOR M. MURPHY:

I -- I get -- I can see how you could be that persuasive with -- with the Treasurer on an issue where you could have that -- have that opportunity to -- to -- to make this influence, but, you know, there's a national standard that's going to be implemented in January. TRS has acknowledged that they'll be the first ones in this national standard that's already covering this. I mean,

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

this, with all due respect, is an example of, you know, doing something just to make a show when it's already going to be addressed coming up. So why are we really doing this if it's already, frankly, going to be done with a national standard? And again -- and -- and I really think this last point bears harping on a little bit. We have over a hundred-and-eleven-billion-dollar debt in our pension system. I don't want to do anything that makes that worse. When the people who give us the best return on investment in the system say this leads them to consider not investing our funds, you're jeopardizing these pensions even more. And look at how much we have to put in out of the General Revenue Fund. It's already over twenty percent of our budget. The worse our return on investment is, the more that money is that comes out of the other things we want to fund. Let's go slow on this. the feds -- if there wasn't a national standard to be considered, that TRS has already embraced, maybe this would be something worth more consideration, but people are on this already. Why does the Illinois Senate have to inject itself into it? Let's -- let's -let's -- let's hold off on this one and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Bennett, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

### SENATOR BENNETT:

Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Bennett.

## SENATOR BENNETT:

Senator, for the purposes of legislative intent, does this legislation apply to funds of funds?

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

### SENATOR BISS:

Thank you for the question. So there's the requirements that would go into effect if the task force failed to adopt a policy that we liked. Those requirements, as I read them, do not apply to funds of funds. Then there's the question of what the task force ought to consider. I would think it would be healthy for them to ask analogous questions about funds of funds as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss, do you wish to close? Senator Biss.

## SENATOR BISS:

Thank you. I just want to be very, very quick and address some specific statements. First of all, regarding the claim from TRS that this bill applies to thirty percent or more of their portfolio, that's a previous amendment. With TRS's input, we made a change in Amendment 3 that shrinks that number we believe considerably. Next, about a national standard - yes, there's a national standard that's now been written. That's why that was written into the bill as well in Amendment 3. The question is, will the national standard take hold? And TRS has been a leader in helping to shape that national standard. The role that we're playing here is to help them push that national standard to broad adoption across the industry. A small number of firms have adopted it, a lot have not. As more pension funds require it, it will spread. Finally, there was some claims made that this would have the effect primarily of lowering returns. I think we got to rewind a little bit and ask why we pass transparency laws when it comes to the expenditure of public money. We do that because that

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

strengthens our bargaining position to push down costs. I want to end by saying what I said in the beginning. Today, our pension funds are literally paying fees that they are unaware of and can't find out about. Right now, TRS, for instance, is paying fees to private equity companies that they just have no idea what those fees are. This bill would fix that. In fixing it, it would empower them to be tougher, stronger, and better negotiators. And so in the long term, this would certainly, I believe, have a positive impact on the asset values in our pension funds. I urge an Aye vote on this simple measure of transparency about the expenditure of public dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 6292 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 32 voting Aye, 16 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 6292, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Next up's House Bill 6298. Senator Biss. Senator Biss seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 6298 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 6298. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Biss.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss, to present Floor Amendment 1.

SENATOR BISS:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Thank you, Mr. President. I move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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 approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 6298. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6298.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Biss.

SENATOR BISS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 6298, as now amended, does two things. First, it authorizes the Board of the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund to issue subpoenas in administrative hearings, and then, secondly, it allows retired teachers who teach only driver's ed to teach up to nine hundred hours in a school year without canceling pension benefits. That's specifically to respond to a -- an inadequacy in the availability of potential driver's ed teachers that exists in Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Bill 6298 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 50 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 6298, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6303. Leader Radogno. Mr. Secretary, please read the Leader's bill. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6303.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Leader Radogno.

## SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I know it's late, but this is an important bill and one that is on a subject that is of great interest here. This bill creates the firearm {sic} (firearms) trafficking offense. It creates an additional tool for law enforcement to target straw purchasers, who are not only unable to legally possess a firearm, but buy firearms out of state and bring them into Illinois with the intent to sell them in a -- in -- on the illegal black market. I know we're all aware of the gun violence crisis in Chicago, and, in fact, a recent University of Chicago Crime Lab study showed a staggering trend in the flow of illegal firearms into Illinois. In 2010, approximately sixty percent of all the firearms recovered from crime scenes in Illinois were originally purchased outside of Illinois. And from 2001 to 2010, the number of firearms coming in from out of state increased consistently each and every year. The

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

firearm trafficking law does not apply a penalty to law-abiding gun owners. It specifically targets gun traffickers, who already cannot illegally {sic} possess a firearm. Consequently, there is no opposition from the usual pro-gun groups. Enacting this provision under Illinois law will ensure that local police and prosecutors have an additional tool available to them to combat gun violence and the illegal -- on the illegal gun market. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Raoul, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR RAOUL:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the bill, Senator Raoul.

## SENATOR RAOUL:

I'd like to commend the sponsor for her work on this. You know, I think this is a -- a major and important step in this effort. Just today I received a text message from a -- a neighbor, who is actually a -- a, you know, a former lobbyist, who lives a half block away from me, and said to me, "I know you're really busy down there, but we had three shootings within the last day on our block." Excuse me, Mr. President. As I think about remaining here for the weekend and continuing our work, I'm conflicted, 'cause I think about my kids back home. So I support this bill. I understand the usual stakeholders who weigh in on the subject are supportive of this, but there's more difficult things that we have to do that they probably won't be supportive of that address the same issue and we have to have the willingness, the will, to

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

embrace those measures too, because it's about saving lives. I urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, you wish to close? Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 6303 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 51 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 6303, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. House Bill 6333. Senator Koehler, on 6333. Do you wish to proceed? Please read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6333.

(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. This requires schools to request an asthma action plan each year from parents or guardians of a pupil with asthma. The bill requires ISBE to develop a model asthma episode emergency response protocol before September 1st of 2016 and requires each school district to adopt an asthma emergency response protocol before January 1st of 2017. It also requires that a -- school personnel who work with pupils to complete a training program on asthma every two years. Be happy to answer any questions.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall House Bill 6333 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 50 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 6333, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave of the Body -- Mr. Secretary, let's return to House Bill 5973. There he is. Senator Raoul. Indicates he wishes to proceed. I believe Senator Raoul seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 5973 to the Order of 2nd. Is that correct, Mr. Secretary? Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading, we have House Bill 5973. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Raoul.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Raoul, to ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2. SENATOR RAOUL:

Floor Amendment 2 is a technical amendment that corrects a drafting oversight.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

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 approved for consideration?

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, we have House Bill 5973. Please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 5973.

(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. House Bill 5973 is work of the Safer Foundation, the Office of the Governor, and the Illinois -- Illinois Department of Financial (and) Professional Regulation. It's consistent with the work being done by the Criminal Justice Reform Commission. It provides a two-step process for issuance of licenses to become a funeral director, roofer, or barber when the individual has a prior felony conviction. If the felony conviction is not directly related to the profession, which is defined to include forcible felonies, then a criminal record should not be a basis for denying the license. If the offense is directly related to the profession for which an applicant seeks licensure, then mitigating factors must be applied before the application is denied. It also clarifies that the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations {sic} (Regulation) may revoke, suspend, place on probation, or refuse to renew a license if an individual is convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor relating to dishonesty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 5973 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 42 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 5973, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, with leave of the Body, we're going to go back to House Bill 3554. 3554. Leader Harmon, do you wish to proceed? Indicates that he does. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 3554.

(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. House Bill 3554 amends the Wage Payment and Collection Act to improve the process by which recovered wages are returned to the aggrieved employee. With the amendment we have adopted here in the Senate, I believe we've addressed the concerns that the Department and the -- the administration have. I'm not aware of any opposition and I ask you for your Aye votes.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3554 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

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, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. House Bill 3554, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. To fulfill our responsibilities under Article V, Section 9 of the Constitution, we will now proceed to the Order of Advise and Consent. Senator Muñoz.

## SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on an appointments set forth -- Appointment Messages 990216, 217, and 218.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz moves that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the Appointment Message {sic} just read. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries. The Senate is resolved into Executive Session. Mr. Secretary, on page 26 of the Senate Calendar is the Order of Executive Appointments - Appointment Messages. Mr. Secretary, please read Appointment Message 990216.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Mr. President, the Committee on Executive Appointments recommends that the Senate Do Advise and Consent to the following salaried appointment: To be a member of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, Joseph Gomez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Mr. President, I move that the Senate advise and consent to the nomination.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. 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, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nomination. Mr. Secretary, Appointment Message 990217.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Mr. President, the Committee on Executive Appointments recommends that the Senate Do Advise and Consent to the following salaried appointment: To be a member of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, David A. Gonzalez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

### SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Mr. President, I move that the Senate advise and consent to the nomination.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. 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 49 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. A majority of the Senators

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nomination. Mr. Secretary, Appointment Message 990218.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Mr. President, the Committee on Executive Appointments recommends that the Senate Do Advise and Consent to the following salaried appointment: To be a member of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, Craig Johnson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Muñoz.

### SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Mr. President, I move that the Senate advise and consent to the nomination.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. All those in favor will vote Aye. Those 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 49 voting Aye, 0 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nomination. Senator Muñoz.

### SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move that the Senate arise from Executive Session.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Senator Muñoz moves that the Senate arise from Executive Session. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed,

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries. The Senate has arisen from Executive Session. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave of the Body, if you'll turn to page 22 of the regular Calendar on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, we have House Bill -- 6328. Senator Collins, do you wish to move that bill to 3rd? Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Bill 6328.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. 3rd Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, towards the bottom of page 23, on the Order of Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 58. Senate Joint Resolution 58. Senator Mulroe, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Joint Resolution 58, offered by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe, on your resolution.

## SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This resolution is the result of negotiations related to House Bill 4633, which was earlier discussed and sponsored by Senator Haine. It creates an eleven-member task force for the purpose of gathering information, considering recommendations by NAIC, and recommending legislation concerning unclaimed life insurance policies, including how to treat those policies identified in the records of life insurance companies as lapsed. It will terminate December 30

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

 $\{\text{sic}\}\ (31)$ , '16, so in about six months, after a -- and a report is due on that date.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Any discussion? Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Indicates he will yield for a question. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR M. MURPHY:

Senator, in committee, we had a good conversation about this resolution and I think the Treasurer had indicated at that time that this task force would have the authority to look into whether or not we want to continue to have the Treasurer's Office give private auditors contingent fee contracts and he had acknowledged that there have been over twenty million dollars in contingent fee contracts given to private auditors, and I had felt that that was something that ought to be looked at. He felt like that within the confines of this resolution that could be looked at and I guess my specific request to you is, are you willing to insist that this issue be considered and looked at by this task force?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe.

### SENATOR MULROE:

Yes. Senator Murphy, I think that's within the confines of the resolution. We're trying to make sure that any beneficiaries that are owed money when someone dies gets their -- their money to them. They're the beneficial owners of the policy. The auditors that have been involved, they do receive a ten percent contingency

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

fee. That's money we would prefer to go to the beneficiaries, rather than to the auditors, but because of the structure right now, it's -- it's going to auditors who have actually uncovered a lot of money that they would -- people would not have otherwise received.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Further discussion? Senator Haine, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HAINE:

To the resolution, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

To the resolution, Senator Haine.

## SENATOR HAINE:

I rise in support of the -- strong support of the -- the resolution. This -- this will charge the -- the -- this task force with looking at the issue of lapsed policies, as was previously mentioned. This is a complicated topic because lapsed policies has a wide range of possibilities: those that terminate by operation of the policy; those that terminate because of unpaid premiums; those that were actually in force and have cash value that go on, but the -- the insurance company doesn't know that they are -- that the person, the beneficiary, is deceased. So the NAIC, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, which includes our Director of Insurance, will look at this issue in depth and work with this task force. This is a very good idea and I thank Senator Mulroe for bringing this forward. It's a great way to look at this and bring closure to the entire issue to the benefit of all insureds and insurance companies that perform this valuable service.

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

As this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 58 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 33 voting Aye, 16 voting Nay, 0 voting Present. Senate joint resolution, having -- having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, again on Secretary's Desk, Resolutions - we're on page 22 now - we have Senate Resolution 957. Mr. Secretary, 957. Senator Mulroe, on Senate Resolution 957. Do you wish to proceed? Please read the resolution.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 957, offered by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe, to present your resolution.

## SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. -- President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 957 urges all private and public high schools, colleges, and universities to offer specified information to students and parents concerning meningococcal disease. It urges the foregoing entities to recommend that president and -- present and entering students receive meningococcal vaccines according to the Centers for Disease (Control) and Prevention Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. Thank you.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on the resolution? Seeing

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, leave of the Body, we're going to go down to Senate Resolution 1364. Senator Mulroe, on Senate Resolution 1364. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1364, offered by Senator Mulroe.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Mulroe, on your resolution.

### SENATOR MULROE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1364 designates June of 2016 as American Legion Boys State and Girls State Month to increase the awareness of these programs that educate and inform young citizens.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Any discussion on the resolution? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, with leave of the Body, let's go to page -- excuse me, 23 of the regular Calendar. We have Senate Resolution 1781. Leader Trotter. Indicates he wishes to proceed. Mr. Secretary, please read the resolution.

## SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Senate Resolution 1781, offered by Senator Trotter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Trotter.

## SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1781 is a resolution by the organization

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

A.B.A.T.E. declaring the month of May for motorcycle awareness and also motorcycle safety. And would like to see the resolution passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1781 {sic}. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, let's go to House Joint Resolution 124. It's on page 24. House Joint Resolution 124. Senator Harris. Oop, wait a minute. Oh, there it is, yes, House Joint Resolution 124. Senator Harris, do you wish to proceed with your resolution? Indicates that he does wish to proceed. Mr. Secretary, please read Senator Harris's resolution, House Joint Resolution 124.

### SECRETARY ANDERSON:

House Joint Resolution 124, offered by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Senator Harris.

## SENATOR HARRIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Joint Resolution 24 {sic} (124) urges the Congress to reauthorize Section 4 of the federal Voting Rights Act, which contains the formula for determining which states and local governments are required to obtain permission from the federal government before making changes to the election law. I request an Aye vote.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Thank you. Is there any discussion on the resolution? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Mr. Secretary, Messages

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

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 concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 2929.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2929.

Passed the House, as amended, May 27, 2016. Timothy D. Mapes, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Mr. Secretary, Communications from the Secretary of State. SECRETARY ANDERSON:

Letter dated May 27th, 2016.

To the Honorable President of the Senate:

In compliance with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, I am forwarding herewith the enclosed Senate bill from the 99th General Assembly as vetoed by the Governor together with his objections.

Senate Bill 777.

Respectfully, Jesse White, Secretary of State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With leave of the Body, all those resolutions read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, have there been any objections filed to any resolution on the Consent

121st Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Calendar?

SECRETARY ANDERSON:

No objections filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SULLIVAN)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Resolution Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries and the resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, there being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 3 p.m. on the 29th day of May 2016. The Senate stands adjourned.