53rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Burke: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We'll be led in the prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Assistant Doorkeeper Padget: "Let us pray. Lord, as we prepare for Session today, I ask for freshness of your spirit to quicken our thinking, that out of confused issues may come simplicity of plan, that out of fear may come confidence, that out of hurry, may come deliberation, and that out of frustration may come guidance. Let us get to work, not head first, but heart first. May we be able to disagree without being disagreeable, to differ without being difficult, to be honest without tension, and to be frank without offense in an atmosphere of team spirit. These things we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Burke: "Amen. We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Mason."
- Mason et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Burke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Buckner is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Buckner: "Madam Speaker, let the record show that Representatives Carroll, Will Davis, Guerrero-Cuellar, Jones, Ladisch Douglass, and Blair-Sherlock are excused today."

53rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Burke: "Leader Keicher is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Keicher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Elik, Niemerg, Ozinga, Sosnowski, and Spain are excused for today."
- Speaker Burke: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 105 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2878, Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 3743, and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3903. Gong-Gershowitz, Chairperson Representative from Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Amendment(s) 5 and 6 to House Bill 1497 and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) and 3 to House Bill 3062. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 3 to House Bill 2352 and Floor Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 734. Representative Morgan, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment(s)

53rd Legislative Day

- 2, 3, correction... 3, 4, and 5 to House Bill 2077 and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2450. Representative Walker, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) Bill 3643. Representative Ann House Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2527 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 3086. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 2507 and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 2 and 3 to House Bill 2518. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 3 to House Bill 2858."
- Speaker Burke: "Moving to page 7 of the Calendar, on the ordinance (sic-Order) of Senate Concurrences, we have House Bill 1497, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please... the Chair recognizes Representative Ford."
- Representative Ford: "Thank you Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with the Senate's Floor Amendment #5 and 6. It amends the Automobile Renting Occupation and Use Tax Act to include peer-to-peer car sharing businesses and

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

the tax imposed upon the Act do not apply to rental cars. Those were the changes that was made in the Senate. I move for the passage."

Speaker Burke: "Thank you. Is it... have you concluded, Rep. Ford?

Representative Windhorst is recognized."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Representative. Just to get going this morning on our side, this passed unanimously out of the Senate and was in committee this morning. Is that correct?"

Ford: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And what was the vote in committee this morning?"

Ford: "We were together, everyone."

Windhorst: "It was unanimous. Is that right?"

Ford: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "Oh, in the vote of unity, please vote 'aye'."

Amendments #5 and 6 to House Bill 1497?' This is final action.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #5 and 6 to House Bill 1497. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McLaughlin, for what reason do you rise?"

McLaughlin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

McLaughlin: "I'd like to introduce to the Members of the Body, Ben Rider, who is down here today from my district. Ben is a senior, going into his senior year at St. Norbert's, a Green Knight. For anybody that went there, I wanted to make sure we had that on the record. Ben is in his second year as an intern with my office, so very happy to have him. And his sister is also serving. Ben is a gentleman who's with the ROTC. So, when you see him on the floor, please thank him for his service, now and in the future. Ben is a Loyola Academy graduate, and his father attended one of the great prep schools in Illinois, the Elgin Academy, of which I'm also an alumnus. So, I just want to make that's on the record. But please give Ben a round of applause and a warm welcome to Springfield. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Welcome to the Capitol. Continuing on the Order... on page 7, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2077, Representative Vella."

Vella: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I move to adopt Senate Amendments 4, 5, and 6 to House Bill 2077. The..."

Speaker Burke: "I... do you mean Amendments 3, 4, and 5?"

Vella: "That's right. That's right. I mispronounced it. Yes, 3, 4, and 5."

Speaker Burke: "Okay, please explain your Amendments."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Vella: "Sure. The Amendment clarifies the requirements that when a health care provider has to submit prescriptions for controlled substances electronically. These clarifications are agreed upon between the Illinois State Dental Society, the Illinois State Medical Society, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, the Illinois Pharmacists Association, and the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. It passed the Senate unanimously, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Frese is recognized."

Frese: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just... to this Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing it, doing all the work, getting all the agreements. I support your Bill. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Vella to close."

Vella: "I urge its adoption. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #3, 4, and 5 to House Bill 2077?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #3, 4, and 5 to House Bill 2077. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have House Bill 2507, Representative Kifowit. Please proceed."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 2501. Senate Amendment... Senate Floor... or 2507,

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

I apologize. Senate Floor Amendment #1 is the property tax omnibus Bill, and we can discuss this when discussing the Bill."

Speaker Burke: "Yeah, you can go ahead and discuss the Bill."
Kifowit: "Oh, very good. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speake

"Oh, very good. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 2507 is the property tax omnibus Bill. There are several components of this Bill, as it pleases the Body, and it's broken down into different articles. So, Article 5 comes from House Bill 1048, which is Representative Ford. And then what this is, is it talks about the disabled veterans homestead exemption for veterans of World War II. As you can imagine, there is not many World War II veterans left in our... left for us actually. And... what this does is it includes veterans of World War II, regardless of their level of disability. These veterans would receive a hundred percent reduction of their property assessed value. Also, in Article 5 of this Amendment is the removal of what is called the honorable discharge requirement. And just for the sake of informing the Body, the VA, the USVA, views general under honorable conditions honorable and technically honorable discharges from the U.S. military. It really is a matter of administration of these two different discharges. However, there are nonveteran individuals that are interpreting these two discharges distinct and under different criteria. So, the ... what we are doing is we are looking at and identifying disabled veterans for the homestead exemption with regards to a service connected disability and that they are receiving disability compensation. This is based on the VA, the USVA, acknowledging

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

these individuals are honorably receiving their compensation and they're receiving a disability compensation. You don't receive disability compensation or VA benefits if you have, like, a dishonorable discharge or a negative discharge per se. So, we are looking at service connected disability with regards to the eligibility under the homestead exemption for veterans with disabilities. We're also clarifying the amount of the homestead exemption for veterans with disabilities and their surviving spouses. Again, there are individuals who look at disabled veterans and have removed or not given them their exemption based on the value of your home. We have seen in areas where the home has gone up in value and then these disabled veterans are not properly recognized or given recognition for disability. So, this clarifies that with the house, if it goes up in value above the... the \$250 thousand of the property's equalized assessed value, that they are to pay the taxes above that. They don't completely get eliminated from the program. Floor Amendment #1, in Article 10, is House Bill 2950, which was presented by Representative Kelly. This is a homestead exemption for surviving spouses of fallen officers and rescue workers. Again, this is a small subset, and this is just the right thing to do for our surviving spouses of fallen officers, fallen rescue workers. The amount is equal to 50 percent of the equalized assessed value of the property. In Article 15 of the Amendment is Senate Bill 2356, Sponsored by Rep. Yednock, Senator McClure. This is valuing nonprofit wastewater facilities at one-third their fair cash value. That's pretty much self-explanatory. What this does is it

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

applies only to the facilities themselves and not the land value of which they are on. It takes into account that when they are sold there is a lot of removal, site restoration that goes with that. Under Article 25, Representative Burke, Senator Castro, Senate Bill 2287. This is incorporating that language into the Bill, clarifying the meaning of fair cash value under the Historic Resident Assessment Freeze Law. So, this amends the Historic Resident Assessment Freeze Law to clarify that the fair cash value of the historic building equals the value of the property prior to the commencement of any rehabilitation work, as finally determined for that year by the assessment officer, board of review, and the Property Tax Appeals Board, or a court. Article 30. So, this is under Article 30. This was under House Bill 2830, Representative Ness, and this is expanding the eligible size of townships to elect multi-township assessors. So, this is helping our small townships. It is raising the threshold from 1 thousand residents to up to 3 thousand residents of qualified townships by 2030. Article 40, this was language incorporated from Leader Hoffman's Bill, House Bill 2316, and this allows petroleum refineries may negotiate property tax settlements. So, this allows petroleum refineries to negotiate a settlement agreement for real property tax assessments along with taxing districts in which the refinery is located and clarifies the Department of Revenue's current practice of valuing pollution control facilities at one-third of their fair cash value. Article 45 incorporates the language of Leader Hoffman and President Harmon from House Bill 3098. And that allows tax districts subject to PTELL... they can seek a

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

referendum, go to referendum, to increase the aggregate extension applicable to the taxing district. Article 45 of Bill 1377, was this Amendment, House Representative homestead exemption for Hernandez, special municipality-built homes. So, this creates a new exemption for single family homes that were sold by municipalities that are located on land which was exempt from property taxes prior to the construction of the home or on land in which the municipality conducted environmental remediation pursuant to the Environmental Protection Act. The homestead exemption lasts for 10 years and provides for a 50 percent of the home's equalized assessed value for the first 8 years and 33 percent reduction in the next 2 years. Article 50 is language that was... that was inserted concerning nursing homes specialized mental health facilities, beginning with tax year 2023. Real property in Cook County that's used to provide services requiring a license under the Nursing Home Care Act or under the Specialized Mental Health Facilities Act shall not be assessed at a higher level than a residential assessment. I ask for your support."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, I appreciate the thorough nature with which you went through the... the Motion. I just have a couple things I wanted to ask about. First, with regard to the changes to PTELL, would you give an explanation as to what that change does?"

53rd Legislative Day

- Kifowit: "I believe you're just talking about allowing a referendum. This provides that tax districts subject to the PTELL, they may seek a referendum if they want to increase the aggregate extension applicable to the tax district for a specific dollar increase. If you look at State Law, there are certain caps with regard to this aggregate. And so, this would allow for an increase in the aggregate extension for the school districts."
- Windhorst: "And that would require referendum approval for that to occur?"
- Kifowit: "Referendum approval of the voters, correct."
- Windhorst: "There is a change, I believe it's Representative Lilly's Bill. HB1075 is included, regarding park districts and the Municipal Aquarium and Museum Act. I believe current law provides that the park district can only provide a levy... or extension of a levy in that situation. This being expanded to the municipalities. Is that accurate?"
- Kifowit: "We... we did talk about Representative Lilly's Bill to be in here. My notes said that that was not included in the text of the Amendment of the final draft, but we will look into that. But staff is saying that that was not included in the Amendment."
- Windhorst: "Is there a provision regarding the Park Districts and Municipal Aquarium and Museum Act?"
- Kifowit: "I'm sorry. Madam Speaker, it's... I... I'm having a hard time hearing. Thank you. Representative Windhorst, I'm sorry. If could you please repeat your question?"
- Windhorst: "Was there a portion of the Bill dealing with the Park District and Municipal Aquarium and Museum Act?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Kifowit: "Let me search the text of the… there was discussion about it, but again, I was told that it was not included. But those are in my notes, and I can search the full text in a few minutes."

Windhorst: "I believe it may be on page 23 of Amendment 1. We can move on to another question."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Sir.""

Windhorst: "With regard to Article 55, the Nursing Home Care Act, those... the real property that is licensed under that Act, what does that change do?"

Kifowit: "What this does is... is currently... the nursing home is what we were talking about under Article 50, correct?"

Windhorst: "I believe it's... I show Article 55."

Kifowit: "55? What... what we have is, concerning the nursing homes and specialized mental health facilities, is that they're going to be assessed... they shall not be assessed at a higher level than the assessment than residential property in the county in which the nursing home and mental health facility is located. That's what you're referring to?"

Windhorst: "That's correct."

Kifowit: "And your question again, Sir? I... I apologize."

Windhorst: "What is that... behind that change, and what is it designed to do?"

Kifowit: "Oh, behind that change. The... the fact of the matter is that these facilities are residential facilities in nature. They... they are there for individuals to live in. And so, the thought process and the rationale behind this is they are residential... they are residential in nature and that they should be given the same assessed value as a... as the residents

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

are around them. That... that's the simplicity of the rationale behind that."

Windhorst: "And then you... I feel like you may have mentioned this at the start, regarding the World War II veterans and the exemption they will receive from taxation based on disability level. Would you just further clarify that for me?"

Kifowit: "What this is, is this was originally House Bill 48, and we don't have many World War II veterans around. And if they are blessed to be able to be still living in their homes, that this allows them to receive that 100 percent reduction on their property's assessed value. Again, there's not many World War II veterans around. They would have to apply for this, but they won't have to apply for it every year. I think I know personally of only two World War II veterans around, and only one of them is blessed to still live in their house."

Windhorst: "And is there any known opposition to your Bill?"

Kifowit: "I have been... I have not been told of any known opposition
 of the Bill."

Windhorst: "And the Amendment passed unanimously in the Senate and was unanimous in committee this morning?"

Kifowit: "Correct."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Kifowit: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, I... I came in kind of partway through. Could you start over and go through..."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Kifowit: "Of course. I am so thrilled that you love to hear my
voice on the House Floor."

Davidsmeyer: "Just... just kidding.

Speaker Burke: "The Chair... the Chair is not allowing that."

Kifowit: "I'm completely flattered."

Davidsmeyer: "Just kidding. So, what... what does this Bill do to lower property taxes for taxpayers in the State of Illinois?" Kifowit: "Well, what this Bill does is it clarifies and it cleans up language. So, it's more of a cleanup Bill. It helps our veterans, which right now there's hundreds of veterans getting letters in the mail, disabled veterans, getting letters in the mail by a nonmilitary assessor interpreting the law incorrectly. And they stand to actually lose their exemption that they've had for five years. So, it maintains them. You could call that a reduction, but I think it's the right thing to do. It does reduce taxes for widows of our fallen... our fallen officers and our..."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and I want to... I want to clarify that I... I will be supporting this, but I believe... I believe it was Representative Yingling, probably four... four and a half years ago, who got an agreement that we'd have a property tax task force that would come up with something that would actually do something to lower property taxes for everyone, instead of just pushing it off on other groups of people. So, I think that we need to... I'd be interested to hear where that is and if we're ever going to actually do something on that. I... I agree we should support this. We should move forward with this. But we can't neglect the actual issue of ever-rising property taxes in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Kifowit: "Absolutely. I agree. And, Representative, I've had numerous talks with our new leadership and our new Speaker who has committed to that as well. It's just a process that we need to engage in. So, I agree with you a hundred percent."

Speaker Burke: "Chair recognizes Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Mayfield: "Representative, I know you've been working on this since last year 'cause I gave you a lot of push back and told you I wanted changes. I was part of the property tax subcommittee that we had, and there were a lot of things that I asked for that are not in this Bill. Let's start with the very first one, the disabled veterans homestead exemption. I'm the author of that underlying Bill, and I told you that there was a drafting error in that Bill. It was never meant for anyone to have a zero-dollar property tax. Never. That zero-dollar property tax is devastating certain communities here in the State of Illinois. Did you talk to any of the assessors in those areas who have been begging us to change that provision for the last five years?"

Kifowit: "I personally have not. I know that there are Members of this General Assembly that is working on it. Last year's property tax Bill we did pass, and the Department of Revenue should give us an idea of how this is affecting not only that community, but also Rock Island, also St. Clair County, to look at the State of Illinois making them whole. I know Leader Hoffman is working very diligently on that issue as well. The case in point is that when that Bill passed for a hundred percent permanent and total disabled veterans, hundred

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

percent, they will not be, you know, going back. For our hundred percent disabled veterans, it does give them a complete exemption. And through discussions and in... in changing that, what you are doing is now you are putting a burden back on somebody who is a hundred percent disabled. Through the report that we passed last year that we should be getting with regards to the Department of Revenue, the State will know what the impact is."

Mayfield: "Again... okay. Okay... Representative, I appreciate all of that, but you're adding to that without a report. You have no data to support what it is you're doing, and yet you're adding to that class. I'm not saying take anything away from anyone, but we have to, at some point, close the spigot and say we're not going to continue to add to that burden, we're not going to continue to push those payments down onto other taxpayers. Because that's exactly what this does. You're adding to the burden without data. How can you justify that?"

Kifowit: "We're not adding to the veteran areas that you're talking to in Great Lakes. There is a small amount of individuals that are the surviving spouses of fallen officers and..."

Mayfield: "I'm not asking about the fallen officers. I'm not on that piece yet. I'm still on the very first one."

Kifowit: "For the World War II veterans?"

Mayfield: "Yes, Ma'am. For the World War II veterans."

Kifowit: "That's... the World War II veterans is not a significant..."

Mayfield: "Right, but you're giving them a zero percent tax bill."

Kifowit: "Correct."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Mayfield: "That was never the intent of the underlying Bill. Now, I agree that they should receive something, but a zero percent tax bill... because anybody that understands taxes knows that somebody is going to pay for that. So, it may not be somebody in my district, but it will be somebody in the district where they live. So, those dollars will then be redistributed to those other individuals. We thank them for their service. Not saying that they don't deserve something, but a zero percent tax bill in this day and age, when property taxes are through the roof, is just not tenable. And I told you this last year. You said you would work with me on this. You did not work with me on this, and here I am looking at this Bill, with this line item on here, where we are adding to, as opposed to correcting what should have been done. Now, I was told by Leadership to let you take the lead on this. Obviously, I need to file my own Bill because you're not going to meet with me, you're not going to correct this, and this is just going to continue to be a problem here in this state. This is a problem. I told you this last year."

Kifowit: "Correct. And when we talked about it, we talked about Great Lakes, we talked about Rock Island Arsenal, we talked about St. Clair County, and those areas without our bases. The World War II..."

Mayfield: "I talked about the Bill in general."

Kifowit: "...the World War II veterans, in general, is such a small
 dollar amount..."

Mayfield: "Are you including their spouses as well?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Kifowit: "...and they are distributed throughout the whole state, and it would amount to roughly a few dollars on the other properties."

Mayfield: "Will their spouses be included as well?"

Kifowit: "No. It's just our World War II veterans."

Mayfield: "Under the underlying Bill, spouses are included. So, I don't see..."

Kifowit: "Okay."

Mayfield: "...any language here that excludes the spouses. So, what we are doing is we are expanding that into perpetuity."

Kifowit: "No, just the World War II veterans. And the World War II veterans are dying every single day."

Mayfield: "Is that clarified in the language? That it does not include their spouses, or is that a loophole?"

Kifowit: "Staff is going to look at the exact language. If you have a... a page and line, I can look at it right now, but..."

Mayfield: "Well, you're the one who corrected the Bill. You don't know? To the Bill."

Kifowit: "Very good."

Mayfield: "I agree that we should be providing some type of relief to our veterans. I totally agree. They served their country. They came back. Some of them did not come back a hundred percent. But to say that any individual does not have to pay a tax, that they get zero dollars, and that those... and that burden is pushed off to other individuals is just not right. I've been asking for the last couple years for this to be corrected. I was told by the Sponsor that she would work with me to correct this language to thereby reduce property tax burdens on other individuals. That meeting has not happened.

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

I'm asking. I know that a lot of individuals are for this because of the provisions in here. I won't ask you to vote 'no'. I will say either don't vote or be a 'present'. Let's send this back to the drawing board so that we can provide real property tax relief on... without hurting other individuals. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Meier is recognized.

Representative Meier."

Meier: "Will Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Meier: "I don't want to ever talk against a veterans' Bill, but I have many people in my district, because I am right near Scott Field, that have problems. I'm in favor of this Bill. I want this Bill to pass, but I want to bring up something that I filed, House Bill 1239. And it states in this Bill that any... because the largest amount of our taxes goes to schools. So, to start solving the problem from the funds lost, any schools within 45 miles of a military base in the State of Illinois would receive funds from the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois that would be given to the Support Our Veterans and Neighborhoods Fund to help make up the difference. Is there anything in here to help make up the difference in this Bill?"

Kifowit: "That's not in this Bill, per se, but that is what we are working with the Department of Revenue on, those dollar amounts that should be available June 1... or July 1, I apologize. And then we will look on that over the summer and look and analyze the data. But that... that is..."

Meier: "I like..."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Kifowit: "...under consideration and that is on my radar."

Meier: "I like you saying we'll look at it in the summer and try to work together. Those are good words. Once again, I am for this Bill. I'll vote 'yes' for this Bill. But when you have large military bases in your area, that area is hit harder. So, we're just trying to find a way 'cause it's... it's many millions of dollars these different districts and that area are losing for each district. So, thank you for working on it, and thank you for bringing this Bill forward."

Kifowit: "Absolutely."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Kifowit to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2507?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, there are 95 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2507. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following Committee Action taken May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 1199."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Fritts is recognized."

Fritts: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Fritts: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my privilege to introduce my intern for the summer who's with us today, Isabelle Lindenmeyer. She's from my hometown of Dixon. She is a senior at Illinois State University, majoring in political science with a minor in legal studies. She's at the college level of Kiwanis, serving as an international trustee for eight states and one country and heads the international bylaws and policy codes revision. Not only does she serve the people of Illinois by serving in my district office, she's also a member of the Illinois National Guard as a Human Resource Specialist out of the 404 HSC MEB in Bloomington, Illinois. She plans on attending law school with a joint master's in public policy. It is great to have her here today and great to have her with me this summer. So, if everyone could give her a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Welcome to the Capitol. Continuing on the Order of Concurrences, on page 7, we have House Bill 2518, Representative Croke."

Croke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to adopt Amendments...

Senate Amendments 2 and 3."

Speaker Burke: "Move to concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3?"

Croke: "I move to concur, excuse me."

Speaker Burke: "Okay. Please describe your Amendments."

Croke: "Sorry. Apologies, I've lost the Bill. So, Senate Amendment 3 adds a TIF extension for the City of Chicago. And then Senate Amendment 2 is a gut and replace, becomes the Bill, and becomes the TIF extension omnibus."

Speaker Burke: "All right. Representative Keicher for a... is recognized."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Keicher: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Keicher: "So, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I'm... I'm not addressing the Sponsor because different folks have had these over time. We have gone long past the time where we need to have TIF reform in this state. We're proposing here to extend a handful of TIFs to 35 years. Folks, 35 years ago, Ronald Reagan was the President of this country. Thirty-five years ago, the Soviet Union was a country on this planet. Now, we're going to allow municipal governments to continue to manipulate funds out of our schools that so desperately need them because of the volume of mandates that we continue to pass. I'm incredulous that we see two of them being extended to 47 years. I turn 50 next month. We're extending these basically for my lifetime past. And in many of these communities, the municipal fathers who get complaints from their constituents, the property taxes is out of control. They point to the schools as being the problem. The schools are not all the problem. As we look at these Bills, we have a TIF for Peoria going to 35 years, has already taken in \$6.1 million. The City of Rock Island, going to 35 years has already taken in \$4.3 million. The City of Evergreen Park extended to \$19.8 million. The City of Sparta, \$10.5 million. The Village of Channahon, \$138 and a half million. The Chicago TIF, \$131.9 million. These are dollars that are not going to our school districts. These are dollars that we are forcing property tax increases on to our community members, and it is high time that we force TIFs to live within their 23-year life cycle and send a message that get it done in 23 years or close it

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

and open a new one. I urge a 'no' vote on behalf of the property taxpayer in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Croke to close."

Croke: "Well, happy early birthday, Leader Keicher. And I ask for an 'aye' vote, and I do want to stress that obviously the TIF extensions are in districts on both side of the aisle. So, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 2518?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 2518. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving on to page 8. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2527, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2527. This would extend... give me a quick second here. So, this adds an executive director for the Illinois Finance Authority, or his designee, to the Municipal Water Wastewater Funding Study Committee. It extends the date that the committee is required to report the findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly to March 1 of 2024, instead of September 30 of 2023, and extends the date the provisions concerning the committee are repealed

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

as of January 1 of 2025, rather than January 1 of 2024. Would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Burke: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2527?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there were 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2527. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have House Bill 2858, Representative Stuart. Take... take your time. We're here all day."

Stuart: "I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3."

Speaker Burke: "Please describe the Amendments."

Stuart: "Sure. Senate Amendment 1 simply adds the language from House Bill 2911, which we passed through this chamber unanimously with 112 votes. It was an initiative of Representative Collins. And Senate Amendment 3 adds House Bill 2860, the language from that, which we also passed in this chamber unanimously with 113 votes."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, this Bill, with its Amendments, has to deal with reporting of suspicious deaths.

Is that accurate?"

Stuart: "Yes."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "And it provides that they may report that information to the Department of Aging. Is that accurate?"

Stuart: "Yes. Yes."

Windhorst: "And what changes, if any, does it make for mandated reporters?"

Stuart: "It's adding people in the financial industry as mandated reporters."

Windhorst: "And it also has an anti-discrimination provision?"

Stuart: "Yes."

Windhorst: "What does that do?"

Stuart: "I don't want to misspeak. I'm trying to find my notes on that. I believe that... I believe that language is from House Bill 2911, if I'm not mistaken."

Windhorst: "And does it prohibit employers from discriminating against an employee who makes a good faith report concerning information of a suspicious death?"

Stuart: "Right, yeah. So, it's just protection so that somebody can report something. This is all about looking out for our seniors, and this came out of our Elder Abuse Task Force."

Windhorst: "Thank you. And you noted it was unanimous in the Senate and in committee. Thank you."

Stuart: "Correct. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Are you done, Rep. Windhorst? Seeing no further questions, Rep. Stuart to close."

Stuart: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2858?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2858. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2878, Leader Hoffman."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: House. I ask the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2878. The Amendments gut and replace the original Bill and become the procurement omnibus Bill here for the State of Illinois. It has several provisions, including... including provisions from House Bill indicating former coal miner employee preferences in... in certain... certain jobs. It provides for single prime procurement and a cleanup of the bid preferences for Illinois bids. That would be Representative Stuart's Bill, House Bill 3912, and my Bill, House Bill 3551. It provides provisions from Representative Costa Howard's Bill, House Bill 2303, which award to not-for-profit agencies for persons with significant disabilities. It includes enhancement of the veterans' preferences. House Bill 2288, Representative provides for small business set-aside Rosenthal. It reporting, CMS facility leases, which is Senator Turner's provision, Senate Bill 2227. It also provides the Reimagining Hotel Florence Act, which is a Pullman neighborhood initiative of Leader Smith on House Bill 779. It has two Bills that were significant to Representative Tarver concerning contractor diversity reporting and requests for waiver of

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

aspirational goals. It also includes... includes State Fairgrounds procurement changes and an expansion of public-private partnerships for transportation and several other provisions. Once again, this is a procurement package, and it contains bipartisan Bills that are all put into one. And I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, we had some discussion in..."

Hoffman: "I apologize, Leader. Could you take this out of the record momentarily, please?"

Speaker Burke: "Out of the record. Next, we have House Bill 3086, Representative Harper. Please proceed."

Harper: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3086. The Amendment encourages Interagency Committee on Pesticides to examine the possibility of continuing education courses to satisfy pesticide applicator competency requirements. It removes opposition from the Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Association, and I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Motion. For Members on our side, the underlying Bill contained a fee increase from \$100 to \$250. Our vote was 68-48... 41-1. If you wanted to review your vote from previously, 68-41-1 on this Bill. It was 36-18 in the Senate. Thanks."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3086?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3086. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative... on the Order of Concurrences, we're back at page 7 with House Bill 1612, Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Do you need me to explain the Amendment? I'm sorry."

Speaker Burke: "You have Amendment #1."

Tarver: "Yes. It just clarifies that this is in relation to individuals with intellectual disabilities, not developmental disabilities, which I think was the original intent when we had it on the House side in the beginning."

Speaker Burke: "So, you're moving to concur with Senate Amendment #1?"

Tarver: "Yes."

Speaker Burke: "Okay. Representative Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Representative Tarver, this Amendment just makes a technical change. And I believe it went through the Senate unanimously, and originally it was through the House unanimously."

Tarver: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "All right. Thank you."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Burke: "Representative Tarver to close."

Tarver: "I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "'Shall'... the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1612?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1612. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Next, we have House Bill 2352, Leader Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and the great Members of this Assembly. I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2."

Speaker Burke: "Can you check, Rep. Evans?"

Evans: "1 and 3."

Speaker Burke: "Is it 1 and 3?"

Evans: "I think it was 1 and 3. All right. Thank you. This is an initiative of Cook County. Because a cap was written into law, the amount the county was paying into our pension system was not close to keeping pace with its current obligations. So, we came up with a simple solution by making a larger pension fund contribution than State Law required through an intergovernment agreement. To the date, they have been responsible by paying an extra \$2.3 billion and increased the fund ratio of pension considerability. We're now asking this legislation to make these higher payments permanent through

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

legislation. This Bill has support of our pension fund as well and our pensioners. Additionally, this legislation assures that the county is consistent with federal safe harbor guidance by tying the Tier 2 cap to the Social Security wage base. This legislation has no cost to the state, and all financial obligations are the counties. It also adds eligibility for employees to accrue requirement service credit for military service, prioritizing our great men and women who serve this country. They have worked with their actuary and are comfortable with taking on the projected cost. This does not impact other pension systems, just Cook County. I humbly ask for your support."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Reick is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He will."

Reick: "Representative, does this... I know you say that this Bill is revenue... it doesn't have an impact on revenue. Are you saying this does not include a tax increase?"

Evans: "It doesn't have impact on state revenues."

Reick: "It will have an impact on county revenues is what you're saying?"

Evans: "I don't believe so. I think... they believe they have the fiscal capability to keep that from happening. But we see an impact, I mean, there's always going to be a cost. It currently has an impact. You have to pay into it. So, I'm not really... it's hard to answer that question. I mean, every... all of their obligations have an impact on revenue."

Reick: "In committee it was discussed that what we're looking at here is a Bill that merely extends this... the current practice

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

of Cook County to allow for what... what is actually happening, putting it into statute. So, what... if Cook County is currently levying taxes, both in terms of sales tax allocations and property taxes, what's the need for this Bill, Sir?"

Evans: "Again, as I mentioned in the statement, my understanding is that it writes it in law and allows them to... it allows them to make the higher payments and to be even more fiscally responsible, understanding there are some restrictions within the law and them making the above requirement payments. So, they want to make sure they make those above requirement payments."

Reick: "Okay. During... during committee, again, we were... we discussed the fact that Cook County's funding ratio has gone from like 50 percent up to, say, 63 percent, or something like that. My question is, is there any provision in this Bill that says once Cook County attains a funding ratio of ... let's pretend we're in a perfect world and it hits a hundred percent. Is there anything in this Bill that says, okay, we're going to put the brakes on what is being done here and move away from a funding or a... or a model that takes not only the money to pay for current accrual but... the underfunded accrual and moves that back to a normal funding levy or a normal funding allocation of taxes so that maybe we could have a tax decrease or... or a tax cut for Cook County taxpayers once they've fulfilled their obligation to fund their parent pensions up to a hundred percent?"

Evans: "Yes. It's my understanding that they communicated with you in committee that they're open to whatever possible restriction that you would be looking for. But it's also my

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

understanding that because of the President's Office and Cook County's fiscal responsibility, they don't anticipate any tax increases to cover these costs because they've been so fiscally responsible. But they're always open to considering that, and I am as well."

Reick: "But my... okay then, if you're willing to consider it, are you willing to consider a trailer Bill that provides for language that says what goes up must come down once we reach our goal?"

Evans: "Yes, yes."

Reick: "Okay. I guess... and can you explain the... the change in the way that Cook County is assessing its property taxes from the levy model to a blended or the model that's described in... in the Bill?"

Evans: "Yeah. I have the Bill here. I'm... I'm trying to figure out where you see a property tax change."

Reick: "Where... I'm talking about replacing the multiplier applied to the existing property taxes to the entry age actuarial cost method using a 30-year layered amortization for unfunded liabilities. Can you discuss that change in... in calculation for me, please?"

Evans: "Yeah, again, we have to be clear. That's not a change in property taxes. That's a change in how they assess the fund. In their view, they were doing it in a very old, antiquated way. Now, they'll be doing it in a way that's more actuarially sound. Again, the county has already been fiscally conservative. Now, they're going an additional step by relying more on actuary analysis."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Reick: "But what this does... what the... the method that I just described. Right now, Cook County is on an unsustainable pathway, a ramp, as it were, to bring property taxes down, where in about 20 years they're going to be paying a huge amount of property taxes if they stay on the ramp. Whereas, this entry age levels out the amount. So, there is a change to the property tax levy, the way... the way taxes are levied for pension purposes in Cook County. Can you... can you describe for us exactly what that does and... and explain how that does benefit the Cook County... the general Cook County taxpayer, please?"

Evans: "Again, overall fiscal responsibility from an executive office benefits the taxpayers. I think living in Cook County my whole life, being involved in government and politics for the last 20 years, I think you've seen great utilization of county funds. They're generally in the black. We're talking about a well-funded pension system. These are just things to make it even more well-funded. So, some of the concerns you have are just general tax concerns. It's not germane and specific to this Bill. There's no change in the levies. They're trying to do a good job better, and I think we should allow them to do it because... there's Bills for you to have an issue with, and I'm not... but this is just not one of them. Because I'm looking for the problems, and they don't really exist in this particular legislation."

Reick: "But... to the Bill, Madam Speaker. We had a really robust discussion, both in subject matter and today in committee, about this Bill. And I think over here we're going to see some yeses and some noes. What we're doing... what this Bill

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

does is this codifies current practice in Cook County and has some features to it that I think are attractive, not only for Cook County, but probably for municipalities statewide, if we could move to this entry... entry-level position or at consider discussing it. I think that what we're looking at here is an effort by Cook County to memorialize current practice so that if there's a change in administration in Cook County somewhere down the road, a... a subsequent administration won't backslide and put us back in the position where the Cook County funding ratio is even... is worse than it is. It's going in the right direction. I will support the Bill, but I would like my... my colleagues to vote their switch. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Wilhour is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Wilhour: "Thank you. Leader Evans, we hear a lot about the safe harbor provision when we're talking about pensions, especially here lately. And you mentioned that, and I know that Senator Martwick, that's one of the… one of the reasons that he is pushing Bills like this. Could you explain why this Bill is necessary in regards to the safe harbor provision?"

Evans: "It's to guarantee that the pension benefits are sufficient for the county to remain outside of the Social Security system. And it ties the pensionable salary cap to the Social Security wage base for Cook County Tier 2 employees. And in general, just as far as my opinion, it's important because we want to make sure our pensioners receive the money in which they deserve."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Wilhour: "Okay. Well, what's the ... what's the evidence that you have that safe harbor is even an issue on this ... in this system?"

Evans: "I don't know that this Bill is solving an issue. That's the wonderful part about this Bill. Things are going good. They're looking to make things better and be more fiscally responsible and start that process to demonstrate even more fiscal responsibility. So, again, I think some of the concerns that you all have are just general concerns, and there is a Bill for your concerns. This particular Bill is just not for the concerns in which you have. Everything is going okay. They actually want to do better. And I'm shocked, too, you know."

Wilhour: "I... I appreciate that, but my understanding in committee is they are actually doing a... I wouldn't... I don't know if I would call it an actuarial analysis, but they are doing an analysis on this system right now. And my understanding is there will be a report forthcoming on whether or not safe harbor is a... is a issue on this legislation. Wouldn't it be prudent to wait until we get that report before we... before we make this change?"

Evans: "Yeah, well, I think safe harbor is an issue in every..."

Wilhour: "Is it?

Evans: "...yeah, in every one, but..."

Wilhour: "There's no actuarial analysis on any of this stuff that...
that we're talking about, where safe harbor is even an issue
at all. We talk about safe harbor constantly in here. We're
changing these systems. We put \$3 billion on to the City of
Chicago last week or the week before, based off of these safe

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

harbor... basically, could be an illusion. You know, shouldn't we... shouldn't we be running actuarial analysis to see if this is an issue before we... before we just enhance pensions and do the things that we do here?"

Evans: "Yeah, well, I agree with you, and there's a Bill for all of that. But that has absolutely nothing to do with this one."

Wilhour: "What do you mean there's a Bill for all of that?"

Evans: "Well, there's a Bill..."

Wilhour: "It seems to me there's about 15 or 20 Bills for... for all of that, but we never... we never deal with the issue of whether or not this is actually a problem."

Evans: "Yeah, but you are correct."

Wilhour: "Do we want to fix Tier 2? Do we want to fix Tier 2? Or do we want to enhance benefits? We need to make... we need to make that determination here."

Evans: "Yes. And, again, I join you, but there may be a Bill in which your concerns are germane to. This Bill is doing some very clear-cut things. Everything is okay. They want to make it better."

Wilhour: "Okay. Well, I... I appreciate that aspect of it. My understanding in... in committee in looking at this Bill is basically they... they are doing this right now. They're levying for this. They're levying this amount right now. What we're doing is we are codifying into state statute the current practice that is... that is being done right now so that, you know, let's say there's a change in the Cook County Board or a change of perspective or something like that, that this current practice will... will continue to go on. Is that... would that be accurate?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Evans: "Well, I think if... whatever new administration will come in the future, if they want to participate in fiscal responsibility and pay an additional cost and increase the pension reliability for our pensioneers, I think that's fine. What you're saying is neither wrong or correct. I guess they can be more fiscally responsible. Again... again, we have to get back to this Bill. Many of your concerns are about pensions in general. This pension system is funded well. They want to pay more. They want to make sure military service is clear. They have the revenues to make it. This is not a tax increase. All these questions make sense, just not for this Bill. This is one that we can support. Everything is going good. Fiscal responsibility is happening in Cook County and... yeah."

Wilhour: "You say fiscal responsibility is happening in the terms of they're... they're funding this system to... to what you... what you want to fund it and what probably we should fund it. But to say that, you know, that everything is fiscally responsible, I think there's taxpayers in Cook County and the City of Chicago that would certainly disagree with you. But I'll go to the... go to the Bill here. What we are doing here, there's... there's a couple different things. Number one, there's no actuarial analysis to say that safe harbor is even an issue. So, it's imprudent to be voting on this kind of stuff without that analysis put out there. And number two, the biggest thing that we are doing is we are, as a General Assembly, codifying into state statute a tax increase on... on Cook County. We're codifying an increased levy on Cook County right now. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is a tax increase.

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Voting for this is voting for a state-mandated tax increase on a... on a locality. That should be a... definitely should be a local decision. We have no business doing that here in the General Assembly. So, I would strongly encourage a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Weaver is recognized."

Weaver: "Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

"I quess, first of all, I want to thank you guys for bringing this forward. I commend Cook County leadership for wanting to solidify practices happening today to make sure the pension is adequately funded. But to say that it doesn't have anything to do with safe harbor, I just think is... is incorrect. You know, there's a piece of it that says, 'wages of Tier 2 participant under Cook County Article shall track with Social Security wage base.' In our committee hearings, we asked Cook County and the fund, is this a safe harbor provision? To which they told us, yes. So, I don't know how we can say it's not safe harbor when in committee they told it was. And while I expect to be a 'yes' vote on this because the county's getting serious about funding their pensions, the fact is that we have not done analysis on what is required for safe harbor. And it's irresponsible to claim that this is for safe harbor when we don't know what safe harbor is. So, what am I missing? Is it safe harbor or was the county and the pension fund wrong?"

Evans: "Well, I think it's my understanding that's an issue with the Social Security Administration. And, you know, you're saying safe harbor over and over again, but I just don't think

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

that's an issue for this legislation because it's not impacted. If so, again, that's an issue for the Social Security Administration to get involved. There was a question asked about an actuary analysis to figure out if you're in violation. Again, the Social Security Administration is constantly engaging with Cook County. So, you're concerned about a problem that will be addressed with the county administration. And it's really not, you know, germane to this particular piece of legislation and what they're trying to do. And I trust the county leadership to address whatever safe harbor issues will come as they engage with Social Security Administration and the fund. So, it's kind of... that's a concern that's not really greatly impacted by this legislation."

Weaver: "I think that we're just a little caught off guard to hear that because when we were in committee what we heard from the county and the fund is that it was. We don't need to belabor it. Like I said, I'm going to be a 'yes' vote on it. I appreciate what the county is trying to do to solidify these funding contributions to make it solid for the future, but we've got to do analysis on what the safe harbor delta is before we just start making assumptions about how much more benefits we need to give. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative McLaughlin's recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

McLaughlin: "Representative, I'm glad we've got pension Bills coming before the House. If I remember correctly, last year, we did it on the last day as well. I just want to make sure

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

I heard your analysis correctly. You said we're doing well in our pensions. I..."

Evans: "This particular one. All I'm talking about is what we have in front of us. So, whatever other pension funds... this particular fund, it's my understanding is funded well into 60 percent, and that this legislation, that with the additional contributions, will shore that up. So, specifically talking about this fund."

McLaughlin: "Okay. So, this one's 60 percent funding?"

Evans: "Again, it's my understanding it's somewhere in that 60 percent range. With the continuing contributions, it'll be really high soon. Even more than that soon."

McLaughlin: "Yeah, I just want to make sure that if the public's listening we aren't giving them an unrealistic expectation. When you add all the pensions together in Chicago, they are about 34 percent funded, and they're almost on the verge of insolvency. So, as it relates to this one pension, I appreciate you stating that 60 percent. Again, IMRF and those plans are up significantly higher. So, I just want to make sure that when we state that we're healthy and we're doing well that we're accurate on the funding ratio because, to Representative Wilhour's comments, I'm extremely concerned about recognizing the liability at this stage. We should have recognized it 20 years ago. But I appreciate you answering that question and just want to make sure that our side knows the specifics of this one fund. And I would love to discuss the other funds in the City of Chicago before the last day of Session next Session. So, if you could help me with that, I would join you in doing that, Sir."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Evans: "I'll do my best."

McLaughlin: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

Speaker Burke: "Leader Evans to close."

Evans: "I request your support. And, again, I really applaud the leadership of Cook County for being fiscally responsible with this fund. I got a lot of pensioners in my community. I want them to have a pension. And eventually we'll solve all the other problems, but please join me in passing this Bill so we can shore up this one particular fund. And really thank Cook County for their strong leadership. So, I ask for your support."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2352?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed... all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2352. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Gabel's recognized."

Gabel: "Speaker, let the record show that Representative Carol Ammons is excused for the rest of today."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Reick."

Reick: "Point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Burke: "Please proceed."

Reick: "You know, I think this last discussion we had points out something that is becoming more and more quite evident on

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

this floor. There are two types of diversity. There's a diversity of people who look different but think the same. And there's a diversity of thought. There's a diversity of opinion. There's a diversity of philosophy. And there's a diversity of opinion on legislation all over the place that comes from this side of the aisle. We had a very robust discussion, and my good friend from Beecher City spoke against this Bill. I spoke in favor of the Bill. We had some people voted 'yes', some people voted 'no'. So, I guess the point I'm trying to make is, where is the real diversity in this room? The real diversity is over here. It's us. We think about what we're doing here, instead of looking at the board and figuring out how we're going to vote. So, I would invite any Member over on the other side of the aisle who wants true, honest-to-goodness diversity, join us. Come on over here. The water's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Next on the Calendar, we have House Bill 2450, Representative Avelar."

Avelar: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am asking today for the Body to concur on Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2450. As amended, HB2450 will ensure that health care providers will have the tools and knowledge to effectively serve the neurodiverse community, while at the same time providing providers with the flexibility they need in order to fulfill their continuing education requirements. I will go over a little bit about what each Amendment does. So, Senate... Senate Floor Amendment 3 does the following. It adds one hour of health care cultural competency training. It provides health care professionals two licensure... licensure cycles to take

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

mandated hours on opioids, Alzheimer's, and cultural competency. For those professionals who have received opioid training and are mandated at the federal level to take the eight hours for a DEA license, it reduces the state-mandated hours from three hours to one hour. And it also adds a trigger mechanism that if any more mandates are added, then the time period in which health care professionals have to complete all the statutory mandates will be extended to three licensure cycles for physicians and dentists and four licensure cycles for other health care professionals. We are also maintaining that implicit bias and sexual harassment be taken every licensure cycle. Senate Floor Amendment 4 requires every new professional to take Alzheimer's training during their first renewal cycle. And at this moment, I'm open to any questions."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Avelar, there's a question about the Amendments that you're adopting. We're showing that the Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 were adopted in committee."

Avelar: "Yes, that's correct. And we are concurring on Senate Amendment 3 and 4. And 1 and 2, I'm sorry."

Speaker Burke: "All right. So, we're moving to concur in Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4?"

Avelar: "That's correct."

Speaker Burke: "Okay. All right, Representative Windhorst."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. This has to do with professional or continuing education requirements primarily. Is that the… the focus of the Bill?"

Avelar: "That is correct."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "It looked like the vote in committee and over in the Senate had a few 'no' votes from the Republican side, but our analysis shows that this ultimately ended up being a negotiated Bill. Is that..."

Avelar: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "...accurate? And who was involved in that negotiation?"

Avelar: "Sure. The stakeholders that were involved in the negotiation included the Illinois State Medical Society, Equality Illinois, and other entities. You know, this legislation is supported by civil rights and community health care and labor groups. So, I could give you a list of everybody who supports the Bill as well. That includes Access Living, Equality Illinois, Citizen Action Illinois, Illinois Nurses Association, AIDS Foundation, as well as other medical societies too, in the State of Illinois."

Windhorst: "Is there anyone who's opposed to the Bill?"

Avelar: "Yes. So, we do have opposition, and this is the Alzheimer's Association, as well as AARP Illinois. And the nature of the opposition is given that... what this will do is for the Alzheimer's requirement, the required training, instead of happening every single cycle, this Bill would make it so that it happens in every other cycle."

Windhorst: "And I'm assuming that was an accommodation made with the stakeholders during the negotiation."

Avelar: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hauter's recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hauter: "Well, thank you to the Sponsor, Representative Avelar, and for Chairman Morgan's work on this. I know you did great work to get so many different medical society and organizations. Can you just give us a... kind of a flavor... I know you did with Representative... or Leader Windhorst, but could you just give us a flavor of the breadth of medical society who were opponents..."

Avelar: "Yes."

Hauter: "...and then became proponents of this?"

Avelar: "Sure. So, we have the Illinois State Medical Society, the Illinois State Dental Society, the American Nurses Association of Illinois, the Illinois Optometric Society, the Illinois Society for Advanced Practice Nursing, the Illinois Radiology Society, the Illinois Pharmacist Association, the Illinois Society of Eye Physicians and Surgeons, Illinois Chiropractors Society, and I have about 10 more associations as well."

Hauter: "Okay. All right. Thank you for that. And it just demonstrates just a wide variety of different medical organizations who... who are supporting this. Is there any mandated... like what's the net gain on mandated courses now versus... versus courses that are not mandated or the amount of hours are not mandated now?"

Avelar: "Yes. With this occurring change, what it would allow is for the net gain of an hour back to health care professionals to do training in the topic that they choose."

Hauter: "Okay. And also, are you committed to, in the future, limiting the number of mandated hours for CMEs for health care professionals in the future?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Avelar: "I'm definitely open to those conversations. That's those conversations we just had this Session."

"To the Bill. So, I rise today in support of this Bill, Hauter: as amended. And I rise in support of Illinois health care professionals who are increasingly frustrated with the politicians and special interest groups managing controlling our continuing medical education. I can't emphasize enough how important this topic is to so many health care professionals. And the Sponsor demonstrated how many organizations and special interest groups in health care that are in support of this Bill. I know there's people like me on the floor, there's Dr. Jacobs, there's Dr. Schmidt, who this affects greatly. Health care professionals must take hours and hours of continuing medical education, CMEs, to maintain their licensure. And, unfortunately, the State of Illinois, this state, and this General Assembly, and others have, over the years, unlike most every other state, started to heavily mandate specific, maybe important, topics, but are often redundant and unnecessary in our CMEs. Can health care professionals make the decisions on what's critically important to our areas of continuing education and not politicians and special interest groups with their own agendas and ideologies? Once again, politicians and special interest groups have no idea what we are dealing with, and they are deciding for us the topics that they think that are important and that they think that we need to be educated on and crowding out topics to our specialty that are just patient-related and very patient safety-oriented. It's gotten out of control. I mean, look, we are in a highly changing,

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

highly specialized field of health care where the research, the literature, and the diseases themselves are complex and rapidly changing. People's lives are on the line, and it's reached the point where politicians constantly tell us what we need to know. It's absolutely out of control, and this Bill changes that. We see so many redundancies all over the system and people not communicating what they think is important for us to know. As the Sponsor said, the Drug Enforcement Agency just added eight hours of opioids on already three hours that we have at the state level. They don't talk. And it's often unnecessary. We have Alzheimer and dementia awareness training that is not essential to many specialties in the... in the house of medicine. And to the specialties that it does apply to, like dementia awareness, it is an embarrassment and an insult for them to take a high school level course on something like dementia awareness. The point is, I'm asking you to let health care professionals control our own CME once again. This Bill begins to do that. And although there is another mandate and it's not a great Bill, that's what makes it, I think, a good Bill. It reforms and acknowledges that we need to be in control of our health care CME, and some of these mandated CME hours are reduced, spaced out, sunsetted, and flexible. This Bill is a step in the right direction. We have a long way to go. The Sponsor is committed to doing the work that it needs to take to give us back our CME. Vote 'yes'. Continue to vote 'yes'. Give us back our CME again. Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Frese is recognized."

Frese: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Burke: "She indicates she will."

Frese: "Representative, in committee... and I believe one of your first questions you answered was about who was opposing your Bill. And the Alzheimer's Association was in opposition, correct?"

Avelar: "That is correct."

Frese: "Could you tell me the nature, again, of that opposition?"

Avelar: "Sure. The opposition is because currently the law, as it stands, it makes it so that health care professionals have to take an Alzheimer's training any time that they are up for their renewal cycle. What this change would do is it would actually make it so that they are... health care professionals are required to do their... their training every other cycle. I will say that even with this change, we still continue to have the strongest Alzheimer's training requirement in the nation. And I just want to make sure that I put that on the record."

Frese: "And the Alzheimer's awareness group were... they were in committee, and they also stated that they were not invited to the table for this discussion. Is that... is that a true statement?"

Avelar: "I would say that I particularly engage with the Alzheimer's Association and AARP, and I was aware of their opposition and tried to work with them, and I will continue to work with them."

Frese: "Yeah, okay. But they said that they were not... this... your Bill affected them. It changed what they negotiated for in a previous General Assembly. So, I would think that they would probably belong at the table for negotiation in this

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

particular Bill. But they're saying they were not. Is that a true statement?"

Avelar: "I'm not... I'm not disputing that when it comes to the changes that we're making that we are making it so that requirement is not every cycle, as opposed to every other cycle. But I can tell you that I engaged the Alzheimer's Association as well as AARP the moment that I found out about their opposition."

Frese: "Well, I will just voice for them their displeasure for not being included. Because, believe me, I know how that feels when you're not included at the table to discuss things. So, they should not be treated like a minority party, for one thing. Secondly, I just want to mention that this went through the Senate, but it was not unanimous, correct? That vote... do you remember what the Senate vote was?"

Avelar: "That is correct."

Frese: "Is it 52 to 4?"

Avelar: "I could check that really quick. Give me just a second."

Frese: "Let me look too. Yeah, it does say on my analysis 52 to 4 and with 3 people not voting. Is that correct?"

Avelar: "That is correct."

Frese: "All right. Well, I... you know, I opposed your Bill in committee. However, I find your Bill to be a much, much improved Bill than when it... when it first started. I want to appreciate the work that you did and all the people you did bring in. I just wish some of the others would have also, and we could have had a, you know, a slide-through Bill. So, thank you for your work. I'll probably voting 'no' on this particular measure."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Burke: "Representative Avelar to close."

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

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2450?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 2450. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 8 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 3062, Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 and 3 to House Bill 3062. This is an initiative of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois and would indicate that Sangamon and Cook counties are the only venues proper for Illinois constitutional claims seeking declaratory or adjunctive relief from any law, rule, or executive order when such claims are brought against the state or any of its officers, employees, or agents acting in their official capacity. The Amendment also expressly provides that the doctrine of forum non conveniens does not apply to these constitutional claims brought against the state. We all know that over the past three years there have been several lawsuits that have been... been filed across the state regarding constitutional issues... regarding constitutional issues. These

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

issues have been brought in counties and there has been considerable judge shopping as a tactic that's been used by litigants to secure sweeping court orders blocking state policies by steering cases to judges perceived to be sympathetic to these causes. We have, in other instances, indicated that Sangamon and Cook County would be the venues for certain actions. This would simply say that for constitutional actions that are brought against the state that those would be the same venues because it has been very difficult for the Attorney General's Office, with limited office resources that go throughout the entire state, many times without sufficient notice, in order to defend these actions. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Leader, if you could, what is the reason behind bringing this Bill?"

Hoffman: "Well, as I indicated, I think more recently than ever, you know, over the past three years, the Attorney General's Office has been forced to respond to, I would call them in many cases, frivolous lawsuits that have strained the office's limited resources. And I believe that many cases, it has been a result of judge shopping, which is a tactic that has been used by many litigants to secure sweeping court orders blocking state policies by steering cases to judges perceived to be sympathetic to their causes. We're limiting this to constitutional issues, and we're saying that Sangamon County or Cook County would be the proper venue. These cases

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

are normally all coming here anyway, so let's just say that the original venue is going to be here."

Windhorst: "So, part of it is the Attorney General's limited resources in dealing with these actions. Is that what I understood you to say?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Windhorst: "This is the same Attorney General's Office that has requested from this Body additional authority to investigate and bring actions against crisis pregnancy centers this Session, to bring actions against and investigate gun manufacturers this Session? It doesn't seem that the Attorney General's Office is lacking in resources when they're constantly coming to this Body requesting more authority to do things. So, I think that argument strains credulity."

Hoffman: "What was that word?"

Windhorst: "I'm not sure."

Hoffman: "Gredualty? What'd you... okay. Interesting."

Windhorst: "Trying to test the typists upstairs."

Hoffman: "Yes. I can just... I can tell you what the... the Attorney General's Office, how they responded in committee. They indicated that these are constitutional actions. They have certain constitutional lawyers that they... who are specializing in these types of actions. So, when you receive last-minute notices about a county that is far away from where these constitutional officers... or constitutional lawyers are working, that it's very difficult to respond adequately."

Windhorst: "Well, the Attorney General's Office, as you know, has offices throughout the state. In fact, I believe there are 10 offices outside of Cook County itself that are... that are

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Statewide. So, from my perspective, it appears the Attorney General has adequate resources and adequate personnel to deal with these issues. In fact, as I said, they've been coming to us repeatedly this Session requesting more authority. So, for... this argument does not, in my opinion, hold any weight. So, I want... you're familiar with the Mathews balancing test, which is used... oh, I'm sorry, was used to... in Williams v. Illinois Scholarship Commission?"

Hoffman: "I'm familiar with the case."

Windhorst: "Yes. In that... in that case, a venue restriction was held to be unconstitutional."

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

Windhorst: "Saying that it violated due process."

Hoffman: "Yes, but there are distinctions between this proposal and that... that ruling. If you would... I can point them out if..."

Windhorst: "Go ahead."

Hoffman: "Okay. The... the Williams case dealt with a defendant. They were essentially being deprived of access to court because they were deemed indigent. And they were talking about defendants here, okay? They were talking about providing that a defendant had to go to Cook County. It didn't indicate... in this case, what we're talking about is constitutional matters. The defendant is the state, right? So, the distinction is... is in these cases what we're talking about is we're talking the plaintiff, not the defendant being inconvenienced, which was the Williams case."

Windhorst: "So, in my community, if this Body passes a constitutionally questionable piece of legislation, which we

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

appear to do routinely, that results in a court challenge, people from my community will have to travel to Springfield to challenge that action. It cannot challenge that in Massac County. Is that accurate?"

Hoffman: "Under this proposal, Sangamon and Cook would have... would be the proper venue. And incidentally, this is not uncommon. We've done it in several instances where we have provided that Cook or Sangamon County would be the proper venue. For instance, cases brought by the Attorney General to eliminate a pattern or practice of constitutional violations, cases brought by the Attorney General of Illinois to compel compliance with Section 3.5 of the Open Meetings Act, they also have venue in Sangamon or Cook County. Judicial review of certain final administrative decisions relating to the Collection Agency Act and judicial review of certain final administrative decisions relating to the Community Association Manager Licensing and Disciplinary Act, those are all venue would be in Cook or Sangamon County."

Windhorst: "Well, I appreciate that list, but this is much broader than the list you provided. And this is going to have a much bigger impact on individuals in our various communities who want to get justice in their local community, rather than having to travel to Springfield or Chicago to get that justice. You know, where I live, we... I'm closer to the state capital of Tennessee than I am Illinois. And I'm almost as close to Atlanta, Georgia as I am Chicago, Illinois. So, to say if this Body passes an unconstitutional law, in order for me or another person in my community to contest that law, I've got to travel a great distance and bear that expense

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

that comes with that. It's not fair to the individuals in these communities."

Hoffman: "Yeah, I... I believe... so, this proposal would say venue is in Sangamon or Cook. If you were to prevail on constitutional issues, it's my understanding many times the awarding party is giving... given expenses of cost."

Windhorst: "So, I think the better explanation isn't the expense to the Attorney General's Office, isn't the strain on their office and may be more about the judge shopping, basically getting rulings that are not favorable to the Majority Party. But I think the ultimate reason why this Bill is being brought is because you can. You're bringing this forward because you can do it. And we are seeing efforts made to undermine the legitimacy of the court system by efforts like this. We redrew the maps for the... for our Appellate and Supreme Court because you could. You did that because you could. Something unfavorable happened in an election, and you changed the maps. an unfavorable court ruling, where legitimately go to their home court where they live and get a ruling that you don't like or your side doesn't like, and you change the rules. The ends do not justify the means. To the Bill. We have seen many counties throughout our state pass Resolutions saying we don't feel a part of the State of Illinois. We don't want to be a part of the State of Illinois because they're passing these Resolutions, because they don't feel the respect from certain parts of the State of Illinois. And what this Bill does is it basically says you're right. You can't go to court in your local jurisdiction. You can't get justice in your local jurisdiction. You've got to come to

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Springfield or Chicago to get justice, and that is fundamentally wrong. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins is recognized."

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

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Caulkins: "Before I get started, Representative, I take great umbrage in your assessment that my court case was trivial, that I should have to travel somewhere else to get to my court case..."

Hoffman: "I did not... I did not use the term 'trivial'. I did not."

Caulkins: "What did you use? What term did you use?"

Hoffman: "I believe I... and I wasn't necessarily referring to your court case."

Caulkins: "Well, it was a constitutional challenge in Macon County, and you called it, I'll use the word 'trivial'."

Hoffman: "I called... I said 'certain'. I didn't..."

Caulkins: "But by your..."

Hoffman: "Hold it... can I... I'll answer."

Caulkins: "Yes, Sir."

Hoffman: "And then you can whale on me. I said 'certain frivolous actions'. I didn't say 'trivial'. And I don't... I'm not saying that your action is frivolous. I said in other cases I would have deemed them frivolous."

Caulkins: "You also said that the Attorney General gets short notice on these hearings. We know that's not the case. I know personally that's not the case. It took us days and weeks to get a hearing before the judge. And the Attorney General's Office was engaged for weeks and weeks. There's no sneaking up on the Attorney General and giving him a constitutional

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

challenge case in some court other than Sangamon or Cook. And this... that goes to the crux of the case. Representative, we have 25 trial courts spread all over 102 counties so that people can get justice where they live. Don't you trust the local judges that we elect, Representative?"

- Hoffman: "What... what I'm saying is that we... these cases are all ending up here in Sangamon County or Cook County. Why don't we just say that venue is proper for constitutional issues here."
- Caulkins: "That's some of the most convoluted reasoning I've ever heard. Representative, isn't this an attempt to use your handpicked, tamed judges in Chicago and Springfield to continue the ongoing legal assault on our rights?"
- Hoffman: "I apologize. I thought you were making a statement. I... could you restate it?"
- Caulkins: "Isn't this an attempt to use your handpicked, tamed judges in Chicago and Springfield to continue the ongoing legal assault on our rights, as opposed to being able to go to a local court?"

Hoffman: "I've not handpicked any judges. But can I make a point?" Caulkins: "Well, they have in Chicago."

Hoffman: "But can I... I have not. And I... the voters vote on the judges. I don't handpick them. But can I make a point about Sangamon County?"

Caulkins: "Certainly."

Hoffman: "Can I make a point about Sangamon County? I think a reference was made to the Majority Party wanting to basically change these rules to help out the Majority Party. In Sangamon County, in the circuit that it is part of, it's my

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

understanding that there isn't one… one member of the judiciary that is a member of the Majority Party, that's a Democrat. It's all Republicans, okay? It's all Republicans. So, to say that we're trying to… to somehow venue shop to help us, they're all members of your party, the judges here."

Caulkins: "How'd they do it in Chicago, Representative?"

Hoffman: "They're elected the same way that judges are elected throughout the entire state."

Caulkins: "And how many members of the Minority Party are there?

Let's move on."

Hoffman: "But the plaintiff picks. The plaintiff picks. You bring the action. I would assume if... if this Bill were law, I would assume if you picked, you would pick Sangamon County as opposed to Cook."

Caulkins: "I... I pick Macon County."

Hoffman: "The defendant does not pick."

Caulkins: "I would pick the county where I live to bring an action. Representative, are you at all concerned that this is a violation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers?"

Hoffman: "No."

Caulkins: "Don't courts have the power to decide if a litigant has standing to bring a lawsuit, not the Legislature?"

Hoffman: "Venue is statutory."

Caulkins: "No, but this is the Constitution."

Hoffman: "No, this is statutory."

Caulkins: "To the Bill, please. This is a Bill that will trample your rights, my rights, and make our citizens drive hundreds of miles to get justice in a court that has proven it will

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

favor the state over you. Article 6 of Section 9 of the Illinois Constitution says that the trial courts of the state are the courts of original jurisdiction of all justifiable matters... jurisdictional matters. That means any of the 25 trial courts covering our 102 counties can hear any kind of cases. We should let them do their job. This is... it's not even clear that the Legislature... this legislation has the power to take that away. Make no mistakes, the Democrat Sponsors of this Bill are acting just like King George III. In the Declaration of Independence, the Americans declared that King George was unfit to rule because he was forcing them to be tried overseas by his tame courts for made-up crimes. The Democrats today are doing the very same thing. They pass unconstitutional laws to make law-abiding citizens criminals and then they make those same citizens travel hundreds of miles to a kangaroo court that they control. Tyrants are always the same, whether kings or lawless Chicago politicians. I urge a 'no' vote and would ask for a verification."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Ugaste is recognized."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Good to see you up there again.
Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Burke: "He indicates he will."

Ugaste: "Leader Hoffman, you've... you've answered quite a few questions about this, so I'll try not to be repetitive. I may have missed something, but I don't think I have. Is there an exclusion in this Bill for any one group involved in collective bargaining?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hoffman: "There... there is an exclusion that... not for anyone involved in collective bargaining, but for collective bargaining disputes between the state and representatives of its employees are expressly exempted from these venue provisions."

Ugaste: "So, the unions would be exempt?"

Hoffman: "If there was a claim against the state that dealt with a constitutional issue."

Ugaste: "Okay. And why is that exist?"

Hoffman: "I think... I think if you look at how collective bargaining is regulated, it is largely regulated by federal labor law, which is way different than Illinois constitutional claims."

Ugaste: "But this law only deals with challenges to Illinois constitutional claims. It's not for every suit brought against the state, correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Ugaste: "Okay. So, their... their challenges would only be for Illinois constitutional challenges. So, the federal exemption truly wouldn't apply, would it?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that they would fall under the Contract Article of Constitution. So, if some were brought under the Contract Article of Constitution... of our Constitution, that this would indeed exempt them from these venue provisions. But I would say that still labor law, federal labor law, still preempts most state labor law."

Ugaste: "Okay. Thank you, Leader Hoffman. To the Bill. So, we are about to consider a Bill to affect 12 and a half million Illinoisans because the Attorney General's resources are

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

apparently spread too thin. In many instances in the state when some department or agency comes and tells us they're spread too thin, we do one thing. We provide more resources. That would seem to me to be the obvious answer, is provide more resources to the Attorney General's Office if they need them in order to defend against constitutional challenges. That way, the rights of the Illinois citizens remain unaffected. But instead, for some unknown reason, we're now being asked to take the opposite approach. We are going to impact the rights of 12 and a half million Illinois citizens to have access to courts. And I know a case was brought up and it was mentioned it was unconstitutional and the Leader mentioned that in fact it involved indigents and plaintiffs. But you know what? There are indigent people in 102 counties of Illinois and one of them may feel that their constitutional rights are being challenged, and they may just find a local attorney or someone with just enough money to file something locally for them. But now, we're going to take that away because now they either have to go Sangamon County or Cook County because allegedly the Attorney General's spread too thin. And I do say allegedly, and I'll address that a little more towards the end, but we haven't even seen proof of that because, as our Floor Leader mentioned, he's asking for further duties and we are providing him with that opportunity on the floor all Session. As I indicated, we are now about to affect the individual... an individual's right in this state to challenge the constitutionality of laws and Executive Orders to solely two counties. We are denying access to court. And as the Sponsor already pointed out, if it's a problem for the

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Attorney General's Office, there's a remedy that exists. The Supreme Court of Illinois will consolidate the cases. A petition can be filed. And the cases can be consolidated already in a venue of the Supreme Court's choosing. We provide an exclusion for labor unions. And I heard the Sponsor's answer, but I think there's a better explanation. Working men and women shouldn't have to pay union dues to spend extra money to have their cases challenged in the courts of Sangamon County or Cook County exclusively. They should have a right to file them in the county where they are as well. What I can't understand is why we believe that Illinois citizens shouldn't share that same benefit, especially ones who have far less money than our unions. If the AG's Office is spread too thin, we shouldn't have passed those earlier Bills. If they want a specialist involved... you know, there's something I was reminded of when I first became an attorney, and that's we are an attorney, and we're trained in all areas of the law. And if there's an issue we need to consider, well the Attorney General can ask one of their other attorneys to do it. Maybe it's not their preferred attorney. Maybe it's not the best one in the office on the case. But I'm sure it's one more than competent of handling the issue. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask that all of us think hard before we vote on this Bill. We should be a lot more concerned about our citizens' rights than whether the Attorney General's Office gets to have a particular attorney they want in a case defending that case before a particular court. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Hoffman to close."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. So, let me just clarify for the record a couple of things. First of all, this Bill would allow a more workable process for the Attorney General's Office to be able to manage cases filed regarding constitutional issues. That's what it does. It would streamline cases, make sure that these cases are heard in an organized fashion, and prevent misuse of our venue statutes. Venue, proper venue, it's an important statutory privilege that's held by the defendant. defendant. In Illinois, proper venue is granted by the Code Civil Procedure. Courts have repeated... repeatedly interpreted the venue statute as a Legislature's view that the defendant should not be burdened. The defendant should not be burdened with defending an action in a location that does not have connection to the action. Further, the venue statute serves to protect the defendant against plaintiffs' arbitrary selection of forum. Now, we all know what has happened over the past few years. There have been judicial shopping by filing TROs without early notice to the Attorney General's Office, whether they were COVID-related restrictions, whether they were masks, whether they were vaccines, whether they were SAFE-T Acts, whether they were assault weapons ban, and the list goes on and on, to the extent that one lawyer was charging people \$200 just to have their name added as plaintiffs to the lawsuit. Now, where have these cases ended up? They've ended up in Sangamon County. They've ended up here. And, incidentally, another issue that we are addressing here is we are indicating that the doctrine of forum non conveniens does not apply to these

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

constitutional claims brought against the state. So, what does this Bill do? It makes the doctrine of forum non conveniens, which is a product of judicial creation as opposed to venue, not applicable in the context of the new venue statute, and for good reason. For good reason. Forum non conveniens is a relic. It's old. It's past its time. Even before the pandemic, the idea that a given county within the State of Illinois was inconvenient for the purpose of conducting a trial was nonsense. We learned from the pandemic that processes and procedures from trials can be streamlined and made much more convenient for all parties. Technology allowing for remote witness depositions, portability of documents via the Internet, and connectivity of highways makes interstate travel convenient for all who participate in a trial. According to the 2016 Annual Report of Illinois Courts, cases that were resolved for \$50 thousand were only 2.1 percent that actually went to verdict. So, almost 98 percent of those cases that were... were resolved prior to judgment. So, we have a 50-year-old, judicially-imposed forum non conveniens doctrine that ignores advances in technology and infrastructure and that was intended to solve perceived problems when that problem clearly no longer exists. In fact, I would urge the Supreme Court to abolish the doctrine of forum non conveniens across the board. I ask that you vote for this piece of legislation because it makes sense. It ensures that we are going to have judicial economy. We're going to ensure consistency among verdicts throughout the state. And I believe that venue is proper for constitutional

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

issues when the state is the defendant in Sangamon and Cook County. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Burke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3062?' Reminder, Members, that Representative Caulkins has requested a verification, so please remain in the chamber. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 69 voting in 'favor', 35 voting... voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative.

Representative Andrade..."

Speaker Burke: "Representative Caulkins has withdrawn his request for verification. With 69 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3062. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Mah is recognized for an announcement."

Mah: "Madam Speaker, Democrats would request a caucus immediately in Room 114."

Speaker Burke: "The Democrats will caucus immediately in Room 114, then we'll be returning to the House Floor. Representative Keicher's recognized."

Keicher: "Madam Speaker, can you share with us an approximate time frame to expect your return to the chamber?"

Speaker Burke: "I cannot."

Keicher: "Thank you."

Speaker Burke: "The House will stand in recess."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "Evans in the Chair. Returning to the Calendar of page 7, under the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 1199, Representative DeLuca. DeLuca's recognized."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1199. This establishes the month of October as Italian-American Heritage Month. Very excited to have this back in the House. I'm not available for any questions, but I do recommend any comments. I welcome any comments. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'm limited to comments only. Our side, we voted unanimously. This is a great Bill. A minor change with the Amendment. I encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Representative West is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

West: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative, for bringing this forward. Just wanted to gauge from you if there's any language on this that has anything to do with the interaction between Italian Americans and Native Americans, perchance."

DeLuca: "No, it does not, Representative."

West: "Is there a reason to why there's nothing in there concerning Native Americans?"

DeLuca: "Say that again."

West: "Is there a reason to why there's nothing in your language concerning Native Americans?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

DeLuca: "That's going to be in a Bill that we're looking at in the future."

West: "All right. You know I couldn't let you go without me coming back at you. So..."

DeLuca: "Absolutely."

West: "...I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

DeLuca: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ugaste is recognized."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. As one of the few Members of the Italian Caucus on this side of the aisle, or maybe the only one of blood here... oh, sorry, sorry, sorry. We got a few more recently. I remember now, we got a few more recently. Okay, okay. Ease up, everyone. Ease up. I believe this is a Bill long overdue, one that the Sponsor's been trying to get through for quite some time. And I wholeheartedly support him. Would appreciate it if everyone would vote for it. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative DeLuca to close. Representative Rita is recognized. Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Leader Rita can make a comment if he'd like to."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Rita is recognized."

Rita: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "Indicates he will."

Rita: "So, why are we concurring on this? What changes did you make?"

DeLuca: "The change was made in the Senate, and we added 'American', so it is Italian-American Heritage Month."

Rita: "And what was it?"

DeLuca: "It was Italian Heritage Month."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Rita: "Okay."

DeLuca: "It was a one-word Amendment."

Rita: "So, can you explain how did you finally get this done?"

DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker, you know, he didn't have to make any comments. He, you know... I'll go ahead and close if it's okay."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Rita, please bring your remarks to a close. It's closed. Representative Lisa Hernandez is recognized."

Hernandez, L.: "Will... will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He agrees to yield."

Hernandez, L.: "Representative, are you working on an Italian Heritage Month scratch-off ticket?"

DeLuca: "If we do, I will ask for your cosponsorship before it goes to the Gaming Committee."

Hernandez, L.: "Very well."

Speaker Evans: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Thank you very much for the comments. I appreciate your support. Please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1199?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. And this House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1199. And this, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative West, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise real quick to acknowledge my friend from my district, Stanley Campbell, through House Resolution 303, which was adopted last month, but I still want to take a minute to honor him. He... he was hired of the director of Rockford Urban Ministries in 1985, and he is retiring after 38 years. Within that time, he was also the founder of a non-for-profit in our community called the Rock River Valley Food Pantry that serves and helps those who are in need of food in our community. He was a tireless advocate for a variety of important issues including helping those less fortunate, building safer communities, and increasing involvement in mission and peace issues beyond bringing awareness to these and other pressing issues. He is never afraid to do work necessary to find long-term, meaningful solutions. Stanley Campbell will retire from the Rockford Urban Ministries in the ... in the summer of 2023, ending an impressive career dedicated to uplifting the community and people he loves so dearly. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 103rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we recognize and applaud Stanley Campbell's many years of outstanding service and dedication to the Rockford community and we wish him happiness and great success in his future endeavors. And I just ask the Body to help me celebrate before we go... move on. So, help me celebrate Stanley Campbell. Thank you so much."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "Staying on page 7 of the Calendar, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 1076. Representative Yednock is recognized."

Yednock: "Thank you. I wish to concur with HB1076, Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Evans: "Representative, please speak on the Amendment."

Yednock: "Sure. Senate Amendment 1 changes a little bit of the underlying Bill where it actually says that provisions relating to leasing farmland, that in order to do their... lease the farmland, you'll have to have a three-quarters vote of a full county board. It's not going to exceed a term of five years. And it makes sure that there's a few options like, you can cash lease, you can do a sharing cash... a crop-sharing agreement, or a custom farm arrangement. I believe adopting this will pretty much bring everybody into somewhat agreement."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, it was brought out... as was brought out in the Senate State Government Committee about a week and a half ago, as this Bill was being heard there, it was brought out that several counties in the state do own farmland. Several of those that have farm grounds are specifically tied to an established public purpose use of that property, such as forest preserves, airport authorities, and nursing homes. As the Senate Sponsor pointed out, it's important to note that this Amendment in no way takes away the fact that units of government, counties in this instance, need to be conscious of the requirement that any agreement they enter into must

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

meet the public purpose criteria in the Constitution. This point was referenced twice in the Senate. With that in mind, I support this Bill as it brings needed transparency and good governance to how our government does business by including key bidding language and transparency requiring bids to be open in a county board meeting in a public setting. There are things that never took place... these are things that never took place in my county for over 30 years, even though other portions of the County Code required similar steps. Hopefully, this Bill will bring clarity so that such mistakes become a thing of the past. While I had hoped for additional language to include wind and solar as options for county farm ground, I support the current language and ask for a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Yednock to close."

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

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1076?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1076. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cassidy is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Cassidy: "As we approach the one-year mark of the Dobbs decision, those of us on the Dobbs Working Group are rising together to highlight a deeply concerning trend. Last week, a driver rammed his car, full of containers of gasoline, into a building in Danville that was slated to become an abortion clinic. This was an immediate response to actions taken by the mayor of Danville, who had recently narrowly won reelection and had decided to pander to extremists by proposing an ordinance banning abortion in the town, against the advice of the Attorney General and his own attorneys, because he and the council wanted to score political points. Earlier this year, another man attempted to burn the Planned Parenthood in Peoria to the ground because he was angry his girlfriend had been treated there. The clinic remains closed and patients are forced to seek care elsewhere. This is not just abortion care. This is well-person care. This is cancer screenings. This arsonist has cut people off from health care. Last week, one of our Senate colleagues threatened to kick the piss out of anyone he thought shouldn't be in a bathroom with his daughter, to whoops and cheers from his Republican colleagues that made the chamber sound more The Jerry Springer Show than a Legislative Body. Yesterday, the Department of Homeland Security issued a bulletin warning that the LGBTQ community is at substantial risk of violence right now. In my lifetime, I've never seen a warning like that. Today, our former colleague and candidate for Governor shared on her network an inflammatory post urging folks to target Target because this retailer, in a seemingly free market system, chooses to carry Pride Month merchandise in LGBTQ Pride Month.

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Yesterday, the Trib reported that Target stores in our state and around the country were removing Pride merchandise from their stores due to confrontations and threats to store employees. In each of these cases, political speech has been at the... has been an issue. We have seen attacks on clinics, murders of health care workers, attacks on teachers and students. The list is depressingly endless. Words matter, folks. When we speak on this floor, when we make public statements, our words carry power. Inciting violence through dehumanizing people via political speech should be beneath all of us. For example, today in my mentions, this gem: 'Rep. Kelly Cassidy is definitely not a human being.' That said, the silence from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, not just about the inflammatory rhetoric, but even the specific acts of violence in Peoria and Danville, is deafening. Let us be clear. This is not the time for a gentle wink-and-nudge, generic 'we all condemn violence'. This is the time for full-throated rejection of terrorists who use violence as a political tool and the Leaders who use incendiary rhetoric like some kind of terrorist bat signal. Too many people have already been hurt, both via direct acts of violence and the impact of the verbal and physical attacks on the people targeted. The plague of suicides among LGBTQ youth is directly connected to these words. To paraphrase my friend, Montana Representative Zooey Zephyr, who was removed from the chamber recently for defending our community, the blood of these kids is on your hands. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "Moving forward in the Calendar. On page 8, at the bottom, we have House Bill 3903, Representative Rita. Leader Rita is recognized."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. And what this does, it tightens up the ethics surrounding the red light camera corruption and scandals. It does a number of things. It prohibits three... it prohibits these companies from donating to political campaigns. It requires that traffic tickets be issued by the municipality or county, not the private companies. It creates a revolving door prohibition for General Assembly and municipal and county representatives. Requires that the... it requires that the yellow light cannot be changed, and it requires a two-year analysis of the safety impact of that... where that camera is at. And it also authorizes IDOT to create rules for revoking or unauthorized system connected to a bribery or corruption scandal. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, I just wanted to highlight a couple things that are in the Bill. First, there is a prohibition on political contributions. Is that correct?"

Rita: "That's correct, yes."

Windhorst: "And in what context would that apply?"

Rita: "For candidates."

Windhorst: "And is there a provision regarding violations to drivers of red light cameras, that those citations must be

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

government issued, rather than issued by private entities or contractors?"

Rita: "Yes. The municipality, the county. Not a private company to issue them."

Windhorst: "And why was that included?"

Rita: "This way so these companies aren't determining what is a violation or not a violation. It's actually the... the authority or the agency that's actually issuing them, seeing if it was a correct violation or not."

Windhorst: "And I believe there's a provision in the Bill that allows IDOT to remove cameras in certain circumstances."

Rita: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Is that correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Windhorst: "When would that apply?"

Rita: "When did that apply or when would it?"

Windhorst: "I said when would that... under what circumstances could they do that?"

Rita: "They could do that if there was connected to a bribery or corruption scandal."

Windhorst: "And is there an opportunity later for that unit of government to apply to have the camera returned?"

Rita: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Okay. And I... just one final thing. On the provision about employment, I believe there's a two-year revolving door provision that is in existence."

Rita: "Yeah. So, we created a two-year revolving door for... for elected officials."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "So, General Assembly Members or employees or officers of the municipality or local government, if I have that correct."

Rita: "Yes. Including the county. County, municipality, or General Assembly."

Windhorst: "Right. And just, I guess, to note, our current revolving door for this Body is six months. So, this obviously is a longer time period, which I think is a good step to have a longer revolving door provision."

Rita: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Rita to close."

Rita: "Just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3903?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this... and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3903. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Remaining at the bottom of page 8 of the Calendar, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3743, Leader Rita. Leader Rita is recognized."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members and... Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Before I begin my explanation on the Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3743, I wanted to give a quick preview and a brief overview that led to this

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

piece of legislation. The Tinley Park Mental Health Center was one of the state's largest inpatient/outpatient mental health facilities that opened in 1958. It closed in 2012. Its purpose was to help people. To help people in need, to help people treat people in the region and the community in the South Suburbs. Since the closure has been... since 2012, this closure, there's been watermain breaks, there's been fires, there's been overgrown of trees and animals taking over the vacant buildings. It's become a blight, this site. Something is... something must need to be done, and today's the day to do that. Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3743 transfers the Tinley Park Mental Health Center to the Tinley Park-Park District for a dollar. It has two restrictive covenants on the property. One, the Tinley Park-Park District shall not donate or sell the land, and two... and if they do it would revert back to the state. And the second is the Tinley Park-Park District shall not use this land for purpose of gambling authorized by the Illinois Horse Racing Act of 1975 or the Illinois Gaming Act... Gambling Act. If they do, it would revert back to the state. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ann Williams is recognized."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to thank Representative Rita for bringing this Bill to us to consider today. This is not really just about one piece of land. This is really something I think we can look at more broadly. The property at issue here has been deteriorating for years, has become a blight on the community, and it was originally state property intended for public use to care for people in need. Years later, this Bill takes us back to the

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

concept of public use and puts the property in a place where it can be enjoyed and appreciated by everybody in the community, not sold off to the highest bidder for a development that may not be supported by the actual community members. I will note that the use here is something I think we could take a lesson from as we look at other blighted properties throughout the state. When I went to the Senate committee where this Bill was considered just to hear a little more about it, I heard Members on both sides of the aisle talk about similar issues in their own communities, property has been abandoned, allowed to deteriorate. honestly, this is our responsibility as a state. I noted that this Bill, in addition to being supported by the Park District, is supported by the Association of Park Districts, and the Sierra Club, the Illinois Environmental Council, and others. I would urge an 'aye' vote and thank Representative Rita for his vision on this important Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "In committee, I asked a few questions in regards to this property 'cause it was my understanding that there were two governmental entities that were looking to invest in this property. Is that correct?"

Rita: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and you said earlier that we're selling this property for how much?"

Rita: "A dollar."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Davidsmeyer: "And the other entity was going to pay, from my understanding, four and a half million dollars for this property?"

Rita: "So, here, let me... let me back you up here. And there wasn't an offer, nor was this bid. It started under... here, let's go back to 2012. Since the closure, the government entities within the region would wonder what's going to happen with this property. There's been four mayors. I've represented Tinley Park for the last decade since this closure, and I've worked with four different mayors and a number of trustees and local village officials who were trying to take this proposal, trying to work on getting this blighted site done. And nothing was accomplished during this time. CMS... you know, the Village of Tinley Park, most notably, failed to submit a plan according to the CMS quidelines. This was after the notice of the state of the intent to sell and transfer the property. So, there was some very strict guidelines and protocol to follow. This was something that didn't go up for a bid. This was a... a property that was for the public, for the region. And the reason we're doing it with a dollar on this is so that it can be used for public use. So, when you go through this, the history of how this maintained, it's time to ... to put this to an end, to fix this blighted property in a district that I represent, in the area I represent. And it was a plan by both. One was just the intent in the beginning to create a racino, which the community and the surrounding communities were not in favor of. I got a letter from 17 different Legislators that surround this property, all in favor of the park district's plan to create a regional hub of

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

athletic fields, open space, and conservation for their community. Seventeen different Legislators, both the Senate and the House, support the park district's plan. The community of Tinley Park is not interested in a racino/casino. They're interested in opening up a hub, regional, for athletic fields for the community in which they have."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, you can't... you couldn't come up with the same type of agreement with Tinley Park? I mean, they were... they were my understanding is they were looking at \$4.5 million on this property, and you couldn't put a provision on it that says if you put these in place, then it would revert back to the state?"

Rita: "Again, this is not to go to the highest bidder. You know, this purpose, let's look at the original purpose. The hospital was a purpose for the region, for the community, for public use."

Davidsmeyer: "We... this Bill goes around the CMS code, right? I...

I understand blighted property and wanting to get rid of it.

I've been trying to do that in my... in my district as well.

And if somebody was willing to pay \$4.5 million for the property, it'd be... it'd be sold, guaranteed. I... I just have a concern and... same concern that I shared in committee, that when we're looking out for the taxpayer, we should be looking out for the best opportunity to save the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. We're looking at four and a half million dollars versus one dollar. I... I understand... I understand you have your preference on how you would like this property to be used, but my... my concern is that we are not looking out

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

for the best interests of the State of Illinois right now. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Evans: "He will yield."

Halbrook: "So, Representative, I'm trying to understand that CMS or the State of Illinois owns this property now?"

Rita: "Correct."

Halbrook: "Okay. And... and I'm trying to understand. There was 10 'no' votes in the Senate, and it looks like on Senate Amendment 2 there was about equal number of proponents and opponents, 15 on one and 16 on the other and there was trustees in Tinley Park District. Can you help us understand why we have people in Tinley Park that are both proponents and opponents?"

Rita: "So, you have the village and then the park district."

Halbrook: "Yeah. So, it looks like the village, where the trustees were opponents, and the park district were proponents."

Rita: "Correct."

Halbrook: "Why would the Village of Tinley Park Trustees be opposed?"

Rita: "I mean... I can't answer you why they'd be opposed except they were looking to try to get this property to create a casino at one time. I can't explain where they're at now. But to address that the former Representative's question about doing this for a dollar, I have a number of Bills that we... in which they do come through the Executive Committee, which I mentioned at the Executive Committee, and I could start to read these off. You know, there was Senate Bill 1066,

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

McConchie and McLaughlin, to authorize the Department of Natural Resources to convey three parcels of property in Lake County in order to complete a bike path in exchange for a dollar. It was Senate Bill 1067, Spain and Stoller, authorized the Department of Natural Resources to convey an access road to Fulton Township, Whiteside County to the township for the use of a dedicated public road in exchange for a dollar. In the 102nd General Assembly, Senate Bill 84, Spain and Stoller, authorized the Department of Natural Resources to transfer a property in Peoria County to the Village of Dunlap in exchange for a dollar. This land was to be used for a portion of the Rock Island Railroad right-of-way that was owned by the DNR. Senate Bill 1655, Harris and Joyce, authorized a transfer of property from the DNR to the City of Morris in exchange for a dollar. There's other Bills..."

Halbrook: "So, Representative, did all those measures pass? Or they're just proposals that have been here before?"

Rita: "Every year, we do a number of Bills that authorize for a dollar sale for the public use. This is for public use, this... this property transfer, opening up for the region, not just for... for one government entity, to use as a... a sweetheart deal that should be done there. By authorizing this for a dollar, it has... it has clauses to revert back to the state if it's not used for its intended purpose, which is for recreation and conservation. I believe it has enough... it gives them the authority... for the last decade, it sat vacant. This was something the state has abandoned. It's in the community we represent, I represent. And, again, all 17 Legislators on

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

the South Side, in the South Suburbs that represent this area are in favor of this transaction."

Halbrook: "Well, thank you for understanding that... or explaining that, and it helps me to understand it more. I'm just trying to figure out what the best deal for taxpayers is in this situation. It's a long ways from where I live, so I don't know all the dynamics. I'll... I'll admit, I don't know all the dynamics that are in play in there. But, you know, we see this from time to time, that Legislators get involved in things that are many miles from their district. And so, I just wanted to make sure that I was a little bit more clear on what you were trying to get accomplished with your Bill here. So, with that, thank you. No further questions."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Frese is recognized."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Frese: "So, I'm trying to... thank you for some of the history behind this. Is this approximately... did you give the acreage involved? How much it..."

Rita: "Approximately 280 acres."

Frese: "Two hundred and eighty acres. And there's still a number of buildings standing?"

Rita: "Yes. There's... there's buildings. They're... they're abandoned. They're... yes."

Frese: "And they haven't been... they haven't been occupied in over 10 years, 11 years?"

Rita: "That's correct."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Frese: "When... in the era that those buildings were built, was there probably asbestos and other items such as that that's going to have to be carefully removed and dealt with?"

Rita: "There's... there's environmental issues. There's approximately, from what's... what's been done from previous studies, about \$12 to 15 million of cleanup and environmental cleanup."

Frese: "And... and Tinley Park is going to take that endeavor on?

They have the funds to do that?"

Rita: "But this is... this Bill authorizes that and to get that property cleaned up, yes."

Frese: "This Bill also goes... also takes into consideration..."

Rita: "No. It just..."

Frese: "Okay."

Rita: "...it gives them the authority to... it gives it to the park district. And their intent is to clean up the property, clean up the environmental stuff, put together a... a regional sports complex hub..."

Frese: "So..."

Rita: "...not only for the Tinley Park, but the entire region to use."

Frese: "Do you have knowledge of whether or not the money is there for them to take care..."

Rita: "They're in the position... so, Tinley Park-Park District is one of a, I would say, a premier park districts, one that is financially sound. They run a great, great park district, with programs for not only the youth, the seniors. I know the surrounding community uses their stuff."

Frese: "Okay."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Rita: "They have a great, great financial picture with the park district, and they would be able to clean this property up.

Again, we can't wait another 10 more years."

Frese: "Man, I understand it. Like previous Representative Davidsmeyer said, I'm very familiar with this. Similar situation in... just in down the road here, Jacksonville...

Rita: "Yeah."

Frese: "...Illinois. Closed at the same time. Will we see, maybe in the next 48 hours, any document that might come through that might get Tinley Park some money to... to clean this up?"

Rita: "Right now, we want to focus, get this property to the park district. Let's let it be used for public use, what it was... what it was intended, you know, as a public mental health hospital."

Frese: "Thank you. No other questions."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, with regard to the potential sale for four and a half million, which was referenced by a prior speaker, a concern that's been expressed to me is if the failure to sell the property for that figure is going to leave the mental health trust fund lacking those dollars. If that sale were to occur at 4 and a half million, there would be just over 3.4 million to the Community Mental Health Medicaid Trust Fund and just over a million dollars to the Community Developmental Disabilities Services Medicaid Trust Fund."

Rita: "You'd have to look at the debt services first before you do that, but why don't we look at this. There was a TIF

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

district created. We all know what TIF districts are, we debate that. It would be intended to use as a sweetheart deal for a developer to come in there to do that. Right now, the park district's in a financial position to clean this property up. Again, they've tried the village for 10 years plus to try to get this property and failed. We can't put a dollar amount on when the state... it's a state-owned property going to another government entity to use for public purposes."

Windhorst: "With regard to those dollar figures that I mentioned for the mental health trust fund, will there be any effort to make up that funding to the trust fund or to provide funds to the trust fund?"

Rita: "So… so, my understanding is you have the debt services. So, they got to pay off the debt services first before it would go into the mental health trust fund, which would be zero."

Windhorst: "Well, assuming that this Bill passes and the dollar is what it is sold for, going forward, would there be some effort to allocate money to cover that, what would be a difference for the trust fund?"

Rita: "It would... it would end up being zero because of the debt services. So, the..."

Windhorst: "Are... is there any funding in this year's budget for cleaning up the... the facility?"

Rita: "We haven't done a budget yet."

Windhorst: "In a proposed budget, is there any money?"

Rita: "We haven't done that yet."

Windhorst: "Okay."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Rita to close."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Rita: "You know, I see many Bills come through the Executive Committee and before this House Floor. This is something that pertains to a town, a village that I represent and I have represented for the last 10 years. We do this all the time for people's districts. We have a blighted piece of property with environmental hazards. This is something that could clean up the Southland, an area I represent, along with the 17 other Legislators that signed on a letter of support of a plan for the park district to create a public purpose recreational hub. We put enough safeguards on this. This is something that the state... it closed down in 2012 and laid vacant without putting any maintenance into it. It's time to clean this up. This is something that directly affects my district and the districts surrounding. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3743?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3743. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1462, Representative Buckner... Leader Buckner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1462, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Buckner is recognized."

Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1462 removes a prohibition on the issuing of occupational licenses to perform functions in a casino that do not involve gaming to individuals with felony convictions. This Bill is to expand access to the thousands of new hospitality jobs at these casinos, particularly for job seekers who are most disadvantaged because of a past prior criminal conviction. It allows the board to consider an occupational license applicant's criminal record, reputation, habit, social or business associations, or prior activities that pose a threat to the public interest or the integrity of gaming. It is supported by UNITE HERE Local 1, the Chicago Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, and the Safer Foundation. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? We have... Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Mr. Speaker, my light was on prior to calling Senate Bill 1462. I'm happy to hold my remarks until after this debate, but I would like to be called on at that time."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Keicher is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Keicher: "Okay. Thank you for bringing this, Representative. I know we had a chance to talk about it a couple times in the gaming. And can you please share, again, for folks on our side, because I think we'll have both up and down on our side,

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

as we did in the committee, talk to us about the roles that these folks will and will not be able to occupy within the casino complex?"

Buckner: "Yes. Thank you, Leader, for that. These are... these are not folks who are going to be handling money. These are not folks who are... will be operating, you know, gaming, blackjack tables. These are folks who may pick up a job as a server in the restaurant or a custodial engineer. These are back-of-the-house workers, for the most part, who have been shut out of these industries because of the way the current law is written."

Keicher: "And, again, no access to cash, no access to gaming.

These are folks that are going to be in some of the restaurants that are adjacent and on the casino property, some of the hotel operations that are there, some of the housekeeping, front-end, and that type, correct?"

Buckner: "Absolutely correct."

Keicher: "Okay. And in the committee, we had 13 to 3. We had some on our side, both up and down on this. I appreciate you bringing this. I think this is a good compromise. And the Gaming Board had no issue with the Bill as presented because of their ability to review each applicant and consider it individually. So, thank you."

Buckner: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Buckner to close."

Buckner: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1462 pass?' All those voted... all those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open.

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Hammond is recognized."

- Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, on the previous Bill, 3743, our Floor Leader, Patrick Windhorst, was not finished with his questions for the Sponsor. The Sponsor was very kind and patient in answering our questions. However, there is absolutely no reason to cut off a Floor Leader from questioning from this Bill or any Bill. It is disrespectful, and I realize we are within days of adjourning. Let's not do this, Mr. Speaker. It is not the first time. Let it be the last, please."
- Speaker Evans: "Will do. Thank you. Your point is taken. Moving back to page 3 of the Calendar. Under Senate Bills-Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 734, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill on Second Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 & 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Kifowit."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Kifowit is recognized on Floor Amendment #1."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. This Bill, if you are reading on your computers, is one

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

that you might have seen before. It did pass this House. Unfortunately, there was a slight error and the Senate Sponsor would not concur. So, what we did is we just removed 'including a plan established under Section 16-204 of the Pension Code' at the request of the Senate. And then House Floor Amendment #2, I'll just simply state that Minority Spokesperson found a slight contradiction and we corrected that as well. I move to adopt both House Floor Amendment #1 and House Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, I believe you covered the question that I had. This is nearly identical to Senate Bill 1233, which you carried and we voted on earlier this Session, which passed out, I believe, 114-0 and 1 'present' vote. Is that correct?"

Kifowit: "Correct. That's correct, Sir."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Kifowit moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Kifowit."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Kifowit on the Amendment."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I spoke on the Amendment
 earlier. I ask for its adoption... that we adopt House Floor
 Amendment #2."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "Representative Kifowit moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Kifowit is recognized."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As was mentioned earlier by the Leader on the other side, this is virtually identical to Senate Bill 1233 that passed the House 114-0 and 1 'present' on May 16. There was a slight error, and I just ask for an 'aye' vote again. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Reick is recognized."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I appreciate the Sponsor's giving me credit for this, but again, I want to give props to our staff. The staff of... our pension staffer here on the Republican side is the one that found this and brought it to my attention. I think that just shows to the quality of the people we have on this side of the aisle, and I'm very grateful for him to have done that. I think we've made a better Bill out of it as a result. So, I want to thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Leader. And as... I also now have to say that John Webb and this staff on our side is doing a yeoman's job in pensions as well, and I appreciate the bipartisanship that

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- we have had on our committee. And I appreciate your support for this Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 734 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The
 voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
 wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the
 record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting
 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills.

 Senate Bill 424, offered by Representative Olickal, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Moving forward to page 8 of the Calendar. Under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2878, Leader Hoffman. Leader Hoffman is recognized."
- Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur in House... or Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2878. House Bill... or House Bill 2878 then becomes the procurement omnibus Bill that we generally do every year, some kind of a procurement Bill. What it provides for is several pieces of legislation are rolled into this, most of them noncontroversial. It provides for the former Coal Mine Employee Preference Act. It provides for single prime procurement Illinois bid preference cleanup. It provides for awards to not-for-profit agencies for persons with significant disabilities. It enhances a veterans' preferences provisions. It also provides for small business

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

set-aside reporting, disability service organizations, Reimagining Hotel Florence, which is Representative Nick Smith's Bill. It provides for durations of contracts, increasing them, public education programming, contract diversity reporting, and requests for waiver of aspirational goals. It clears all of that up. Those are... those are both contained in House Bill 3606, which is an initiative of Representative Tarver. There are state fairground procurement changes, expansion of public-private partnership for Transportation Act, licensing of software applications indicating that you can't have one sole source software license, public construction bond increase. And then it provides for a crackdown on vendor contributions and is very strategic about the limits and registration requirements. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? Representative Windhorst is recognized."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, with regard to the single prime procurement, if you could just briefly describe what that is, who it applies to, and why that is a positive step."

Hoffman: "Yes. The single prime procurement authorizes the use of single prime procurement method, makes changes... and would also make changes to the Illinois bid preference and clarify the changes to definition of board as used in the Act. Now, specifically with your question regarding single prime, single prime procurement is for the Capital Development Board. It eliminates the limitation or the usage of single

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

prime for construction projects that are under \$5 million. We have found that while we have allowed... since we have allowed single prime, it has been very cost-effective and has been helpful in ensuring that these Capital Development Board contracts are completed on time. And it would also remove the sunset with regard to this."

Windhorst: "Is there anything about this Bill or in the Bill that strains credulity?"

Hoffman: "I don't think so."

Windhorst: "I don't think so either. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Smith is recognized."

Hoffman: "Twice in the same day."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to talk a minute about... to the Bill. Well, no, not to the Bill. Leader Hoffman, these public-private partnerships, how important are they to the state?"

Hoffman: "Well, I know that you have a very important one regarding the... regarding the Reimagining Hotel Florence, which is in the Pullman neighborhood. It will be a public-private partnership that is going to bring economic development to your neighborhood 'cause I know it's important to you. And I know that expanding them and enhancing them, with regard to transportation projects, will create jobs as well as economic development as well."

Smith: "Thank you, Leader. To the Bill. To concur with Leader Hoffman, we do have a project in my community, and the people of Pullman have been waiting for a very long time to see this project to fruition. And the only way we can get it across the finish line is by developing a public-private

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

partnership. So, I really encourage everybody on this floor to vote 'yes' on this Bill and help our district create jobs and economic development. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Mah is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I remain concerned Mah: about the provision that allows the state to enter more easily into public-private partnerships with the passage of ... of this Bill. And I'm especially concerned because when we voted on the House Resolution to begin the process that would use a public-private partnership for the managed lanes on I-55, that was a decision that my community had already weighed in on several years ago when there were hearings on the issue. And my community made very clear to me that they were opposed to such a project and were dismayed to see it come up again. And so, I didn't get a chance to speak on the floor when that Resolution came before us, but I wanted to take this opportunity to explain why I have to take a position against this Bill because of the provision that remains in this Bill that I've expressed my concern about during committee. I... I think that, you know, there are a lot of dangers that, you know, we just have to be really careful of when we make it easier for the state to enter into public-private partnerships. And in the case of I-55 for the managed toll lanes, you know, that would likely bring about a lot more pollution to my area, which is already an environmental justice community. And it would preclude the possibility of having another idea, like a high-occupancy vehicle express lane that would address the traffic congestion, but in a way that would reduce pollution and traffic and has been used in

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

other states. So, you know, it's just something that I... I can't support in good conscience and, you know, I think that we need to devote a lot more care and attention to the risks that we undertake when we enter into these relationships. And so, I would just respectfully ask that others join me in a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ann Williams is recognized."

Williams, A.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Williams, A.: "Leader Hoffman, I just wanted to start with a bit on process here. You mentioned that this was a compilation of several different items. Was that referring to the procurement component or the private... public-private partnership section?"

Hoffman: "The procurement component."

Williams, A.: "Okay. So, I... I know a lot of us have been talking on the floor in the past 24 hours about this. When did the private... public-private partnership component become part of this conversation?"

Hoffman: "We have had public-private partnerships in our statute for 10 years. However, we needed to clean up the statute and make sure that there was a proper safeguard so we could move forward and do it with... with regard to the Department of Transportation, Illinois Tollway, and units of local government. I specifically have carried the Bill for a few years now, I believe, and I introduced it in January. In January or February, it then passed out of the State Government Committee. And since it had to do with procurement, we... we decided we would wait and make it part of the omnibus

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

procurement Bill. Incidentally, this is a much scaled-down version from the Bill that actually passed the State Government Committee in January and February."

Williams, A.: "I think I heard you talk a little bit about guardrails, but I'm a little confused. It seemed a bit inconsistent. In committee today you said that this was going to eliminate barriers to these projects and enable us to move forward more quickly with these projects, but then I thought I heard a later discussion which talked about it implementing guardrails. So, what are we... what are we doing here? Are we making it easier and eliminating hurdles and smoothing the way and streamlining the process, or are we putting up checks and balances? How... how are we... what's our approach here?"

Hoffman: "We're doing both."

Williams, A.: "Okay. Can you elaborate on what that means?"

Hoffman: "Well, first of all, we're ensuring that there are public hearings. We specifically indicate that this only... only deals with transportation, not other types of infrastructure, state infrastructure. We are making sure that some of the guardrails that the House, the Senate, the Governor, COGFA has to do a financial analysis. We are assuring private auditing is taking place. We're... we've put together all the provisions to ensure that... that these things are done, and when they are done, they are done in an equitable manner and they are successful. We also... but at the same time, while we're putting in all those guardrails, we're saying that in allowing for the ability to not only... not only have the regular procurement process, but a process called unsolicited proposals, where people who have projects that they believe could work can

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

bring it to local governments, can bring it to states, and then they can take a look at it."

Williams, A.: "Okay."

Hoffman: "They don't have to move forward with it. They... they don't have to..."

Williams, A.: "Yeah."

- Hoffman: "You asked the question. I'm answering, and then you can ask another question. So, they don't have to... they don't have to move forward with it. They simply have to look at it, and they can reject it if they don't believe that it's sound."
- Williams, A.: "I'm glad you brought up the public hearing.

 According to my reading of the language, the responsible public entity is only required to hold one public hearing. There's no regulation in the Bill or direction as to the time and the scope of that public hearing. You know, I just think these projects, they're pretty major projects. And is this sufficient to address ramifications for safety, climate, connectivity, and quality of life, as the things that Representative Mah mentioned? The one public hearing?"
- Hoffman: "I believe that there... there's a two-prong approach.

 The... the normal procurement process, there would be multiple public hearings. Under the unsolicited portion of this, there would be one. I would... I would think that the responsible... the responsible governmental entity would have several public hearings."
- Williams, A.: "Okay, but it's up to them really. We didn't dictate that here, it looks like. So, I just want to remind the Body, too, and... and also, you know, transportation... we address... and thanks for your fabulous partnership on this. But in CEJA, we

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

addressed the carbon-emitting power plants and the generation piece. Now, we're looking at transportation. Transportation is the number one emitter of carbon in the... right now, over even power generation. So, with that in mind, I think it's important to talk about what we can do to mitigate these projects. Now, I certainly am all for public-private partnerships. And I wanted to... to ask you, I know we talked about it in committee, are you familiar with what happened in Minnesota? And since we talked this morning, have you considered any... have you considered some of the provisions in the... like what Minnesota did to ensure that we're addressing climate as we expand upon these public-private partnerships in the transportation sector?"

Hoffman: "I indicated this morning, and I do mean it, I'd be willing to work with you on that."

Williams, A.: "Okay. So, just to refresh you, in Minnesota they provided accountability to the greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle targets. And what I would say to you there is, we can have it all. We can help grow our region and enhance transportation projects. We can create good, quality jobs, and we can take care of our environment and address carbon emissions. So, I'm hopeful that you will take this seriously, I... and really work with me on how to do this. Like I said, this is not inconsistent goals. To the Bill. You know, I think it's important to recognize that this, process-wise, we moved very quickly on a very major expansion of how transportation projects are reviewed and implemented. And while certainly we all recognize the need for said projects and I think we're all open to it, having about 24 hours to consider and vet a

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

project of this nature is just simply unefficient... insufficient for us to get comfortable with it. I think there's more that we could have done had we had more than a day or two to look at this and addressed issues such as the greenhouse gas emissions and addressed components of the Bill that would make this more of a balanced approach. I would ask that in future efforts to expand on the public-private partnerships we consider these important goals and try and do what's right by our climate and our communities. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Walker is recognized."

Walker: "Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "Indicates he will."

Walker: "Leader Hoffman, will any specific transportation project related to this partnership come back to this House?"

Hoffman: "Every single one of them has to."

Walker: "To the Bill. This is the interesting pratfall or pitfall of omnibus Bills. There are two Sections of this Bill I greatly support, one for Representative Tarver and one for Leader Nick Smith. One that I have serious concerns with. Two out of three ain't bad. I'm going to go with a 'yes' vote. Thanks."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Tarver is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "Indicates he will."

Tarver: "I appreciate that. Jay C. Hoffman, I do want to make sure that I understand 'cause there's been a lot of conversation about this. So, the… this just provides a framework… Jay C. Hoffman, I'm over here. This just provides a…"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hoffman: "Sorry, Curtis J. Tarver. Sorry."

Tarver: "This just provides a framework for the public-private partnership. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it's simply a framework."

Tarver: "Okay. And then, to the best of your knowledge, will there be rules drafted as relates to this?"

Hoffman: "As is any type of major project like this... or if there is a major project, IDOT, who oversees these types of projects, the Tollway that oversees these types of projects, will be the entities that will be putting it all together. This is just providing the framework in order to allow the framework to be put in place for private-public partnerships and transportation only in Illinois."

Tarver: "And then typically, when they draft rules, they come through JCAR?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "Okay. And then JCAR is a bipartisan group. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "Okay. So, they'll be opportunity..."

Hoffman: "And I believe that you are an esteemed Member of that illustrious group."

Tarver: "It is illustrious. The esteemed part is... it's subject to question. But so... so, that means that there would be an opportunity again for both sides of the aisle to... to look at the rules and make sure those rules are implemented in a way that the statute anticipates. Is that correct?"

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

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Tarver: "Okay. So, look, I think this is a very good Bill overall, and not just because of the part that I have in it. It's something that will allow for more job opportunities. It will allow for very necessary... excuse me, real work to be done as well. I just want to make sure that I understand, as far as the good faith efforts. Are you familiar with the good faith effort portion of the Bill?"

Hoffman: "I apologize. I was talking."

Tarver: "No problem. Are you, one Jay C. Hoffman, familiar with the good faith effort portion of the Bill?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "Okay. And is it your understanding that this allows for an opportunity for us to codify what things across the board would be considered good faith effort? Is that your understanding?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Tarver: "All right. Is your understanding that right now there really is no ecumenical definition, each agency or department can kind of do their own thing?"

Hoffman: "That's my understanding. And your proposals and suggestions would ensure that it is uniform."

Tarver: "Thank you. So, I want to thank you for your work on this and your support. I have to shout out Omari Prince, who is my constituent who helped me with my portion of the Bill as well. And I would just say, this is an important... I know we often overlook things, but BEP is something that has escaped every single administration, not solely this one. This administration is subject to the 185 percent more dollars to the program and has gone from an expenditure of, I think, of

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

17.9 percent, down to 8.2 percent. So, we're seeing that more needs to be done. I think it's a step in the right direction. It's not the end-all, be-all, but I do appreciate your willingness to work with me, Senator Castro on the other side of the chamber. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you. I... I would just like to say this. First of all, there's a lot of good things in this Bill. Representative Tarver just talked about some. Representative Smith talked about others. I think that the provisions concerning public-private partnerships are sound. They simply provide a framework, which we're going to build from. They're going to create jobs and economic opportunity throughout the entire State of Illinois. They're supported by organized labor. They're pushed by organized labor. And I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2878?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all the opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2878. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Leader Manley on the Motion."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Manley: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived so that the following Bills can be heard tonight in Judiciary Crim: Senate Bill 424 and House Resolution 325."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the requirements are waived. Moving back to page 5 of the Calendar. Under Senate Bills-Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 1769, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1769, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by... offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman on Amendment 2."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask that Floor Amendment #2 be adopted. It clarifies the Bill and ultimately becomes the Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Rep. Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1769, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman is recognized on Senate Bill 1769."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1769 would require that by January 1, 2030 all passenger vehicles that are purchased or leased by the state or by a state agency, with the exception of law enforcement vehicles, be zero-emission vehicles or converted to zero-emission vehicles. We exempted out law enforcement, and we also exempted out paratransit vehicles as well."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, there are some concerns, I believe, that were expressed in committee and perhaps in the… in the Senate regarding the Bill, and I'd just like to give you the opportunity to address those. The first is related to the cost to fulfill this mandate. Do we have an estimated cost on what that would be?"

Hoffman: "I... I don't. I don't recall that being asked. That may have been asked in the Senate. I don't recall it being asked in the committee. Maybe it was, but I don't... I don't recall it."

Windhorst: "Do we have that answer, though? I'm sorry."

Hoffman: "I believe, it's my understanding in talking to state agencies, they're going to... over time, and certainly by 2030, they're going to be replacing, either through lease or through purchase, the vast majority of their passenger vehicles. And that's what that is, only passenger vehicles. And they would need to produce zero exhaust emissions. And so, I believe as they replace them, they'll be replacing with those types of vehicles."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "So, your statement is passenger vehicles... so, the Bill is passenger vehicles. So, that would exclude things such as fire trucks and ambulances would not be included."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Is there currently the capacity to meet the need that would exist to fulfill this? In the market, is there the capacity to meet the need?"

Hoffman: "I think... I think there... there is the capacity. The issue that we ran into is we wanted to make sure that there was an exception for law enforcement vehicles. And when I talked to the... the downstate transit individuals, their concern was with regard to paratransit vans with lifts, that there may not be a sufficient market of them. So, we removed them."

Windhorst: "And you... as it relates to their opposition from the transit districts, they remain opposed?"

Hoffman: "No, that removes it."

Windhorst: "They removed it. Okay."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And you mentioned police vehicles. Those are exempted from this mandate?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And the vote in the Senate, I believe, is 33 to 20.

Does that sound correct?"

Hoffman: "Yeah, I..."

Windhorst: "Take my word for it?"

Hoffman: "...I wasn't there."

Windhorst: "You missed it. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ugaste is recognized."

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

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Ugaste: "Evening, Leader Hoffman. Quick question. Are only electric vehicles going to fit within the definition of zero-emission vehicles?"

Hoffman: "It... it is not only electric vehicles. It is zero emission, which zero-emission vehicles, a passenger vehicle that produces zero exhaust emissions of any criteria pollutant, precursor pollutant, or greenhouse gas, but only produces water vapor, in any mode of operation or condition, as determined by the Illinois EPA. So, I think it could include hydrogen vehicles."

Ugaste: "That's what I was wondering, whether hydrogen vehicles would be included in this."

Hoffman: "I believe, yes."

Ugaste: "Okay. And these extra vehicles we're going to be putting on the… consuming electricity, putting on the grid basically.

Are we going to have sufficient power throughout all of Illinois to power these vehicles by 2030?"

Hoffman: "I believe we will, yes."

Ugaste: "Okay. Are... are there any projections from the state? Because I know the MISO region has been having a lot of problems lately, and it sounds like even the... the northern part of the state is... is facing potential problems in the future, according to the analysis we're getting from the interested parties. To the Bill. I understand the desire for clean-burning vehicles. I... I am in support of that. Mandating it by a certain date when we don't even know if all those vehicles will probably be available to us, how much the cost would be, and whether or not we're going to have the power

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

available to run all these vehicles, especially at a time when we're trying to get the general public to buy them as well, I just don't think is... is necessarily good policy to put it into law right now. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Was this idea included in your book? Just a little levity."

Hoffman: "As... as you know, my book was ahead of its time."

Davidsmeyer: "It was ... it was a hit. It was a hit. So... so, my concern ultimately is ... is we are putting ... and I know hydrogen's a little bit outside of this, but hydrogen isn't quite there, and I don't know that it will be by 2030. We're looking at less than seven years from now for it to be ... come up. So, we're putting all our eggs into the electric vehicle basket. And while it may feel good for us over here, on the other side of the world, they are literally raping the land of all these minerals to create all these batteries. They're using chemical processes that are polluting lands on the other side of the world to create batteries. I mean, putting our heads in the sand and pretending like as long as things are good for us it doesn't matter on the other side of the world is a huge problem. And, you know, as long as we recognize that and you're okay with... with that, with these electric vehicles and forcing all this stuff, you know, I guess I... at least... at least you're not ignoring it. But my concern is that we're just trading one type of climate issue for another type of climate issue. And ultimately electric vehicles are

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

not going to be it. I think there will be something that comes up that will be better. It may be hydrogen. It may be something else. But it will not be by 2030. So, I would... I would urge everyone to be a reasonable, thoughtful individual. This world is not going to come to an end in 10 years. We... we have time to actually come up with an option for... for our fleet. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Caulkins is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Caulkins: "Representative Hoffman, we've asked a question about the cost of the vehicles. How much is it going to cost to charge them? What have you put in the budget? What will you budget to put in charging stations for all of these vehicles all across the state?"

Hoffman: "We will address the budgetary issues as we begin to change the fleet over."

Caulkins: "Do you have an idea of what that might cost us?"

Hoffman: "I don't."

Caulkins: "So, we're just going to mandate that we get into electric vehicles in seven years with no idea what it's going to cost, no idea how we're going to pay for charging stations, what it's going to cost for the electricity to run those charging stations?"

Hoffman: "As you know, we have made a commitment, the state has made a commitment to begin to reduce CO2 emissions. And the CO2 emissions that come that out of vehicles contributes greatly to the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. If we're going to make that commitment and as we continue to

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

move forward to getting more charging stations because of that commitment, I believe that they'll be sufficient ones available to help charge this fleet. Now, that's not only going to be for the good of state vehicles, but it's also going to be for the good of the general public who has made the choice to go to electric vehicles."

Caulkins: "Well, I... I beg to differ with you on the general public making that choice. There seems to be a lot of resistance from the general public purchasing electric vehicles. But I just think that we're standing here today in 2023 trying to make policy, make a commitment that we're only going to purchase these vehicles in 2030. Why not wait till 2028? Why not wait for five more years to see where we are? What's... why do you bring this up today?"

Hoffman: "Because it's good public policy."

Caulkins: "But it isn't, Representative. It's bad public policy."

Hoffman: "Then vote against it. It's all right."

Caulkins: "I will. Thank you. To the Bill. No one knows what the future holds seven years from now. No one knows what we're going to be able to do, what kind of electricity we're going to have on the grid available, what charging stations are going to cost, where we're going to put them, what the vehicles are going to cost. This is very premature. There is no need, no need to try to make this policy, pass a law today that mandates something seven years from now. I would urge a 'no' vote. Let's come back in five years when we get closer to 2030 or 2035. This is way, way ahead of its time. It's unnecessary, and I would just... I would urge a 'no' vote. This just is not the right policy."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "Representative McLaughlin is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

McLaughlin: "Leader, quick question. You are aware in '07, '08 we had a worldwide recession, correct?"

Hoffman: "We had... we had a recession?"

McLaughlin: "Well, we had a financial crisis..."

Hoffman: "Yes."

McLaughlin: "...which caused human beings to use the vehicles that you're mentioning, increased CO2 substantially. And yet, in that year, we had an increase in CO2. Can you explain that to me?"

Hoffman: "In '07 and '08 we had a recession..."

McLaughlin: "In '07 and '08, the financial crisis, where we had people... consumption go down..."

Hoffman: "Buy electric cars?"

McLaughlin: "...significantly. Correct. And yet, we had CO2 go up in that year, but you're stating that it was man-made and caused. Can you explain that to me?"

Hoffman: "I can't."

McLaughlin: "Can you explain during COVID..."

Hoffman: "Can you explain it to me?"

McLaughlin: "Oh, no, because it wasn't man-made. During COVID, can you explain to me the consumption and use of vehicles went down substantially, yet CO2 went up? Can you explain that to me?"

Hoffman: "I don't know that that's a fact, but..."

McLaughlin: "Oh, it's absolutely a fact. And this is why this policy is so wrong at this time. Three point eight billion

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

vehicles on this planet use liquid fuel. Are you aware of how much minerals we'll need to create an electric vehicle fleet that you're going to be mandating on the residents of Illinois at extremely high cost?"

Hoffman: "This says simply that beginning January 1, 2030, beginning that date, if you... if the state leases or state purchases a passenger vehicle, that it must be zero emissions. I don't know how long it will take us to do the whole fleet, but I would assume it would take some time."

McLaughlin: "To the Bill. As Representative Caulkins accurately stated, the science, which you've heard debated on this floor, which has been inaccurate on many levels, is not accurate here either. Making public policy without accurate data as it relates to CO2 is going to hurt middle-class and lower- class families in this state. Mandating them to use vehicles and electric grid, which we don't have the capacity for, I can't more strongly oppose this Bill. Just based on the messaging for those that believe that CO2 emissions are man-made when, in '07, '08 and during COVID, consumption and use of vehicles was down substantially, yet CO2 went up. So, for that reason, I'll be urging a strong 'no'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Fritts is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Fritts: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, are pickup trucks considered passenger vehicles for the purposes of this Bill?"

Hoffman: "I believe that they... they would be, yes."

Fritts: "They are considered passenger vehicles?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hoffman: "They would. They would be considered passenger vehicles."

Fritts: "Okay. Thank you. To..."

Hoffman: "But... it's for governmental agencies, okay?"

Fritts: "Correct. So..."

Hoffman: "Yeah. So, it could be ... it could be like state park."

Fritts: "Okay."

Hoffman: "So, it could be a pickup truck, yeah."

Fritts: "So a pickup truck for a state park. How about our universities? Is that considered as well?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Fritts: "Okay. Thank you. Just briefly, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. One of my first jobs when I got to the University of Illinois was in the wheat and oat breeding program, and I was tasked with going around the state to our test plots and maintaining them. I had a pickup truck that had a trailer, and we went around and maintained the plots. And with this Bill, if pickup trucks are not excluded, under the current technology that we have, I don't feel that we would be able to properly make it and maintain those while hauling agricultural equipment to those sites. So, thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Yes. Thank you. I appreciate the comments, and I appreciate the debate. Once again, this simply requires that by January 1, 2030 all passenger vehicles purchased or leased by the state or by a state agency, with the exception of law enforcement and paratransit vehicles, would have zero emissions. And I ask for a favorable roll call."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1769 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.
 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting at 7:30 p.m.: Judiciary Criminal is meeting in Room 114, the Executive Committee is meeting in Room 118."
- Speaker Evans: "Attention, Members. Committees will take place at 7:30 p.m., and we will return to the floor after committees.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is the Motion... recommends be adopted and referred to the floor is Floor Amendment(s) 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 2123."
- Speaker Evans: "The House will stand at recess to the call of the Chair. The House shall be in order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 424; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3902 and House Resolution 325. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 1298. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 332, offered by Representative Johnson, is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Evans: "Returning to the Calendar. On page 4, we have Senate Bills—Third Reading. We have Senate Bill 2123, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2123, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time previously. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 have been adopted previously. Floor Amendments #6 and 7 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Stuart."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Stuart on the Amendment."
- Stuart: "Thank you. Amendment 6, if you remember, we discussed all this Bill in detail last night, and there was a provision about the new citizen voter registration. There's been a lot of discussion, and we want to make sure we do this really well. So, we are going to pull that and continue to work on that. So, that's what Amendment 6 does is just delete that language for now so that we can bring back a better version."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Stuart moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #6. All those in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #7 is offered by Representative Stuart."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Speaker Evans: "Representative Stuart on the Amendment."

Stuart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #7 deals with the elections for the fully elected Chicago school board. And what it will do is extend the deadline for the General Assembly to draw the hybrid and fully elected Chicago Board of Education districts map. It'll move it to April 1 of 2024. And as a result, it also moves the general primary election petition language from the statute because the deadline for the map falls after the 2024 Primary Election. Nothing in the Amendment pushes back the date to elect the hybrid school board. The hybrid school board will still be elected at the 2024 General Election."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Windhorst, would you like to speak on the Amendment?"

Windhorst: "To the Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Stuart moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #7. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2123, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Stuart is recognized."

Stuart: "Thank you. I'll just... I'll be very brief 'cause I know we had quite a long discussion just yesterday, about 24 hours ago, about this Bill. I did want to clarify a few things that

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

were said in the discussion last night. When talked about the provision about Senate petition challenges, I wanted to just make it clear for the record that currently any part of a Senate district covering parts of Cook and part... parts of Cook County and part of the City of Chicago goes to the city. With the change that we're making, challenges in Senate districts covering all of the county and city will now go to the county. And then there was some questions about the reason why we're taking out language about sponsoring entities. And I don't know if I made it very clear, but the... it's not being implemented correctly by the State Board of Elections, and it seems to lack the clarity to be implemented. So, we're going to go back to the drawing board on that."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Do the Amendments address the appointment to the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority?"

Stuart: "They make no change to that."

Windhorst: "So, that lame duck appointment will only be for six months and then, going forward, that restriction will still apply to any future lame duck appointments?"

Stuart: "Correct."

Windhorst: "I know when we talked about it... was it just yesterday we talked about it? Okay. When we talked about this yesterday, I'd asked if there were any other limitations we put on lame duck appointments. Do you know if there are any other limitations in law that we put on lame duck appointments?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Stuart: "I know that we did find that information, and I apologize. I don't have that handy with me now, but we... we will get that to you."
- Windhorst: "Well, I mean, I just... I'd like to limit lame duck activity even more than we do just beyond this one thing. I think a lot of times lame duck activity leads to bad results. Putting that aside, with the change to the drawing of the electoral districts for the Chicago Board of Education, that deadline will be extended from July 1 of this year to on or before April 1 of 2024. Is that right?"

Stuart: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "When is the election that those districts will apply to?"

Stuart: "The 2024 General Election."

- Windhorst: "And you had mentioned the purpose of Amendment 6. It removes language regarding registration at naturalization ceremonies by DHS. What was the purpose for removing that language?"
- Stuart: "So, again, I think we all agree. I think on... everyone in the chamber agrees that that's a great thing to be doing to make sure that new citizens are registered to vote. There was some... just we want to do it well, and we didn't know that what we had provided was going to work with systems that are already in place. And all the stakeholders and people who have been involved in this work for a long time just wanted an opportunity to... to bring it back and write it and do it very well so that we get everybody registered that we should."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Windhorst: "Thank you for your answers. Again, I'm not going to be able to support your Bill, but I appreciate you finding that information."
- Stuart: "Thank you."
- Speaker Evans: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Stuart to close."
- Stuart: "Thank you. I just wanted to also make another point, something that I didn't clarify in the discussion last night. On the question about the 16-year-old, the preregistration for 16-year-olds, I just want to make it clear that the State Board of... sorry, the State Board of Elections will transmit the voter registration application that was most recently completed to the applicable election authority. We just wanted to make that clear. And with that, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2123 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The
 voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
 wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the
 record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 36 voting
 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received
 the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
 Representative Keicher, for what reason do you seek
 recognition?"
- Keicher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could please
 excuse Representative Randy Frese for the remainder of
 Session today."
- Speaker Evans: "The record will reflect. Moving forward to page 8 in the Calendar, under Order of Concurrences, we have House

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Bill 3643, Representative Rashid. Representative Rashid is recognized."

Rashid: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 3643, which is an initiative of the Muslim Civic Coalition, with support from the Jewish Federation and others. The Bill would provide accommodations to public school students who have religious dietary restrictions so that they can eat nutritious food for lunch. It was first introduced in the 102nd General Assembly and has been negotiated with stakeholders. As a result of the Amendment, associations representing school administrators are neutral, as is the Illinois State Board of Education. It passed out of House committee with bipartisan support. I ask for your support. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Windhorst is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Our analysis shows the State Board of Education is opposed. Do you know why they are opposed?"

Rashid: "They are not. They moved to neutral."

Windhorst: "They moved to neutral?"

Rashid: "Yes."

Windhorst: "I've heard some concerns expressed about the potential cost of implementing this program. Do we know if there is one and what that cost would be?"

Rashid: "It is subject to appropriation. We will know more once we have a sense of what the demand will be for the food."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Windhorst: "I guess the question will be which comes first, the appropriation or knowing how much is going to be requested? So..."
- Rashid: "So, this would be implemented in the 2024 school year, next year. So, between now and then, we'd have to come up with a cost estimate. And then, if we choose to appropriate for it, we will."
- Windhorst: "And this will be on the State Board of Education to implement and provide to local school districts?"
- Rashid: "They would have a... they would be the ones doing a master contract that the school districts could then utilize to order food directly so that the school districts don't need to do their own RFPs to get the food or have to do much more work to identify the food that they're... how to acquire that food."
- Windhorst: "Is it up to each local school district to decide to provide this food, or how does that... is it mandated that they provide it?"
- Rashid: "Upon request, it would be mandated if they have the option via the master contract."
- Windhorst: "I... maybe I'm not understanding correctly. So, the State Board of Education will get the master contract, and then each school district must provide it if a student requests it and... and receive that from the State Board of Education?"
- Rashid: "Yes. If... if the school board of education's master contract provides for a vendor, then they would be required to provide that food, yes. Subject to appropriation."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "And the vendor then would have the contract with the State Board of Education but would deal with the local school districts to supply..."

Rashid: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "...rather than supply the state board?"

Rashid: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "And now that the State Board of Education is neutral, is there anyone opposed to the Bill?"

Rashid: "I know of no stakeholder opposition."

Windhorst: "And what was done to remove their opposition?"

Rashid: "There were many conversations over the last few weeks, and I think they got more comfortable with the possibility of doing this master contract. There were initial questions about how to conduct it."

Windhorst: "Thank you for your answers."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Ugaste is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Ugaste: "Thank you. Representative, just a couple questions. I noted that besides asking ISBE to come up with this master contract, Illinois... University of Illinois Hospital staff, Department of Corrections, and I think one other are required to provide these types of meals as well. Is that correct?"

Rashid: "That... that is correct. And they are also neutral. They, in my understanding, are already doing this."

Ugaste: "I'm not asking if they're neutral."

Rashid: "Oh, yes."

Ugaste: "I just want to make sure they're included."

Rashid: "That is correct. Yes."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Ugaste: "Okay. And where in this Bill are we providing the extra funding that's required of them?"
- Rashid: "There would be a... there is a subject to appropriation line in every paragraph that mentions that this would be a requirement."

Ugaste: "It says subject to appropriation?"

Rashid: "Yes."

Ugaste: "Okay. And one other question I have for you. I... I believe these are dietary restrictions based upon religious beliefs.

Is that correct?"

Rashid: "That is correct."

- Ugaste: "Okay. What about other religions' dietary restrictions?

 Are they included in this?"
- Rashid: "Yes. This is including kosher and halal, but not limited to. So, other religions, if they could be accommodated, should be accommodated."
- Ugaste: "What do you mean if they could be?"
- Rashid: "Well, if there is a... if there is no vendor, for example, that were to provide a particular dietary option, then it would no..."
- Ugaste: "Well, Greek Orthodox Christians, on certain days of the week, do not partake in eating certain types of food. Are we going to make certain they're accommodated? Because I don't see it in the language."
- Rashid: "It says, 'but not limited to', so they could be accommodated."
- Ugaste: "But we point out these two specifically have to be accommodated, correct?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Rashid: "Yes, because those are defined dietary regiments, kosher and halal."

Ugaste: "Well, there's been a definition for 2 thousand years as to what Greek Orthodox Christians are eating on certain days of the week as well. So, thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I spoke to a couple of the Senators earlier today about this Bill. I believe the language that we're discussing here today is already in Federal Law. I'm not sure why we're doing this Bill. I'm not going to be supporting it. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Didech is recognized."

Didech: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

you. Representative, we've had several Didech: "Thank conversations about this Bill. I've had, I think, countless conversations with the advocates and the stakeholders working on this Bill. I want to be very clear. I support the goals of this Bill. I... I think making our schools more inclusive to people of all backgrounds... in the 102nd General Assembly, I passed House Bill 160, 169, which gave people time off for religious holidays. It excused students from physical education while fasting. So, there's almost no one in this building who's done more than I have to make our schools more accommodating for Jewish students and Muslim students. So, I want to be very clear about the background I come with on this. But I want to talk about some of the particulars of this Bill, mechanically how this actually works. Because I know on our side of the aisle, there's some Members who

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

support this, some Members who do not support this, and I'm going to do my best Patrick Windhorst impression and make sure everybody understands..."

Speaker Evans: "Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. Representative Hammond, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Hammond: "I would like to say a thank you to someone from our research staff that has been incredible and stepped up beyond our expectations, and that is Nathan Oakes. Nathan, thank you for everything that you have done. He's been with us a very short time, and he is leaving us to be a part of the U.S. Air Marshals. Have I got that correct, Nathan? Not correct. Oh, we don't want that on the record, I guess. Thank you, Nathan, for being a great part of our caucus in whatever you're going to do from here. We wish you all the best. Don't take any photos."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Benton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Benton: "I just want to thank Leader Hammond for all the times that you softened the mood with the jokes and lighten it throughout Session. Thank you very much. It's a nice break."

Speaker Evans: "Returning back to page 8 of the Calendar. Under the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3643, Representative Rashid. Representative Rashid is recognized."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Rashid: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3643, which I spoke about a while ago. I'm happy to answer any questions. I ask for your support."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? Representative Didech is recognized."

Didech: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Evans: "He indicates he will."

Didech: "All right. We'll try again. Like I said, I know there's some Members on our side who support this Bill, some who have some concerns. I just wanted to walk through some of the mechanics of how this Bill actually works. My understanding... and stop me, correct me if I'm wrong. The way that this Bill works is school districts will be required to provide halal or kosher food or other religious dietary needs, but only if the Illinois State Board of Education successfully enters into a master contract for those dietary needs. Is that a correct understanding of the Bill?"

Rashid: "That is correct, yes."

Didech: "And that will be essentially subject to a competitive bidding process, whereby ISBE will issue a request for bids. Vendors will submit their qualifications. It'll be a sealed bidding process, and ISBE will pick vendors. Is that essentially how you foresee this happening?"

Rashid: "That is my understanding, yes."

Didech: "And so, for example, for kosher food. Whether or not a vendor qualifies for that competitively bid sealed contract is going to be whether they are a kosher certified vendor as

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

certified by the Illinois Department of Agriculture. Is that accurate?"

Rashid: "Yeah, subject to the Kosher Food Act."

"Right, yes. So, the Kosher Food Act ... and that's what I Didech: want to spend most of my time talking about. And this ... we've had a conversation in depth about this before. So, we're going to be repeating some of this, but I think it's important for the Members of the Body. What this Bill does is it inserts a new definition for kosher food into the Kosher Food Act. And one of the things that, you know, I've... I've learned, I've been here a few years now, is the definitions are really the foundation of our Bills, right? They could do lots of things that we think are good, things that we're trying to accomplish. If we don't get the definitions just right, it can cause unintended consequences, negative unexpected repercussions. So, I want to walk through this definition of kosher that we have in the Kosher... that we are, in this Bill, adding to the Kosher Food Act. What it is says is, 'kosher means supervised, prepared under, and maintained in strict compliance with the laws and customs of the Jewish religion, including, but not limited to, the laws and customs of shechita requiring the slaughter of animals according to appropriate Jewish law, and in compliance with the strictest standards of Jewish law as expressed by reliable, recognized Jewish entities and Jewish rabbis.' So, essentially, if a vendor wants to be a kosher food vendor, they will make an application the Department of Agriculture. And the Department of Agriculture will make a determination as to whether they qualify under this definition. Is that ... is that accurate?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Rashid: "Yes."

Didech: "So, let's work through this definition. Tell me, what is a Jewish rabbi?"

Rashid: "I can't answer that question."

Didech: "So, how do you expect... okay, how do you expect the Department of Agriculture to answer that question if you're not able to answer that question?"

Rashid: "I mean, the department will figure that out because that is... they'll have the professionals to do that. I... I'm not a expert in Jewish law. And so, I can't tell you what a rabbi is."

Didech: "Have you spoken to anyone at the Department of Agriculture about this Bill?"

Rashid: "I have not."

Didech: "So, we don't know actually if they have the professional expertise to determine who is a Jewish rabbi and who is not a Jewish rabbi?"

Rashid: "Well, we... we have the Halal Food Act, which does have very similar language that's been on the books for over 20 years, and it has not been an issue for them to do this in accordance with Muslim dietary laws according to Islamic institutions and leaders."

Didech: "So, over the past 20 years, how many times have they enforced the Halal Food Act?"

Rashid: "I don't know, but I do know it has been enforced."

Didech: "So, this language... so, what you're saying, and I believe you, is mirrored after the Halal Food Act..."

Rashid: "Yes."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Didech: "...which you say that they are able to successfully enforce?"

Rashid: "Correct."

Didech: "So, let's talk about the Halal Food Act. How does the Department of Agriculture determine who is a Muslim Imam and who is not a Muslim Imam?"

Rashid: "I don't know."

Didech: "Does this give you some hesitation about this Bill, given that we don't know how the Department of Agriculture is going to determine who's a Jewish rabbi, who's a Muslim Imam? Does they... walk me through that, why you're comfortable with that."

Rashid: "Honestly, I trust them to figure that out. I think an Imam or a rabbi is a relatively standard position in a religious community. And so, I trust them to figure it out."

Didech: "So, you... you think a rabbi is a standard position? So, let's..."

Rashid: "It's not a standard position. It's a... it's a standard... it's a title within the Jewish religion that they can... that they can decide if someone is a rabbi or not."

Didech: "So, let me... let me ask you this. Let's... let's dig a little deeper into this."

Speaker Evans: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Didech: "All right. Well, let me... all right, I will go to the Bill. I think I've made my point. I... I think this Bill comes from a very good place. I don't know how I'm going to vote on it because I like what you're trying to do, but the definitions matter. The unintended consequences are something that we're going to have deal with. And I also fear a little bit that we're giving people false hope 'cause I think... I

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

don't know how the Department of Agriculture is going to implement this. I don't know how anybody's going to get certified as a kosher vendor under this definition of kosher food. So, I appreciate what you're trying to do, and thank you for taking the time to answer these questions."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Halbrook is recognized."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Like I'd spoke earlier when this Bill... before this Bill was pulled from the record, I spoke to the opposition Senators, and they stated that this was already Federal Law, that there was really no reason to do this Bill. And, again, I'm not supporting it, and I would ask others not to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Johnson is recognized."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very quick. I just... a question was asked earlier about if in the Department of Corrections other denominations are recognized. And during times of Lent, they do... fish is served on Fridays in our correctional facilities across the state."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Rashid to close."

Rashid: "Thank you. I want to just say a few things. We have...
we've addressed the concerns of the school districts, the
bodies representing school administrators who have moved to
neutral. The Illinois State Board of Education is neutral.
This Bill is subject to appropriations. And so, it only
requires them to carry this out if ISBE provides a master
contract and there is an appropriation for this. It doesn't
go into effect until next year. We're going to... I'm happy to
continue working with ISBE to make sure this is successfully
implemented. We've worked with the school management

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

associations and will continue to work with them as well. We... to the point of the last speaker, this is not part of Federal Law because this would require the school... the schools to provide this accommodation if the request is made and the contract's available and the appropriation is there. So, again, I know of no stakeholder... stakeholder opposition, and I ask for an 'aye' vote so that we can feed our students nutritious meals that meet their dietary standards. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3643?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3643. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3902, Representative... Leader Barbara Hernandez is recognized."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on House Bill 3902. This is an initiative from my community, City of Aurora also, to help more cities like Highland Park. This is a drone Bill. The drone Bill will be able... currently, the police officers cannot use the drone Bills for special occasions or events. So, now, with this Bill, we're able to narrow it down where they'll be able to use it for parades, concerts, marathons, and so on. It's very detailed in what

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

they can use it. And also, it has to be hosted by the State of Illinois or a county, municipality, township, or park district as well. This is mostly for open to the public. The ACLU is neutral to this as well. There is notification that the individuals have to post. If you're hosting a special event, you should let people know that they're going to be under surveillance during this time frame. It has to be posted 24 hours before the event, during the event as well at main entrances. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? We have Representative Windhorst."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, I know there was a lot of work put into this Bill to bring stakeholders either to agreement or to neutral. One of the important ones, I believe, for your side of the aisle was the ACLU, and they are now neutral on the Bill. What was changed to bring them to neutral?"

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct. And it was mainly a few items such as the 24 hours. So, if there's any camera footage, they have, for special events, 24 hours to eliminate all those footages, all the recordings, and so on, the pictures that may... they may take. If there is, let's say, unfortunately, something happens, then that footage can be used as evidence."

Windhorst: "And the primary purpose of this Bill is to assist law enforcement during..."

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct. Yes."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "...parades, special events that are sponsored by governmental entities to make sure that they can keep people safe?"

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "And this was unanimous in committee just earlier this evening, and I believe had only one 'no' vote in the Senate.

Is that correct?"

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Guzzardi is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

Guzzardi: "Representative Hernandez, we had a little bit of a discussion on this in committee moments ago, but I wanted to clarify one of the points that I had raised. I think we spoke after committee, and I feel more comfortable with the answer, but I just want to make sure that it's stated clearly here on the record. It's about this retention of the footage. So, there's... the footage can only be retained in general for... for 24 hours. Is that correct?"

Hernandez, B.: "For special events, yes. So, in this case, yes." Guzzardi: "For the special events, yes. Sorry. We're adding, in this Bill, the ability for law enforcement to use these drones over these special events and the routed... excuse me, routed events. And the exception to the 24-hour retention is if there's reasonable suspicion that the footage contains evidence of criminal activity. Is that right?"

Hernandez, B.: "If something happens at that moment, yes."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Guzzardi: "Okay. Yeah. So, that's the thing that I had brought up in committee, and I just want to make sure that we have this on the record on the floor here as well, that the only ability to retain that footage beyond 24 hours is if there's an incident that happened during the course of the event that law enforcement responded to during the event. Then they have the reasonable suspicion that there may have been criminal activity, and they can retain the footage. Is that right?"

Hernandez, B.: "That's correct."

Guzzardi: "Okay, great. Yeah, I was just... the concern that I had brought up in committee is that law enforcement might retain this footage even if there hadn't been obvious evidence of a crime. They might look through the footage and then find evidence of a crime and then retain the footage. But as I understand your intent and the language of the Bill, that won't be allowed. So, I appreciate you helping me understand that and making me more comfortable about that concern. And I appreciate all the great work that you've put in on this issue, and thank you for bringing this measure forward."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Swanson is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

Swanson: "Thank you. Leader, I've just got a couple questions. I...

I really like this Bill. I hoped that possibly we could expand
it for some more protection for our law enforcement officers,
possibly in a pursuit on foot or in car, something like that.
Especially for us in the rural areas where we do not always
have the police protections. I think it'd be very beneficial

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- for us to use in our communities. My question is this. Who will be the operators of that drone?"
- Hernandez, B.: "It would be the police officers that pass a course in order to... that are FAA approved."
- Swanson: "So, most likely, they're going to have to go through some type of training."
- Hernandez, B.: "Yes."
- Swanson: "And would... would that town then have to carry, or community or that city, whatever, that department, will they have to provide some special insurance protections for that operator if he would break a window or fall on the crowd or whatever and hurt somebody?"
- Hernandez, B.: "That would fall under the liability that they currently have."
- Swanson: "Okay. Is there potential that it... some of this could be contracted out to a private contract company to do some of this work too?"
- Hernandez, B.: "It's not addressed in this Bill specifically, but it was mainly for the officers to be able to use... use the drone if they are, like we said, certified."
- Swanson: "Right. And I think that's something that maybe should be considered, I think, as we open up some of these other opportunities, maybe some private businesses that may be involved in some of this type work. To... to the Bill. There are so many opportunities with this piece of legislation, in my mind, that opens up better protection for our law enforcement, better protection for our public, better protection for groups of people in large crowds as we... this is where this is kind of... originate at because of the

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

protections and from what we saw in a terrible tragedy this past summer. So, I... I appreciate this Bill coming forward. I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Wilhour is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Wilhour: "Thank you. Leader Hernandez, is there anything... is there anything in this Bill that would protect us from potential surveillance from hostile foreign actors? Information sharing, surveillance, stealing our information, surveilling critical..."

Hernandez, B.: "Well, there is a part where it says that we're not... facial recognition should not be part of this, unless there's a, let's say, a high risk of a terrorist attack. Is that something you're looking into?"

"Not necessarily. I do appreciate that fact. This is... Wilhour: this has actually been an issue across the nation on some of this stuff. I... I support giving law enforcement this... this ability, but a 2020 study by Bard College found that one organization, DJI Drones, account for 90 percent of the drones that are used across the... across the nation for... for this type of stuff. And that particular brand is a Chinesemanufactured drone. And the Defense Department has actually banned purchases of those drones in 2017, and there's about the information-collecting bipartisan concern technologies that these foreign actors, especially the ... the Chinese-owned companies, have. And I'm hearing that that is not addressed in... in here at all."

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Wilhour: "Okay. Well, thank you. I'll... I'll go to the Bill. Like I said before, I... I appreciate the need and the usefulness of this... this kind of stuff, but these safeguards are important in a... especially in the... in the climate that we're in right now. So, I would urge us to move towards putting those safeguards in there. And until that happens, I don't think it is prudent to support this Bill in its current form. So, thank you very much, though."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Reick is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

Reick: "One question. I know out in where I live we have parades, and we have third-party drones doing flyovers for purposes of marketing and things like that. You know, this is a great event in Woodstock, come on out. And here's great people having time. Does your Bill allow for the use of third-party, noncontracted drone footage to be used in the event there is some kind of an... of an occurrence, that would be able to be used, you know, that... that this Bill would allow somebody who's authorized under the Bill to use? Can we go out to a third party who had no intention of being part of the... the ambit of this Bill, but they're there anyway and they have filmed something or they've recorded something that would give evidence that way? Is this... does this automatically draw them in as... as a person or as a company or a user that can... whose information can be used?"

Hernandez, B.: "No. This just addresses the abilities for police officers to use the drones for safety of the community, to do

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

their job, to do a better job in a way to help them in... in this. That's mainly what this Bill is doing."

Reick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Weber is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Weber: "Hi, Representative. Thank you for filing this legislation.

I would like to point out that I've had similar legislation for five years I've filed and never been able to get a hearing in committee on. So, I'm glad you covered some of the issues in some of my drone Bills that I've had. Originally, this was brought to my attention by Gurnee Police Department, concerned that in the current Drone Act there is nowhere in there that it allows for training. Does this Bill allow for training?"

Hernandez, B.: "For training or trading?"

Weber: "Training. Like the current Drone Act, very limited on what they can use drones for. Training is not in there, so most police are training on their own time."

Hernandez, B.: "No, this Bill does not cover the training of that.

It's just, like I said, being able to use it for special events."

Weber: "So, maybe if you're able to get another drone Bill in, we can add training in there on... so they can do it while they're actually on the clock. That would be nice. Also, I have areas in my district that are landlocked, they're completely surrounded by water that are not easily accessible. We had been looking into at trying to get the drones to be able to fly out to those areas to do a surveillance to see what

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- exactly is needed when a 9-1-1 call comes in. Is there anything in there that would allow those to be used for that?"
- Hernandez, B.: "The drones can be used for rescue missions and searching. So, if there's all of a sudden someone is missing and they... they can send a search party..."
- Weber: "Well, this is literally just a 9-1-1 call from an island."
- Hernandez, B.: "And then if it is a rescue mission, they can use a drone for that purpose."
- Weber: "Okay. So, the problem is, a lot of times they don't know that. They might just get a call or a text, and they are not able to go out and look for a problem. They're only able to go out after a problem is identified."
- Hernandez, B.: "So, if someone does call 9-1-1, they can use the drone and dispatch it there."
- Weber: "Okay. All right. Well, we can cross that off my drone list, then. So, that's a good thing. I know a lot of times drones have been used and been brought to court because it is very hard to narrow down what they can see and record, such as, like it's okay on public property, but it's very hard to take out what they can see in the backyards of people's property. I think they've lost because that's considered an invasion of privacy on a lot of those. So, is... is there anything in your legislation that limits, like, that type of footage from being recorded?"
- Hernandez, B.: "Like I said, they're only able to use the recording... oh, well, not use... have... be able to record for 24 hours during the event and then they have to remove all footage if there's no incident that happened in the next 24 hours."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Weber: "I know Representative Guzzardi had brought this up, and I appreciate it. I know he's got some of the same concerns I have when it concerns people's privacy. So, could you explain, it says 'may be subject to FOIA'. Can you explain that in detail so we understand exactly what that means?"
- Hernandez, B.: "So, it can be FOIAable, but it also has certain circumstances in that case."
- Weber: "Okay. Can you expand on what those certain circumstances are? I'm just concerned. Like... like I said, this could be capturing stuff in people's private backyards."
- Hernandez, B.: "So, no. For that purpose, they would not be able to unless there was a criminal action that happened in that backyard, then that's when they can do that. But if... they can't just bring a drone to a neighborhood unannounced."
- Weber: "Yeah, I don't... that doesn't sound right 'cause I know cases have been lost that, you know, it's not... that is not necessarily public view, what's in people's backyards. What exactly does the language say and do you have... so, it just says may be FOIAable?"
- Hernandez, B.: "So, when it comes to the… the photographing, they shall make every reasonable attempt to photograph only the building or the structure, avoid other areas. So, if something does happen, that's the only thing that they can do and photograph."
- Weber: "So, if something is videotaped, I know that on paper we redact things. Would that video footage that was not involved, not in the building, be removed from the FOIA, or would that be part of it?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Hernandez, B.: "If it was a... if there is something that happened criminally and they need to FOIA, then that will be shown. If it's not, then it will not."
- Weber: "Okay. All right. Well, I know... you know, I'm always concerned about invasion of privacy, especially that's been a huge issue with the drones. I know we've got a lot of safety concerns for the public as well. I'm sure at some point this'll probably end up in court because it will pick up something on footage that wasn't on public property and people will not like that. So, anyway, thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Tarver is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

- Tarver: "Thanks. Leader Hernandez, a few... a few questions for you, and I'm trying to scroll through this. So, walk me through. If there's a policy violation, it looks to me, based on my reading, that that same law enforcement agency kind of polices itself. Can you walk me through that? If for some reason they use this... this footage for some purpose that they should not."
- Hernandez, B.: "The Attorney General can investigate complaints about the usage of drones by law enforcement. So, there is a way to complain if there is something that they, the police officers or department, is abusing that power."
- Tarver: "But prior to that, right? Prior to that, that agency has to determine whether there's a violation, that agency has to determine whether or not they... they think it's willful and wanton. Is that right? So, the initial... the first step is for that agency to essentially police itself?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hernandez, B.: "Yes."

Tarver: "Okay. And then there's the ability for the Attorney General to..."

Hernandez, B.: "To complain."

Tarver: "...investigate?"

Hernandez, B.: "Yes."

Tarver: "Okay. Is there a private cause of action?"

Hernandez, B.: "We do not address that in this Act."

Tarver: "Why is that?"

Hernandez, B.: "The language itself is just to narrow it down. It was a big Bill that they were working on for several years to narrow it down to just specifically, like I said, special event occasions to just prevent what happened in Highland Park. But..."

Tarver: "No. I... we're going to get to the origin of the Bill, and I appreciate that. My question is actually a little more... is different. My question is why, if it's been thought about and contemplated for several years, is there no private cause of action that an individual themselves could pursue if law enforcement is using this in a way that it should not be used?"

Hernandez, B.: "I can't speak for other individuals that created this Bill in the beginning, and I know there's different sections of the Bill itself. But like I said, this Bill itself was narrowed down from the City of Aurora and done in the Senate."

Tarver: "So, it was narrowed down. So, there was a private cause of action at some point, and then this was like a funnel, and it just came down to only to the Attorney General?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hernandez, B.: "Not... not what I'm saying. I don't know what it had in the past and throughout the years. There were probably some things that I think they were working on way before I came in."

Tarver: "Sure."

Hernandez, B.: "So..."

Tarver: "And this is not directed at you individually. So, let me be very clear about that. I'm just trying to understand why, in a situation in which a person can have their rights violated, that person does not have the ability to pursue any legal redress. The only allowable situations for the Attorney General, which seems very political, quite honestly, in nature, is that we keep continuing to create causes of action where the Attorney General can investigate, and it doesn't leave the average citizen, who may have had their rights violated, the ability to pursue justice. So, I'll leave that as more of a statement. The other reason why I'm concerned about that is because this, just like Chairwoman Williams' Bill, just like Leader Greenwood's Bill in the past, it's another Bill that says, hey, law enforcement can use this and it can only be retained for criminal purposes, right? So, what if, for some reason, this drone picks up an officer doing something that he or she should not be doing? That drone footage could not be used in an administrative capacity. Is that correct?"

Hernandez, B.: "Sorry, can you repeat your question?"

Tarver: "Sure. If for some reason this drone picks up an officer, video footage of an officer, doing something that he or she should not be doing to a citizen, that citizen has no ability

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

to utilize this information because it only can be retained for criminal purposes. Is that correct?"

Hernandez, B.: "That is correct."

Tarver: "Okay."

Hernandez, B.: "But it is only for special event safety concerns."

Tarver: "So, a person who potentially has... I'm sorry. I didn't
 mean to talk over you. Say it again."

Hernandez, B.: "This is only for the officer to use it for safety concerns in the community."

"Okay. So, you have to ... you have to see some issue with the fact that an individual can have his or her rights violated by law enforcement. The only person that can use this video footage is law enforcement to pursue somebody for potentially a crime. But it could never be used against law enforcement if they were perpetrating something that's a little bit less than a crime but an administrative issue. So, if the officer's potentially going to be decertified or separated in some capacity, you can't retain this footage, which is the same thing that was in Chairwoman Williams' Bill about the license plate expanding cameras for ISP. The same thing was in Leader Greenwood's Bill about expanding cameras for ISP. So, again, we continue to put forth policies that says you can use the video if there's something criminal in nature, but never to look at, not even the Attorney General apparently, never to look at a private individual having a cause of action if their rights have been violated. That is fundamentally a problem."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Hernandez, B.: "I do want to add that there is footage. So, they probably can ask when it comes to the body cameras. I think we passed that a few a year or two years ago to..."

Tarver: "Is that language... is that language in this Bill?"

Hernandez, B.: "Not this, but it was in the SAFE-T Act, to add the cameras for 2025."

"Okay. I... I'm not going to go back and forth with you on Tarver: the SAFE-T Act, and I appreciate... giving that to you. But the reality is that we tore the safety up in cameras. You do realize that the Governor, last budget had, I think, a total of \$5 million in grants for the entire State of Illinois for people to apply to get body cameras? So, to talk about body cameras is really a nonissue. I know it's supposed to be until 2025. We found \$400 million off the grid that does not come back here for the Governor to have a closing fund, and we have \$5 million in the budget for body cameras. I don't ... I don't really think body cameras is the point that we need to talk about. I will go to the Bill. And I appreciate you allowing me to have this conversation back and forth. This is another Bill where all of a sudden because of the demographics of the individuals harmed, right... because this Bill's been worked on for five years, supposedly, or several years. Now that white individuals primarily were harmed in a rich, white suburb, all of a sudden, it's time for drones. There were no... there was no push for drones. There was nobody going to the White House when it was a mass shooting in Washington Park, right around the time of Highland Park. We have mass shootings, unfortunately, in the City of Chicago very, very often. And nobody had the political fortitude or concern for

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

people of color to bring a Bill that related to drones in some other way to monitor these events. So, it's frustrating, and my frustration is not with you. I have a great deal of respect for you, and I appreciate you bringing this Bill. I want to definitely say that on the record. But it is highly offensive that, yet again, we're putting forth Bills that do not allow private individuals to have a cause of action when they're harmed. You have to rely on a political person to do it for you. In addition to that, you... excuse me, if you're in same communities, it does not matter until somebody white dies. It's the same thing with heroin, same thing with fentanyl, the same thing with all these things. As soon as it makes it to the suburbs... and I certainly am not trying to disparage anyone who was harmed in Highland Park. I also don't want to minimize or forget the fact that people are getting shot and killed, unfortunately, in Chicago every single day. And I haven't seen anybody put forth anything meaningful unless and until someone white in the suburb was harmed. And that is offensive."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Hanson is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Hanson: "Thank you, Leader, for bringing this forward. I wanted to speak to the safe operation and certification of those that operate these drones. There was some concerns earlier. Anything in the sky the government uses, whether it be a helicopter, a plane, or a drone, is governed by the FAA. The Federal Aviation Administration must issue a COA, a Certificate of Authorization, for such uses. That could be

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

harmless things, such as GIS mapping that could be monitoring river levels, that could be monitoring avalanches. It could also mean fire and police rescue. So, when it comes to will the right people be operating these drones that have training, the answer is yes. The FAA has to okay it, and just like acquiring a pilot's license for a plane, you've got to acquire a license for operating a drone. To the Bill. Thank you, again, for bringing this forward. This is truly a case where technology can aid in manpower and in personpower for monitoring large crowds. Think about concerts, think about parades, where there may not be an obvious, natural viewpoint, whether it be at the top of a building, the top of a hill. Drones help. Drones are operated by people that are trained and certified, and I support the Bill. Thank you for bringing it forward."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Cabello is recognized."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I hear a lot of concerns, but this is something that I think is going to help save lives. One of the things that I heard was from one of the Members on my side of the aisle is a valid concern, and we need to maybe address that into a trailer Bill after this one passes. Another Member had spoken about if two police officers or a police officers were doing something wrong. Number one, they have body cams on. Number two, they're not going to get rid of the video then. They're going to save that video. They're not going to let that video out. They're going to give it to the Attorney General or whoever else is doing the investigations. I don't see them just getting rid of it after the 30 days. Because

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

more than likely, if they're doing something wrong, there's probably a crime, and they have to keep it after that. So, this is not going to be a FOIAable thing if they get rid of the video. Because if they only keep it for 24 hours after a crime and no crimes are committed, the video is gone. So, I... I also heard concerns of people saying that it's going to be over private property. It may be, but the actual footage is going to be for the crowd. We're not going to be looking into people's homes. We're not going to be looking into what people are doing on their private property. This is a rare Bill that helps the police that the ACLU is neutral. This is something, I think, that is going to help with some of the national tragedies that are going on, and I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Hernandez to close."

Hernandez, B.: "I just want to say thank you, and this Bill is very important to a lot of communities. It will help a lot of officers to be able to do their job, protect our communities. Once again, this is not going to be just a drone that can be in anyone's neighborhood for whatever reason. This is a specific purpose for special events, missing person, rescue missions. That's it. This is not going to be someone in the corner or a group in the corner and just keep an eye on individuals. This is not what the purpose is. So, this is going to be a way to keep people safe. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3902?' This is final action.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all the opposed

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3902. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keicher, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Keicher: "Mr. Speaker, if you could please excuse Representative Hauter for the remainder of Session today."

Speaker Evans: "The record will reflect. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2023: recommends be adopted, referred to the Floor is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 1298."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Reick, for what reason do you seen recognition?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Please speak your point."

Reick: "You know, that last Bill that we just talked about reminded me of something. Over the course of this Session, we have passed an awful lot of Bills that have given the Attorney General the ability to prosecute or to examine actions on a case-by-case basis. This Bill did the same. But at the same time, today we passed a Bill that said if you have a cause of action against the State of Illinois you must come and sit at the feet of the king in the seat of power, here in Springfield or up in Chicago. Mr. Speaker, we are at risk of no longer being a republic of laws but a government of men. I think we

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

fought a revolution against those things. This is the kind of stuff that led to that. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Hollman: "Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills.

 Senate Bill 250, offered by Speaker Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. First Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for a Bill. Leader Manley on the Motion."
- Manley: "Speaker, I move that the one-hour posting requirement be waived so that Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1298 can be heard immediately."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Manley has moved to waive the posting requirements. All in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. The voting is open. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to suspend Rule 15(d) for immediate consideration. Leader Manley on the Motion."
- Manley: "Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 15(d) for immediate consideration of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1298."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Manley has moved to suspend Rule 15(d).

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.

 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'.

 And the Rule is suspended. On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills—Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 1289, Leader Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. At the top of page 4

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- of the Calendar, under Senate Bills—Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1298. Leader Gabel is recognized."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Senate Amendment..."
- Speaker Evans: "Mr. Clerk, please... please move this Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill on Second Reading."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1298, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor... Floor Amendments #2 and 3 are offered by Representative Gabel. Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative... Leader Gabel on Floor Amendment #2."
- Gabel: "Thank you. Floor Amendment 2 is an Amendment to become the health care Medicaid omnibus Bill, which I can talk to... speak to on Third Reading."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Gabel moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by... offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Gabel on the Amendment."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 3 is some Amendments to the health care Medicaid omnibus Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Representative Gabel moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Evans: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill on Third

Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1298, a Bill for and Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Gabel is recognized."

Gabel: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm thrilled to be able to present our health care Medicaid omnibus this evening. This is a Bill that is the product of our work group, the Medicaid work group, where we met for about two or three months, 7 a.m. on Thursdays. It's a group of both Democrats and Republicans, both the House and the Senate. We reviewed about 30 Bills during that time. And of those, we have put about 13 of them into this... into this omnibus Bill. This omnibus Bill includes key investments in state's health care workforce, and improves access to health care. In this Bill, there are rate increases for providers and as well as some technical changes to the state's Medical Assistance Program and the Department on Aging and Department of Insurance. So, this ... this Bill includes rate increases for inpatient substance use disorder treatment. It includes across the board rate increases for hospitals. It creates a new billing code for dementia assessment and care planning, a rate increase for supportive living facilities, a rate increase for federally qualified health centers, a rate increase for care for medically fragile technologically dependent children and their full-time nurses, an increase to the nursing home

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

support rate, a rate increase to support a \$17 wage for home workers through the Community Care Program, a rate increase for ventilator care at nursing homes, a rate increase for occupational therapy, physical therapy, and speech therapy, a rate increase for community-based mental health services, a rate increase for ground and air ambulance, a rate increase for medically complex developmentally disabled individuals, a rate increase for adult day services, and reimbursement for telehealth services for developmentally disabled individuals, reimbursement for services provided by subclinical professionals at FQHCs, a rate increase for long-acting reversible contraceptives, limited licensure international medical graduate physicians, and some technical language for the HBIA program."

Speaker Evans: "Any discussion? Leader Windhorst is recognized." Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

Windhorst: "Leader, I appreciate you going through the different rate increases, some of which have been advocated for, for some time. Do we have... well, first, this is the Medicaid Working Group omnibus. Is that accurate to say?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Windhorst: "And that working group includes Republicans and Democrats?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Windhorst: "Was this approved by all Members of the working group?"

Gabel: "We reviewed it with both the Democrats and the Republicans."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Windhorst: "Did it have everyone's approval?"

Gabel: "It seemed like it, yes."

Windhorst: "With regard to the rate increases, do we have an estimated cost for what the Bill will be?"

Gabel: "Yes. The overall cost identified by Department of Health Care and Family Services was 317 million this year, in Fiscal Year '24."

Windhorst: "And with regard to some of the various rate increases, what is the implementation date for those rate increases?"

Gabel: "The last Amendment changed the implementation rates back to January 1 of 2024. For the most part."

Windhorst: "January 1 of 2024?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Windhorst: "Did I understand that correctly?"

Gabel: "For the most part."

Windhorst: "So, essentially, \$317 million for 6 months' worth of funding?"

Gabel: "Approximately."

Windhorst: "So, in the next year, in order to keep this same level of funding, we would essentially have to double the amount that's included in this Bill."

Gabel: "Approximately."

Windhorst: "So, that's going to create, I think, fairly obvious, a very large problem for the budget going forward after this year."

Gabel: "Well, we... we planned for it."

Windhorst: "And how... what is... how is that planned for?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Gabel: "Well, we knew that it was going to cost that much next year. So, we're prepared to put that much into the budget next year."

Windhorst: "Well, I believe that's going to be some of the concern you hear from this side of the aisle, is that we're setting ourselves up for a large budget problem in... in future years. So, I... you know, I appreciate what you've laid out and the effort you've made to bring this together, but I have to encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Any further discussion? We have Representative Tarver."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicates she will."

Tarver: "Leader Gabel, just a quick question on this. Is any component of this Bill... did any component of this Bill relate to JCAR?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Tarver: "Pardon?"

Gabel: "Oh, yes. There's emergency rulemaking in this Bill."

Tarver: "And just to the best of your ability, why is that? Why is it going to JCAR?"

Gabel: "For the HBIA program."

Tarver: "Okay. As someone who sits on JCAR... and this is not a knock on you, I want to be very clear about that... this emergency rule process has been abused by this administration several times. During the pandemic, certainly outside of the pandemic. There's nothing right now that stops the Governor himself from wrapping his arms around this program and putting quardrails in place. This is exactly what continues to happen,

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

which is that he wants to be able to say, hey, look, I expanded this program, and then punt to the Legislature, particularly JCAR, to say, now put the guardrails around it. And so, again, this is not a knock on you, but this is something that has happened consistently with this Governor, particularly with JCAR. And that's a little bit concerning to me because I sit on JCAR. It's not my job to do the Governor's bidding. If the Governor wants to cap this program, he can have... he can have a sound bite and say two things. I think this is a good idea. Everyone should have good health care, so we're going to expand the program. But at the same time, we don't have an unlimited pot of money, so we have to cap it at some point. Both things can be true. But instead of doing that from the very beginning, every time there was a question about this program, he punted it and said, I hope the Legislature ... they'll figure it out. And here we are, figuring it out. And I'm glad that we are because I do believe that everybody deserves to have health care and access to health care. I absolutely do believe that. But I don't believe that the Governor should continue to abuse the JCAR process with emergency rules, temporary rules, potential dynamic rules, permanent rules. I think that the Governor should just stand up and be the Governor and simply say that we're going to expand the program because it's the right thing to do, and we're also going to put guardrails around it because it's the right thing to do, as opposed to punting it to a Body to do so in rules. He has the ability to do it right now. There's no need for JCAR. And so, I appreciate you allowing me to express that point. I have no issue with you or the Bill.

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

It's just the fact that the Governor continues to do this, and it's getting a little bit old at this point. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Evans: "Indicates she will."

Flowers: "Representative Gabel, last year, we had an issue... I had an issue with some legislation that you had passed that allowed the ambulance drivers to get out of the managed care. And as a result, quite a few patients was harmed, quite a few died. And it is my understanding that there's still problems for these patients, especially the ones that's going for dialysis. And I introduced a Bill to have funding for African American drivers so they could be trained to be ambulance providers for those who did not want to come into my community to pick up the nonemergency patients. There was funding last year, \$500 thousand I believe, for a training program that did not get funded. And so, I'm asking you, is the funding in this Bill?"

Gabel: "This is the Medicaid budget. There's no funding in Medicaid to train providers. No."

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Gabel: "There's no funding in the Medicaid program to train providers."

Flowers: "But these are... this is for Medicaid patients because the ambulance was in the managed care program, which is Medicaid. And because of the pay, the ambulance drivers wanted to get out of dealing with managed care. And so, that left the patients who were incapacitated and needed a ride, a prescription ride that was written by the doctor for them to

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

come by ambulance because of their condition, and there was no way for them to get the services. And so, now, the services is still a problem, and you're saying this is not about Medicaid. I don't understand that because this is part of the Medicaid budget. This is the Medicaid Working Group."

Gabel: "Well, let me... let me just say that speaking with HFS, they have said that there are no current problems with people complaining about not being able to be picked up by ambulances."

Flowers: "Well, I haven't heard that because I still hear the complaints, and people are still calling California and Florida for rides. So, same stories that you can tell me, I got a few for you as well. Now, I'm trying to be very diplomatic with you, Representative. I'm asking you about the funding."

Gabel: "And I told you, there is no funding in this Bill to train ambulance drivers."

Flowers: "Because it's not Medicaid related? Is that what you said?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Flowers: "And so, why is it not Medicaid related, Representative, when we are talking about Medicaid patients having access..."

Gabel: "Medicaid doesn't... Medicaid doesn't pay..."

Flowers: "...Medicaid patients having access in order to get to their required doctors' visits in order for them to keep a quality of life. Now, you in charge... you're in charge of the Medicaid group. You said last year that you would put the money in the budget. You told me this year you would put the money in the budget. And so, is it any place in the budget?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Gabel: "To train drivers, no. There's additional funding in the... in the budget for ambulances to be able to pay their drivers more money. So, hopefully they can recruit more EMTs and be able to do more... more visits and pick up more people."

Flowers: "So, is that what Medicaid patients have to do in the African American community and the brown community? They have to hope that the services come? Are they not entitled to the services just like other parts of the state?"

Gabel: "They are entitled, and the Medicaid..."

Flowers: "Are they not entitled?"

Gabel: "...the Medicaid program includes transportation when appropriate and..."

Flowers: "Well, wait a minute. Are you saying... these patients, are you saying that what they're getting is not appropriate when it's a part of their health care?"

Gabel: "No, it's totally... if it's appropriate. Some visits are appropriate to be used by ambulances. And some transportation...

Flowers: "Well, the only..."

Gabel: "...is appropriate to be used by medicars."

Flowers: "Well, let me make... let me set this record straight. Because the only patients that I'm talking about are the ones that is required to come for nonemergency purposes. The ambulance. They cannot catch a Lyft. They cannot drive. Some of them can't get down the steps because they're incapacitated for whatever reason. So, it would require someone trained to assist them. So, you don't think that's a part of Medicaid for these patients who are on managed care... Medicaid managed care?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Gabel: "Medicaid managed care is still... will still provide transportation at times..."
- Flowers: "But they're not providing for all the patients."
- Gabel: "Then we need to look into that. We need to deal with the department."
- Flowers: "Well, you look into that. Because I know about it, but obviously you don't care about it. Because you know about it as well because it was your Bill that..."
- Gabel: "I have cared about it. I've asked HFS about it. They told me they had... do not get complaints any more about people not getting rides to where they need to go."
- Flowers: "Maybe because they can't get their calls through. That could be a problem as well. That could be a problem as to the reason why they're not getting any complaints."
- Gabel: "Well, Representative, I did follow up. I asked them. They told me they were not having any issues anymore."
- Flowers: "Well, I'm telling you tonight, Representative, that the patients are still having issues. And I took you on your word that you were going to do something about it. But now, you're telling me that these Medicaid patients are not entitled to rides."
- Gabel: "That is not what I said. I never said that they were not entitled, Representative."
- Flowers: "What did you say again, please?"
- Gabel: "I said that they are entitled to appropriate transportation to wherever they have to go for their medical services."
- Flowers: "So, what do you deem... what do you deem appropriate?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Gabel: "It is not my opinion. It is the rules. It is the rules. It is..."

Flowers: "But you said appropriate because any of the rides that I'm talking about..."

Gabel: "Excuse me. Excuse me."

Flowers: "Representative, the… no, excuse me. The only rides that I'm talking about are the appropriate rides for the Medicaid patients who are in need. And the telephone numbers that you've given them to, that the phone numbers is out of state. And they will not… the ambulance companies that they are calling that's out of state that Human Services is giving to them to call is telling them, we can't make that ride to pick you up. So, I'm asking you again, what should I tell these patients to do, that's still waiting on an ambulance services?"

Gabel: "Well, as I told you, from... HFS says there are patients...

there are no patients waiting for an ambulance."

Flowers: "And so, should I accept that?"

Gabel: "Okay. Are we going to go on with this forever?"

Flowers: "Should I accept that?"

Speaker Evans: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Gabel: "Come on, Marcus."

Flowers: "Representative, should I accept what you're telling me?"

Gabel: "I am..."

Flowers: "Because you said that there are no patients waiting, should I accept it?"

Gabel: "I'm very happy to work with you on this issue more. It is not part of this Bill right now. I asked you to come to the

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Medicaid working group. You did not. You did not want to bring this issue there."

Flowers: "Representative, I've had enough of working with you because you do not work on the issues that's important to my community."

Gabel: "And I..."

Flowers: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Hammond is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

"Thank you. And, Leader Gabel, I... I think to begin I would like to set the record straight with a question that Leader Windhorst had asked about earlier, regarding this product, this omnibus Bill that we are discussing here tonight or I... yeah, I quess this morning. So, the ... and for a little history for those that don't know, the Medicaid Work Group was a group that was created a number of years ago, and it has been a particularly effective group, I would say for the most part, particularly in previous years. It is a bipartisan, bicameral, and bichoice group. We have looked at all issues, all Bills related to Medicaid and fully vetted them, heard from the various groups. And then, as a group, we got together and we reviewed the Bills and the issues that we had talked about. And we figured out what we could afford, what we couldn't afford, what made sense, what didn't make sense right now, perhaps we could deal with it at another time. So, when you stated to Leader Windhorst that this is in fact a product of the Medicaid Work Group, I don't believe that that is entirely true. Would you agree with that?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Gabel: "Could you repeat the question part of that?"

Hammond: "So, when you stated to Leader Windhorst that this omnibus Bill that we're debating..."

Gabel: "Ah, okay. We did meet with you to review them, to review what we were thinking about putting in the Bill."

Hammond: "To review them. So, to be clear, about a month ago we stopped hearing from the providers and those that were coming to the group with initiatives that they would like to see in this Bill. That was about a month ago. A couple of weeks ago, your comment to me was, 'I'll be ready to talk to you next week about the Medicaid Bill.' That was a couple weeks ago. And then Tuesday night, we in fact... I don't know, we had about 24 hours notice. We had a Zoom meeting on Tuesday night where you presented what you had chosen to be in the Bill to our... to me so that I could relay it to our Members. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Yes. With the Senate there as well."

Hammond: "And I will just state that this group has never operated in that way before. We have always had those discussions either... no, we had them as a group and our Leaders, Leader Harris, Leader Demmer, had private conversations that land the airplane. But they were always done on a bipartisan way. They were never done in this way. So, I would say that your response to Leader Windhorst was disingenuous certainly. But that being said, I think that the Medicaid Work Group is a terribly important group for this chamber, as well as the Senate, and I would really hope that, as we move forward, we can get this back together again and do it right and do it

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

the way it's supposed to be done, in a bipartisan manner. I have a couple of questions on this Bill that's before us."

Gabel: "And let me say, Representative, that we will be... we will be looking at doing it differently next year."

Hammond: "I'm going to take your word on that, Rep... Leader. Thank you. So, the... the cost associated with the Bill that we are dealing with tonight is, for all intents and purposes, a sixmonth cost, correct?"

Gabel: "For the most part. There may be a few things that start earlier."

Hammond: "There are a few, I think, as I look at the list, that are annualized. So, about \$317 million for the 6 month?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Hammond: "And not included is what we anticipate to be about a \$549 million cost for the undocumented population. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Yes. Five hundred forty-five."

Hammond: "And I will say, you know, our hospitals have waited for 28 years for an increase. They're going to see a 10 percent, as opposed to the... the 20 percent that they had asked for. I'm hopeful that many of our rural hospitals, certainly that are few and far between and are struggling, can make it with that 10 percent. And as well as a number of our nursing homes that have been struggling. So, Representative, I thank you for your work on this, and I'm also going to thank you for your word that, moving forward, our Medicaid work group will not be operating in the way it did this year. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Representative LaPointe... Representative LaPointe is recognized."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

LaPointe: "Leader Gabel, I want to ask you a question for the purposes of legislative intent. In Article 100, Section 5-5.01a, subsection (g), which is related to the expansion of dementia care for the Supportive Living Program, is it your intent for this to apply to the current solicitation for the applications for dementia care services by the Department of Health Care and Family Services?"

Gabel: "Yes, it is."

LaPointe: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. It includes rate increases for various provider types. And when we're talking about mental health and substance use disorder treatment providers, because that is health care too, we're talking about our nonprofit providers who take predominantly Medicaid. So, we're talking about Lutheran Social Services, Haymarket, Gateway, Ada McKinley, and Chestnut, providers all over the state. Not too long ago, we would have also been talking about the Women's Treatment Center on the West Side of Chicago, but in 2021, they closed down because they were losing money, like a lot of our predominantly Medicaid mental health and substance use treatment providers perpetually lose money. So, for the Women's Treatment Center, that's 45 beds for substance use treatment gone, that's 600 people who are longer getting daily methadone treatment. The rate increases in this Bill are so fundamental if we want to maintain access to care, health care and mental health care, for the people on Medicaid in Illinois. The rate increases are fundamental if we want to stop the closures and stop our

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

workforce from bleeding. I'm very, very proud of the rate increases in this Bill, but I also have to remember that the number of detox beds for people on Medicaid in this state right now is actually decreasing. There's a six-month wait for adolescents trying to access substance use treatment. Our mental health providers who take mostly Medicaid are so understaffed. As I talk about a lot, they pay their master-level therapists in the mid-40s. And people leave to go to private practice or to take higher paying jobs at Medicaid managed care organizations. Ada McKinley, that serves the South and the West Side, have a 50 percent vacancy rate when it comes to their behavioral health clinicians. And I point this all out not because I don't love the rate increases in this Bill, because I absolutely do, but I just need to underscore the urgency to stay focused on continuing to increase our Medicaid rates in the years to come if we really do believe in concepts like access to care and treatment, not trauma. I thank everyone in both chambers on both sides of the aisle for participating in the weekly Medicaid working groups. I want to give a special shoutout to staff extraordinaire, Taylor Howard. And, Leader, I really appreciate your work on this package. Let's say that again. The staff who worked on the Medicaid Working Group and the omnibus package deserve a whole lot of credit. This is really important stuff. So, thank you, Taylor Howard. And thank you, Leader Gabel, for leading this charge. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Reick is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Reick: "Leader Gabel, my good friend and co-JCAR member from Chicago brought this up earlier, but I'd like to bring your attention to several specific parts of the Bill, Amendment 3, please. On page 75, line 14, the Bill discusses the issuance of emergency rules. Can you explain to me how that is specifically going to work in the context of this Bill, please?"

Gabel: "Sure. You know, this language will allow the Governor and the Department of Health Care and Family Services to contain the costs of the program so that it will not impact any other program."

Reick: "Through the issuance of emergency rules. Okay. Administrative Procedures Act has requirements for the issuance of emergency rules. And down on lines 22 or thereabouts, it says that 'General Assembly finds that the adoption of rules to implement the change made by this amendatory Act of the 103rd General Assembly is deemed an emergency and necessary for the public interest, safety, and welfare.' Those are the requirements that are in the IAPA. Would you explain to me which... what we're talking about here? Are we talking about the public interest? Are we talking about public safety? Or are we talking about the public welfare? Which one of it is it?"

Gabel: "I think all of them."

Reick: "In what way?"

Gabel: "Well, I think the part that you're talking about is to... is to be able to implement all of the rates that we talked about earlier."

Reick: "Implement the rates to do what?"

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

- Gabel: "The rates to... the increased rates for psychiatric care for the hospitals. The piece..."
- Reick: "Let's cut to the chase here, Ma'am. We're talking about what we have comfortably come to understand as being a \$1.1 billion cost to cover undocumented people in this state. That's the specific part of this emergency rulemaking that I would like you to address."
- Gabel: "Oh, okay. Yeah... yeah, I think I'm looking at a different
 part of the language."
- Reick: "I just quoted it to you. It's on page 75 of Amendment 3.

 I... and also on page 358, but there's a different bit in there that we'll talk about in a moment."
- Gabel: "Yeah. I think the emergency language speaks for itself."
- Reick: "No, it doesn't. I'm asking you a question. What part of what we're trying to do here to provide coverage to undocumented people in this state rises to the level of an emergency that needs to be administered through the issuance of emergency rules by this Governor?"
- Gabel: "Well, the rulemaking can take quite a long time. And there are concerns that if we continue to wait that we won't be able to contain the cost of the program, which is the whole purpose of the rulemaking."
- Reick: "So, it can be... well, let's go to page 358 of the Bill. I think it's Section 150, Section (e), as in echo. We talk about, 'In order to provide for the expeditious and effective ongoing implementation of this Section, the Department may adopt rules through the use of emergency rulemaking in accordance with Section 5-45 of the IAPA, except that the limitation on the number of emergency rules that may be

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

adopted in the 24-month period shall not apply.' Would you explain to me what motivates... what motivated that language?"

Gabel: "The concern that... that, as we're monitoring this program, that there may be times when we need to change the rules more often than within one 24-month period."

Reick: "Do you understand the fact that when emergency rules are issued that after the expiration of that 150-day period within which those rules are in effect, there is a 2-year moratorium on issuing new emergency rules under the IAPA?"

Gabel: "Yeah. Yes."

Reick: "And do you realize that, by this language here, you're basically blowing that out of the… out of the water and saying it doesn't apply in this case. Is that what you're saying? We don't have to abide by the Illinois Administrative Procedures Act in this case because you've decided to waive it in this Bill?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Reick: "That's pretty darn..."

Gabel: "Well, I mean, the attempt here is to contain..."

Reick: "Yeah, I know what the attempt is, Ma'am, but the fact is, is that what you're doing is you're violating the Illinois Administrative Procedures Act through a unilateral Act in this Bill."

Gabel: "Well, let me also point out that there's a repeal date on here. This is to be able to spend the next year really understanding what this issue is and being able to contain the costs."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Reick: "No. What we're doing here is we are finding ways to hide the way in which this money is going to be spent. And what we're doing..."

Gabel: "Not at all."

Reick: "...is we're saying that we're going to pay out 1.1 billion over 12 months. We're going to cut it in half this year because we're not going to start until January. But in effect, what you're doing is you're saying we're going to find ways through the rulemaking process, which gives us the ability to make this... these payments without, you know, basically under the cover darkness. It's 12:39. We're talking about this Bill. That's kind of apt. The problem is... to the Bill."

Gabel: "I disagree."

Reick: "To the Bill. Disagree all you want. To the Bill. We just got done with 20-some months of disaster declarations by this Governor. What we have here now is... is a re-enactment of the same thing. He's issuing disaster declarations through the color of administrative rule. He's waiving the rule requirements that we all abide by when it comes to issuance of emergency rules. Those are there for a reason, when there is a true, honest-to-God emergency that deals with public interest, public welfare. This is not an emergency of... of a pandemic making. This is an emergency of the making of this administration for allowing this to happen. And therefore, what we're looking at is a... a unilateral suspension of the IAPA for the convenience of this Governor and this administration. It's going to cost us an awful lot of money, and they're going to do it under the color of emergency rules,

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

and they're waiving the rules in order to be able do it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Caulkins is recognized."

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

Speaker Evans: "She indicated she will."

Caulkins: "Thank you very much. Representative, the question was asked earlier, and I didn't get a clear answer. All of these rate increases, which are long overdue for the most part and woefully inadequate as we heard earlier, one of the other speakers. Which one of these are going to be put into effect July 1, and which ones are you suspending until January 1?"

Gabel: "I think most of them will be starting January 1."

Caulkins: "Well, then maybe it's easier than which ones were..."

Gabel: "Particularly the ones that require a waiver from the Federal Government."

Caulkins: "So, just to simplify it, which ones will go into effect, then, July 1?"

Gabel: "I'm not sure. Sorry."

Caulkins: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a sham. We are playing a shell game with our health care system. We're promising people rate increases, desperately needed, but we're not going to give it to them until January 1. Our DSP workers deserve these rate increases. We have a \$50 billion budget, and we can't come up with a 1-year rate increase. We're going to play some shell game and pretend like we're helping people, and we're going to improve their lot in life, and we're going to provide for them. But, oh, we're only going to do it starting in January. Why? This is not your priority, which is shameful. This should be our

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

priority. The previous speaker talked about the need for beds for care, the need to pay people what they deserve. I hear it all the time from your side of the aisle. We need to pay people what they deserve. So, now, instead of paying people what they deserve on July 1, we're going to string this out. We're going to make things worse. We're going to not pay people what they deserve or what little we can give them until January 1, and it's going to further degrade the health care that we provide in this state. It's shameful. Absolutely shameful. Fifty billion dollars and we can't find the money to pay what people to deserve to earn. It is disgusting."

Speaker Evans: "Representative Mayfield is recognized."

Mayfield: "I yield my time to Representative Flowers."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Representative, can you please tell me how much money is in this budget is being appropriated for public health funding?"

Gabel: "For public health what?"

Flowers: "Public health. How much funding is in the budget for public health?"

Gabel: "You mean... of this budget or the... this is not a Bill about the whole budget. You're talking about in this Bill?"

Flowers: "Let me ask you this. Is public health in this Bill?"

Gabel: "Well, the federally qualified health centers, if you consider them public health, that's \$50 million. I mean, these are hospitals. These address the public's health."

Flowers: "Okay. So, that means if we're talking about hospitals, are we talking about access to care?"

Gabel: "We are. Which is why we're increasing the rates..."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Flowers: "Okay."

Gabel: "...for providers so they can provide more care."

Flowers: "So... and so, how much money is... of public health is being dedicated to prenatal care?"

Gabel: "There are... there's actually... well, all the hospitals are getting a 10 percent rate increase. So, for those hospitals that do deliveries and OB care, they will get an increase. There is a special funds for critical care hospitals, particularly focusing on those that provide OB services, 3.5 million in that category. FQHCs provide OB care, prenatal care sometimes. There's..."

Flowers: "Representative, you are aware of the gap in regards to women of color and prenatal and morbidity and mortality. How much money is being appropriated for those services to help close that gap and save lives?"

Gabel: "I mean, there are OB services in here for critical care.

This Bill, in and of itself, provides more access to care for everyone in the Medicaid program."

Flowers: "Representative, I... I think you're missing the point. I mean, I'm talking about women. I'm talking about African American women more specifically because we're dying at a higher rate. And I would think that that would give some type of indication that there would be an emergency. And so, therefore, there would be more money in this area in order to close the access gap and the preventive measure gap. There's a problem here. And so, for you to just talk about this broadly, as if there's no difference between, you know, this hospital and that one or either access, that, to me, presents a problem. Let me just say on behalf of my constituents and

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

all the families who have been neglected when it comes to public funding on our public health care, can you tell me, does this budget prioritize access to care for the people in my district that has been negatively impacted?"

Gabel: "Yes. This Bill prioritizes safety-net hospitals. Safety-net hospitals receive 10 percent more than they did last year. There is \$75 million in this budget in one-time grants for safety-net hospitals. And I have heard from many of the safety-net hospitals that they are... that they're quite... that they support this Bill and that they... that they will be able to use these funds to keep their doors open and continue to provide quality care."

Flowers: "I just want to say that public health is one of the few issues that impact everyone in the State of Illinois, regardless of their geography, their race, their age, their ethnicity. And no matter who you are, public health is important, and we just saw that during the pandemic. And of the amount money that we are being asked to appropriate today, how much money will be dedicated toward expending for mental health funding for children, first responders, and many others whom we've seen that's been neglected during this process?"

Gabel: "The majority of the money. I mean, there's going to be...
as I said, there's going to be rate increases for mental
health providers, for inpatient substance use disorder
treatment, for community-based mental health services. I'd
say at least half of this budget, \$150 million for next year."

Flowers: "You know, Representative, you remember back in the day when we used to stop the clock, and this kind of remind me of

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

an old saying that a clock is broken twice a day. I'm sorry. A clock is right twice a day. And I said that to say that this budget for this issue have some serious problems with me, but I know the people of the State of Illinois deserve better. I know the people of the State of Illinois deserve this money and much more. And it is for that reason and that reason only that I am going to begrudgingly support this budget because I really don't think it's good enough considering the problems... considering the problems that the people in my district and all across this state have been having with getting access to quality care. And they're dying every day just trying to get to the care. And during the pandemic, I am often reminded that it was the most of the people and the first person that died was from my district. So, I'm here tonight to speak on behalf of those people who cannot speak for themselves and to say that I expect better. And I tried to work with you to get better, but obviously there's a problem."

Speaker Evans: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Flowers: "And I would appreciate that you would extend the courtesy to me that you did to my colleague on the other side of the aisle. Because I, too, am going to continue to look forward to working with you, but it's been a struggle. But because of my constituents, that's what I have to continue to do in order to get the care that we need in my community. Thank you."

Speaker Evans: "Leader Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for your comments. This Bill... again, this Bill will create investments in our

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

communities and investments in the workforce, access to health care. I think it's wonderful that we can... we can provide funds for our hospitals, our community mental health centers. I... I'm thrilled to be able to present this Bill, and I look forward to working with all of you in the future. Thank you, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Evans: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1298 pass?'
 All those in favor in vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote
 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please
 take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes',
 31 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
 received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 329, offered by Representative Meyers-Martin. House Resolution 330, offered by Representative Yednock. House Resolution 331, offered by Representative Mason. And House Resolution 333, offered by Representative Johnson."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Gabel moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Gabel moves that the House stands adjourned until Friday, May 26, at the hour of 5 p.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

53rd Legislative Day

5/25/2023

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution #4, offered by Representative Swanson. Senate Joint Resolution 6, offered by Representative Hammond. Senate Joint Resolution 40, offered by Representative Mayfield. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."