110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Speaker Hoffman: "Members, the House will be in order. Members, please be in your chair. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Mike Keppler. Reverend Keppler is a Chaplain with the Illinois State Police. Reverend Keppler is the guest of Representative Kifowit. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, please turn off your cell phones, and please rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend."
- Reverend Keppler: "Shall we pray. Heavenly Father, we gather today in this chamber for the purpose of remembering those who have fallen in service to our country. You have reminded us in holy scripture, be careful and watch yourselves closely so that you do not forget. We hear and heed this admonition to care and remember this day, lest we forget. May these ceremonial moments of solemn reflection have your blessings, and may our sincere expressions of grief and gratitude for selfless acts of heroism and sacrifice be further etched in our minds and hearts this day. And we pray all of this in the blessed name of the one who gives life abundantly and eternally. Amen."
- Speaker Hoffman: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit 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 Hoffman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Gabel is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Gabel: "Speaker, let the record show that Representatives Andrade, Flowers, and Ladisch Douglass are excused today."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Keicher is recognized to report any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Keicher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Sheehan is excused for today."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Have all recorded themselves who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There being 113 Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Members, please rise. We'll begin the memorial service, presentation of colors. The Color Guard team's from Lincoln's ChalleNGe Academy in Rantoul, Illinois. Mr. Clerk, please read House Resolution 819."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 819.

- WHEREAS, In accordance with the established tradition of the Illinois House of Representatives, it is fitting that we honor our brothers and sisters who have given their lives in service to our country as the guardians of our long-held freedoms; and
- WHEREAS, To honor those brave souls who were sacrificed long ago or to pay tribute to those brave men and women of today who have continued that fight for freedom, no better words have been written than the Gettysburg Address; let us now recite those words so humbly said by our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln: "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from those honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."; and

WHEREAS, Those words from long ago still speak to the sacrifice of the brave men and women whom we now honor; it is altogether fitting and appropriate that we, with heavy hearts, again accept the honor of reading the roll call of those American Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines from the State of Illinois who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the years since the previous tribute; therefore, be it

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that a copy of this resolution be presented to the families of the fallen heroes honored on May 22, 2024."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kifowit moves for the adoption of House Resolution 819. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Roll Call of Fallen Soldiers."
- Gabel: "Private First Class Harry Jerele, Illinois Army National Guard, remains identified December 20, 2023, died December, 1942, Berkeley."
- Cabello: "Corporal Nathan Carlson, United States Marine Corps, died June 8, 2022, Winnebago."
- Rita: "Chief Gunner's Mate Caprice Pryor, United States Navy, died June 8, 2023, Chicago."
- Caulkins: Lance Corporal Evan Campbell Brown, United States Marine Corps, died August 11, 2023, Monticello."
- Tarver: "Specialist Nathaniel Jefferson, Illinois Army National Guard, died August 11, 2023, Chicago."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Captain Eleanor LeBeau, United States Marine Corps, died August 27, 2023, of Belleville."
- Crespo: "Staff Sergeant Charles Crumlett, Unites States Air Force, died March 15, 2024, Streamwood."
- Kifowit: "Additional names provided by the Department of Defense. Senior Airman Tyler Jo Law, Air Force, May 28, 2023. Petty Officer First Class Connor Wayne Baker, Navy, July 8, 2023. Specialist Christian Cortez-Rogel, Army, July 22, 2023. Chief Warrant Officer 3 Larry Vargas, Jr., Army, died July 23, 2023.

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Captain Nicholas Montgomery Terry, Air Force, died July 24, 2023. Staff Sergeant Johnathan Calvin Lawrence, Army, died July 29, 2023. Airman First Class Joshua Mitchell Hopper, Air Force, died September 25, 2023. Private First Class Mikhail Bobel, Army, died October 9, 2023. Staff Sergeant Vincent Joseph Camarata, Army, died October 19, 2023. Private First Class Cesar Gonzalez, Army, died October 20, 2023. Master Sergeant Colin Austin Corrigan, Army, died November 30, 2023. Sergeant Eddie Pryce Longs, Army, died December 5, 2023. Petty Officer Second Class John Andrew Stonis, from the Navy, died January 17, 2024. Specialist David Elliot Lockhart, from the Army, died March 7, 2024. Sergeant Cordell Walker Dunning, from the United States Army, died March 27, 2024. Staff Sergeant Matthew Joseph Clancy, United States Army, died April 2, 2024. And finally, Mr. Speaker, Private First Class Albert Antonio Chavez, United States Marine Corps, died April 3, 2024."

Speaker Hoffman: "'Amazing Grace' shall be performed by Representative Sharon Chung and Representative Suzanne Ness."

Chung and Ness: Sings 'Amazing Grace'

Playing of 'Taps'

Speaker Hoffman: "Please retire the colors. Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly.

I want to personally thank the Color Guard for the presentation of the colors from the Lincoln Challenge. We had Cadet Nakynzy Hodge, Cadet Eric Eberhardt, Cadet Clayton Gutmann, Cadet Markas James, Cadet Kyra Stirnochuk, Cadet Lilly Vail, Michael Camacho, and James Campbell. And also, in

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the... in the House, Mr. Speaker, we have ... I would like to personally thank, for taking the time out of his busy schedule, Brigadier General Daniel McAuliffe, who assisted in placing the wreath. He is the Assistant Adjutant General of the Air... Illinois Air National Guard. He is a commander of the Illinois Air National Guard. He's responsible for the command, control, and operations of plans and programs affecting more than 3 thousand Illinois Air Guard personnel located at Scott Air Force Base, Peoria and Springfield, Illinois. We also want to thank and... for their participation, Colonel Steven Rice. Colonel Rice is the Commander of the 182nd Mission Support Group, 182nd Air Wing, Peoria, Illinois, and he is in charge of seven subordinate units that are responsible for providing facilities and infrastructure, communication, engineering, emergency management, security, law enforcement services, human resources, transportation supply, aerial port activities, combat communications, music, logistics, and contracting programs in the support of the 182nd Air... Airlift Wings, federal and state missions. And my esteemed appreciation for them taking their time out, and I would like the Body to give a warm welcome to these individuals."

Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. The Chairperson with the Committee on Police & Fire reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5008. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 4460, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 4789, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5357. Representative Harper, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5488. Representative Costa Howard, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption & Child Welfare reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 4350 and a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill Representative Will Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 3446 and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5430. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1400; and recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 4 to House Bill 299. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor... Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 4966 and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 and 2 to House Bill 5288. Representative Burke, Chairperson

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 613. Representative Morgan, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5344. Representative Stava-Murray, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Health reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5405. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 and 3 to Senate Representative Rita, Chairperson Bill 3156. from Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3098; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to House Bill 890, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 2703, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 2878, Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 3268, and Floor Amendment(s) 1 to Senate Bill 3755. Representative Stuart, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5450. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s)

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

4 to House Bill 793. Representative Mason, Chairperson from the Committee on Child Care Accessibility & Early Childhood Education reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5596. Representative Tarver, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2779; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 4942. Representative Cassidy, Chairperson from the Committee on Restorative Justice reports the following committee action May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate Bill 426. Representative Gong-Gershowitz, Senate Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 2 to House Bill 222. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 814, offered by Representative Ford; and House Resolution 818, offered by Representative Mussman, are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

McCombie: "Ladies and Gentlemen in the House, today we have a guest that I would like you to say hello to if you have an opportunity, Leader Jim Durkin. Welcome."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Keicher."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Keicher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege,
 if I may."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please... please state your point."

Keicher: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's a grand honor of mine, in the gallery behind us, to recognize Gazly Andi. The commissioner is visiting as a scholar at Northern Illinois University through the Post-Doctoral Visiting Program. He comes to us from Indonesia, where he serves as the Police Grand Commissioner Adjutant with the INTERPOL. He is the head of Transnational Crimes Unit, focusing on combatting human trafficking, money laundering, international terrorism. INTERPOL Commissioner Gazly is part of a decade's long tradition between Northern Illinois University and Indonesia where NIU alum and its Center for Southeast Asian Studies program have proven such a force for justice and democracy in Indonesia. We thank commissioner, for helping make the world safe for democracy and the work that you do to preserve that in your country of Indonesia. Welcome to the Illinois House, sir."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome. Leader Elik."

Elik: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Elik: "Thank you, Speaker. I would like the entire Body to give a warm welcome to my district office staffers that are my Pages for a day. I have Andrew Brinkman and Emma Long are here with me today to see how things work on the House floor. So, please give them a warm welcome."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Weber seeks recognition."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Weber: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Weber: "You know, protecting our citizens in the State of Illinois is one of those things most important. And I know we had a visitor today here in Springfield, one of the leading law enforcement officers in the State of Illinois. Please join me in welcoming McHenry County Sheriff Robb Tadelman to the State Capitol. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Bunting seeks recognition."

Bunting: "...privilege, please."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Bunting: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to take the time to introduce my Page for the day. Standing beside me is Logan Brummel, from Pontiac. He is currently attending Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. He is a soon-to-be sophomore, double majoring in agronomy and agricultural business. He is a recent member of the Alpha Gamma Rho fraternity, as well as a member of the agronomy club and the Iowa corn club. Even though we lost him to a great agricultural university out of state, we as elected officials have the duty to Logan to implement policies that will benefit him to come back home to this state, be a great community advocate, prosper in business, and raise a family with a strong rural Illinois values. Please join me in giving Logan a warm Illinois House of Representatives welcome to this chamber. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Welcome. Representative Rosenthal."

Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Rosenthal: "Today, with me, I have Doug Neverdowski. He is a junior at Gillespie High School, and he's one of the Gillespie Miners. He's on the student council there, and he's actively involved in a... in a compact that says Miners Preparing for... Caring for Teen Driving. So, it's actively involved in keeping kids from driving distractively. He wants to spend 20 years in the Navy and then come back and be involved in politics. So, please welcome him to Springfield."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Moving to page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 299, Representative Yang Rohr.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 299, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2, 3, and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Yang Rohr."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr on Floor Amendment 2."
 Yang Rohr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 2 becomes the bulk
 of the Bill, and I ask that we adopt it and discuss it more
 upon adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 299. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Yang Rohr."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Yang Rohr: "Thank you. Amendment 3 fixes a drafting error, changing the number 12 to 13. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 299. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Yang Rohr."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr."
- Yang Rohr: "Amendment 4 makes some language changes that removes opposition, and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 299. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed '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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 299, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr."
- Yang Rohr: "Thank you. House Bill 299, it confronts one of the more disturbing trends that we are seeing taking root in our schools, in recent months especially. Using artificial intelligence, we are seeing middle and high school students, mainly, creating sexually explicit images and sharing those doctored pictures with their classmates. It's an epidemic that has proliferated very recently. It usually sees teenage

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

girls most often as its victims, where we will see their classmates using widely available nudification apps, similar ... similar apps to pervert real photos of their classmates. These deepfakes and deepnudes can have devastating consequences. They're used to harass, to humiliate, and to bully young women. It causes harm to their reputations, their mental health, and their college and job prospects. Use exploitative AI apps is so new that schools are often unprepared to address these issues and schools are unsure and unprepared for what to do. House Bill 299 gives schools the framework for dealing with this by clearly including it in the bullying prevention and cyberbullying part of the School Code. And in doing so, it makes sure that there's a policy and procedure framework for reporting these incidents, for informing parents and quardians, and for investigating and addressing these issues. Abuse of AI is making students feel unsafe in schools, and I ask for the Body's support in making sure that we as lawmakers act quickly to address these issues. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, this Bill's designed to address bullying and cyberbullying through the use of digital replicas. Is that accurate?"

Yang Rohr: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "And we have a definition of bullying and cyberbullying that includes posting or distributing sexually explicit

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- images that are digital replicas. Is it limited to those images or does it go beyond sexually explicit images?"
- Yang Rohr: "It specifically calls out sexually explicit images, but it does include, more generally, the… the use of… of AI to make digital replicas."
- Windhorst: "And with... in order to qualify for... as bullying or cyberbullying, would it be necessary that those images, if they're not sexually explicit, involve some sort of harassment?"
- Yang Rohr: "Yes. So, the... the use of the... of AI and generative AI, it could absolutely go beyond sexually explicit uses, which is why the... the Bill was written as it was. We did make sure to specify that this is bullying through the use of these applications. So, it... it addresses the need to... to have an intent to bully in order to qualify for use of digital replicas as bullying."
- Windhorst: "I... I'm just trying to make sure we're not capturing more than what's intended with this legislation. So, if friends generate a digital replica or an AI image that is non-harassing, not sexually explicit, basically done among friends, that's not considered bullying. Is that..."
- Yang Rohr: "Yes. That is... that is correct. Within the bullying and cyberbullying statute, there are a number of other qualifiers to make sure that... that this is limited to... to bullying. So, for example, it must cause a substantial disruption to the educational process or the orderly operation of the school, which is within the existing policy."
- Windhorst: "And if there is... if there are images, rather, that violate this section or this legislation, how... how is that

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

enforced? Is it school discipline, or is there other enforcement mechanisms?"

Yang Rohr: "This Bill addresses the school discipline only. And...
and so, it allows the... the schools to... to decide what is
appropriate within that school setting."

Windhorst: "And the Bill passed unanimously in committee as well as the Amendments. Is that correct?"

Yang Rohr: "It did. And... and that is correct."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Keicher."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

"Excellent. Thank you, Representative, for bringing Keicher: this. I... I like the concept. I always worry about free speech issues. So... so, my questions are ... are supportive but wanting to know what the parameters are that are out there. And I did little trouble hearing earlier with have а conversations, so I apologize if I'm asking duplicate questions that you had already answered. You know teenagers do stupid things, right? And... and they sometimes act in a stupid manner. So, if a circle of friends does something that ... that is meant to be humorous and it doesn't involve a fellow student, it's a non-identifiable person, yet it's a sexually explicit image, what are the consequences in... in your legislation that would... would prevail there?"

Yang Rohr: "Within this... this Bill specifically, you... the person needs to be identifiable. And so, the situation you described, it would not be covered under this Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Keicher: "Okay. It... so, it needs to be an identifiable person.

 And... and so, that would carry forward to your AI-type generation. If it... if it meant to look like a fellow student, then that would also be, even though it's not actually them, it would be meant to be them, that would be covered by your legislation, correct?"
- Yang Rohr: "Right. Right. Within the language it says, I believe, if a reasonable person could identify that person. And I also wanted to assure you we worked closely with the ACLU who has similar concerns as you in... in protecting free speech. And, you know, in... in, I think, Amendment 2, they... they did have some concerns about just what you said. And in working with them to get to Amendment 4, I... I believe that we addressed their concerns, which are similar to your concerns."
- Keicher: "Okay. And... and then the... the final area that I have a question on is... is consequences and legacy. We've heard a couple pieces of legislation this Session that dealt with folks that are being held accountable for something that they did, rightly so, but then they have that legacy carrying with them going forward. So, if... if we had a young teenage male who made a bad decision and sent an image of somebody else, they're held to discipline at the school level, what follows them post-school either in the... in the public dialogue, in the criminal records of the local county? What legacy will be left behind for them to explain or deal with once they leave school? Does that make sense? I can restate it if you want me to."

Yang Rohr: "If you wouldn't mind restating."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Keicher: "Yeah. So, let me... let me simplify it a little bit. Let's say we have a 15-year-old young man. He sends an image of a fellow student that's sexually explicit. He falls under the parameters of your Bill. He's held accountable. He... can you... thank you. So, he's held accountable under your Bill. He graduates school. He goes to apply for his first job. Are any of these consequences that he's suffered as a 15-year-old going to prohibit him from gaining employment in a background check scenario?"

Yang Rohr: "So, the reason why we're... we're putting this into the school discipline section is because a lot of this is so new and we did not want to have this come through any criminal or civil liabilities or incidents."

Keicher: "Excellent. Okay."

Yang Rohr: "And so, this seemed to be... like, having it dealt with in the school, within the discretion of the school, seemed to be the most appropriate for minors."

Keicher: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr to close."

Yang Rohr: "Thank you. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 299 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 3 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3765, Representative

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Kifowit. Representative Kifowit. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3765, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Kifowit."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kifowit on Floor Amendment #3."
Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly.
What you have before you is a Bill that has been worked on for over a year. We had several subject matters hearings on many of the components of this Bill, and I will briefly go through them. What we have is, in House Bill 3763, as amended, in this Bill… and I'll parley back, Mr. Speaker. If we adopt the Amendment, then I can continue my line of reasoning in

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick, can we adopt the Amendment and then debate on Third Reading? Representative Kifowit moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 on House Bill 3765. All those in favor vote 'aye'... say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3765, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kifowit."

the... in the debate."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was starting to discuss earlier, House Bill 3765, as amended, is components of the Pension Code that we had numerous subject matter hearings on

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

last year and has virtually no... or no or little effect to the overall pension liability of the state. In such, we have three technical changes in this Bill and two programs that are used for retention and for our police and fire. So, the technical change number one, it's clarifying language to the term 'investigator' with the Illinois Department of Lottery. There are two such investigators who were eligible under Tier 1, were classified under Tier 2, and this simply puts them into the right category in which they belong. The second technical change is language clarifying that a 4-year degree is not required for DJJ employees to earn their pension. What we have right now is two individuals that do the exact same job. One individual does not have a degree, another individual has a degree, and the one without the degree is being denied their applicable pension. So, that changes that. And then the last technical change is with the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund. What has come to our attention is that individuals... the pension fund reinterpreted how they would calculate service credit. And when we... they have two individuals on a part-time basis, one individual works five days a week part-time and another individual might work three days a week part-time. They both work the same amount of hours. They were getting different pension credits. One was getting five days pension credit, the other was getting three-day pension credits. So, this normalizes and changes the fact that both employees would get the 20 hours that they worked in pension credit. What the Pension Committee looked at last year in subject matter is a DROP program. DROP is a deferred retirement option plan. This is only for police and fire. And I will state that it has a

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

delayed effective date until January 1, 2026. In short, the DROP program allows an individual to technically retire but continue to work in their position in police and fire. What police and fire are telling is that they are having trouble hiring and... and they need to retain these individuals with knowledge for their service. And so, what the DROP program does is creates a separate account for the pensionable earnings to go into. The individual essentially retires, so it... it eliminates that pension liability for that individual and they can continue to opt to work another two to five years. And this has a sunset provision of five years. So, this is a temporary program to help with retention in our police and fire. And then finally, with regards to attraction for our police and fire, we are adopting a reciprocal Act for both police and fire and Chicago police and fire for individuals to be able to take their pension with them in the department in which they work. And so, with that, that's similar to teachers, our university professors, and the like.

Mr. Speaker, that's the ... that's the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Reick: "Representative, on the technical... the first three technical points that we... we did in the Bill dealing with the lottery, the DJJ, and the third one, are those all of the... is that the entire extent of the employees who are affected by this and will there be any others?"

Kifowit: "To the best of my knowledge... and we had testimony from AFSCME. To the best of my knowledge, these are the... the last

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

of the adjustments. I cannot foresee, there might be another one that might come up, but if we do, we'll have subject matter hearing and present it to the committee. But it is my understanding that these are the three main technical changes that we are looking at... through."

- Reick: "And these are the only employees that, at this point, we've identified as being affected by this?"
- Kifowit: "Yes, Sir. There's two for the lottery. DJJ is a little bit more, and I don't have the number of the employees for that, but that was a minimal cost by COGFA. And then CTPF, it doesn't really have any change. It's just reidentifying those employees."
- Reick: "Right. Okay. Let's move on to the DROP plan because obviously that's the one that is drawing so much attention.

 I'm going to ask you, the first question is, is this a pension enhancement?"
- Kifowit: "Thank you for that... that question, Minority Spokesperson. It is not a pension enhancement. In fact, this will save money in the pension system because an individual technically retires. Therefore, the liability stops when they retire. What this does is allow them to work two to five years in their area of expertise to continue to fill that gap so that they can then hire new individuals and bring those individuals into the... into that workplace. So, it is not a pension enhancement at all."
- Reick: "When does this... when... if this Bill passes into law, when will it go into effect?"
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Minority Spokesperson. The law goes into effect January 1, 2026. Because this is a new program, there

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

might... once we pass it, there might have things come up that we might need adjust next year. So, we have one full legislative cycle before it goes into effect in case we need to make some changes."

- Reick: "We'll have some questions about that further on. The... so, if I understand correctly, what we're dealing with here are people who have technically retired, their pension is being paid into the fund that is administered by the DROP, and only money that is additionally going into that... into that fund are the employees' own contributions. There's nothing coming out of state or out of municipal or county or any other agency or departments that fund this. This is not a pension plan, so much as it is a... sort of a divine contribution, deferred compensation type thing?"
- Kifowit: "Correct, Sir. And it functions along the same lines as the pensions function now. So... so, it does go into a separate account that is a nominal account within the pension systems."
- Reick: "How does the money come out of the fund at the time the employee finally fully retires?"
- Kifowit: "The program is designed for the individual to have a lump sum upon when they cease working for the entity of which they're working for. So, they would get a lump sum. And they should work with their financial advisor, whether they can roll that over into another account or whether they take the lump sum and buy a new car or whatever they want to do with it."
- Reick: "This... given the... given the eligibility requirements that are in place right now for the DROP plan for police and fire,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

we're dealing mostly with Tier 1 employees at this point. Are you... is that your understanding?"

Kifowit: "That's correct, Sir."

Reick: "Okay. The fact is, is that what we're looking at, if... if I understand correctly, is that the pension funds themselves are actually saving money in the short run to the point where there's no money going out of the departments or the municipalities or whomever into the fund to fund this, but the money is being kept within the plan itself to earn additional earnings for the fund itself and the members thereof."

Kifowit: "Correct. The nominal account stays with the fund. The fund is allowed to charge fees, as they were to administer any account that they do, and the money is... that puts into this nominal fund is the amounts of the pension that the individual would take. However, it is now being diverted to a secondary or nominal account."

Reick: "Okay. One of the concerns that were raised, just before we discussed this most previous Amendment, came from some of our municipalities. I got a lot of... I got a lot of phone calls at the last moment from municipalities up in McHenry County, was the fact that, and my... our good friend from Barrington Hills brought this up as well, is that what we may have is a situation where we have a... let's say we have a police department that is not suffering from... from recruitment or retention and they've got people who've taken the exam, who are standing in line, on the waiting list to get in, and somebody may take the DROP, and thus keep a, admittedly, lower salaried Tier 2 person from taking that position away from

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

somebody who's making more money, thus coming out of the... the local department's budget and all of those other things. Is that something you're willing to consider as an adjustment to the plan or to the... to the DROP before it goes into effect in 2026?"

- Kifowit: "That's precisely why there's a delay in the implementation of this program is to look at situations such as that. I know many of the police and fire I know, they are looking at that retirement age and they're going to be out the door quicker than you can blink. But I know that there are some specialty individuals that might agree to stick around for a couple of years. So, that is one of the reasons, some of these nuances, that the Bill has a delayed effective date to look into if that were to be a possibility, an individual would want to work a little bit longer. And then, if they're not an essential employee or something to that effect, we can look into that."
- Reick: "Something... something that just came up is when the person retires, goes into DROP, that person no longer is contributing to the pension fund. He or she is contributing only to the DROP. Is that correct?"
- Kifowit: "That's correct. And the pension liability is now ceased for that employee. Whereas, if a new person would be hired, their pension liability is immediate upon hiring. But when they entered the DROP, they don't contribute into the pension and their liability for that pension is... has stopped."
- Reick: "Okay. But that brings up a potential problem in the fact that if they're no longer part of the non... of the non-Social Security pension, are they then responsible for paying into

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Social Security during their period of employment where they're not members of the pension plan itself?"
- Kifowit: "No, because technically they're receiving their pension payment, so technically they're retired. They're no longer part of the system. But in the receiving their pension payment, that pension payment, though, is just being directed into a nominal account that's being held by the fund."
- Reick: "Okay. Thank you. When a person finally leaves the DROP program and ultimately retires, what will be their... just... let's talk about the pension itself that they have been deferring. Will that pension payment begin at the level it was... it would have been had they started taking their pension on the day they retired or will that be augmented by the three percent? Will... will the three percent compounding COLA and the... and the additional, will... will they go out at a higher... at a higher pension payment based upon the COLA and all the stuff that's in place for Tier 1?"
- Kifowit: "No. Their... their pension payment would be the payment as if they were retire. So, if they retire and their... their pension payment is a thousand dollars upon their retirement, plus their COLA, that thousand dollars plus the COLA is going into a nominal account and they will just continue to keep working for two to five years. And so, therefore, it is as if they had retired. So, we're not incurring any more pension liability. That money is just diverted. So, whatever they were entitled to in their pension payment is what will go into the nominal account."
- Reick: "Does this plan fully sunset after five years and is subject to having to be, you know, reauthorized and... and have

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

to go through this all over again? Or is there like an evergreen provision or a... or the ability to extend it out without coming back to the General Assembly for further action?"

Kifowit: "There... there is a five-year sunset. This is... is brought to our attention because they are having recruitment issues. They are having a lot of vacancies in the police and fire. So, this is a short-term plan to allow individuals to work a little bit longer while they're working on the recruitment issues."

Reick: "Thank you for answering those questions. To the Bill. We've been going through this for a long time. We've had subject matter hearings during the summer last year. I think we've thoroughly vetted this. And we looked at a lot of plans around the country, DROP plans that were... had been implemented and, frankly, didn't work. There were some in municipalities out east. There were some of them down in Texas. And I do believe that what we've done is we've taken into account the failures and the reasons for the failures of those other plans, and I think we've crafted a pretty good Bill here that will solve a short-term problem. We do, we do need to figure out how to retain and keep good public safety officers and first responders. What this is going to do is give us some breathing room to figure out how we can best do that. So, I thank the... the Sponsor for answering the questions and working the Bill as hard as she did. And I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative McLaughlin." McLaughlin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

McLaughlin: "Representative, we've had a number of conversations and I just wanted to make sure I heard you accurately. You mentioned that... I think you said that how the pensions are funded today is how they'll continue to be funded and the state and the municipalities will not be on the hook. I just want to make sure I heard that correctly."

Kifowit: "Correct."

McLaughlin: "Well, okay. So, here's... so..."

Kifowit: "Well, they're... they're not going to be on the hook, but as you know, and we've talked and we've side barred about this, pensions and market volatility are connected."

McLaughlin: "Yeah."

Kifowit: "And as of right now, every pension IMRF..."

McLaughlin: "Representative, may I interrupt? That's not where I'm going."

Kifowit: "Okay."

McLaughlin: "But I appreciate it."

Kifowit: "Very good."

McLaughlin: "What I'm saying is if the pensions are underfunded, which..."

Kifowit: "Correct."

McLaughlin: "...every state pension is."

Kifowit: "Correct."

McLaughlin: "Every year, the state or the municipality gets hit up with a request to make a contribution to bring the pension funding up. So, I just want to make sure you... you meant to say they're funded as they are now."

Kifowit: "Correct."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- McLaughlin: "And if not a hundred percent funded, the state and the municipality will be on the hook to make a contribution that's actuarially determined to a minimum amount. That... that's what you meant to say, I think, correct?"
- Kifowit: "Correct. In that... in that context, correct. When I was talking about the other percentage, it was in a different context."
- McLaughlin: "I only wish it was true, the other statement that you made..."
- Kifowit: "Well, we're working on that."
- McLaughlin: "...that we wouldn't have to make contributions. My God, our credit rating would go right through the roof. So, I just wanted to be accurate on that."

Kifowit: "Yes. Thank you, Sir."

McLaughlin: "But as it relates to the other part, everybody on this side's for the DROP plan. I think we all supported it last year. The question that I have as a former mayor is, we... and a head of a police department, we always were trying to figure ways to improve retention. I do know the Municipal League and Mayors Caucus and the township, their concern is, is that the delay in bringing younger officers online has a cost. Is there any analysis that's been done... and the thought process here is if have a force of a hundred, 10 individuals decide to go a DROP and they stay on, you don't hire 10 25-year-olds out of the state academy. And so, therefore, you have higher comped workers on your balance sheet versus lower comp, and you always want to have fresh, talented, younger individuals in police and fire for obvious reasons. Has there

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

been any analysis to the municipal cost to that part of what may occur?"

Kifowit: "It... that's hard to analyze, and we've asked for... as you can see there was a pension impact note put on this Bill, and they... they pretty much said that is was very hard to analyze that. Number one, who... who is going to participate in the DROP is one of the questions. And then, secondly, it's not always the case that newer people, inexperienced people is the right thing for the department. So, sometimes a... an individual who's worked for the department is very, very experienced in that specific line, and what they need is, they need one of the current officers or a new person to learn under that person for a period of time so that then they have a qualified, knowledgeable person to work. So, while I understand that on the surface you might say younger individuals that are getting hired that are now contributing to the pension liability would be more preferred than an older individual that would be paid a little bit higher, but the pension liability has ceased when they retire, there is that nuance of an experience factor, is what I've been hearing from individuals in law enforcement and fire, that... that also would help with the DROP program."

McLaughlin: "Yeah, nothing against a number of our fine individuals who are public safety, but I would love to have a 26-year-old Mike Kelly pull me out of a fire versus a healthy, I'm not sure how old he is. But it's always better to have younger individuals on these departments to... to take care of not only the public, make sure we don't have a higher workforce. On the other issue that we talked about in

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

committee, I just want to be sure. You were talking about the DROP program having a segregated performance, segregated metric for the account. Can you give us some details on that?" "Well, I stated it's in a nominal account. And as it Kifowit: sits right now, our pension system has a guaranteed rate of return. The nominal account within the pension fund would not have quaranteed rate of return, but what it does is it has a ... a guarantee that they won't lose any principal. So, as I was talking before on your first question, is our pension systems are tied directly with the market. So, when the market goes down, the state has to put in more money for the pension and we need to make that difference up. That's no difference with the nominal account. The only difference is there's no quarantee, so the ... the difference that needs to be assumed would be much less than the regular fund would be."

McLaughlin: "Yeah."

Kifowit: "Now, because this doesn't have a implementation date until January of 2026, what's been... we've been looking at with the State Board of Investments is allowing for an average. And when you take in a five-year average, which is the maximum of this Bill for the DROP, then that would smooth over any down market turns and would reduce that liability of the state."

McLaughlin: "So, when you say guarantee, what you really mean is there is a contractual benefit that has been promised in the State Constitution, not a guarantee. It's a contractual promise not to diminish or reduce benefit based on an actuarial assumption. That... that's, I think, what you mean, not a guarantee. Guarantee, I think, is..."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Kifowit: "It..."

McLaughlin: "...giving perhaps the wrong..."

Kifowit: "It... it's..."

McLaughlin: "...'cause the guarantee is that the public will be on the line to make any payments if the account doesn't perform at a six, seven, seven and a half percent, whatever the return assumption is for the life of that participant."

Kifowit: "It... it's just a return assumption. It could be two. It could be one. And then, in working with the State Board of Investments, one of the ways we can eliminate that risk, or mitigate that risk, I would say not eliminate, mitigate that risk is to allow for the average five-year return. As you see in... in our Morningstar reports, you have the three-year, the five-year return, and looking at that five-year return number of the fund would be beneficial. The person is essentially retired. So, they are getting their pension payment. They're agreeing to this, and they're agreeing to those terms. So, I... I am not a constitutional lawyer, but I would gather to venture that... that it's a different standard than the one... of the pension protection clause of the Constitution. But, again, I'm not a lawyer and I am just hypothesizing."

McLaughlin: "So, just so everyone in the Body understands, the agreement is that the municipality or the state is on the hook, your word guarantee, for whatever the assumed rate of return in the contract is. So, when you say it'll never go below zero, it very well could."

Kifowit: "It could."

McLaughlin: "But that would be made up by the taxpayers who pay the municipality or the state to make contribution."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Kifowit: "It's..."

McLaughlin: "So, I just want to make sure we understand the vernacular here. It's a two-sided..."

Kifowit: "The vernacular that you are talking about is how the pension works right now. If we have a down market, the state, the municipalities have to put in more money. What we're talking about is a small amount of individuals that we want to preserve their principal. So, if we have an assumed rate of return that is guaranteed, which is not in this Bill, but is in our pension system of 7 percent, and the market dips down to 14... negative 14, the state needs to make that up all the way to 7 percent."

McLaughlin: "That's my point. Thank you. Thank you."

Kifowit: "That is what happens today."

McLaughlin: "Thank you."

Kifowit: "Thank you."

McLaughlin: "I just want to make sure we understand that the state makes up the difference."

Kifowit: "Today."

McLaughlin: "The state's made up of taxpayers."

Kifowit: "Not changing anything else. This happens today."

McLaughlin: "The taxpayers are on the hook."

Kifowit: "Happens today."

McLaughlin: "Doesn't happen by magic. I just want to understand."

Kifowit: "It... it happens today."

Speaker Hoffman: "All right. All right. Hey. Hey."

McLaughlin: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

McLaughlin: "So, I just want everyone to understand that there is no guarantee. The taxpayers are once again on the hook. The DROP is an excellent way to retain great employees, but I do know the municipalities, the state are very concerned about what this will do to bringing in younger workers when we need to balance that and what that cost will be. Didn't even get into what will disability claims be. What will 58-year-old firemen dragging my body out of a burning building turn into. So, there's a lot in this Bill that we agree with over here, but I think we have to be realistic on who's paying, what the liability is, and what the cost is. So, thank you for the discussion, Representative. I look forward to evaluating the Bill, and I'd love to get those numbers before I support it. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Weaver: "I... I think that we're overthinking this. This is a good Bill. I appreciate you working on it, Representative Kifowit. It... it's going to help assets improve. Pensioners continue to pay into the pension asset fund even after they've reached their typical retirement when they're under the DROP plan. It's good for liabilities, as it delays the point of when the COLA begins. It helps people work on longer. We have shortages in our departments currently. Yes, there is risk on the table if the assets underperform, but the reality is this is managed by expert fund managers who aren't going to a 30-year target that's a risky asset base. They're going to do a two-to-five-year target based on what the consumer needs and... and adjust

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

risk appropriately. And we have opportunity to further clarify how we're... they're allowed to invest those assets so they can be even less risky than they already are. I urge a favorable vote. I appreciate you working on this. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Record. I want to clarify the record. Police and fire can, on Tier 1, can retire at 50, so they would... in the DROP program, it's only a 5-year program. So, at most, the individual would be 55, not 58. So, I just wanted to clarify that for the record so that individuals understand that the program is a five-year program, two to five years, and it's a pilot program as well. We had robust debate. I appreciate all the work from the other side of the aisle. The Pension Committee has done a yeoman's job on this Bill, and I appreciate your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3765 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair is going to implement a two-minute timer. The Chair is implementing a two-minute timer. On page 3 of the Calendar is House Bill 4799, Representative Meyers-Martin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4799, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. This Bill was read a second time previously. No

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meyers-Martin. Oh, Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4799, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meyers-Martin."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. House Bill 4799 amends the Illinois Gaming Act. It provides that the Illinois Gaming Board shall allow sworn law enforcement personnel employed by the board who retire in good standing to keep their previously issued board identification cards or issue photographic identification cards to sworn law enforcement personnel employed by the board who retire in good standing that indicate their separation from service. And the Illinois Gaming Board police special agents are certified police officers. They are special agents that have attended state certified police academy, Chicago sheriff, or State Police academies. They are maintaining certified police officer training yearly, and they also collect a police pension. The reason for requiring the Gaming Board to provide those retirement credentials is that retired officers cannot participate in the Illinois Retired Officers Concealed Carry Program without a retired ID from the department you retired from. This passed out unanimously out of committee, and it is supported by AFSCME Council 31, as well as the Illinois Gaming Board. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Benton."
Benton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Benton: "Thank you, Representative, for bring this Bill. I think it's a good Bill, ended up coming through committee. There was just that discussion that we had during committee about making sure that some of the provisions for not only a bachelor's degree, but also military service, that that's taken into account to make sure that nobody's left out for this process."

Meyers-Martin: "Yes, and I do remember that conversation. And it is my understanding that the bachelor degree and the police... the police experience, it's either/or."

Benton: "Yeah. Just wanted that clarity. Thank you for bringing this Bill. And as you know, you're always one of my favorites. So, thank you."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meyers-Martin to close."

Meyers-Martin: "I thank this Body for listening to this Bill, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4799 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 20 of the Calendar, on the Order of Resolutions appears House Resolution 501, Representative Ness."

Ness: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I... we filed this Bill back in November, but I was waiting for a special guest to be here

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

with me today since I filed this Resolution on her behalf. This is my mom, Lou Ness, who is also a McHenry County Board member and the commander of the American Legion for Post 412 in Woodstock, Illinois. So, House Resolution 501 honors the work they've done. The members of the Illinois House of Representatives wish to recognize McHenry County on the occasion of its participation in Operation Green Light for Veterans in an effort to further support veterans and their families; and

- WHEREAS, Veterans swear an oath to defend the U.S. Constitution against enemies foreign and domestic, and they have repeatedly put themselves in harm's way to fulfill this oath; it is important to acknowledge and support the sacrifices the veterans and their families have made in carrying out this oath; and
- WHEREAS, Countless Americans throughout history have given their lives in service to the defense of the U.S. Constitution and the founding principles of this country; and
- WHEREAS, Many veterans have suffered trauma and loss as a result of fulfilling the oath they took on induction day, including serving through combat, handling the relocation of their families, and experiencing the loss of their communities; and
- WHEREAS, The security of the United States depends on the strength of our Armed Forces and the men and women who continue to step forward and volunteer to do their duty, endangering their lives to defend our shores in the process; and
- WHEREAS, Veterans often need help assimilating back into civilian life through the use of local, state, and federal

110th Legislative Day

- resources, providing intervention specially designed to address the impact of military service; and
- WHEREAS, The National Association of Counties encourages all counties, parishes, and boroughs to recognize November 6 through November 12, 2023 as Operation Green Light for Veterans to raise awareness of the unique challenges many veterans face and the resources available at the county, state, and federal levels to assist veterans and their families; so therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize McHenry County for its participation in Operation Green Light for Veterans and its continued support for veterans and their families. Thank you."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ness moves for the adoption of House Resolution 501. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Moving back to page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading appears House Bill 5430, Representative Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5430, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis on Floor Amendment #1."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. I'd like to adopt it and debate the Bill on Third."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5430. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5430, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5430, as amended, amends the Children's with Disabilities Section of the School Code, amending provisions regarding student resident districts. The Amendment adds that parents or guardians who move out of Illinois after a child is placed in a nonpublic school or special education facility, public out-of-state school, or county special education facility shall enroll their child in a school in the other state to initiate reimbursement to Illinois. If this is not possible due to the laws or regulations in the other state and the parents or quardians of the student have proven that they have attempted to enroll the child but were refused by the other state, the student shall be a resident of the last school district in which they were enrolled in Illinois. The provisions around if a student is abandoned by their parent or quardian in a state statute... in state statute are amended to provide for only three satisfactory attempts to reach the parent or quardian if their location is unknown. And if the school in question... and the school in question must provide an affidavit showing that they reached out to the parent or quardian. If no response has been had within 14 days after

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

those attempts, the school district's superintendent or the facility's director must report to the State Board of Education as soon as possible. ISBE may also aid in attempting to reach parents and quardians whose locations are unknown. And finally, the Amendment adds to the... to statute language pertaining to placement in residential facilities and paying the cost of those fees. There is a part of the mandated categorical line item for a special education private tuition fees that the state covers. There is no funding methodology changes in this Bill. Rather, the Bill covers what to do if a student is not currently enrolled in a school district or the resident district is unknown. In these circumstances, the appropriate resident school district must be identified before the placement of the child, except in emergency situations. Parents who place their children in a facility must sign a contract upon the placement to affirm that they understand their legal obligations, including the obligation to enroll their child in the appropriate resident school district at the time of placement or upon the child reaching the age of three years old. School districts identified as the resident school district cannot deny the enrollment based on the child's placement. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill goes back several years. In Harvey, which is the town that I grew up in and a big part of my district, is a facility called the Children's Habilitation Center, which, and I want to emphasize, which, first and foremost, is a medical facility for medically complex children. This is not a facility where kids can get placed after enrolling in a school district and going through an IEP or 504 process where

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

they find that this is the best place for them to be educated. That's not what this place is. This is a medical facility. So, if a young person has ... is born with medical complexities or is involved, say, in a very bad car accident and needs a long-term residential medical facility placement, that's what Children's Habilitation Center is. It is not first education facility, but because the State of Illinois requires a level of education to be provided for children in these types of settings, they provide and cover the cost of education. Now, are they in the boundary of a local school district? They are. But in some cases, because some of these children have been there since they were children before enrollment... school enrollment age, they are then asked ... or the school district doesn't feel like they have to enroll the child. In some cases, these parents are not in that district. Some cases, these parents are... have, because of situations, have moved out-of-state but their children still remain in the medical facility. This conversation, again, has been going for a few years, and what this Bill represents is a few years of conversation with the State Board of Education, Department of Children and Family Services to try to determine who should be responsible for covering the cost of educating a child in Children's Habilitation Center. Again, it's a medical facility first. It's not established as a educational facility, but they are subsequently required to provide education services for the children located there. Over the years, I have encouraged the school district, Children and Family Services, the State Board of Education to come to a decision on where the child should be placed, relatively,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

should be educated. Unfortunately, they have not been able to do so. And it's my understanding there has been a multimillion-dollar lawsuit going on to cover who should be responsible for the cost of educating this child. So, absent of the lawsuit, what I have subsequently asked, I went to Children's and said, look, write the Bill that you feel needs to be in place to help address the situation of covering the cost of children. So, finally, when they wrote a Bill, because it rubbed some folks the wrong way, now everybody wanted to come together to figure it out, and I appreciate that. If that's what it took to get us over the hump to really having real substantive conversation about who should educate the child or cover the cost of educating the child, that is what their Bill did. When we first came together, obviously, the State Board of Education and others recognized that there was some challenges with the Bill. So, it did require some additional conversation. The Amendment, as adopted, which becomes the Bill, represents the agreement between Children's Habilitation Center as well as the State Board of Education to lay some framework about covering the cost of educating children in situations like that. And, again, I can't say it enough that Children's is an ... excuse me, is a medical facility have subsequent responsibilities appropriate age of educating a child. I have visited this facility, and many of the children in there are probably never going home 'cause their families ultimately aren't equipped to deal with the medical complexities that exist. They receive excellent care at Children's, and they want to continue to provide that care and subsequently, at the appropriate age,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

they want to be able to provide a high-quality education for the young people in their facility as well. It's a tough place to visit, Ladies and Gentlemen. I mean, it really... it really impresses you when you see it and when you go to the facility and see the work that they are doing with these medically complex children. So, if anybody wants to visit, I welcome those Members to come out there and check it out. But this Bill is finally trying to land the plane of who should be responsible for the cost... covering the cost of educating these children. Some have argued that this opens the door for other states to start dumping their children. And I would argue, no, that's not the case because, if nothing else, this effort raises the flag so if there is a situation with a child from out of state, again, acknowledging that first it is a medical facility, but now, if we look at the possibility of them being there long-term and we have to deal with the education, if anything, we're now setting some parameters, some guidelines or quardrails, as they're like to called, about how they have to interact with the family to make sure that if the child is there at the point in which that child has to be educated, that we know exactly how to deal with it. Whether it's the existing school district where the facility is located or working with the parents relative to the out-of-skate... outof-state school districts where they work. And ISBE was obviously stepped up and said we will help to try to work with the other states and their respective boards of education to make sure that if Children's is the right place for them for medical reasons and we feel that they're going to be there long-term, that Illinois will also engage in making sure that

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the education of that child is indeed taken care of as well. With that being said, Mr. Speaker, I'll stop, and I am sure that there are questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

- Windhorst: "Thank you. I appreciate the explanation of the Bill.

 There are a lot of parts to this that we're trying to grasp,
 especially with the Amendment that we had passed out of
 committee this morning. Just so everybody understands what
 we're trying to address here, what is the... just the overall
 issue generally that this Bill is trying to address?"
- Davis, W.: "The Bill is trying to address who accepts the responsibility of covering the cost of educating a child located in Children's Habilitation Center."
- Windhorst: "And who are the children served by that facility?
 Would you describe their condition?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I guess from a technical standpoint, and this is not my space personally, but from a technical standpoint they are considered to be medically complex. So, these are young people who are on ventilators, feeding tubes, I think the term is G-tubes. Many of them are bedridden and they also... then some still suffer from developmental disabilities and intellectual disabilities as well. And let me just add, primarily, most, if not all, of the children in Children's are children of color."
- Windhorst: "And the issue that we have is that these children cannot be in a traditional school placement?"

110th Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "I'm... I'm sorry. I should... I should add that, as I was just told, the children are... many children are placed there as infants and are 100 percent Medicaid eligible."
- Windhorst: "And they are... would not be in a normal school setting or not able to attend a normal school setting. Is that correct?"
- Davis, W.: "No. No. No, they would not. I'm sorry."
- Windhorst: "And the issue is who bears the cost of the education of these individuals, and that's what the Bill attempts to address?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, to say it succinctly, I'll say, yes. But, I mean, we have mechanisms where children that have certain situations, they are registered in the school district, they come together with families, create IEPs, and sometimes those IEPs create placements or... or create the need for placements of some of these young people. But that's why I want to emphasize is that the children there are there medically first. It's not a education facility like the one in Jacksonville or the Phil Rock Center that are there for education purposes. This is a medical facility. So, again, these are medically complex kids. And then, as they grow older, the state says you should still provide education for them. Now, we get into the situation because they not ... they haven't necessarily been enrolled in a school district, but the facility is covering education costs. But we know that there are other mechanisms in the State of Illinois in which children in situations like that can be placed and subsequently have their educational needs met and covered financially."

110th Legislative Day

- Windhorst: "And there are two situations I... I want to bring up that you addressed, but I just want to highlight them. One is where the... the parents of the child remain in state, do not move out of state, they remain in state. Who would bear the cost of education at that point?"
- Davis, W.: "If the parent is in state, what we're ultimately asking is that that parent should enroll the child in a home school district. That could be if the parent lived in the South Suburbs or in Harvey or Dixmoor, it could be School District 147. But let's say they actually live in Southern Illinois. It would be the home school district where the parent resides. 'Cause, again, this is not a education placement, this is a medical placement first. But the parent enrolls that child, and through the mechanisms that currently exist for the placement of children, that child subsequently could be possibly placed for education purposes there. And then using the mechanisms that we have in place for special ed placements, the dollars will flow, essentially, from the home school district to the facility to help cover some of those costs."
- Windhorst: "So, it goes from the home school district to the facility. Does the home school district receive reimbursement from the state?"
- Davis, W.: "I... I believe so. They do."
- Windhorst: "And the situation where the child is at the facility but the parents move out of state. How does funding work in that situation?"
- Davis, W.: "So, a few steps there. But the first step is, in an ideal situation, the parent will subsequently enroll their

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

child in the school district where they currently live. Now, if that school district rejects that child, specifically out-of-state, if... if a... if that out-of-state school district rejects that child, then, I think the way the Bill is worded, then the... then the responsibility would go to the last school district where that child was registered if they are of age."

- Windhorst: "And what if the parents do not register the child locally, they just are not involved. Does the Bill address that situation?"
- Davis, W.: "So, there are two things. There are two things. The Bill... so, in the situation like that, a... a word comes in called abandonment. So, if the child is then considered abandoned, then... then that's where DCFS can be engaged because the child is then deemed abandoned. And then if... then at that point, CHC does have some responsibility working with the State Board of Education to reach out to the parent three times. And then after three times, then... then the State Board comes in to continue to work with CHC to see if they can be successful at trying to help contact the parent for the purposes of trying to see if the parent will then acquiesce, possibly even give up their rights so that the child, which is now in Illinois, can then fall into the Illinois systems that are appropriate for them and continue to receive care and education."
- Windhorst: "The concern I've heard expressed is that the way this is laid out, it may encourage abandonment in those situations.

 Would you care to address that concern?"
- Davis, W.: "Well... so, in the situations... in situations like that,

 DCFS already has some definitions of what they consider to be

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

abandonment. So, reflecting on their current definitions of what abandonment is, then that invokes some other processes, and I'll... I'll call it that way, to try to figure out then how the child should be cared for generally. Again, in this case, we're talking about medical situations first before education situations."

- Windhorst: "Does the State Board of Education have a position on the Bill, as amended?"
- Davis, W.: "Based on the Amendment, the State Board of Education is neutral."
- Windhorst: "And was the Amendment done to bring them to neutral?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I'm going to say, yes, it was. But, I mean, it was hard to do this without the State Board of Education. They play a critical role in this process. So, they were willing to engage, first and foremost, I want to make sure we acknowledge that, and worked with the Children's Habilitation Center, again, that's doing the medical side of this. So, yes, their work helped bring them to neutral on this Bill."
- Windhorst: "And what about administrative groups, such as the superintendents, regional superintendents, principals' association? Have any of them expressed their opinion on the Bill?"
- Davis, W.: "According to Logan, regional superintendents supported it and that was it. No... no other communication by any of the other groups."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Davidsmeyer: "Representative, I... I heard you mention Jacksonville earlier. And I appreciate you bringing that up because I have heard a couple of concerns about the Illinois School for the Deaf and the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired, which are... you had a lot of emphasis on it being a medical facility first and a school second. Whereas, Illinois School for the Deaf and Illinois School for the Visually Impaired are schools first, right? So, I... I just want to make sure that the language of how this Bill is written does not include those two schools."

Davis, W.: "I don't believe it does..."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "...include those schools. I feel pretty confident it doesn't."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, my understanding is that... I've heard the interpretation from ISBE is that it does. The interpretation from many others is that it doesn't. So, I... I'm not an attorney, so I just... I want to ensure that... I know we can state legislative intent on the floor, but if for some reason the Board of Education tries to apply it to those schools, that we can do a trailer Bill as quick as possible to change that to make sure that this does not... does not cover those two schools."

Davis, W.: "Well, let me... let me say, Representative, I appreciate... appreciate where you're headed. And, again, that is not my intent."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "Just so we state that..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Davis, W.: "...clearly and succinctly. That is not my intent. If there is some desire to include schools like that, I'd be than happy to work with you to make sure that that is not the case, cause it's certainly not my intent."

"Yeah, and... and I appreciate that because the Davidsmeyer: Illinois School for the Deaf and Illinois School for the Visually Impaired have had a long, long history of providing great education, great opportunities for kids that cannot have those opportunities within their own school districts. And even better than those who... many of who try to provide those... the training and the teaching that they have at the Illinois School for the Deaf. So, I... and Visually Impaired as well. So, I... I just want to make sure that the long history of... of great education that are provided by those two facilities are ... are not impacted by this legislation. So, I ... I appreciate your intent. I will be reviewing. I may not support at this point, but I... I do ... because I don't want it to be an unintended consequence of ... of this legislation. But I do appreciate exactly what you're trying to do, and I hope to keep working with you on this."

Davis, W.: "Well, I... I will."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "But I hope you can appreciate the pathways in which I think young people come to the school that you're referring to and the pathway in which young people wind up in Children's Habilitation Center."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Davis, W.: "So, again, we're talking about two different... two different kind of facilities. I think placements in your school are kind of already addressed."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "We're not trying to change any of what exists for placements in the school for... in Jacksonville that you're referring to. Again, this is for children who medically are being placed here, who then subsequently, at the right age, then require to be educated."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "And this is about trying to make sure we cover the cost of the education for those children which is..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "...I'm going to say different, but only because of how these children are placed versus how children through normal or current existing mechanisms come to the school you're referring to."

Davidsmeyer: "Absolutely. Thank you so much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Blair-Sherlock."

Blair-Sherlock: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Blair-Sherlock: "This Bill was negotiated heavily between CHC and ISBE, in part because the original iteration of it would've created unintended consequences. It would've changed the way special education is funded in the State of Illinois. We had to create a unique vehicle for children who are placed for medical reasons as opposed to being placed for educational reasons. That's why this Bill, especially as amended, would not affect the School for the Deaf. The School for the Deaf,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the children are placed there as part of the IEP process and, therefore, the funding goes through that IEP process. These children are placed for medical reasons, and the schools just have to accept their placement and conduct the IEP for services. But this would not apply to circumstances other than these unique circumstances. And I have never heard... I've been in many conversations with ISBE about this Bill. I've never heard them once say that they were concerned that it would apply to other settings. Maybe the original version, which I did not agree with, but this is a good Bill. This was heavily negotiated, and I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Wilhour for two minutes."

Wilhour: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Wilhour: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Davis. We've had really good discussions on this in... in committee. Everybody over here completely admires what you're trying do. What you're trying to do is probably a necessary thing. But when we talked about this in committee, especially initially, ISBE, the Alliance of Administrators of Special Education, pretty much all of the education bureaucracy was adamantly opposed to this because they said that the costs were going to be astronomical on it, largely based on the out-of-state potential placements in this. And from what I'm seeing right now, that... that particular issue still hasn't been... still hasn't been really addressed. So, we're still open to, you know, astronomical costs on this... on this program. I mean, what's your take on that?"

110th Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "Well, I... so, let me answer... let me go to your first point. When the Bill was first introduced, you are absolutely right, there were a lot of concerns. The Amendment, again, has brought the State Board of Education to neutral. 'Cause I don't think any of those organizations you mentioned slipped in opposition to the Bill. They were concerned, but they didn't slip in opposition the Bill. So, subsequently, the Amendment, working with the State Board of Education, has brought the Board of Education to neutral."
- Wilhour: "Okay. But the reason for the... the concern was the... was just the absolute potential astronomical cost of the... of the deal due primarily to the out-of-state issue, and that issue wasn't... wasn't really resolved."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I... I think where we are now is kind of flowing the same way that resident districts already cover costs for placements. This is more in line with the way things currently are and the way that situations currently exist. So..."
- Wilhour: "But currently out-of-state folks can't take the ..."
- Davis, W.: "...even... even when you ask today..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, Representative Miller yields you two minutes."
- Davis, W.: "Well, let me... let me just continue. Even when you ask today, Representative, about cost, ISBE said that they felt that... I won't say that there aren't costs because if we're paying for the cost of special education, there's something there, but it's already... it's... we already have current mechanisms to help cover the cost of... of special education. And this is not changing any of that, using the existing mechanisms that currently exist."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Wilhour: "Thank you. I'll just... I'll just go to the Bill. Again, we... we appreciate what's trying to be done here. I understand that ISBE is... is, you know, supposedly neutral. Well, they are neutral on this, but they have not... they've specifically not said that the cost... the astronomical cost of this initiative has been addressed. And, you know, for that reason, I think the... we need to do some more work on this, and thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative, the previous speaker, we are in receipt of an email from ISBE saying this is... this does not add cost to the... the situation we're trying to address does not add cost. Now, they sent an email saying it. You can believe it if you want. I don't know if it was sent to your staff, but they sent an email saying that that was indeed the case. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, obviously, we have worked to try to address an egregious situation that exists in my district, admittedly, with the placement of children at Children's Habilitation Center for medical reasons, who are then subsequently have to be educated. This Bill is an agreement not only with CHC, because they're the medical facility, but working with the State Board of Education to try to cover all the nuances that could possibly come up with regard to this. Whether or not the parents are out of state, children that may have been subsequently abandoned by their parents, we're trying to cover all the bases here with this. Now, in any situation, admittedly, I've been here long enough, can something pop up next year? And if it does and it happens in one of your

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

districts, hopefully you'll be brave enough to bring it forward so we can address the situation and not just rail against what we're trying to do here. So, again, Children's Habilitation Center has been at this for a very long time. They are a great medical facility who is now charged also with the education of young people. What we are asking here is that there's a mechanism to help cover the cost of this situation... of the education provided for these young people. So, while we know that anything can happen, this represents an agreement between the facility and the State Board of Education where they have said we will help, we will work with the families in these situations, we will reach out to other states' departments of education if we have to to try to make sure that we're covering all the bases. We already have some existing mechanisms for covering their costs of special ed placements. This does not disrupt that. This does not change that in any way."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, please..."

Davis, W.: "This is about a medical facility."

Speaker Hoffman: "...please close."

Davis, W.: "And with that, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5430 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading appears House

110th Legislative Day

- Bill 817, Representative Vella. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 817, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Vella, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Vella on Floor Amendment #2."
- Vella: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #2 to House Bill 817 updates the Illinois business development tools to make use even more... make us even more competitive for new jobs and capital investments. Illinois has made tremendous progress over the last couple of years. We here have played an essential role in the growth by providing the tools..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, let's... let's adopt the Amendment and then we'll go to Third Reading."
- Vella: "All right. Let's adopt the Amendment. Yes, sure. Fine.

 All right."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Vella moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 817. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all opposed '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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 817, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Vella."
- Vella: "Thank you very much. So, we have been making great strides in Illinois with the CEJA and the REV Act. These... this piece

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

of legislation... these pieces of legislation helped us kick off a new era where Illinois is competing and winning projects across the State of Illinois, and we're doing it when we are sending out equity and opportunity. Illinois has tripled its corporate investment from 2022 to 2023. New jobs created under the EGDE and REV credits increased alone 60 percent. The number of retained jobs increased 15-fold, and Illinois has (unintelligible) victories with Whalen, Stellantis, Gotion, Ferraro, and many more. To continue to grow and create and retain jobs for all of our constituents, we have to adapt these tools. The proposals in this Amendment are a response to industry needs and to this moment in time for our state. We are on the precipice of good times ahead. It has been projected that the incentives included in this Bill will win us a project... projects that will generate an estimated \$21 billion in new state revenues. Obviously, this is a big Bill, but a quick overview. It adds incentive tiers to support our manufacturing base and attract more large manufacturing projects. It engages us with newer industries like green steel, film tax credits, EV, takeoff and landing aircrafts, new film credit, and quantum computing. It grows the number of Rivers Edge communities by seven more downstate cities. It addresses a gap between our energy cost and other state energy costs. And it provides an incentive for large energy storage projects for grid resilience. To be clear, this legislation is not intended to effect, conflict with, or negate any party's responsibility to comply with the certified transcript of payroll requirements obtained in the Illinois Prevailing Wage Act if the underlying project is considered

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

public works under the Prevailing Wage Act. This Bill puts us in the best possible position to bring Illinois into a leadership role and attract new economy jobs and new investments. This Bill is supported by the DCEO, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Illinois Municipal League, Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce, and the Illinois Manufacturers' Association. There is no opposition. I am open to questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to discuss certain of the aspects of the Bill, that way we have a... a full idea of what is covered here. So, first, there is the quantum computing campus program, which is tied to 500 million quantum... quantum computing campus capital requests that the Governor's included as part of his budget request."

Vella: "That is... that is part of the budget request of the Governor. That is not in this Bill."

Windhorst: "All right. But this is tied to that plan?"

Vella: "Well, they're both tied by the word quantum, but mine is just a tax credit. His is... he wants... he wants capital."

Windhorst: "And would you explain, number one, what quantum computing is and what you hope to accomplish with this?"

Vella: "Quantum computing is the next step in computing that's going to speed up computing a million-fold. I am not a physicist. I am not smart enough to explain it all the way. I just know it's going to speed up computing and that Chicago, right now, is a center for excellence across the country, and

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

this will bring it into kind of like the Silicon Valley of quantum computing."

Windhorst: "And there will be a campus, and we expect that to be located at one of our institutions of higher education."

Vella: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Has that been identified yet?"

Vella: "It has not. So, this is... this is the first step to identifying that. Obviously, it's going to be around where the people are, where the infrastructure is, and where more and more of the... the water and... and the energy that we need to... to keep the quantum computing going."

Windhorst: "And there's also the state tax credit within the high impact business tax credit program for battery energy storage systems."

Vella: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "How will that tax credit work?"

Vella: "It's like any other. It's... it involves incentivizing businesses to come, add jobs, put money in, and what... so, the... the batteries are... so, let's say you have a solar panel farm in your district. The batteries will hold that energy at night, instead of, you know, losing it and bleeding it out during the day, and we can use that at night to... to power our homes. California's doing it. I think they're about 25 percent battery use from these solar panels."

Windhorst: "Have there been locations or businesses in the state that have been established that will be interested in this?

Have they expressed interest through the drafting of this Bill?"

110th Legislative Day

- Vella: "Yes. There... there's several energy companies that have already talked about, downstate and upstate, putting these batteries all... kind of a... kind of a spine of these battery things that make sure we have enough energy going forward."
- Windhorst: "It also creates the EDGE Tier 2 tax incentive program.

 What will that mean for the... the EDGE tax incentive program?"
- Vella: "All right. Hold on one second. There's a lot of... there's a lot of... I think what it's doing is it's... it's raising the cap on... on the EDGE credit so we can bring in bigger... bigger investors."
- Windhorst: "And we're also expanding the REV Illinois tax... IL tax credit, to expand eligibility for non-EV firms with green electricity in their production. Is that correct?"
- Vella: "Yes. And also, takeoff and landing vehicles. So, planes now, they're... most of the fuel that is burned in a plane is takeoff and landing. There's a lot of firms now, especially in Illinois, who want to come to Illinois and are currently here who want to develop engines that will takeoff and land with just electricity and not burn off any fuel."
- Windhorst: "And we're also expanding the MICRO Act to include research and development expenditures, which will fold into quantum computing and expand the lifespan of firms to retain their MICRO Act eligibility."
- Vella: "That is correct. And that's... that's a big one. So, what we're hearing from manufacturers, especially of micro is, and quantum, is there's a lot of upfront R&D costs. We're giving them credit for that as long as they spend it here and hire people here to do it."

110th Legislative Day

- Windhorst: "We're making changes to Blue Collar Jobs Act. What changes are those?"
- Vella: "Pardon?"
- Windhorst: "To the Blue Collar Jobs Act, what changes are we making to those?"
- Vella: "Let's see. So, based on industry feedback, we're allowing third-party verification of construction wages rather than submission of monthly payroll data."
- Windhorst: "I'm sorry, would you mind to repeat that? Would you please repeat that for me? Sorry."
- Vella: "Sure. Sure. Sure. So, based on industry feedback, we're allowing the Blue Collar Jobs Act credits to be based on industry standards or third-party verified construction wages rather than the submission of monthly payroll data."
- Windhorst: "And that was requested by stakeholders. Is that correct?"
- Vella: "That is correct."
- Windhorst: "And there are seven new River Edge Redevelopment Zones. I believe we have Moline, East Moline, Ottawa, LaSalle, Peru, Quincy, and Rock Island. Is that correct?"
- Vella: "That's correct."
- Windhorst: "We're also expanding the life of existing R&D income tax credit by five years..."
- Vella: "That's correct."
- Windhorst: "...moving out the sunset to 2032. It appears, if our analysis is correct, that this will have a cost estimate about \$294 million. Is that accurate?"
- Vella: "So, yes and no. Over the next 30 years, the tax credits may cost about \$200 million, but the... what we're going to get

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

from that is about 21 billion. So, it's really going to... it would cost us 20 billion not to do this."

Windhorst: "How long a period of time would that initial cost of 294 be did you say?"

Vella: "That would be over the course of 30 years."

Windhorst: "All right. What impact do we anticipate this to have on the FY25 budget?"

Vella: "None at all."

Windhorst: "None at all. And then when... what year will we first anticipate any impact on the budget?"

Vella: "Again, that's... that's in flux because of deals that are happening, and obviously it's going to depend on the businesses when they come in. But I would not envision this year or next year, maybe '27-ish 'cause these are big... these are big businesses making big moves. It's going to take them time to scout out those places, do everything else."

Windhorst: "And is... I believe I read that there was some tax incentives for entertainment or motion pictures. Is that included in this Bill or... do I have that correct?"

Vella: "I... I believe so. Yes. We have that film... filming in the State of Illinois tax credits. It's to compete with other states. We had lost a lot of that. There used to be a lot of filming in... in Chicago and... and downstate. We lost a lot of that, and now we're going to bring it back. Try to bring it back."

Windhorst: "Well, I... and we have a lot of different programs that have been included at the request of... I guess is it a DCEO package that... where a lot of these programs have come. Is that correct?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Vella: "The... the programs really are a result of talking to businesses. DCEO then collecting them up, we talked about them, and then they... they came in here. All of this came from talking to the business community, asking what they want. Some... so, we're competing with, especially for quantum, we're competing with New York and Colorado. For EVs, we're competing with Michigan and other states, and we're trying to put together the best possible package for them to pick us."

Windhorst: "I know there'll be others that have questions or comments, so I appreciate you walking through the Bill."

Vella: "Of course."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Keicher."

Keicher: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Keicher: "Excellent. Thank you, Representative, for bringing this. I'm... I'm excited about the opportunities it has. We've worked on a couple of the other incentives that are in here together, so I appreciate this one coming. My concern is... is more about what is happening in the Illinois energy sector. These organizations are going to be a very large power load requirement. Are there any provisions in the Bill to make sure that some of the adverse decisions the ICC has been making regarding investing in our infrastructure can be overcome so we can meet the obligations that are outlined in the incentive?"

Vella: "So, I can't comment on the ICC. B, I can just say this.

Representative Yednock's nuclear Bill, the battery storage,
geothermal that's been coming around the pike, a lot of that
stuff is going to bring down energy costs. And it's going to

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

be clean, and we're going to have plenty of it for the new industry."

Keicher: "So, one of the ... one of the things that we're looking at is for... for the energy needs. Over the course of the last 18 months, Illinois has lost 2 thousand jobs in the energy sector, folks that have either not gone back to work or linemen that have gone to other... other states, good union jobs. And... and what I'm told is this, coupled with the AI explosion, coupled with the data center incentive that we have, is very quickly going to absorb all of the available extra energy we have out on the grid. So, I'm not saying that your Bill should or shouldn't address this, but what I really think we need to do is we need to focus on allowing energy companies to come back to Illinois, to bring their employees and their union labor back to Illinois, to expand our baseload power through natural gas and nuclear expansion. So, I appreciate this. I don't want to see it hobbled by a lack of energy in Illinois..."

Vella: "Sure."

Keicher: "...due to what the ICC has been doing to hobble the energy sector. So, I'm here to help you make sure that we get that done. Thank you, Sir."

Vella: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Ugaste: "Representative Vella, before we get started, let me make it clear, I greatly support what you're trying to do in bringing jobs to Illinois and businesses to Illinois. I think

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

that's very important. It's something I have advocated for since the second I... I arrived in the House. I do have one question for you to start. I... I note from an information sheet I received that part of the Bill defines green steel manufacturing as the production of steel without the use of fossil fuels and with zero net carbon emission. Can you tell me the process for manufacturing steel without fossil fuels or zero net carbon emission? It..."

Vella: "I cannot tell you the process myself, no, but I know that there are people who can and..."

Ugaste: "I didn't expect an answer, but thank you. I just wanted to get out there. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

"It's a wonderful idea that we're trying to bring more Ugaste: jobs and more businesses to Illinois. I greatly support that. I see that there's a special provision in here for the Blue Collar Jobs Act to make that even better. I haven't spoken with them, but I strongly suspect that former Leader Wheeler greatly appreciates that as well. What I don't understand is why year after year we will come here and put together incentive packages but we refuse to address underlying problems of just creating natural business growth in Illinois by addressing some of the issues that business wants us to take care of, such as high taxes, workers' compensation reform, regulatory reform, litigation moderation, so that they don't feel like they're constantly under attack from being sued. There are numerous Bills here that we have that would take care of this situation. We could be talking about growth and figuring out how to have extra revenue divided

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

instead of wondering are we going to meet our goals and can... do... will we have enough revenue to do what we did last year. While revenue's grown lately, it hasn't grown because of great increases in business. Again, Moody's, our own company we hired, projects we will lag behind the rest of the nation. So, while I greatly appreciate this, I would appreciate even more if we'd start doing something to just address the underlying problems for our business climate. It's great that we get together to do this every year. I'm sure you'll have support on this side of the aisle. Everyone wants more jobs, more businesses here. It'd be really nice though if all of you would consider our proposals that would just help that grown occur throughout the year and not just based on a handful of incentives we have. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Davidsmeyer: "Actually, I'm just... I'm just going to go to the

Bill and it's not to..."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "...cut you out of the conversation. I... I gave you kind of a little bit of preview in committee, so you kind of know what I'm going to say, and I appreciate you discussing this Bill with me prior to this... this debate. And I'm going to hit on a couple of things that the former Representative just... just spoke about, and its general business... general business climate in the State of Illinois, but... but, more importantly, dealing with where we're at today. So, when... about a decade ago, our budget was in the low \$30 billion. We

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

have a proposed budget of almost \$53 billion this year. And the idea behind business growth and having more businesses and more taxpayers and more of that is that everyone should have to pay less, right? But, unfortunately, right now, the way it works is as our economy grows, politicians in Springfield get more money to spend. So, that is an absolute problem, especially in a year like this where we're looking at the Governor's proposed raised taxes on current Illinois businesses, \$526 million in net operating loss changes, 101 million in capped retailers discount, increase in sports wagering tax, which is \$200 million on... on whoever chooses to participate in that, on individuals, 93 million in standard deduction change, which is a tax increase on everyday Illinoisans, and... as well as sweeps from... from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. So, we're asking current Illinoisans to continue to pay more while we give tax breaks to others that come in. The reality is all of these things only go to big business, large corporations, and the small businesses and the individuals in the State of Illinois are left to foot the bill. They never receive the benefit because their taxes never go down because somebody else is paying more. So, the ... the goal behind this is bring in more business, decrease the tax burden on everybody else because when more people pay in, you cover your cost and everybody pays less. So, I understand... Representative, I understand that you understand these issues and... and I hope that we can work together, maybe even this year, to make sure that we're not keeping the high burden on the average Illinoisan and the average business, that we can lower those costs to them by bringing in other people. So,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

thank you for bringing this forward, and I hope we will think about these things in the future as... as we look at budgets and... and the needs of the state. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Final speaker, Representative Jiménez."

Jiménez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I appreciate the Sponsor's work with DCEO on this Bill, and it's forward thinking and helps our state attract businesses that are important for our state's long-term economic growth and fiscal health. This is a good package for... to position Illinois as a leader, both in the tax space and across other industries. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Vella to close."

Vella: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a result of many weeks and months of hard work. It will take Illinois business climate into the next level. I want to thank Governor... Deputy Governor Claire Lindberg for her leadership on this. And I have special thanks to Lisa Stott and Tito Quiñones, who's, I mean, spent hours and hours and hours on this. He's home sick right now. I wish him well. This is going to be good for Illinois. It's going to be good for the citizens. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 817 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Senate Bills on Third Reading appears Senate Bill 317, Leader Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 317, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 317 expands Public Act 101-0198 which is... which closes a loophole, pardon me, and permits lessees of government property to avoid paying property taxes. This was done with the situation that happened in DuPage County and now we are expanding it to the rest of the state. What happens is when a nonpublic entity leases from a government entity, for example, like a day care leases space in a school district or a restaurant operating at a park district, they don't pay their property taxes. Typically, we know it as, the way to remedy that, it becomes a property tax sale, but it's not possible with the government property. So, this Bill allows the state's attorney in all counties, not only DuPage, to be able to remedy and recover the taxes. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 317 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Buckner."

Buckner: "Mr. Speaker, may the record reflect that Representative Ford is excused for the remainder of the day."

110th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hoffman: "The record will reflect. Moving to page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1960, Representative Evans. Leader Evans. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1960, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time previously.

 Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Evans, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Evans on Floor Amendment #3."
- Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of the Assembly. Amendment 3 allow IDNR the ability to regulate scooters on their property. If they should question about liability, the Chicago Park District municipality will have the same liabilities under Senate Bill 1960 that they currently have on their existing law. Request your support on the Amendment."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Evans moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1960. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1960, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Evans: "Leader Evans."
- Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of the Assembly. I present Senate Bill 1960, which is an initiative

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

of small business owners in Illinois looking to launch their own low-speed electric scooter business. The Illinois Vehicle Code treats these small scooters like they're cars. Senate Bill 1960 provides a clear framework in the Illinois Vehicle Code that would treat electric scooters as low-speed vehicles, just like e-bikes, bicycles, and others that are part of Illinois, while still giving local governments and IDNR a clear way to regulate them. This Bill creates a uniform and safe operating standard for each scooters with speed limits to 10 miles an hour, clearly defined rider roles, and required safety equipment. Senate Bill 1960 will level the playing field for small fleet operators, expand to new territories, support businesses, small expand availability of convenient transportation options for last mile uses by passengers. This would encourage clean environmental friendly alternatives and provide new options that compliment public transportation. Senate Bill 1960 supports small businesses, traffic safety, our environment, and scooters are a lot of fun. So, I request your support."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Evans: "Thank you. Excuse me."

Windhorst: "Leader, this would allow for, as you said, municipalities, park districts, forest preserve districts, conservation districts to authorize the use of these lowspeed scooters. Is that accurate?"

Evans: "Yes."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "How is a low-speed scooter defined?"

Evans: "It's my understanding with speed limits to 10 miles an hour with clearly defined rider roles and required safety equipment."

Windhorst: "Is there any limit on how fast the... the scooter is able to travel? There may be a... a speed limit of 10 miles an hour, but is there something that governs how fast the scooter can go?"

Evans: "Well, 10 miles an hour will be the limit. So, those that... it's 10 miles an hour. I really don't... I don't know who would..."

Windhorst: "So, that would not only be what would be the limit for the scooter but also the speed limit that the municipality would put in place?"

Evans: "Yes."

Windhorst: "I... I note that we are requiring that the person be 18 years of age or older. Is that correct?"

Evans: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Of course, 16-year-olds can drive motor vehicles in our state. Why was 18 chosen over 16?"

Evans: "Well, I think that's a solid age for a new adult. I can work with you in the future to reduce the age once they become more standard. But, you know, when you're making legislation, you want to find an age that people can agree with. But I'm kind of with you. I think hopefully, over time, we can vastly reduce the age and allow... you know, once they become more common."

Windhorst: "Our analysis shows that the Municipal League and the Association of Park Districts are opposed due to immunity not

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

being included under the Local Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. Would you care to address that concern that was raised?"

Evans: "Yeah. I think it's pretty clear. I mean, they would like immunity. I think people would like immunity from a lot of things, but it's just really not possible to allow them to... to do that."

Windhorst: "You... you didn't feel that was appropriate to include?"

Evans: "No. It wasn't appropriate, and the park district and municipality will have the same liabilities that they currently have. So, I mean, there's a Supreme Court ruling in Alave v. Chicago which addresses the same issues raised by IML and the park district. So, I think it was just them looking to do some aggressive negotiation that was a little unnecessary, but, you know, this is where we fell."

Windhorst: "And without this legislation, would municipalities be allowed to authorize these low-speed scooters or would... are they... how would they be governed under the law without this Bill?"

Evans: "Yeah. That's my understanding. They can fully opt out. I mean, I hope no one chooses that route, but there is an opportunity for them to opt out."

Windhorst: "Thank you for answering my questions."

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader... Leader McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. Sorry, Leader Keicher. Just a couple questions for you, please. So, this says it's not allowed on state highways, correct?"

Evans: "Yes."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

McCombie: "Okay. So, could it be on county roads and townships?"

Evans: "Double-checking. My understanding is, yes, and they would have the opportunity to opt out, but yes."

McCombie: "Who would have the opportunity to opt out?"

Evans: "The... the county government could, yeah, opt out."

McCombie: "Oh, okay. All right. Is there any licensing fee or a certificate or a... like a sticker like some municipalities have for golf carts, per se? Is there anything in here at a cost to the consumer?"

Evans: "Nothing in the legislation, I think, that would prevent that if they wanted to establish that, like a scooter sticker or something. There's nothing that prevents that in the legislation."

McCombie: "Okay. And I'm looking at the rules and it states... it looks like they have to have a headlight. Is that correct?"

Evans: "Yeah. For night, yeah, for, you know, evening usage. Yep." McCombie: "Okay. So, you can drive this after dusk?"

Evans: "Yes."

McCombie: "Okay. And is there any sort of flag that is required or any yellow or orange signage that's required to help people see these scooters?"

Evans: "Not specifically in this legislation, but I... you know, I think towns may be able to add a little something extra if they wanted to do something like that. But it... it was just a light that was added and the speed limit and just the things we put in the legislation."

McCombie: "Okay. All right. And DNR, you said, is in support of this?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Evans: "Yes. With... with the Amendment."

McCombie: "Well, this is great because I have a... a freedom to ride Bill that I think that DNR would love. It's... it's much more conservative than this and I... I think has more safety measures in place and actually has some fees that would be... to help out DNR. So, I look forward to, hopefully in your committee, that we could work on that together and get the UTV Bill passed for the freedom to ride for around our state. Because as of now, from my understanding, there are about 41 counties that have resolutions in the State of Illinois that are asking for this to be passed. So, I... I would ask, Leader, that you would be helpful with me getting that to the floor."

Evans: "Around here, people like yes, so the answer is yes."

McCombie: "All right. Well, I love it. Thank you. Then, in this case, I'll support your Bill, Sir."

Evans: "Thank you so much, Leader."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Keicher."

Keicher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been able to meditate on this a little longer while Leader McCombie was talking. I'm hopeful that the Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Keicher: "Excellent. Thank you. Leader, a couple things have...
have popped up as I was meditating on this and it really deals
with the liability exposure that we have on there. Did I hear
you earlier say that park districts or... or other government
units could opt out of this being able to be done on their
property?"

Evans: "Okay. Yeah, just for clarity, my understanding is they would have to opt in as a automatic opt out. So, they don't

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- have to do anything not to opt in, but they would have to opt in if they choose to."
- Keicher: "So, if they want to participate, what unit of government would need to opt in? I heard you say county boards earlier, but would it be... I know park districts have some issues. IML has some issues. So, who would be able to opt in to the use of these?"
- Evans: "So, we have it here, municipalities, park districts, forest preserves districts, and conservation districts."
- Keicher: "And I would assume that rules would be set in place to allow them to... through the rulemaking JCAR process to allow them to govern what exactly they would and wouldn't allow on pathways and certain parks and certain designated trails. Is that your intention?"
- Evans: "Yeah, I don't know about JCAR. That... that gets in... I don't want to make any JCAR commitments. I guess my intention is that it be broad as possible. You know, when I utilize a scooter, I want to be all throughout the forest preserve. I don't want to be too restrictive. So, it's not my intention for JCAR to go in there and make this extremely restrictive. I want the world to be free for scooter usage as much as possible."
- Keicher: "Let me rephrase, I guess. So, if... if a park district opts in and they only want them on designated routes within one park, you're good with them putting rules that Leader McCombie was referring to, like the scooter must have a... a flag on it, the scooter must have an emblem. They could make those rules is your vision, correct?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Evans: "Restricting specific pathways is a challenge for me, so that's not what my legislative intent is. But rules regarding flags and safety is important. So, I'll give you a prime example. If I pull my scooter up in a parking lot, I don't want the parking lot to be restricted. What we don't want is games to be played with restrictive access usage. If the park is available, let's use it in a park. I have to push it to the path and put it in my car. We just don't want games to be played, so I want this to be broad as possible. And of course..."

Keicher: "Okay."

Evans: "...you know, you members of JCAR, you know, do what you will, but it's not my legislative intent for restrictive... a lot of restricted access."

Keicher: "And so, I'm worried next about the liability that this may or may not create. So, if someone on one of these scooters is... is in the parking lot or on a sidewalk and they run into somebody who's walking, does that create liability in your opinion on either the park district..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader... Leader, Leader Davidsmeyer gives you two minutes."

Keicher: "Thank you."

Evans: "I don't know that it's my opinion. I think, you know, there's a lot of lawyers here. Liability, it... it exists, and I think that the current law covers that. This will be another piece of equipment in our parks and our roadways, you know, for the lawyers to handle if situations come up. So, I don't... yeah."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Keicher: "But do you see the park district as being a liable party
 in that scenario where you have someone on a scooter that...
 that hits a pedestrian?"
- Evans: "Well, I don't really see anything. Whatever the law says would be liable, whether I was with my... running around with my son flying a kite or however those situations, you know, come about. And the... my understanding, electric scooters would be permitted uses and not intended uses. So, it... it could potentially cover some liability or not. I'm... I don't want to, you know, get... you know, I don't want to delve too much into that because that would be whatever the law currently covers."
- Keicher: "Was there a specific reason why the Government Employee

 Tort Immunity was not included in what you prepared?"
- Evans: "I think in our negotiations, you know, the reason is, I mean, we can... we can exempt them from all and everything that would happen at a park. So, that... I didn't see a reason for it to, you know, total... it was a request. It was a very... it was an understandable request, but I don't know that it made sense with this legislation. Because there's a court case, and I mentioned this earlier, the Supreme Court case had a ruling in Alave v. Chicago which addressed the issue raised by IML and the park district, yeah, regarding liability."
- Keicher: "And... and what did that... did that say that removed them
 from liability if a pedestrian was struck by someone on a
 scooter?"
- Evans: "It remove it if it was an intended uses of the roadway and the parkway."
- Keicher: "If it... I'm sorry, if it was or was not an intended use?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Evans: "If they were not intended uses of the walkway."

Keicher: "Okay. So, if it was on a designated pathway... and I wrapping up here, Mr. Speaker. If it was on a designated pathway for the cart to be used and a pedestrian... and there was a collision, the park district could face liability?"

Evans: "Well, it's my understanding that they wouldn't."

Keicher: "Okay. They would not?"

Evans: "Yes, is my understanding. Yeah."

Keicher: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Morgan: "Leader, just so I better understand, can a municipality currently regulate electric scooters?"

Evans: "Yes."

Morgan: "So, this is not going to lead to a massive proliferation of scooters in our cities and towns. Is that right?"

Evans: "No."

Morgan: "And the reason I ask, just so you know, is because I've been to some cities in other states where there are thousands of scooters, electric scooters, just littering the streets and the parks and just left everywhere and I just want to make sure you're not trying to crack that door open and, in fact, you're just trying to give municipalities the power to regulate this. Is that right?"

Evans: "Yes."

Morgan: "All right. Thank you, Leader."

Evans: "No, thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Evans to close."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Evans: "I request your support. Thank you all."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1960 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2667, Representative Hauter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2667, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hauter, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hauter on Floor Amendment #1."

Hauter: "Are we adopting the Amendment or is this..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hauter moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2667. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2667, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hauter."

Hauter: "Mr. Speaker, this is a tennis Bill I'd like to serve up to the House. It's a hard-hitting Bill that the General

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Assembly will love. It calls for the issuance of the Illinois US Tennis Association/Midwest Tennis Foundation, Youth Tennis license plate decal. I know, controversial. And it establishes the Youth Tennis Foundation that the proceeds will go into that fund. I ask for an 'aye' vote. I... I know everyone loves it. I removed all the demographic data from this Bill, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2667 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's 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 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2682, Representative Yang Rohr. Please move this Bill back to Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2682, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Yang Rohr, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Rohr on Floor Amendment #1."
- Yang Rohr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment does three things. It makes some clarifications, moves back the effective date, and makes the appointee language in line with other task force language. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2682. All those in favor

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

say 'aye'; all 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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2682, a Bill for an Act concerning

State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr."

Yang Rohr: "Thank you. Senate Bill 2682 creates the Increasing Representation of Women in Technology Task Force. This task force would be responsible for setting the recruitment and retention of women in technology positions and recommending policies to drive that recruitment of women in technology positions forward. It was brought to me by a group called Vision 1948. 1948 was the last time when women in technology were at parity with men, with 50 percent women, 50 percent men. It has gone downhill from there and now it is at a about 30 percent rate. This task force seeks to try to get that number back to 50-50. And I ask for the Body's support."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, it... it appears that part of the task force responsibilities will be to collect data on the state of recruitment, advancement, and retention of women in technology positions and that provision is subject to appropriation. Is that accurate?"

Yang Rohr: "That is accurate."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "And do we anticipate what costs would be associated with that provision if there was an appropriation?"

Yang Rohr: "I do not have that cost, but that is the... that was identified as the only part of the Bill that would have a cost. And so, if there is no appropriation, then that would be the part of the Bill that would not happen."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Yang Rohr to close."

Yang Rohr: "Thank you. I ask for your vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2682 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading appears Senate Bill 3081. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment and please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Barbara Hernandez, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hernandez on... Leader Hernandez on Floor Amendment #1."

Hernandez, B.: "The Amendment just makes a technical change from universities to university."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hernandez moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3081. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed '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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is an initiative from the Community College Board, and it would allow to waive transfer fees from public community colleges to a public university in Illinois."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3081 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 30... or, Senate Bill 3112, Representative Delgado. Representative Delgado. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment and please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3112, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Delgado."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado on Floor Amendment #2."
- Delgado: "Yeah. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 clarifies that an extension that's discussed in the underlying Bill cannot exceed 45 days."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Rep. Delgado moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3112. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed '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 Representative Delgado."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado."
- Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #3 addresses a technical change in the language on quorum. It's specific to the majority of appointed voting members, and then I can explain the whole Bill when we move it back to Third."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Rep. Delgado moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 3112. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. And 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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3112, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3112 relates to long-term care and DD advisory board time frames. Current law states that if the board... if one of these long-term care advisory boards does not advise the department within 90 days, the rules are considered acted upon. But what the experience has been lately is that the department will schedule a meeting on day 91, which is not within the time frame of the statute. And for these meetings, the proper draft rules or materials may not have been provided well enough in advance and sometimes there are lengthy rule changes. And currently, as of right now, the board has three vacancies that have not been appointed over the past four years. So, 3112 clarifies that this... in the statute that a meeting must take place within the 90-day window. Or, if the department needs more time, to extend that 90-day window, but it cannot exceed 45 days. And in order to address the vacancies and the renewals so that the boards can carry out their duties, 3112 changes the quorum language. And we wanted to be specific with this House Floor Amendment #3 that the quorum is the majority of the appointed voting members. And the DD Facility Advisory Board language mirrors this language for the Long-Term Care Advisory Board as well. So, again, we're just trying to make these advisory boards function in an expeditious way, which was always the intent. As far as I know, no opposition, and I ask for an 'aye' vote and available for questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."
Windhorst: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "Thank you. The time frames you outlined, the extension from the 90 days with the possible additional 45 days, what occurs practically if the... now the 45 days extension is missed? If... if the board goes past the both the 90 days and the 45 days, what practical effect does that have?"

Delgado: "I believe that then the rules would be considered enacted. And one of the concerns here, of course, is that the reason these advisory boards exist is because there is a need to weigh in on what those rules look like and... and how they function. And so, rather than just having the rules go into effect, we wanted to make sure we provided this extension and provided some clarity about what... how that was supposed to work."

Windhorst: "And as you said, we also addressed... this Bill addresses the quorum, that it shall be a majority of appointed members rather than a majority in attendance of voting members. Is that right?"

Delgado: "Correct."

Windhorst: "All right."

Delgado: "Because then that would just mean anybody who shows up makes a quorum. And that was a little bit of a... a drafting error, so we wanted to make sure it was clear."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3112 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3136, Representative Canty. Mr. Clerk, please move the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill... no. Mr. Clerk, please leave this Bill on Third Reading for the purpose of no Amendment. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3136, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Canty."

Canty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present Senate Bill 3136. This Bill will create a multi-disciplinary task force chaired by two members of the Legislature to design a model for family recovery plans for substance exposed infants. Required by federal law, a family recovery plan is a plan for medical treatment, recovery services, and referrals to community resources for both infants and caregivers. SB3136 will encourage pregnant women with substance use disorders to seek and stay in treatment and prenatal care. Importantly, DCFS will still receive reports of infants born with positive toxicology screens and will still investigate those cases. DCFS will continue to investigate and bring in law enforcement at the appropriate time as their investigation proceeds, concluding within 60 days. It will also require a court to consider a parent's access to and compliance with recommended services prior to terminating parental rights. Ultimately, Senate Bill 3136 is a maternal health care Bill, and healthy moms mean healthy

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

babies. This Bill passed out of the Senate and out of the House Adoption & Child Welfare Committee with bipartisan support, and I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, I believe one of the things that we're trying to accomplish is to encourage or remove obstacles to women who are pregnant in seeking treatment for drug use and addiction. Is that accurate?"

Canty: "Yes, Sir."

Windhorst: "And there has been some discussion about changing the way DCFS or hospitals report to the state's attorney regarding indications of substances in the blood of the... the child, or the test results of the child. What are we changing with regards to those notification provisions?"

Canty: "Yeah. So, this Bill does not make a fundamental change to the current operation of the child welfare system. What it will do is instead of sending a positive toxicology screen to both the state's attorney and DCFS, as is current practice, it will instead send the toxicology screen to DCFS for them to complete their investigation. If further intervention is needed, they will then send their entire investigation, including the positive toxicology screen, to the state's attorneys."

Windhorst: "And my understanding, the Bill also changes the way those toxicology screens could be used as evidence in court. Is that correct?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Canty: "Yes, Sir. It does create parity among child abuse allegations. And instead of using that positive toxicology report as a standalone and a presumption of unfitness for parents, you must take into consideration the entire realm of the child."

Windhorst: "So, just speaking from a proof standpoint, when you come to a juvenile court case, that toxicology report would be considered as evidence under current law. With removing that, how would the state prove the toxicology of the child?"

Canty: "It would still be considered evidence. It just would not be a presumption of unfitness to be a parent."

"And the concern is, by removing that presumption, Windhorst: that that's going to create, perhaps, more obstacles for receiving the appropriate care for that child, but may not need to be in the home that they're... they're living in. So, I think the concern I have... I know this is a very difficult situation. I appreciate what you're trying to accomplish with this legislation. But the court system is designed, even though the presumption exists, to reunite the child with their parents, with the mother, if that's appropriate. And the court system, the quardian ad litem, the attorney for the parents, the prosecutor, and the judge are all working to try to make that occur, if it's appropriate, if it's in the best interest of the child. And by removing this provision, we may be creating a situation where children that should be removed from the home are not going to be when they would under current law. So, that's a big concern I have. And although I've given a speech and not asked a question, I'll allow you to address that point."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Canty: "I... I just want to say, we always take into consideration the best interest of the child. Baby is always first. And while reunification is ultimately a goal that we hope we would be able to reach, it is not always going to be possible with every family. Instead, what we're doing here is creating parity among similarly situated allegations of child abuse."

Windhorst: "Thank you for answering my questions."

Canty: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Reick: "Representative, this Bill... I'm... first of all, I want to say thank you for bringing this. I think it was a good Bill, and I fully support it. There are... there have been questions raised by state's attorneys about the possibility of investigations or child abuse or... or harm falling through the cracks if, in fact, the state's attorney is not immediately informed of what's going on. But I'm... it's also my understanding though that the toxicology report... no toxicology report is effective until the child is born. Is that correct?"

Canty: "That is correct."

Reick: "Okay. So, the state's attorneys, mine in particular, have been somewhat adamant about the fact that they believe that the failure of the state's attorney to be brought in immediately until... and not have to wait until DCFS has finished its investigation somehow creates a... a risk of harm to a child. How would you address that situation?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Canty: "As... as you know, the state's attorneys do not have authority on their own to remove a child from the home. They would always need to work in conjunction with DCFS, and this Bill does not make a fundamental change to that situation."
- Reick: "But as... they don't have the right to remove the child, but they do have the right or the... the authority to go immediately into court and start proceedings if, in fact, there is a positive toxicology. Is there a danger here of there being a gap in time between birth and action taken that could result in the harm to a child?"
- Canty: "No. And we've committed to having the state's attorneys work with the task force to express their concerns and make sure that they're adequately addressed. But DCFS also has the authority to immediately go in and take temporary custody of a child if they believe that is necessary and go before a court and bring the state's attorneys in at that time."

Reick: "Okay. So, what we're basically..."

- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, Leader Spain gives you two minutes."
- Reick: "Sorry, I didn't realize we were on a two-minute timer.

 Sorry. Now, you cut me off my... I forgot what I was going to ask."
- Speaker Hoffman: "I'm sure it was brilliant."
- Reick: "Okay. The... the goal here is to get women into prenatal care and to maybe get off of drugs, at least during the terms of their pregnancy. How does... how do you... what was the motivation, and how do you... how do you see that as working?"
- Canty: "Women right now that deal with substance abuse disorder are frequently afraid to come forward for prenatal care or

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

for treatment due to the concern that their children will be immediately taken away from them. We want to encourage them to seek out treatment for their substance use disorder and prenatal care, and we want to encourage them to stay in that care."

- Reick: "But if in fact the operative substance abuse test isn't the... isn't the one... until the one that's taken at the time of birth, what type of danger does the woman have of having her child taken pre-birth or... or there be some sort of action taken against her before the child is born?"
- Canty: "I'm sorry. Can I get you to say that question one more time?"
- Reick: "Yeah, that was a dumb question. What... what motivates... you know, the woman's pregnant. She's carrying the child. What motivates a mother to not seek prenatal care? What kind of evidence exists to keep a woman from seeking prenatal care based upon a fear that if something that can't happen until the child is born?"
- Canty: "So, I don't have a specific case in front of me. Sorry, it's hard for me to see you. I don't have a specific case in front of you, but in talking with doctors that work in this space and work with children that are born with positive toxicology screens and with women struggling with substance use disorder, I can tell you that their biggest concern is watching their patients die. And so, what they want to do is make sure these women know that we are trying to get you the help that you need."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meier yields two minutes."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Reick: "One final... I've got one final question. This Bill... actually, the first time I heard about this Bill was when the Illinois State Medical Society came into my office and talked about it. I didn't hear about it from you. I talked about it... I heard about it from the Med Society. This is an initiative of the Illinois State Medical Society. Is that correct?"

Canty: "Yes, Sir."

Reick: "Other than the state's attorneys, what other kind of opposition... the individual state's attorneys, not the State's Attorneys Association, what other opposition have you... have you noted from... for this Bill?"

Canty: "So, the opposition that I know of is only one. It is the state's attorney for McHenry County. The Bill is supported by the State Med Society, the Nurses Association, the Cook County Public Guardian, the Kane County State's Attorney, the Illinois Collaboration on Youth, the Illinois Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the Illinois Court Appointed Special Advocates, among many, many others."

Reick: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Reick: "A lot of this comes from... a lot of the opposition from one... from one location comes from a tragic case that we all know everything about. But the fact remains is that until we break the cycle of drugs in our... in our society, we've got to find ways to help children be born free of that scourge. I believe that we have to take a leap, yes, this is a leap, to some extent. Because what we're doing is we're trusting an agency that has not been giving us good reason to trust them in the past. But until we make some kind of an effort to say

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

we're going to work with you, we're going to work with the Med Society, we're going to work with doctors, we're going to provide services prior to the involvement of the child welfare agency, we're never going to get anywhere in this state with this... with this problem. We need to take risks. This is... there is a risk. I will be the first to admit this, and I think the Sponsor feels the same way. But we cannot continue going the way we are because, if we do that, we're going to end up with same outcomes that we've had for so long. It's time to take action, and this is proactive action, and I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hauter."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Hauter: "I think this is a... this is a good Bill. I'm... I really like it, but I do... I do have some questions. I think there's some misconceptions. I... I did speak to a couple of neonatologists about this whole process 'cause I was very interested. And I'm... I'm wondering if we're over emphasizing, or maybe there is variability in the way that this is implemented. Because in my area, they were unaware that blood tests were forwarded to the state's attorney. And, in fact, they deny that that ever happens, and they wouldn't know even the mechanism that that would happen. Is... is it possible that it is... it is practiced differently in different areas of our state?"

Canty: "I will concede that as possible."

Hauter: "Okay. So... so, in my area, they said that not every woman is tested. Is that... is that your experience as well?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Canty: "I do not have data on that, but having had two kids myself, I can tell you both of my children were tested."

Hauter: "Okay. So, in... in my area, the Peoria area where I practice, the... the neonatologist there said that we would never test every woman. That would be... that wouldn't be indicated. It would only be if there was signs or they had... they had issues with a drug-exposed child. And so, I think that maybe we're overemphasizing the degree that law enforcement in... is involved in these across the state. So, is that... is that possible? Is that conceivable?"

Canty: "I... I can... can see that... I do want to make clear that it's the children that are tested..."

Hauter: "Yeah."

Canty: "...not the pregnant women."

Hauter: "Yeah, but sometimes the... the woman is... is tested if they have a reason to believe that..."

Canty: "Correct."

Hauter: "Yeah. Okay. So..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Davis yields two minutes."

Hauter: "And I'll just... I won't have very many questions, but I did want to... I just want to emphasize again. So, if the test was forwarded to law enforcement, their role... and we are all, you know, a little bit leery of the accountability and the... and the competence of DCFS. But who does the investigation... if law enforcement says this is... this is a possibility of child neglect or child abuse, this is an unsafe home, we want to bring charges up, who does the investigation?"

Canty: "DCFS. And this Bill makes no changes to the Juvenile Court Act."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Hauter: "Okay. So, we're... we're pretending like we don't trust DCFS. We want to put it in the hands of law enforcement, and law enforcement says, thanks, we're going to send it back to DCFS."

Canty: "Correct."

Hauter: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Hauter: "This is a... this is a good Bill. It's supported by the people that are interested in... in caring for patients and combining and balancing... incentivizing women to get prenatal care. We have a... a real problem with perinatal and... perinatal morbidity and mortality. And it incentivizes them to get care. It incentivizes them to get treatment. And it also allows for safe discharge of a... of a drug-exposed child. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, as you was working on Senate Bill 3136, was there any data that you used to come up with the composition of this task force?"

Canty: "Yeah. I believe some of the data came from the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecologists and the… sorry, give me one second here… the Illinois Perinatal Quality Collaborative."

Ammons: "Thank you. Can you share with me what their expert opinion is as to why this is necessary for us to do right now?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Canty: "Transitioning from a punitive to a notification-based system can help encourage expectant parents to seek treatment and improve maternal and fetal health in Illinois."

"Thank you for clarification. I... I support this Bill. I support this Bill because several of us have been working for years to address this issue, where we saw statistically demographics that represented high-percentage of African American babies being taken in the hospital and very little services being provided to the mother. Because a person has a drug addiction does not mean that they are not able or capable of receiving assistance and caring for their baby. In many cases, we saw a consistent number of those children being put into adoption agencies and, therefore, much of the research that we've done demonstrated a, kind of, perverse incentive to utilize the hospital system and the police system to take and separate babies from their mothers. The data supports this change. And so, I thank Representative Canty for really, really working on this. And I hope that out of this task force and all of the expertise that I see in the composition, that we're able to not just remove the punitive measures, but we also should be moving... removing the racial implications of the child welfare system on Black families. Specifically, because they make up the highest percentage of children removed from their homes, even though statistical demographics show that people across the nation, regardless of their race, use drugs at almost the same rate. But the number of Black babies taken out of their families' homes is astronomically high. And so, this is our step and way to try to redress this issue not only using the data and expertise,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

but to provide services for the families who, unfortunately, may be struggling with drug addiction. But that does not mean that they should be criminalized and punitively held to be removed from their families. I do hope that we are able to make some progress with this Bill. I'll be looking for the report that comes out of it, and I appreciate the hard work that you've put into this, Representative Canty. And I certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Costa Howard: "Okay. Representative Canty, a few questions just to make sure that we have a clear record here. The... one of our speakers today referenced changes to the Juvenile Court Act. Is it fair to say that there is nothing in this piece of legislation that changes the Juvenile Court Act?"

Canty: "Correct. This Bill only addresses the Adoption Act."

Costa Howard: "Okay. Thank you. As part of that, there were some references, and, again, for clarity for the record, is it fair... is it true to say that DCFS is the one that would send test results to a state's attorney's office if they needed to do a shelter care hearing... or take protective custody, excuse me."

Canty: "Yes. Yes."

Costa Howard: "Okay. You mentioned maternal health Bill. Could you explain what you mean by maternal health Bill?"

Canty: "This is a Bill that is designed to help women that are struggling with substance use disorder. If we can get them healthy early in their pregnancies, we have a stronger

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

likelihood that they will have a healthy child and we have a stronger likelihood that they will stay healthy to take care of that child."

Costa Howard: "Thank you. To the Bill. I want to point out a couple things. I really appreciated Minority Spokesperson on this committee, who really worked hard at... at understanding what this Bill was really about. I want to thank Representative Canty and Senator Castro for working out all of the details within this Bill. I have to echo Representative from Champaign's comments today about what the disproportionate reality of the children who are taken. This is a good Bill. This is about keeping families together and making sure women who are pregnant get the care that they need so that we have children who are born healthy. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Canty to close."

Canty: "Thank you so much. Substance use disorder is the leading cause of death for pregnant women here in the United States.

This Bill will help solve that problem. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3136 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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 81 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3137, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3137, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there's an Amendment."

Speaker Hoffman: "I believe the Amendment has been adopted."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Fantastic. Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 3137, also known as Jordan's Law, requires substance use disorder programs and mental health and developmental disability facilities in the state to provide notice of the death of a patient in the program or facility to the patient's personal representative, if known, within 24 hours of death. This Bill was initiated as a result of a tragic situation that occurred in my district where a family tragically lost their child and were not notified that their child had passed away. I know of no opposition. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Association of Behavioral Health, and happy to answer… answer questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3137 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 19 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions appears House Joint Resolution 73, Representative Mussman. Representative Mussman."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Mussman: Joint Resolution 73 denies the School Code mandate waiver modification request from Regional Office of Education #4 in Boone-Winnebago County on the basis that the waiver request is outside the scope of the waiver process. The state has a waiver process by which twice a year schools and districts may request waivers of mandates or modifications of mandates found in School Code. There is a series of steps and dates laid out in statute by which ISBE and the Legislative Caucus Leaders accept or deny these waivers. The vast majority of waivers are accepted, but in this rare instance where this particular waiver request is being denied, the next step in the process is for the General Assembly to pass a Joint Resolution stating that they deny the waiver for final consideration. The waiver from ROE #4 is requesting to expand the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program, the ALOP, so they youth below fourth grade can attend ALOP programming. Current statute allows for students in grades 6 through 12 to be placed in a setting outside of the school for ALOP programming but states that grades 4 through 5 be served in their home school environment and not served in a separate facility. At this time, the statute does not provide any guidance on serving students in an alternative program below fourth grade. ISBE feels strongly that this request shines a light on the larger issue of children in these lower grades struggling with extreme behavioral concerns and the need for a statewide resolution on how to provide more support in interventions to prevent these behavioral problems from escalating and possibly exacerbating student expulsions.

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Therefore, it is determined that the waiver process is not the best way to address this concern. The school district will utilize an alternative method of educating these young students next year. And the stakeholders commit investigating the scope of need across existing ROEs and working to update our statute to provide guidance on how to best serve students in these elementary grades, with special attention being paid to adverting expulsions, the need for sensitivity regarding this critical stage of social and emotional development, the historical disproportionate impact on students of color and special education, and the need for due process in determining appropriate interventions on removals. Again, to be clear, this Resolution is a procedural move to formally deny the waiver. The school district will utilize a different pathway to serve this population of students in the next school year, and the stakeholders will now move to consider best practices for using alternative learning opportunity programs to serve students with high behavioral needs below the age of fourth grade in order to update statute guidance. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. I would like a record vote on this as well, please. And... and just to the Bill. Thank you, Representative. I understand the procedure process of this, but I... I must ask my... my side of the House here to commit to voting 'no' on this. This is... several of us here have parts of the... the Winnebago-Boone County area. And this particular school district, many of us have gone through the Summit Academy, and it is a wonderful school and their... their intent

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

is to really, quite honestly, save children in Winnebago and Boone Counties. And I just wish this wasn't the way it was going, but I understand the procedure part of it. But I do ask my House Republicans to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman to close."

Mussman: "I appreciate that viewpoint. Again, these students will get the services they need simply in an alternative method than by the waiver request, and our goal is to come back a find an opportunity to help students statewide. I would then appreciate an 'aye' vote from my Democratic colleagues just to ensure that the process goes as it needs to."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 73. 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 73 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And House Joint Resolution 73 is adopted. Moving to page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3238, Representative Slaughter. Representative Slaughter. Out of the record. Remaining on page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 3506, Representative Ann Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3506, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ann Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill simply comports
Illinois law with a U.S. EPA directive which included
revisions to Title V permitting resolutions... regulations, I
apologize, that will eliminate affirmative defense

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

provisions. We're simply changing Illinois law to comply with federal law, and happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, why is this necessary?"

Williams, A.: "So, in July 2023, the U.S. EPA finalized revisions to the Title V permitting regulations. This eliminated affirmative defense provisions in the federal… at the federal level, and so indicating that these provisions on the state level would be inconsistent with the enforcement structure of the Federal Clean Air Act. So, the U.S. EPA directed the states to revise their Title V Program so that they were consistent with the federal law enforcement."

Windhorst: "Would there be any consequence to the state if we didn't make the change in law?"

Williams, A.: "We generally comply with the directives required by EPA, so I don't know that we've contemplated not complying."

Windhorst: "Is there any potential loss of federal funding if we don't make this change?"

Williams, A.: "I'm not... I don't believe that to be the case, but I'm not sure."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams, A.: "I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3506 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 692, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 692, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would create the Task Force on Interjurisdictional Industrial Zoning Impacts.

Effectively, what this is, is we've seen..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk. I apologize."

Morgan: "It's good, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "I apologize. Third Reading. I forgot to move it. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 692, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, again, this creates a task force to look into what's happening in a variety of communities as these industrial zoning complexes, basically large, sometimes million, square foot facilities are being built and the impacts on communities. This creates a task force with a variety of stakeholders to talk about the ways in which this is impacting their communities. This has

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- 15 different appointments from both chambers and both... both Leaders. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

 Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 692 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 12 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2804, Representative Vella. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Vella."

- Vella: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2804 is very simple. It gives CMS the authority to promulgate rules to facilitate electronic filing in administrative hearings. Currently under Illinois law, they do not have that authority. This Bill is a result of discussions between JCAR and CMS."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2804 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Voting's 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

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fritts, for what reason do you arise?"

Fritts: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Brief point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hoffman: "Please state your point."

Fritts: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in honor of budget week, I would like to welcome a very special guest back to the floor, my predecessor, former Deputy Leader and former Chief Budgeteer for the House Republicans, Tom Demmer."

Speaker Hoffman: "Hey, welcome back, Tom. Page 12 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2978, Representative Croke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2978, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2978, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Croke."

Croke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this Bill pertains to the access agreements that the Secretary of State has with companies who collect the motor vehicle data. This is in response to some concerns about safeguarding personally identifying information and data collected through functions performed by the SOS, including issuance of driver's license,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

ID cards, vehicle registrations, and vehicle titles. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. This Bill is dealing with privacy of motor vehicle records. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yes, Sir."

Windhorst: "And it will, among the provisions, prevent the disclosure of Social Security numbers, confidentiality of captured photographs, signatures, images, confidentiality of documents submitted for application for driver's license, among other things. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yes."

Windhorst: "As it relates to Social Security numbers, will the Secretary of State still be collecting those Social Security numbers in order for a person to obtain a driver's license?"

Croke: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Just... this Bill prevents that from being disclosed to outside entities unless available or required by law. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yeah. So, my understanding is this actually more puts safeguards into place that that information could still be provided. But now, in those access agreements that the Secretary of State has with, let's just say company X, who is... who gets that data, company... the Secretary of State will now know in those access agreements who company X is sharing that information with, to almost do a double-check that company X, when they are sharing that information, they're

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

doing it with approved companies that are acting in... acting in a way that follows the federal guidelines."

Windhorst: "There has been some discussion that I've heard that this provision, or others in this Bill relating to Social Security numbers or other identifying information, may allow people who are ineligible to vote or may not be lawful citizens of this country the ability to vote. Are you aware of that discussion or concern that's been raised?"

Croke: "Yeah. So, obviously, in Executive Committee that... there was a robust conversation about the... that concern. This does not change how the Secretary of State's Office deals with any of that information or automatic voter registration. So, if ... if you don't mind, just for the record, if I can read a few bullet points on how this is still kind of all the same process. So, all applicants who provide one of five documents proving U.S. citizenship, as specified in the Bill, will be automatically registered to vote at the SOS, though they may opt out through their local election authority. So, they have to still... those document... that documentation is still required. The U.S. citizenship document will be recorded in a document capture screen and U.S. citizenship will be entered into a designated field which will start that automatic voter registration process. If U.S. citizenship is not indicated in the designated field, programming will prevent back- and optout automatic voter registration. Applicants who... whose documentation does not allow the SOS to determine citizenship or noncitizenship will not be automatically registered to vote. Existing election law will control, which also applies to voter registration, through the Illinois State Board of

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Elections website during in-person registration at local election authority offices when mailing a voter registration application. So, this is all the exact same process that we currently have."

- Windhorst: "There are provisions in the law regarding enforcement of violation of immigration laws. How... what changes to the law are made with this Bill?"
- Croke: "So, again, my understanding that this Bill does not actually change that. It just is adding additional clarifying language and still this... still existing immigration law is... it's just reenforcing existing Secretary of State practices."
- Windhorst: "And... and so, I... I understand, and those on my side understand, this is primarily with the sharing of facial recognition or photographs to be used in the enforcement of immigration law. Is that accurate?"

Croke: "Yes."

- Windhorst: "And... and that would be prohibited, those items could not be shared for the purpose of enforcement?"
- Croke: "Just one moment. So, this is existing statute. The Secretary of State is barred from disclosing highly restricted personal information or personally identifying information and providing images, documents, or facial recognition services to any immigration agent, except as necessary to comply with the following circumstances: a court order, a judicial warrant, and a subpoena for individual records issued by a federal or state court."
- Windhorst: "Thank you. And there are fees involved for the disclosure of these records to private companies that'll be charged by the Secretary of State. Is that accurate?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Croke: "Yes."

Windhorst: "What are those fees?"

Croke: "One moment. I'm going to try to see if I can get those for you. I do not have them at my fingertips right now."

Windhorst: "And as you're getting that, just another question. I believe it'll be my last one, other than the answer to the prior one. The ACLU is opposed. What is their opposition?"

Croke: "My understanding is that the ACLU feels that this does not go far enough, that they would even like to further restrict the... what companies can do with this data or essentially what access agreements that the Secretary of State's Office can enter into. But it's the Secretary of State's position that this Bill is just... kind of meant more to... to clarify and to allow them to assess what companies are... are getting the data and they are just going to continue to follow the federal law on that."

Windhorst: "Thank you for that answer. Do you happen to have the answer... the prior answer to the fees question?"

Croke: "I'm sorry. I don't have that information."

Windhorst: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield for two questions on this?"

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Ammons: "Thank you. One is, I read the last part on here referencing the ACLU's opposition to this. Are they still in opposition to the Bill as it currently stands?"

Croke: "Yes."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Ammons: "And can you explain the opposition of the ACLU? If you can. If you can't, I respect."
- Croke: "So, just for... again, if I... I'm sure I could probably find a statement of the exact... their... the specific reasons that they're opposed. My overall understanding is they just do not feel that this Bill goes far enough in how to restrict the data that the Secretary of State has getting into various companies' hands for certain types of usage."
- Ammons: "And... and the analysis suggests that the Secretary of State's Office sells the information currently. Is that what I... is that correct? Am I reading that correctly?"
- Croke: "Yeah. There are fees for the access agreement. I... I think that the Secretary of State may disagree with the idea that they're... they're selling it, but there are fees. I mean, so... I guess..."
- Ammons: "It says... it says, actually, selling. It says the ACLU's opposition is because it doesn't include enough privacy protections and it doesn't limit the Office of the Secretary of State from selling driver data that do not exist in current law."
- Croke: "Well, then I... I guess I would disagree with the word of selling. There are fees that are associated. So, the... the federal government has legislation that kind of pertains to all of the states. The... the information's not necessarily just being sold for any type of usage. One of the... the reasons that a Secretary of State may enter into an access agreement is for the ability for a body to, you know, collect taxes from individuals. Or there are certain fines or fees associated with failing to pay for parking or failing to pay

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

for various things that they enter into an access agreement because the Secretary of State can't also be the ones who are collecting those... those fees. So, it helps for, like, municipalities, for instance, who are collecting fees for... for parking and... and things like that, various... like revenue components."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you for... this was news to me. And so,
I read that and I read it again just to make sure that I
understood. And perhaps you disagree with the word that was
drafted here using selling."

Croke: "Yeah."

Ammons: "It would be helpful for us to..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "...know that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative... Representative Avelar... do you need more time?"

Ammons: "Oh, thank you. I don't need much. I just wanted to register my 'present' vote today because I'm concerned about our state agencies selling to whom, I don't know, but I certainly do think that the people deserve to know where their information is going. And two, that we've had so many data breeches in government, private and public sector, that this should be certainly looked at a little further as to who's getting the driver's license data. We should certainly be concerned about that. So, I appreciate you answering what you could. Thank you very much."

Croke: "Very quickly to just to respond to that. So, this... the goal actually of this Bill is to do that. So, when the... the Secretary of State is essentially trying to do this Bill to

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

be able to know in their access agreements and require the companies that they have their access agreements with to provide a list of who those companies are providing the information to. So, that's kind of the... the goal of the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I... I originally came over to you to ask, you know, what the goal of the this was because I had the same concerns about selling information. And I appreciate the explanation that you gave in regards to, you know, if somebody drove off from a parking garage, they may be able to use that information to collect taxes that would otherwise revert back to the State of Illinois. So, I understand that portion. But... but my focus... the focus of my concern right now is Section 2A-103(9), I believe. It says the last four digits... these are the exceptions to the rule. So, the last four digits can be given to the State Board of Elections for purposes of voter registration. And then you scroll down to Section 105, and when it deals with citizenship or immigration status, it specifically leaves out the State Board of Elections. So, you're providing the information on one hand to ensure voter registration is proper, but if they're not legal citizens, you are not allowed to provide that information. So, I... and I shared in committee when... when I was gerrymandered out of my district and I had to move, it took me three tries through the Secretary of State's Office to try to get my... my information, my voter registration changed. And then finally, I had to go to both county clerks to actually get it changed.

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

So, I think there's... there's a... first off, there's a misunderstanding that when you go to the Secretary of State's Office that your voter registration is changed here and there, and... and I think there has to be an explanation on that. That's a side issue. But here, we are specifically saying that the information that is shared with the State Board of Elections cannot tell them if they're a citizen or not. And we have expanded driver's licenses significantly, allowing illegal immigrants to have ... to have driver's licenses. And then we changed it... you know, there... there was a restriction on there that... that explained that they were here not as a citizen. Now, they receive the same exact driver's license as anyone else. My concern is the belief and the validity in our system of elections. And when you... when we do these things, when we put these... when we don't have an exception to share this information with the Board of Elections, it seems like we are trying to do something nefarious. It seems like the Secretary of State is putting forth an effort to do something nefarious or to allow something nefarious. And... and I hope that is not the case. And... and I... I hope that we can make a change to this. I can't support it ... as is, and ... and I'm sure you probably have the votes. But the reality is, if we want to ensure a belief in our election system, we can't leave this stuff out. We have to ensure that the people that are... are meant to vote have the opportunity to vote and the people that shouldn't be don't have access to the system. So, I... I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

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

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

- Ugaste: "Representative Croke, I... I know... I see what your Amendment and Bill here changes, according to our analysis. I think you were reading existing law earlier mentioning that the Secretary of State's Office should or should not do certain things regarding registering people to vote. Did I understand correctly listening to the debate?"
- Croke: "Yes. So, it was just existing law and... and some of the provisions that were mentioned by the... the previous speaker by Leader Davidsmeyer. It was just a recodification of... of existing statute."
- Ugaste: "Okay. So, it's existing in the statute that the Secretary of State's Office is not supposed to register anyone that is not a U.S. citizen to vote. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yes."

- Ugaste: "Okay. But I thought I read somewhere today that it says that the Secretary of State's system doesn't prevent anyone who doesn't provide proof of citizenship from being registered to vote. Do you know if that's accurate?"
- Croke: "No. And I... Representative, that is... is inaccurate. There are... without one of those documents that shows citizenship, they will not be admitted into the automatic voter registration portal."
- Ugaste: "So, will the… the Secretary of State's Office will automatically… the system will automatically preclude that.

 That's your understanding? Or they just shouldn't be admitted?"

Croke: "Yeah. They will... they will not be admitted. No."

Ugaste: "Okay. Thank you."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Cassidy: "Representative, can you speak to the ACLU's concerns about this Bill and specifically their concerns with how it might impact the Reproductive Health Act and our need to protect data privacy of patients and providers?"

"One moment, Representative. Okay. So, in response specifically to that. So, to respond to the opposition that alleges that the Data Privacy Act does not protect data that could be used to prosecute abortions that occur in Illinois and other states. The Illinois Secretary of State's database overwhelmingly includes personally identifying information about Illinois residents, not residents of other states. A request, for example, from another state for personally identifying information pertaining to a resident of Missouri would be futile. That information would be held by the State of Missouri. A request from another state for personally identifying information of an Illinois resident that may be accused of assisting in an abortion provided in the State of Illinois but for a constituent of the other state would be subject to the existing Reproductive Health Care Act. The Reproductive Health Care Act specifically applies to all state laws, ordinances, policies, procedures, practices, and governmental actions and their implementations, whether statutory or otherwise, and whether adopted before or after the effective date of this Act. This includes the Data Privacy Act. Pursuant to the Reproductive Health Act, the State shall not deny, restrict, interfere with, or discriminate against

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

an individual's exercise of the fundamental rights set forth in this Act and shall not prosecute, punish, or otherwise deprive any individual of the individual's rights for any act or failure to act during this individual's own pregnancy if the predominant basis for such prosecution, punishment, or deprived rights is the potential, actual, or perceived impact on the pregnancy or it's outcomes or on the pregnant individual's own health. A violation of this Section would result in..."

Cassidy: "Representative..."

Croke: "...an action against the state."

Cassidy: "Representative, I don't think I need you to read me the RHA. What I really would like to know, because I do believe that the ACLU has valid concerns, Indiana law enforcement could ask the Secretary to provide information related to an Illinois license plate on a car used in connection with an Indiana resident accessing abortion care in Illinois. I know the request was that we use the same language that we've used several times, including other Bills for the Secretary, making it explicitly clear that we are... that the data would not be used to identify people seeking, providing, or assisting with lawful health care. So, we've been using that lawful health care language in several Bills. I'm deeply concerned that that's not in here. I'm... I'm additionally concerned about the facial recognition piece, given that we haven't spoken to that in other protections. I think that leaves that even more vulnerable. And I'm deeply concerned, also, about the possibility of that data being sold, given

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

that that's allowed as well. Is there a reason why you were unwilling to add the lawful health care language?"

Croke: "So, quickly, RHAs... RHA applies to all of the situations that ACL... well, at least the Secretary of State believes that the RHA protects... applies in all situations that were brought up by the ACLU. I think that if the ACLU..."

Cassidy: "The ACLU disagrees with that vehemently..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Rep... Representative..."

Cassidy: "...and given that we've done this on multiple Bills..."

Croke: "Representative, can I please finish?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy,
Representative Mussman gives you two minutes."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Croke: "Thank you. So, the other component of this, when it comes to the facial recognition, we're talking about internal processes within the Secretary of State's Office. If the ACLU would like to bring legislation forward that addresses that specific component of facial recognition, I... I do not see what is preventing them from doing that."

Cassidy: "Given the fact that the RHA remains a relatively new level of protection, given that we have done this using the belt and suspenders method, if you want to call it that, to make reference to the RHA, to make reference to lawful health care to make sure that we are truly protecting the data, I think until we do that, I cannot support this."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Croke to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2978 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

is open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Croke."

Croke: "I request Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Hoffman: "Mr. Clerk, Postponed Consideration. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to waive the posting requirements for several Bills. If there is leave, we will take these Motions together as one Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Leader Buckner on the Motion."

Buckner: "Speaker, I move that the posting requirements be waived on the following Bills so they can be heard in committee: Senate Bill 998 in Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools Committee; Senate Bill 457 in State Government Administration Committee; Senate Bill 3552 in Judiciary - Criminal Committee; Senate Bill 125 to Executive Committee; and Senate Bill 3201 to Police & Fire Committee."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Mr. Speaker, we request a record vote on the Motion."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Buckner has moved to waive the posting requirements. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of the… vote 'nay'. The voting's 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 71 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the posting requirements are waived. Moving to page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3238, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3238, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3238 is an initiative of the Commission on Equity Inclusion. As you can recall, we created this expand access to state contracts commission to minorities, women, persons with disabilities, and veterans and to assist the state enhancing the equity inclusion throughout our workforce. This Bill has two main components. Each component pulls language from a couple House Bills that we've actually voted out of this chamber before, House Bill 4360 and House Bill 3421. The first component shifts statutory responsibility and requirements of the Business Enterprise Program from CMS to the Commission on Equity Inclusion. The second component is reflected in an Amendment that we added in our chamber that grants the Commission on Equity and Inclusion oversight authority to collect supplier diversity reports by state agencies. This oversight includes publishing each report on the Commission and Equity Inclusion's website and potentially holding annual hearings with the state agencies to discuss compliance with supplier diversity reporting requirements. As the duties and responsibilities for this commission and as the commission evolves, it's important that we legislatively provide a framework for this commission to thrive and meet its objectives. Senate Bill 3238 provides a great starting point for this commission to be a catalyst and cornerstone of our state's diversity,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

equity, inclusion efforts. I urge a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 3238."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, we had a similar House Bill that came through this chamber, I believe, to this. I believe that was House Bill 4360. Do you recall that Bill?"

Slaughter: "Yes."

Windhorst: "It was... is that... that was your Bill, correct? Or it may not have been, I'm sorry."

Slaughter: "I believe that was my seatmate Representative Harper's Bill."

Windhorst: "Do you know if this Bill, Senate Bill 3238, is the same as House Bill 4360?"

Slaughter: "It contains language from 4360. Yes."

Windhorst: "And just for Members on our side, the vote on House Bill 4360 is... was 98 to 8. So, you may want to check your vote on House Bill 4360. Representative, overall, what are we hoping to accomplish with this legislation?"

Slaughter: "Again, wanting to build up. It's a relatively new commission, the Commission on Equity and Inclusion. Wanting to build that up, evolve it, legislatively provide framework so that we can continue to give this commission more responsibility, more oversight over our diversity, equity, inclusion efforts here. So, again, a great Bill to provide that cornerstone. Many of us have championed DEI efforts in this chamber and those efforts have required reporting. That reporting is now going to be on their website so that we can

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

see it, so it'll be more transparency there. And then in regards to the other piece, one of our traditional cornerstone efforts that we work with called the BEP Program, will now be shifting from Central... Central Management Services over to this commission. And so, we think that these provisions will allow the commission to... to now thrive in regards to its objectives."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3238 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 88 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 13 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3412, Representative Croke. Representative Croke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3412, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read a second time previously.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3412, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Croke."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Croke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this is a really great Bill, everyone, just to throw that out there. So, Senate Bill 3112 (sic-3412) is the Uniform Money Transmission Modernization Act. This legislation is based on the model law developed over years of negotiation between state regulators and payment industry, all under the leadership of the Conference of State Bank Supervisors. It will replace Illinois' current..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Croke, one minute."

Croke: "Oh."

Speaker Hoffman: "The Chair would recognize the Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, Alexi Giannoulias, is in the Chamber. Alexi. Representative Croke, please proceed."

Croke: "All right. Back to this good Bill. So, basically, by adopting this law, we're going to bring Illinois in law... in line with other states who are adopting this model legislation. The Senate passed this Bill unanimously. It passed committee also unanimously, and we have also amended it in the House to remove most of the opposition. And I do want to really quickly thank IDFPR for all their work on this and for dealing with myself and financial institutions because I do really love an agreed Bill in that committee. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Ugaste: "Representative Croke, for the people on our side of the aisle, could you just briefly state what this Act is seeking to do as far as regulation and what... what have you?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Croke: "Yeah. So, basically, we have existing legislation. We have a money transmitter law. It's... it's TOMA, what we refer to it as. This essentially updates that because we know that since TOMA was passed, I believe in like 1996, the way that we transmit money is very different. So, this really kind of brings us into the current world that we are in as it pertains to money transmitters. And it just... it regulates persons and companies who transmit money from one party to another in exchange for compensation. The new Act contains actually a lot of the provisions from TOMA, but it... again, it's designed to encourage interstate cooperation in investigations in licensing of money transmitters. So, again, it... it very much is trying to update us to bring us in line with other states and their existing money transmission Acts."

Ugaste: "Okay. And... and I believe you mentioned that this brings us into the current age of money transmission. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yes."

Ugaste: "And that you have worked to eliminate just about all opposition. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yes."

Ugaste: "There's one small segment of money transmitters that still has a slight issue with it, but I believe you've even indicated you'll work in the future with them?"

Croke: "Yeah. So, there is one specific kind of niche group that is still currently opposed, but the Act for them does not go into effect until January 2026. And I have given them my word that I want to address that concern they have. Real briefly for the Body, it... it has to deal with companies that take in

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

a large amount of sums to then pay various taxing bodies. They have so much money in... essentially in their account for a 24- to 48-hour period that they would not be able to comply with the regulation that has a certain liquidity component but... so I'm very aware of what their concern is, how we need to make this regulation kind of work for that style of company, and I have said... given them my word that I will work on it."

Ugaste: "Okay. And I appreciate that. Knowing you to be a person of your word when it comes to working with various people on Bills, I am going to urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

McCombie: "Thank you. I think many of us in the chamber have issues and concerns with IDFPR overall. And I think it's interesting it states here that we're going to require a license to provide money transmission services. Is that correct?"

Croke: "Yes. And... and there are... we do currently require licenses for... for money transmitters. This essentially, though, brings in more... it's a modernization Act, so it is bringing in more money transmitters that would fall under regulation."

McCombie: "Well, I think it's interesting. And I'm not sure, Representative, if you're aware that I recently had a constituent that was getting her nurse's license and was a four-hour, one-way to get here, needed to go to work the very next day, and had to physically drive here to pay \$30. So, I think its real rich that we are asking... that we're going to

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

start requiring a license for money transmission services when the agency doesn't allow that themselves on some of their licensing."

Croke: "So, Leader, I am not going to justify the issue that we have with IDFPR and their professional licenses. I also have constituents who are essentially languishing for weeks because they are not getting their professional licenses. However, this... I do believe this is very different. We're talking about financial institutions. We're not talking about individual consumers. We're talking about financial institutions for the most part, where... what I would consider financial. Payroll processors. They are already regulated, but because of the nature of money transmission in 2024 versus 1996, we have to update this... this law in order for consumer protection. I... but I do not dismiss the concerns that you are bringing right now, and I also know that I have concerns with the professional licensing of IDFPR."

McCombie: "Thank you, Representative, for sharing the concerns.

And I would ask that you use your, all of you, use your position being in the Majority Party to really push the agency to handle their disfunction. And I appreciate you. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Keicher."

Keicher: "Mr. Speaker, please let the record reflect that
 Representative Bunting is excused for the remainder of the
 day."

Speaker Hoffman: "The record shall reflect. Representative Croke to close."

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

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3412 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 14 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3473, on behalf of Leader Smith, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3473, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman on Floor Amendment #2."

 Mussman: "I would like to adopt the Amendment and debate the Bill on Third, please."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3473. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3473, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman."
- Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3473 is in response to the CDC indicating that there is

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

an alarming upward trend of diabetes diagnosis in our youth, especially among Blacks, Latinos, Hispanics, Asians, and other minorities. It is important that parents are aware of this crisis and are informed about warning signs to watch for in their children to bring to the attention of their primary care provider. Therefore, this Bill amends the School Code to require the State Board of Education, in coordination with the Department of Public Health, to develop and post informational materials and make those materials available on their website so that each school district and charter school can then share those materials on their website. This version of the Bill is significantly scaled back from its original introduction. All stakeholders are now neutral. Parents often see their school as a trusted source of information and spend time interacting with the various sources of information they make available on their websites. I do think this is a reasonable option to spread awareness to help parents better protect their children. The more we can prevent or diagnose and act early on, the better for our state and its residents so that they can live their best and most healthy lives and we can help to moderate our new and future health care costs, which I think is a win-win. I appreciate your support for this Bill. I'd happy... be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, as you outlined, initially this Bill required school districts to provide information to parents of type 1 diabetes in writing as well as on their

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

website. The Amendment only requires that it be posted on the school's website. Is that correct?"

Mussman: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "I think about the only concern I've heard expressed is not necessarily as it relates to type 1 diabetes, but at what point... what is the limiting principle? Meaning how many ailments, illnesses, and diseases will we be asking school districts, or not just asking, mandating school districts to put on their website."

Mussman: "I don't think that there is a definitive answer to that. I think that that is within the power of this Body to be looking at medical trends that we find particularly of note, and we have the ability then to add or subtract from our statutes as we find necessary. For instance, I have a Bill from our own Department of Health removing requirements on their reporting regarding Reye syndrome because Reye syndrome is no longer a problem in our state and in much of the United States at all. So, that is being taken away. And, again, we would have the ability if... if people become properly notified about the dangers of diabetes and how to prevent it and those cases go down, we might remove that and instead report on something else that would be important to families to know, like the prevalence of ticks and Lyme disease might be something we want them to be posting on their websites."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mussman to close."

Mussman: "I appreciate the questions and the support for Rep. Smith's Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3473 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's 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, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3649, Leader Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3649, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read a second time previously.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Evans... or Third Reading. Leader Evans... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3649, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the great Members of this Assembly. I rise and ask your support for Senate Bill 3649. It's an initiative of our great Illinois AFL-CIO organization. Ladies and Gentlemen, when Illinois voters passed the Workers' Rights Amendment in 2022, they made it clear that workers' rights come first. Senate Bill 3649, the Illinois Workers Freedom of Speech Act, tackles the growing problem of political and religious speech in the workplace. When employees are forced to listen to their employers political or religious speech, which often includes antiunion rhetoric, it truly impacts all workers. And we heard from a variety of workers who want to see this Bill pass and

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

just want to go to work to work. You know, a captive audience meetings, female hotel room attendants reported being concerned, cornered alone in hotel rooms, (unintelligible) workers had their gender-affirming health care covertly workers threatened, and immigrant were told documentation status would be revealed. Even in pro-states like Illinois, employers have tremendous power over workers and can require them to attend captive audience meetings. When the workers decline to participate in these meetings, there is nothing that prevents them from being fired or disciplined. To stop this, we need to follow the lead of the other six states who've passed similar Bills that protects workers' rights. Workers go to work, not to discuss political or religion. I just request your support to protect workers, and let's keep work, work."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Ugaste: "As the Sponsor indicated, the Workers' Rights Act passed a couple years ago. Workers in Illinois enjoy as many or more rights, I think, than just about anywhere in the state, and I'm not saying that's a bad thing. This is now extending further into what is already first controlled by federal law and superseded by federal law regarding what type of speech can take place in the workplace. And workers are already protected. There can't be any threats against them of retribution or retaliation, or reprisal or force or a promise of a benefit when discussing views, arguments, or opinions. Employers are already not allowed to do that. But this is

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

going a step further. Some people establish their businesses as part of their religious beliefs or their political beliefs, or they do want to talk about unionization with their workers. And we are now taking away another tool that businesses have, in one sense, regarding their ability to talk to their workers and what's important to them. I asked in committee about the right of a store that opens up to sell Christian or Muslim or Jewish items, whether they can speak with their workers regarding their religion. And under this Bill, they aren't exempted. Now, when this Bill came over and they had worked on it a little bit, we saw a House Bill first that didn't come to the floor, but there was an... unions were going to be subject to it, as well as many religious institutions, and they were eventually backed out. But I don't think it went well... far enough because we still have some companies that are going to be regulated that shouldn't have to be. In any event, I believe that the ... this will eventually lead to nothing but a lot of litigation and cause our Attorney General to spend a lot of time and resources in defending it, when similar Bills have been passed in other states have already been challenged and many of them already lost, at least in the initial process. So, while I definitely like to protect the rights of workers, believe they need... need to be kept safe in the State of Illinois, I also don't believe in impending... in going too far and limiting the rights of business in the State of Illinois, and therefore would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Evans to close."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Evans: "Ladies and Gentlemen, workers want to work. Workers don't want to deal with nonsense at work. They want to work and they want to go home with their families. We passed this Bill in six or seven other states and many more are coming. We're on our way to 50 because workers want to work and they don't want to be mandated to attend waste-of-time meetings. They don't want to be inundated with stress. Let workers work. Please support this Bill."
- Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3649 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 79 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative LaPointe on Senate Bill 3753, page 14 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3753, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative LaPointe."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative LaPointe on Floor Amendment #2."

 LaPointe: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 brings Equip for

 Equality and another parent group of adults with

 developmental disabilities to neutral on the Bill by tweaking

 some language related to reconsiderations."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative LaPointe moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3753. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3753, a Bill for an Act concerning

health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative LaPointe."

"Thank you, Speaker. SB3753 builds off the long-term work that we are all doing to build up a variety of safe and quality residential options for our adults with developmental disabilities, from our state operated developmental centers to our CILAs. And let me be very, very clear. We have a long way to go with this work. This Bill specifically codifies criteria that has to be met for an individual seeking an administrative admission or continued placement in a stateoperated developmental center, such as the need to meet clinical criteria. So, it makes sense that someone is housed in an SODC and a mandate to have received or attempted to receive education regarding community-based services and supports. The clinical assessments must be conducted annually to make sure it's the most appropriate level of care. In terms of the educational component, individuals and their families and guardians shall have the right to know the options of supports across the full spectrum of care and when they have a desire for a... a less restrictive environment, excluding when there are safety concerns. The Bill also codifies the sanctions and appeals process for providers that fail to comply with conditions that are specified in rule or contract. In terms of provider issues related to discharging

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

individuals, the Bill creates a process for discharge reconsideration requests. And as I mentioned, that process is going to be housed in the Department of Human Services. The Bill did pass the Senate unanimously, but we have amended it in the House. And as I mentioned, Equip for Equality and the Illinois League of Advocates for Developmental Disabilities, which includes parents from Murray SODC, is neutral on the Bill and provided input. Happy to answer questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Meier."

Meier: "Will Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Meier: "I'm happy to stand up here today and say things that I've worked for, for 12 years are in this Bill by us working together to see Murray parents know that ILADD and VOR are all working together to make things right. I definitely agree with the Sponsor, we have a long way to go. We have troubles in our SODCs, and we have troubles in CILAs. We have to get together to make things right. This is a long time coming. You have heard me speak for many years about some of the problems in the CILAs because we seem to turn our back. I look at this as a great... working together. Maybe I don't have to go to the Auditor General to get reports on how bad it's been in the CILAs anymore. We no longer want to hear of rapes. We don't want to hear of starvations. We don't want to hear them in an SODC of abuse. We want to make sure our most vulnerable are protected. And it is a very proud day for me to be up here saying this, that we are working together to get something done to make a difference for our most

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

vulnerable people. So, thank you, Sponsor, for bringing this forward. Thank you for working with us. Let's keep it going."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a quick question on the Bill?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you so much for working on this. I have a niece who has developmental disabilities, and these are very important things for us to have available for them for continuation and quality of life. I just wanted to ask, in the analysis here, it has... I know you mentioned Illinois League Advocates and Murray's Parents Association are now neutral. Can you talk about AFSCME Council 31's opposition, or are they neutral... I mean, are they neutral at this point on the Bill?"

LaPointe: "Rep. Ammons, that's a great question. I... I believe that they are neutral, and I will try to verify that in a matter of seconds. But I... I did... I was in conversation with AFSCME on this Bill and... and on many Bills that share a similar goal. We're in conversation, and they are neutral. And, yes, I have confirmed, they are neutral."

Ammons: "All right. Thank you so much for clarifying that."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative LaPointe to close."

LaPointe: "Thank you so much for the questions. And just want to emphasize again that... that we have a long way to go and we do, we see, and we feel the bad behavior that does happen still by our professionals sometimes in CILAs and in state-operated developmental centers. And I feel the need to mention that today 'cause some of you might have seen the news that

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

an incident that happened at Choate in Anna, Illinois, in Southern Illinois, in February came out in the news today. And I read it and I hurt. I hurt for the person who was assaulted allegedly by a staff person at... at Choate. I hurt for all the other residents. And I just want to acknowledge that we still have a long way to go. And all of this work that we are doing, including our... our advocacy to get wages up for our community providers and our DSPs, is moving towards the same goal as a... lots of safe quality options for people in the community or high-quality SODC services if that is the right place for them. Thank you for listening. Thanks for your work on this. To my collaborators, I urge an 'aye' vote." Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3753 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 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Remaining on page 14 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3768, Representative Costa Howard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3768, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Costa Howard."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard on Floor Amendment #2."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Costa Howard: "Mr. Speaker, can we adopt the Floor Amendment and then debate it on Third?"

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3768. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all opposed '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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3768, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3768 amends the School Code as it pertains to a very special school in my district, the Philip J. Rock Center. For any of you who've ever had the honor of touring that school, it is a school for the deaf-blind. It is... it is a remarkable school. It's one of the only in the country. It is them the only in the country. And it... it actually is a place, it's a home. It's a residential school for our kids. They are putting a.m. we're finally renovating that building. We're going to have the opportunity to offer this educational opportunity to students... more students across the state. So, what the Bill will do is amend the School Code and add certain provisions to allow that the school allow visual... I'm sorry, who have both hearing and visual impairment, as well as students who have solely visual impairment and solely hearing impairments that meet very specific requirements. It... the Bill also outlines some different definitions, and it also authorizes

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the operation of its own employer for purposes of employment. Again, this is an ISBE-based school and I am very proud to make these recommendations to change... for changes."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this..."

Costa Howard: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "I'm sorry. On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "She indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, I have a... just a quick question on the advisory council compensation. There was some language that was stricken related to compensation and... on the advisory council, and I just wondered, are we eliminating their compensation or making some change with that... that deletion?"

Costa Howard: "One... one second, Leader."

Windhorst: "I believe it's on House Amendment 2, page 9."

Costa Howard: "I'm sorry, Leader. Give me... oh, okay. Okay. Leader, yes, the language was stricken. However, Rock Center is in agreement with the Amendments that were made."

Windhorst: "And so, the board... it's a vision the board will no longer be compensated. Is that accurate?"

Costa Howard: "According to the Bill."

Windhorst: "Yeah. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Hoffman: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, what... what is this Bill actually attempting to do? I... I mentioned earlier, in... in Jacksonville we have the Illinois School for the Deaf and the Illinois School for

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the Visually Impaired, which provide amazing services to folks throughout the entire State of Illinois. So, I... I just want to make sure that... to understand what you're trying to do."

Costa Howard: "Right. Leader, I'm... I'm assuming you're asking are we going to be plucking students from other schools, and the answer to that is no. This is a school of opportunity. One of the things that we... about this school is, with the Amendment, was that it always prioritizes deaf-blind. That... that is the core of what the Philip J. Rock School is all about. That's what we do. However, we have an opportunity to be able to expand this experience, this educational experience, to students around the country by opening that up a little bit more. As I mentioned, the school will be breaking ground on updating their facilities very shortly and we want to make sure that we had the opportunity to reach as many students as possible. So, no, we are not trying to... to take from one school to the other. We are trying to expand opportunities. And, again, it will always be deaf-blind first priority, and then if... if either a visually impaired with certain limitations or hearing impaired as well, they would have the opportunity to attend the school as well."

Davidsmeyer: "That... that's great. And I... I think... I think we need to make sure that everyone throughout the state understands the... the availability of this type of education because I think the... this is often the best place for a number of students and if we can provide this opportunity for a lot of people. I... I just want to say that my middle school, I've got an eighth grader and a sixth grader and they're both in sign

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

language class right now. So, it's a great opportunity for... for people to be part of the community and... and I just wanted to make sure that we're working in tandem and working together to make sure the educational opportunities are there throughout the state. Thank you."

Costa Howard: "Absolutely, Leader. And... and, again, we already have kids who are, and I'm going to call them kids 'cause they are always our kids, who are on the waiting list to be able to be a part of this opportunity."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Costa Howard to close."

Costa Howard: "Be a part of change, and let's do something good for kids today. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3768 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; 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 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Remaining on page 14 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3771, Representative Olickal. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3771, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Olickal."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Olickal."

Olickal: "Thank you. Floor Amendment 1 takes care of a concern from the clerks, and it also puts the set of schools where

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the grant can be used in better alignment with other ISAC programs. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Olickal moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3771. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed '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 Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3771, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Olickal."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3771 is Olickal: initiative of ISAC to give wrongfully convicted people more flexibility in how they can use their grant that we created for them several years ago, the grant for exonerated persons for people who are in prison but later found to be innocent. It helps them pay for college or for a State of Illinois high school diploma. The program has been... only been funded since 2020, but it has had low... very low take-up and only a few grants... few grants have been awarded. ISAC has been looking for ways to make the program work better for exonerees without blowing... or busting the program's budget, and this Bill would do that in a few ways. It would align this program more with other grant programs that ISAC administers. It would allow exonerees to give any of their grant eligibility that they didn't use to a dependent. And the Bill would also require clerks to post information about the program in courthouses to help promote awareness of the program. Again, no opposition

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

to this Bill and is an initiative of ISAC. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates he'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, this is a... a scholarship program for dependents of... of exonerated persons in Illinois.

Is that correct?"

Olickal: "The program is for exonerated individuals. This would expand eligibility. Let's say an exoneree has left over grant funding, they can pass that on to a... a dependent."

Windhorst: "Is there any residency requirement for that dependent to use the grant?"

Olickal: "There is not a residency requirement, but the grant has to be used in a institution within Illinois."

Windhorst: "So, if... if the individual's out of state, they have to come to Illinois for school?"

Olickal: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Are there any costs associated with this program?"

Olickal: "There is right now. The program... \$150 thousand has been allocated. But as of now, only 3 grants have gone out, totaling about \$16 thousand."

Windhorst: "And is that 150 an annual allotment?"

Olickal: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Olickal to close."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3771 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting's

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

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 71 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to Senate Bills on Third Reading appears Senate Bill 275, Leader Spain. Out of the record. Representative Mayfield on Senate Bill 464. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 464, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. We have a unique opportunity in...

I'm sorry, in North Chicago to build a new school and the federal government is going to pay for 80 percent of that.

So, we just are looking for authority to do this. Recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 464 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's 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 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 508, Representative Delgado. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 508 is actually similar to something that we have seen... we had seen last Session. We had to make some changes to the Bill to make sure that it complied with federal law. So, that's why you're seeing this now. It prevents an employer from imposing greater work authorization verification requirements than required by federal law and requires employers to notify employees of certain government actions regarding their work authorization status. So, in more specifics, if the employer believes that there is a discrepancy in the documentation the employee submitted, and they must notify the employee how to remedy the problem. They may also ... they must also notify an employee if a government agency has informed an employer that there is a problem with the employee's work authorization status. It requires employers to notify an employee if a government agency is conducting or intends to conduct an inspection of I-9s the employer has collected. And it also requires that employers notify an employee if a government agency has concluded that an employee's I-9 and supporting documentation does not prove that they are authorized to work. And if the employee contests that determination of a final decision, that the agency communicates that to the employer. There are civil penalties associated with this. They're enforceable by the Department of Labor or the individual employee if they file a suit. To the extent that any of these Bill's requirements conflict with federal law, which I don't believe they do at this point, but federal law will control regarding all of this, including the use of the E-Verify system. I am

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

happy to answer any questions, Mr. Speaker, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Indicates she'll yield."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, one of the provisions of the Bill says that an employer shall not impose work authorization verification or reverification requirements greater than those imposed by federal law. So, basically, federal law would set the... the limit and the employer cannot go beyond that."

Delgado: "That's correct."

Windhorst: "We also have, in addition to the provisions that you mentioned, you... you referenced the penalty and I just want to discuss the penalty provisions. It says that an employer that fails to provide the notices required, per affected employee, shall be subject to a civil penalty of a minimum of 2 thousand or up to 5 thousand for a first violation and then 5 thousand to 10 thousand on subsequent violations. Is that accurate?"

Delgado: "Yes. That's accurate."

Windhorst: "And then the Department of Labor being involved with the enforcement of the penalty and... and the penalty be... be determined based on the size of the business charged and the gravity of the violation."

Delgado: "Give me one moment. I just want to make sure we've got it right. Just to make sure I get it exactly right here. So, the court can consider the appropriateness of the penalty. That's something that the court can consider. It is not necessarily prescriptive in that case. And just to be clear,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- on the previous question you asked, those violations only are going to incur a civil penalty for a willful and knowing violation. So, there are some burdens of proof associated with that as well."
- Windhorst: "And also, I believe referenced to be considered in determining the penalty is the gravity of the violation. Is that correct?"
- Delgado: "That is something that the court can take into consideration. Yes."
- Windhorst: "And as it relates to this provision, what are the factors for the gravity? Like what is a more serious versus less serious violation?"
- Delgado: "I think that's all going to be dependent upon the... the facts that are presented. And so, I... I don't know that I can give you a... a great example of that, but, you know, I believe that our courts, when they handle these kinds of issues, they certainly have... the way that they approach this is based on the court's experience and also any court cases that may have preceded it."
- Windhorst: "We had previously passed, as you referenced, Senate Bill 1515, which was vetoed by the Governor in his message at the request of the Sponsors and advocates. What does this Bill do that corrects the problems that were in Senate Bill 1515?"
- Delgado: "So, one of the concerns that were... the concerns that were brought to us from some of the folks at the federal level was that we wanted to be very clear that we were not conflicting with federal law. We know that, you know, at the state level we have different kinds of restrictions. And so,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

this was drafted in close consultation with a number of folks at the federal level to ensure that we were not doing anything that would be outside of that, the scope that is appropriate for state law."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Ugaste."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

"Not that it's the intention of the Sponsor, but yet, here we have another Bill that's going to add to the burdens, cost, and... and just unnecessary added conditions on business in the State of Illinois when they really haven't done anything. In this case, they will have hired a worker who, for whatever reason, their employment information has a problem at the federal level. The employer hasn't done anything. They hired someone. They're trying to employ them. But now, all of a sudden, it's going to become their burden to help this person clarify this issue, to provide them with time, to provide them with information, to make sure they understand everything going on to clear it up. And maybe some employers will do that anyhow. Maybe they can afford it. Maybe some of them can't. Maybe some of them are operating on a thin margin or don't have enough people, but we're still going to require it of them. And then we wonder why anyone says Illinois isn't business friendly. I am certain there are agencies to help people who have these problems. I'm certain if a worker's an exceptionally good worker or someone, someone really wants to keep, they will certainly help them. But when we prescribe it by law and add penalties to it, all we're

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

telling business is, if you come to Illinois, we're going to make things more difficult for you. And that's the way they see it. It's not the… what I'm telling you. That's how they view this is happening. So, again, I'm not speaking to the intent of the Sponsor. I'm talking about what the result of the Bill is going to be once it passes. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Delgado to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to cover a couple of things just so that the folks here in... in the... in... on the floor know. So, as a part of the discussions around this Bill, we consulted with the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce, the IMA to make sure that we would craft this in a way that was feasible for business. All of them are neutral on the Bill. They are... they were grateful that... for the fact that we had these conversations. And so, I do think that if you're a business that is acting in the appropriate way, this isn't going to be a huge burden on you. This is really a workers' protection Bill and trying to make sure that, you know, receiving a no-match letter isn't something that is going to result in you getting fired for no reason, especially if it's something that can be addressed. So, again, I ask all for an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much." Speaker Hoffman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 508 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

back to page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading appears Senate Bill 275, Leader Spain. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 275, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 275 is an amendment to the Vehicle Code and directs the Secretary of State to begin the offering of an eight-year driver's license, giving all of our drivers and constituents a little more time and convenience without having to renew their drivers' licenses as... as frequently. This has been a unanimous endeavor in the Senate and look forward to a 'favorable' roll call in the House. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hoffman: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 275 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... Ortiz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 3 of the Calendar appears House Bill on Second Reading, House Bill 4718, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4718, a Bill for an Act concerning property. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

but several notes have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to waive the notes...
rule the notes inapplicable."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi has ruled...

Representative Fritts. I apologize."

Fritts: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Motion. First of all, I would ask that we take a record vote on this Motion. And second of all, just, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the applicability of this, this is going to be one of the most... probably the most important vote that we take today in this chamber. This is a land transfer that has direct impact on my constituency, and I would argue that every single one of these notes are applicable, whether the applicability is there or not. Something needs to be filed because, once this happens, there's no going back. And I would ask that... that the Motion be denied. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi has moved that the...
that the notes be ruled inapplicable. All those in favor vote
'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there
are 61 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And
the notes are deemed inapplicable. Anything further, Mr.
Clerk?"

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

Speaker Hoffman: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4718, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Guzzardi."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members of the House. House Bill 4718 will transfer ownership of Shabbona Lake State Park to the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation. I want to explain why we're here doing this Bill today. It will require a little bit of a history lesson. I'll try to keep it brief. In 1829, the U.S. government signed the Treaty of Prairie du Chien, the Second Treaty of Prairie du Chien. That treaty recognized the claim of Chief Shab-eh-nay of the Prairie Band Potawatomi over 2 parcels of land in Illinois totaling 1280 acres, 2 parcels. Chief lived on this land for many years with his family. In the late 1840s, they went to visit their relatives in Kansas, where they had been removed to. And when they came home after of a couple years of visiting with their family, they found that their lands had been sold by the federal government to white settlers. No one who's an expert in this area or has reviewed the legal evidence disputes the fact that this sale was illegal, the sale of this land. In fact, in 2001, the U.S. Department of the Interior issued a letter saying we believe the U.S. continues to bear a trust responsibility to the Prairie Band for these lands. Here's the trick. Today, this land now has a variety of uses. A small corner of the land, around 130 acres, was purchased by the Prairie Band Nation in 2006 and was just last month, you may have all seen the news stories, that this land was placed in trust with the federal government to form the first reservation in Illinois history. Some of

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

these two parcels that were guaranteed to Chief Shab-eh-nay and his descendants. Some of them are county forest preserve now. Some of it is private farmland or residential land. But the majority of it, and some neighboring land, is the Shabbona Lake State Park. This park was bought by the state starting in 1969 using federal conservation funds. Again, it wasn't state money that bought the park. It was federal dollars. Those federal dollars come with a requirement that the park be used in perpetuity for conservation purposes or else the federal government must be repaid 80 percent of the value of the land. So, the legislation before us rights a historical wrong and it resolves these thorny questions about land ownership because of an agreement that the Prairie Band Potawatomi are willing to enter into with the State of Illinois. They have agreed that they will relinquish their claim on the privately held land and the county... the privately held land, excuse me, in exchange for us conveying the park to the Prairie Band. In addition, before we make that conveyance, they have agreed that they will enter into a land management agreement with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources to keep the park open for public recreation. That's specified in the plain language of statute. So, this is a win-win-win. This keeps this beautiful public asset available to members of the public. It resolves two centuries of disputed title to this land. And, most importantly, it fixes a promise that we broke to the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation, we, the United States, broke to the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation 185 years ago. The gentleman that spoke earlier said this is an important Bill. I couldn't agree with him more. I

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

appreciate the Body's indulgence in that brief history lesson, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hoffman: "On this question, Representative Fritts."

Fritts: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the importance of this issue, I would request that everyone is in their seat with a verification on this vote. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Fritts: "Thank you. Representative, I appreciate you bringing this initiative forward. It is a very important issue like we discussed, and, you know, as you had alluded to, there's no doubt in my mind that there's something that needs to be done here. But can you... just for a little bit of background here, can you tell me where this park is?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. The park is located in DeKalb County in... in your legislative district, Representative."

Fritts: "And what town is it near?"

Guzzardi: "It's near the Village of Shabbona, I believe."

Fritts: "And where is the Village of Shabbona?"

Guzzardi: "It's..."

Fritts: "Just... could you describe it for me?"

Guzzardi: "Sure. Yeah. It's north of the LaSalle-Peru area. It's south of Rockford. It's west of Aurora."

Fritts: "So, it's in Northern Illinois. Okay. Appreciate it. And who's district did you say that this was in?"

Guzzardi: "It's in your legislative district, Representative."

Fritts: "It's in my district, okay. And so, if it's in my district, affecting my constituency, could you explain why you're the one who's running this piece of legislation?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Guzzardi: "Well, as you know, it wasn't originally my legislation.

It was Representative Walker, who's now Senator Walker, who's been working on this issue for many years with you, as I understand. And he left this chamber and wanted to see this worked on. And he knew that I had a passion for these issues.

And so, asked me to carry this Bill and send it over to him in the Senate."

Fritts: "Okay. Have you ever been to the park?"

Guzzardi: "I've not. No."

Fritts: "You've never been to the park. Okay. Have you ever been to the reservation?"

Guzzardi: "No. I have not. Well, I know you have, Representative.

I know you've traveled down there..."

Fritts: "I have."

Guzzardi: "...with Representative Walker."

Fritts: "I have because, as we've alluded to, this is an incredibly important issue. I've been to the park. These are my constituents, my friends, my neighbors. And in knowing what an important issue this is and that something will be done in the future, I did travel to Mayetta, Kansas, specifically for this reason. So, let's talk history a little bit, as you'd alluded to earlier. How much land was guaranteed in the initial... in the initial agreement in federal treaty?"

Guzzardi: "Two sections."

Fritts: "Two sections totaling how many acres?"

Guzzardi: "Twelve-hundred and eighty."

Fritts: "Twelve-hundred and eighty. Okay. Can you tell me how many acres is the state park itself?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Guzzardi: "I believe it's roughly 1500, give or take. You will know more specifically than I."
- Fritts: "Okay. Okay. So, if it's roughly 1500 acres and they were guaranteed 1280, why are we giving extra acres than they were ever guaranteed in the first place?"
- Guzzardi: "Well, I suppose you might consider it an interest payment on 200 years of stolen land."
- Fritts: "Gotcha. Okay. Was that agreement made by the State of Illinois?"
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative, Representative Weaver gives you two more minutes."
- Fritts: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative. The... was that agreement made by the State of Illinois?"
- Guzzardi: "What agreement is that, Representative?"
- Fritts: "The initial treaty agreement, was that made by the State of Illinois?"
- Guzzardi: "No. No. It's a treaty between the federal government of the United States and the Prairie Band..."
- Fritts: "Okay, the federal government. So, why are the taxpayers of Illinois then on the hook for paying, in your mind, interest payments, or a couple hundred acres of interest payments, on a land that... on an agreement that they never... that 49 other states made along with them?"
- Guzzardi: "Well, as you know, there weren't 50 states in 1829.

 But..."

Fritts: "Well..."

Guzzardi: "...the..."

Fritts: "...sure."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Guzzardi: "...the reason is that the state has gotten itself involved in this issue by purchasing land, using federal funds, of course, as I mentioned, purchasing land that, as I said, everyone recognizes legally belongs to the nation. So, the state... unfortunately, the state is involved in this issue whether we like it or not."
- Fritts: "Okay. Why is it then that the federal government isn't the one making right on this if it is a federal issue? Because it was a federal treaty and a federal agreement between them and the nation."
- Guzzardi: "Well, I... I think we all wish that the federal government would have made right on this in 1849. And the federal government has had many, many opportunities to make right on this in the last 180 years. But, today, before us, we have an opportunity to make it right ourselves, and I think it's incumbent upon us to take that opportunity."
- Fritts: "It's not our agreement to make right on, but I'm not going to argue that at this point. What... why not go to court? If there is, as you say, legal proceedings in place here that say that that is their land, why not take this to court? That's what the system's for. It's... the judicial system's there to be a check on the Legislative and Executive Branches. So, why are they not taking this to court?"
- Guzzardi: "Well, so... it's a great question, and I want to get into it a little bit 'cause I think there would be... I want to walk through the consequences of what would happen if the tribe prevailed."

Fritts: "Please do."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Guzzardi: "So, if they were given the land that they were promised in this original treaty..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Reick gives two minutes."

Guzzardi: "...if they were given the land that they were promised in this original treaty, here's what they would get. They would get half a state park. So, the state would have half a park and they would have half a park. That doesn't seem like a terribly good outcome for anyone. They would be..."

Fritts: "We still retain ownership of half a park, but go on."

Guzzardi: "They would be given part of this county forest preserve, and then they'd be given a bunch of private land that people currently live on today. And I don't know what kind of position those folks would be left in. I think that is a very precarious position for those folks to be in. And... and that's why... I think that's part of the reason why... we mentioned that the Village of Shabbona. The mayor of the Village of Shabbona supports this initiative. The village board voted on a resolution supporting this initiative. The... the village has endorsed this proposal, I think, partly because they understand that it will resolve these messy land disputes."

Fritts: "That's... that's a whole different area, but I can't speak to what the board does. I can only speak to my residents and what... what they bring to me. So, the intent of this legislation is to give a... to trade the state park in exchange for giving clear titles to all of those other residents, correct?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Guzzardi: "Yeah. And the... the nation has committed that they won't pursue their claim to those other areas if we engage in this agreement with them."

Fritts: "Can we do that, though, Representative? The reason why..."
Guzzardi: "Can we... can we do what?"

Fritts: "They're saying that an... in exchange for this state park, they will clear the titles of my homeowners... or my private property owners. They don't have the authority to do that because Congress is the only one who has the authority to do that. Not this General Assembly, not them, Congress, correct?"

Guzzardi: "They have said... they have committed that they will not pursue their claim to the remainder of these lands..."

Fritts: "Okay."

Guzzardi: "...to the privately owned lands in the area."

Fritts: "So, are they committed enough to make this land transfer agreement subject to that federal legislation going through exempting the property of my homeowners?"

Guzzardi: "Well, I think if you were a member of a tribal nation, you might be a little skeptical of waiting around for the federal government to come help you out."

Fritts: "Okay. So..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Elik gives two minutes."

Fritts: "So, in your mind now, we're going to give away the entirety of a state park that we own on the hope and prayer that at some point in the future the federal government will take up this issue and clear the titles of my property owners?"

Guzzardi: "That's not my view, Representative. My view is that..."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Fritts: "Okay. Explain your view, then."

Guzzardi: "I'd be happy to."

Fritts: "Please."

Guzzardi: "I'm, in fact, right about to. My view is that the nation today, should we not pursue this agreement, the only avenue left to them will be pursuing a legal settlement of this that will leave those folks' titles in serious jeopardy. My view is that we should trust them when they tell us that by engaging in this agreement with them, they will no longer pursue their claim to those privately held lands."

Fritts: "Representative, I mean, we're doing the business of the taxpayers of Illinois."

Guzzardi: "Yes, we are."

Fritts: "We're talking about handing over a \$15 million asset on the… is there… let me just stop for one second here. Is there anything in this legislation saying anything as such? And… and it's not… I know the chairman. I know… I've been out there. I know these people. I trust them. But, you know, if this kicks… if this can goes down the road another hundred years, let's say, you and I won't be in this chamber anymore. The chairman, everyone else is going to change. So, my property owners in my district are still in limbo."

Guzzardi: "If... if your concern is about clearing the title of the property owners, the worst thing we can do is not pass this Bill today. That will leave their title in the most uncertainty."

Fritts: "Okay. Representative, are you an attorney?"

Guzzardi: "No, I'm not, Representative."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Fritts: "You're not. Okay. Well, let's just go down this rabbit hole a little bit. If they... if they do take the this to court and they say that this is their land, et cetera, there's only two things that this... that the court system could rule, at least in my opinion, and I'm not an attorney either to speak to it. They can agree that, number one, they're going to pay them off for the land, or that, number two, they're going to take said land back by eminent domain and pay my property owners off. I don't think that there's a court in this nation that's going to unseat 30 property owners from property that they already own and operate right now. Let's... let's talk the future if this is passed."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hauter gives you two minutes."

Fritts: "Thank you. Let's talk the future if this is passed.

Infrastructure, gaming, can we speak to this a little bit?

What..."

Guzzardi: "I'm... I'm glad you mentioned gaming. It's a conversation that's come up with... with a number of my colleagues. So, I want to walk us all through this as a Body 'cause it's an important topic."

Fritts: "Please."

Guzzardi: "The first thing I want to say about the subject of gaming is that the tribe came before the General Assembly, I think it was 20 or 30 years ago, and suggested the prospect of building a casino..."

Fritts: "They did."

Guzzardi: "...on... on land in this area. That was before casinos were legal in Illinois. Since that time, all of the major metropolitan areas nearby have built land-based casinos

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

there. So, the first thing is that the tribe's view is that it's not a financially viable possibility. The second thing is that, as I mentioned earlier, this land was purchased with federal conservation dollars."

Fritts: "Okay."

Guzzardi: "So, to use it for any purpose other than conservation, including a casino, the tribe would have to pay 80 percent of the land value to the federal government before they put the first brick down. So, that's \$11 million straight off the top. So, in addition to it not being a viable financial proposition, they're out 11 million bucks. And then..."

Fritts: "All right. I would love to go down this road with you..."
Guzzardi: "Well..."

Fritts: "...because Leader Davidsmeyer had brought this up earlier and I think it's a very viable point and something that's going to be argued into the future. If this is their land and their land was taken, so... and I... the way that he had brought it up in committee, and I was very pleased with how he talked about it, if this is your car and somebody steals your car and they make an agreement with somebody else in that time and that car gets returned to you, you're not under any obligation to make any kind of an agreements with the person who took said car. And..."

Guzzardi: "I think what... what I'm hearing you say is that you don't believe that they will adhere to the agreements that they have promised us to make."

Fritts: "That I... excuse me?"

Guzzardi: "That you don't believe they will adhere to the agreements that they've promised us to make."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Fritts: "No. I just don't... it's not that I view it that way. It's that none of this is codified in the legislation."

Guzzardi: "Well, I'm... I'm happy to read to you from the Bill, if that would helpful."

Fritts: "Please."

Guzzardi: "So, 'the conveyance of real property authorized by Section 5', which describes the land conveyance, 'shall be made so long as the conveyance does not violate any federal funding restrictions nor violate the terms off any federal grant nor require the department to reimburse, refund, or provide replacement land to the Federal Government for federal grants awarded to the department', et cetera. So, it is in fact in the statute of the Bill, Representative."

Fritts: "All right. So, let's talk about the Amendment now. So, in this Amendment, we have the requirement of an agreement with IDNR before we move forward on this land transfer, correct?"

Guzzardi: "That's correct. A land management agreement."

Fritts: "A land management agreement."

Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Windhorst gives you two minutes."

Fritts: "Thank you. So, we... we're going to enter into a land management agreement with IDNR. Can you tell me what that land management agreement's going to look like or what the term of said land management agreement is going to be?"

Guzzardi: "Again, if it would be helpful, I can just read straight from the text of the Bill. You may have it in front of you, but I can read it if you'd like."

Fritts: "Please."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Guzzardi: "'The Department shall... may enter into a land management agreement with the... with the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation and other necessary parties for the purpose of maintaining'... sorry, 'managing, maintaining, or operating the real property. Any such agreement shall contain the purpose, powers, rights, objectives, and responsibilities of each contracting party and a requirement that this land remain open for public recreation during the term of such agreement.'"

Fritts: "During the term of the agreement. What is the term of the agreement?"

Guzzardi: "That's not specified in statute, Representative."

Fritts: "So, there's nothing specified in statute. So, when we execute this... let's just say this Bill goes through and we execute this land transfer, what happens to that land once it's... cause it's not... no longer our property. It's part of federal trust, correct?"

Guzzardi: "No. That's not correct."

Fritts: "That's not correct. Okay. Enlighten me. What happens when the land transfer goes through?"

Guzzardi: "There... there's a process that is required to be undertaken for the land..."

Fritts: "Please."

Guzzardi: "...to be placed in federal trust and become reservation land."

Fritts: "Yep. What is it?"

Guzzardi: "There's a process that the... the nation would have to undertake to place the land, if they so choose, into federal trust to become reservation land."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Fritts: "But because they have 138 acres of reservation land there, they would have to continue to... it would be very likely that they would add that to the reservation land, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. I believe that's their intention."

Fritts: "Okay. It is their intention."

Guzzardi: "But it would not in effect immediately upon the conveyance of the land."

Fritts: "Great. So, as far as IDNR goes, in this agreement, what...
there is no term or end date of the agreement, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Not in statute. There will be when the agreement is made, of course."

Fritts: "Okay. So, in theory, they could enter into a five-month agreement, a five-week agreement, a two-day agreement if they want to, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, of course. If everyone here was acting in bad faith and trying to trick you, then, yes, that could happen."

Fritts: "We're not saying that anybody is operating in bad faith.

We're talking about that there's no... there's nothing here in statute that gives a defined length of time to my constituents about how long that their park is going to be open for, correct?"

Guzzardi: "The statute does not specify the term..."

Fritts: "The statute does not specify."

Guzzardi: "...the duration of the agreement between IDNR and the (unintelligible)..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Schmidt gives you two minutes."

Fritts: "Thank you, Representative. Now, I guess my question to you is why should IDNR continue to take care of this? This is subject to appropriation, correct?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Guzzardi: "Yes, it is."

Fritts: "So, not only do Illinois taxpayers lose a \$15 million asset that's subject to appropriation on what they're going to continue to pay into private land..."

Guzzardi: "I'm not sure in what..."

Fritts: "I mean, with all due respect, Representative, I would like them to mow... I'd like IDNR to mow my grass and trim my trees and clean my gutters. But in reality, like, that's not the... that's not my..."

Guzzardi: "That's you're..."

Fritts: "I don't make that kind of an agreement..."

Guzzardi: "Wouldn't we all, Representative?"

Fritts: "...with private property."

Guzzardi: "And if you were legally obligated to enter into an agreement with IDNR about the maintenance of your property, you'd figure out some terms by which you might compensate them for their work or provide them access to your land, right? You'd negotiate an agreement with them. Which is what the law before us..."

Fritts: "Yeah."

Guzzardi: "...requires be done."

Fritts: "And I hope they do and I hope it doesn't..."

Guzzardi: "I hope they do too."

Fritts: "...cost our taxpayers a cent."

Guzzardi: "...but I know they will because it's written in the black and white language of this statute."

Fritts: "All right."

Guzzardi: "It's not just a hope for me, Representative."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Fritts: "One... another... the next thing I want talk about is, let's talk about safety a little bit here. What is that going to look like? Because if this land goes into reservation land with this 138 acres, this is the first reservation land in the bounds of the State of Illinois. So, with that, there's a lot of uncertainty here. Other states have it written into their statute on, you know, what policing powers the local municipalities, 'cause they only have powers if given by us. EMS, how intergovernmental agreements at a local level can work."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Fritts: "Until this framework is in place, Representative, if there's something going on out on said piece of property that's going to continue to be open to the public, are my constituents lives in danger by going on there because police, EMS, fire, whatever, isn't legally obligated... or isn't legally allowed to go on said land?"

Guzzardi: "No, Representative. Your constituents will be perfectly safe because the land conveyance won't happen until a land management agreement is reached with IDNR. And that agreement will include things such as what's the role of IDNR's Conservation Police in making sure that the..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Meier gives two minutes."

Guzzardi: "...that everybody is safe. But these things will be agreed before the land conveyance happens. So, your constituents are not stepping into the unknown. And as you mentioned, 35 other states have reservation land. They have all figured out how to make sure that there is public safety,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

that the lives of the people who travel onto that land aren't immediately imperiled simply by being virtue of being there."

Fritts: "What... and so, all these things are going to be negotiated by IDNR. Are there any Members of the General Assembly who are going to partake in this said negotiation? Does it have to be approved by the General Assembly before it's taken again?"

Guzzardi: "It doesn't, Representative."

Fritts: "It doesn't. Okay. So, this is a strict... this is a strict negotiation on the public safety of my constituents that's going to happen between IDNR and the... and the Prairie Band."

Guzzardi: "Respectively, Representative, IDNR already maintains public safety on this piece of property without..."

Fritts: "Correct. But it's part of the State of Illinois. It's part of DeKalb County. The sheriff can go in. Local municipality police can go in. Fire can go in. Everything can go in because it's a state property. The second that this transfer happens and it's goes through the process and becomes reservation land, this is a completely different story. There's a lot of things, Ladies and Gentlemen, here that really need to be ironed out before such a monumental piece of legislation seeks to move forward. Ladies and... or to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hoffman: "To the Bill."

Fritts: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I... I've raised quite a few questions here that need to be answered, and I would really encourage you... this is a monumental piece of legislation. And unlike any other legislation, you know, if we put in a tax, any kind of tax, whether it be an increase

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

or decrease or whatever, at a later date that can be undone. When this goes through, the land transfer happens, it goes into reservation, that is a piece of property that we lose forever. We lose jurisdiction of, we lose it forever. And I would encourage all of us to think through this long and hard to have the parameters set up to worry about my constituents and the claims that the natives have on their titles as we move forward. You know, no one in this chamber, myself included, doubts the claim that they have of 1280 acres that was talked about. No one doubts that. But the correct execution of how we get this done is pivotal. It is pivotal. know, we're elected for our constituents, constituents, and these are the constituents of my district, my friends, people that I know on a personal level. I sent this... a survey out to every resident within a 15-mile radius. Over 200 of my constituents sent replies back to me with an overwhelming no on this. And it wasn't just a no, because they understand that something needs to be done too. It was looking for a well-thought-out process moving forward on how we correctly execute this. We're not here to say no. We just want to be at the table for proper solutions moving forward. You know, this is... my biggest concern, as I said, is, you know, we're handing over a \$15 million Illinois taxpayer asset at this point in time with no clearing of my owner titles, and that is unbelievably important and something that needs to be addressed before this moves forward. You know, as all of you in this chamber know, I'm a reasonable person. I listen to both sides of every issue. You know, I... I hear both sides. I've been to the park. I've talked to my constituents. I've

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

made the drive all the way out to Mayetta, Kansas so that I can understand both sides of this issue and come up with a reasonable solution to it. I plead with you today, I plead with you today on behalf of myself and behalf of my constituents to wait. Wait on this piece of this legislation, Continue conversations, have a well-thought-out process because this right here in front of us is not the answer to it. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you don't have to... I'm not asking you to say 'no' on this. I'm asking you to wait. And I'm asking you, on behalf of my constituents, to not necessarily vote 'no', just to please don't vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Jones."

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

Speaker Hoffman: "He indicates he will."

Jones: "Representative Guzzardi, you brought this Bill to me and I told you that this Bill is interesting because I understand the emotional attachment to this Bill. But this Bill also presents a federal question, local question, and a state question. And part of the federal question that's in this Bill contains information that a management agreement is trying to fix. Part of that federal question deals with land that was taken. So, before I get into the basic of my questions, this is similar to reparations, where Black people land were taken from them. Would... do support a Bill that will come before this General Assembly?"

Guzzardi: "I would love to work with you on that topic, Representative."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Jones: "I'm not sponsoring that Bill, but I think Members of the...
the Black Caucus..."

Guzzardi: "I think some of your colleagues who've worked on that issue would know that I... I am very open to those discussions."

Jones: "So, are you familiar with the arguments around reparations?"

Guzzardi: "Very much so. Yes, Sir."

Jones: "So, again, would... do you support reparations?"

Guzzardi: "I... yes, I do."

Jones: "You guess you do, or do you?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, I do. Period. Full-stop."

Jones: "I'm going to ask you again."

Guzzardi: "Please do. Ask me as many times as you want, Representative. Yes. Absolutely."

Jones: "Do you support the issue of reparations?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, I do. I can answer that a thousand times if you'd like."

Jones: "This Bill has similar inklings to Black people who've been fighting for years and their property has been taken in Illinois. So, as we sit here and we talk about land that was taken, you got Black people that are fighting for their land that had been taken from them for years."

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir."

Jones: "This Bill, Representative, is... is a tricky Bill, and I asked you about the whole state issue and I asked you about the issue. There are two things that concern me in this Bill.

Part of this Bill..."

Speaker Hoffman: "Representative. Representative. Representative Hanson gives you two minutes."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Jones: "Thank you. Part of this Bill does not have a reverter clause, Representative. Is that in... is that language contained in the agreement?"
- Guzzardi: "I'm... I'm not sure what you would mean by a reverter clause, Representative."
- Jones: "So, are you familiar with what a reverter is, Representative?"
- Guzzardi: "I suppose you're suggesting that there could language in this Bill that would somehow revert the ownership of the land back to the state under certain circumstances."

Jones: "Exactly."

- Guzzardi: "Yeah. I guess my view, Representative, is that this land has never legally been owned by the state. This land has always legally been the land of the Potawatomi Nation. No one has... Rep... even my colleague who spoke before did not dispute that fact. So, the idea that we might create some mechanism by which to take this land back from them, yet again, seems to me just like repeating the same injustice a second time."
- Jones: "Have... have you or Representative Walker... or, Senator Walker had any discussion with the federal government regarding this Bill before us now?"
- Guzzardi: "We've talked to a number of Members of our Congressional... the Representative, now Senator Walker, has talked to Members of the congressional delegation as I understand it. Yes."
- Jones: "And have they given any indication that they're going to move forward with deciding this issue on the federal level?"
- Guzzardi: "I... I think their position is that this issue at the federal level is stuck, and that's why we have a great

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- opportunity to resolve this issue with the Bill before us today."
- Jones: "Okay. So, on the state question and the federal question, if we pass this Bill and the federal government takes up this issue, will we be getting into the federal question or federal mix with our federal officials on this property?"
- Guzzardi: "Getting into the mix in what sense, Representative?"

 Jones: "A legal it... legal fix."
- Guzzardi: "No. I believe that by passing this Bill today we are clarifying the legal status of this land, which will, as I mentioned earlier, the nation has agreed then to no longer pursue its legal claim to the private homes on this territory, which I think will make things a lot better for the homeowners there to not worry that their land might get taken from them at any minute."
- Jones: "So, also with the federal question, Representative, there's the question of \$50 million that's mentioned..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Mayfield gives you two more minutes. Sorry."
- Jones: "Thank you. There's the issue of \$50 million that's mentioned in the background and in this Bill. Can you explain that, Representative?"
- Guzzardi: "Sure. That's... to be clear, it's not mentioned in this Bill at all. The... the nation has in the past pursued federal legislation to try to resolve this issue, as you mentioned. That legislation... because of the complicated issues of title around this land, that legislation would have ceded the nation's claim to this land in exchange for a sum of money to enable them to buy a similar amount of land nearby. That's

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

where that... that language is coming from. But as I said, that federal legislation isn't moving forward and this just presents an alternative and much more straightforward way for us to resolve this."

- Jones: "So, to be clear, that \$50 million is coming from the federal government?"
- Guzzardi: "It's not involved. There's no \$50 million. This Bill has nothing to do with \$50 million."
- Jones: "So, why is it mentioned, Representative? The \$50 million. You just mentioned that there's exchange for the land. They're not going to do this for free. There's \$50 million that's mentioned, Representative. So, who pays that? Is it the federal government or the State of Illinois?"
- Guzzardi: "Can you ask the question again? I'm sorry, Representative."
- Jones: "Who pays for the \$50 million?"
- Guzzardi: "There is... sorry. I need to reiterate this 'cause it's really important. The Bill before us today does not contain any reference to \$50 million. That reference..."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Leader Manley in the Chair."
- Guzzardi: "That reference has to do with federal legislation that would have required the federal government to pay the nation \$50 million to reimburse them for their claim to this land. Instead of that, which ain't going anywhere... pardon my colloquial language. That is stuck in Congress at the moment. Instead of that, the nation has agreed to pursue this avenue which we have before us today. No \$50 million. They'll simply accept ownership of the park and relinquish their claim to their private land in the area."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Jones: "So, that's... presents the federal question, Representative. So, we're trying to resolve a federal question with a state Bill. You just said that it's \$50 million, so they're going to relinquish..."
- Guzzardi: "No. No, Representative, there's no 50... please put that number out of your mind because nothing before us today has anything to do with \$50 million."
- Jones: "So, is there a Bill in Congress right now addressing this issue?"
- Guzzardi: "Yes."
- Jones: "What does that Bill say, Representative?"
- Guzzardi: "The... the Bill says what I just described, which is that in exchange for ceding their claim to the entire 1280 acres, they would receive this sum of money from the federal government. But the point is, that Bill is not going anywhere. So, instead of pursuing that Bill, they are pursuing the Bill that's on the board today, that we're trying a different solution to a complicated problem."
- Jones: "So, Representative, there are two Representatives in this district where this affects. The Senator in this district, is he supporting this Bill?"
- Guzzardi: "I've not spoken with the Senator directly. My understanding is that he is supportive of this Bill."
- Jones: "And the other Representative in this district, is that Representative supporting this Bill?"
- Guzzardi: "The Bill... the land only sits in the Legislative District of one Representative. That's Representative Fritts, who you just heard opposes the measure."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Jones: "Okay. And so, when Representative Walker gave you this Bill, the purpose of this Bill was to solve a state issue that was brought to him, that had a federal question, that it doesn't involve any state funds..."

Speaker Manley: "Excuse me, Representative. Your two minutes have expired. I gave him... the last one was yours, Rita."

Jones: "I know there's somebody in here with two damn..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Buckner will give you his two-minute timer. Go ahead."

Jones: "So, to wrap up, Representative..."

Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir."

Jones: "...my question, when Representative Walker brought you this Bill, he brought you this Bill to resolve a state issue that had a federal question and he spoke to the Senator in the district and the Representative of the district to resolve this question, correct?"

Guzzardi: "He has had extensive conversations with both the State Legislators and local elected officials in this area. Yes."

Jones: "Okay. That concludes my question. I will watch, Representative. I have committed that I will watch on this Bill. I am concerned about the question. I think it presents a great issue. Thank you for taking it up. I will watch and decide. Thank you."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Rep... Leader Hammond for two minutes."

Hammond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Hammond: "This Bill was heard the other day in... in committee, and we heard from a number of people. We certainly heard from the chairman. The chairman was pointedly asked by a very passionate homeowner, representing many, many hundreds of homeowners in the area, what his intentions were, what his future plans were for this property. He really couldn't answer those questions. When he was questioned about a casino, the response was, 'That's not our intention at this time.' That just made me feel all warm and fuzzy. I'm sure it made the homeowners as well. When he was asked about future highvolume use, he was unable to answer those questions. There are serious, serious questions about what is going on here right now. And one of those is that this land... which if you haven't seen it, please get online and take a look at it before you take your vote. It is absolutely stunning. It is thousands of acres of property that is stunning that the IDNR takes incredible care of. They currently pay for this park property. They pay the maintenance. They pay the operation. The questions were asked, what about the fees? If this happens, what about the fees for boating? What about the fees for fishing? What do we do about the safety and security for this area because the Illinois Department of Conservation Police currently are entrusted with that? We were told that'll all be worked out. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the cart before the horse. We need to get everything worked out, everything worked out, including an appropriation for the Illinois Department of Natural Resources that are going to fund the operation of this. Please vote 'no'."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Thank you. Chair recognizes Representative West for two minutes."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll go straight to the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

West: "As you see, I'm a chief-co on this Bill, and it shouldn't be by surprise. Since I've been in this General Assembly, I have been working with Native American tribal members to correct certain actions that were wronged to them back in history, starting with the Native American history Bill and working now with the Native American mascot Bill. I also am aware that I have ... that Rockford's not too far away from this ... from this area, especially when it comes to talking about casinos. I've been able to develop strong relationships with the Potawatomi Nation. I, too, was able to go to Kansas last year and go to the Potawatomi Powwow. Brought my baby girl, and she danced all out of sync with what was... what the ritual said, but they didn't care because it was a time of love and a time of embracing, while myself, Senator Walker, and the Gentleman from the 74th was there to learn more about the Potawatomi Tribe, even though only two out of three of us supported Native American legislation last Session. But, I ... I am supportive of this Bill because we here in the State of Illinois need to correct certain wrongs that was done in... in history. Not saying for us to take it a personal offense because none of us were here 200 years ago. But it... the way we can take offense is if we don't correct these wrongs in the here and now. So, when it comes to the casino question, I want to read on the record what's already been in statute for the past 20 years, the Native American Gaming Compact

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Act. It says, 'Before the Governor may enter into a compact with a Native American tribe authorizing the Native American tribe to conduct gaming in Illinois, the Governor must submit a request for authority to enter into the compact to the General Assembly.'"

Speaker Manley: "Representative, your two minutes have expired.

Are you about to close?"

West: "About to close in 30 seconds."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Stava-Murray will give you her two minutes."

West: "'The Governor must include with that submission a copy of the proposed compact. If the General Assembly enacts legislation authorizing the Governor to enter into the compact within 30 session days after the submission of the request by the Governor to the General Assembly, under subsection (a), the Governor may enter into the compact. If the General Assembly does not enact legislation authorizing the Governor to enter into the compact within 30 session days after the submission of the request by the Governor to the General Assembly under Section (a), the Governor may not enter into the compact.' I just wanted to put it on... on the record and a commitment to my community that's north of this ... of where we are debating on today that as long as I'm in the General Assembly, I'm going to be a fierce advocate for the Native American tribal members throughout that were always... that were original members of the State of Illinois. And I'm going to ensure that there's no casino built on that section based on what we've seen in statute. I just want to make sure that was on record. Thank you."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Davidsmeyer. Two minutes."

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

Speaker Manley: "Indicates he will. I was setting your timer.

Yes. He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. I needed four more seconds back. No, I'm just kidding. Representative Guzzardi, we had a... had a good conversation both in and after committee. And... and I think what... what we talked about was that we don't disagree about what the federal government did. They... they made an agreement for the tribe to own this land, they then came in and sold it to somebody else, right? We're not disagreeing on the history of that. And I'm... and I'm not being adversarial in this because I think that we need to find a solution, but we want to find a solution that works out for everyone involved. So, I know we're getting late in the Session and... but I want to make sure pass the right Bill. Why don't we have something... and I would have brought this to you before the Bill but I've been thinking this through. Why don't we have a, you know, a but-for clause or... or something in there that says as soon as the federal government acts to hold harmless the private property owners, then the property moves to the tribe. And... and I'm only saying that because you've got a lot of people that have, as ... as we heard in committee, that have put their life's work into buying this property and taking care of it and maintaining it. And so, if we pass this Bill, the tribe will own the state park and they will still have claim to that private property until the federal government acts. And that... that's the only thing that ...

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

that we're really asking for is a... a piece of mind. That little piece gives a piece of mind to those individuals that are stuck in this situation, both sides who are stuck in this situation."

Guzzardi: "Sure. No, and I... and I appreciate the conversation that we had and the respectful tenor of your remarks both today and in committee. I guess I would just say that if, again, if I were a member of the Potawatomi Nation, the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation, I would be very skeptical of a resolution that waited on the federal government to make this right because they've been waiting since 1849 and it hasn't happened. So, I just would be reluctant to put something in this Bill that says we'll wait till the feds fix it before we do anything for you."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and so..."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Davidsmeyer. Would somebody like to give their two minutes..."

Davidsmeyer: "I got a lot of people. I got a lot of friends back here. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Look how nice they all are. Representative Miller will give you his two minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, you're asking the people who own the property to be patient but not the tribe who has been working on it for a while. I..."

Guzzardi: "I would suggest that the... although folks may... that the title to that property is not very clear, that it may not be the case that those folks legally own that property today. And, in fact, the U.S. federal government has suggested that

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- whatever title they may purport to hold to that land is not, in fact, legal today."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, now you're saying we're going to give away the whole state park and those people still may get screwed in the process."
- Guzzardi: "The... the only way that would happen is if the tribal nation that has spent decades building relationships in this community, the Chairman Rupnick gets in the car from Mayetta, Kansas and drives seven hours to sit in village board meetings just to get to know the folks in town."
- Davidsmeyer: "No. And... and I understand that part."
- Guzzardi: "So, no, just let me finish my point, Representative, if you don't mind. Though I'm... I know you need... you'll get more time, I'm sure."
- Davidsmeyer: "If we... if we didn't have limited debate, I would certainly not interrupt."
- Guzzardi: "Let me just make the point quickly. Which is to say that the only way that would be true is if this nation that has engaged for decades in constructive relationship building with this community were suddenly, when this Bill passes, to betray all of the agreements that they have made and prove themselves to be completely untrustworthy. If you believe that that's what's going to happen, then maybe you shouldn't vote for this Bill."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I am not saying that this chairman is, but he's elected, right? He is elected. And so, the next one could come in and say we're going to take this property back. Am I right?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Representative Davidsmeyer needs two minutes.

Representative Halbrook."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. I don't want to belabor the point..."

Guzzardi: "I hear you."

Davidsmeyer: "...but we're putting all the pressure on individuals rather than an entire group of people that are... that are coming back asking for this land, right? They have something to gain. The other part of the people have something to lose. The State of Illinois did not do this to these people."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Davidsmeyer: "The federal government did. And so, I think we put the onus on them by saying, we will, as a state, we will give this property to you as soon as the federal government acts, because it's on them to act. We are doing something to these people by... by passing this. And... and the other... the other issue that I have, since we are... we will be giving away state property, will this require a closure hearing from COGFA?"

Guzzardi: "I don't believe so, Representative. The Bill... these sort of quitclaims require by... oh, I forget the number of the rule. Is it 41(b)? I know Chairman Rita knows. The Bill required by House Rule that an appraisal will be filed with the Clerk of the House before the Bill could advance, and that has happened."

Davidsmeyer: "It's... so, it's... it's only property and not... there's no buildings on that property whatsoever?"

Guzzardi: "It's the... it's the state park, Representative."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, if there are buildings on that property, that would be a state facility, and I would say that COGFA

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- would have take action on a state facility closure hearing. So, that would require IDNR..."
- Guzzardi: "No one's purporting to close any of this. I just want to reiterate."
- Davidsmeyer: "You... you are. The state will no longer own it, so that is a... that is a closure of... of a state facility. So, I'm... I'm not trying to throw wrenches in it. I'm trying to provide a solution. That originally solution that says, if... when the federal government acts, the state will cede this entire property, which is more, right? It's... it's property plus interest for... for the years..."
- Guzzardi: "But you get why these guys aren't super eager to just wait for the federal government to fix it, right? Come on, man."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I know. I know. You're... I'm..."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Davidsmeyer, you will take two minutes from Representative Niemerg."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I don't need the two minutes. I just want to...

 I'm going to close. Representative Guzzardi, I agree with
 you. I'm trying to provide peace of mind..."
- Guzzardi: "I appreciate that."
- Davidsmeyer: "...for the individuals who are the private property owners. And I agree that the tribe has said that they don't want to take action on that. That doesn't mean they can't 10 years from now. The... the state facility management agreement that we're talking about could be a 6-month agreement, it could be a 2-year agreement, it could be a 10-year agreement. We don't know what that is. I wish that was spelled out. But... but I... it's the peace of mind for the property owners, the

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

tax paying citizens of the State of Illinois. I know that you care about them. And... and this will be a simple thing to add into this. And it would also give the tribe a peace of mind knowing that this land will be theirs as soon as we take action. I'm happy to sign a letter. I'm happy to send anything to this administration, the next administration at the federal level, to Congress, whoever you need in... in support. I just hope that we can do this the right way and not rush it through. Thank... thank you, Representative."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I love your glasses. You look fabulous. Would you be so kind to ask if the Sponsor would yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, first of all, thank you for bringing this legislation forward. In the absence of Representative Walker, who's now Senator Walker, I appreciate that he had been working on this for a number of years..."

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Ammons: "...since he's come back to the General Assembly."

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Ammons: "I wanted to ask you just a couple of things to make sure that your understanding is clear. Are you familiar at all with the case, the Supreme Court case, dealing with the Black Hills in Wyoming?"

Guzzardi: "I'm afraid I'm not. You might need to educate me,
Representative."

Ammons: "Thank you. Because your Bill really proceeds from a historical context, that this moment, we have an opportunity

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

to correct. There was a case filed in Supreme Court over the Black Hills that was Native American land, and it was sacred land that was taken for the same purpose of national parks. And what people fail to remember, for whatever reason they cannot remember, that national parks only came into play when, of course, the federal government decided that they was going to redistribute that land that actually wasn't theirs in the first place to distribute to private hands, including a Homestead Act that they passed as well to distribute the lands, including the Black Hills. That court case went to the Supreme Court. The Native American tribe in the Wyoming area won the case. And instead of them returning the land, you saw this kind of thing take place in the case of the Black Hills. Are you familiar at all... as my colleague earlier had asked you about your position on reparations, would you consider this a reparatory justice initiative?"

Guzzardi: "I... I would consider it repairing two centuries of harm.

Yes."

Ammons: "And are you proceeding with enough historical knowledge in... to understand the origin of this problem and what you're trying to correct?"

Guzzardi: "Well, you have to forgive me if there are certain gaps in my historical knowledge, Representative. This Bill was presented to me to be the primary Sponsor just a couple of weeks ago, but I've done my very best to educate myself as quickly as I can."

Ammons: "I surely..."

Speaker Manley: "Excuse me."

Ammons: "...appreciate you."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons needs two minutes."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mason. Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you. Just to clarify. Proceeding from the narrative of the historical correction that you're trying to make, the Potawatomi Tribe that you are working with, this is not their first time coming here for this issue, is it?"

Guzzardi: "No. No. They've been attempting to get their land back in one way or another for many decades."

Ammons: "And I do believe from the time that you and I came here in 2015, this was also an issue that they were trying to correct at that time."

Guzzardi: "Indeed. Since that time and well before."

Ammons: "And are they suggesting if this transfer takes place that we would no longer have access to that park?"

Guzzardi: "Just the opposite, Representative. They are agreeing...
in spite of being bound in no way to do so, they're agreeing
that the land will continue to remain open for public
recreational uses through a land management agreement with
the Department of Natural Resources."

Ammons: "So, this particular transfer would just simply correct the historical wrong and return the land back to the original owners, correct?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, Representative."

Ammons: "What I really appreciate... to the Bill... is..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Ammons: "...at the University of Illinois, at every event that we attend, there's an acknowledgement that the University of Illinois is a land grant that sits on the historical lands of

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

multiple Native American tribes. What we have not done, though, is corrected that historical wrong in the case as you are correcting this historical wrong. And I appreciate you taking up the issue because most of us want to ignore the history, cancel history, erase books, and not correct history that has caused some of the harms that we see in community. And I appreciate you taking this issue up, and I encourage an 'aye' vote on this matter."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "Indicates he will."

Swanson: "Thank you. And... and watch my battle buddy to my right.

If I need two minutes, he'll be there for me. Thank you. You
mentioned earlier this afternoon or evening when this
discussion started that 35 other states have reservations
currently. Were those reservations in those 35 other states
set up by State Legislators or by Federal Legislators?"

Guzzardi: "It's a mix, Representative. There have been a number of states, and forgive me for not having the list in front of me, but a number of states that have done what we're doing here today. Ceding, C-E-D-E, ceding state park land to Native American tribes who have legitimate claim to that land."

Swanson: "But was there other federal actions that were began before the states got involved?"

Guzzardi: "In some cases, yes. In some cases, no. There are some states that have done this of their own initiative as we're doing here today."

Swanson: "And do you happen to know what states those are?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Guzzardi: "I... I don't. And I'm hoping that someone who knows will text me in the next couple of minutes..."

Swanson: "Okay."

Guzzardi: "...so I can read a list to you."

Swanson: "So, I'd really... it... I think it'd be interesting for this Body to know that is there a precedence for this or is there not a precedence for this. If there's not or if there is, either way, has anyone approached any of our federal Legislators about doing this?"

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Swanson: "And we've gotten no response from any of our federal Legislators?"

Guzzardi: "Oh, no. A number of our federal Legislators are supportive of this issue. Unfortunately, the... the Bill remains mired in Congress. And sadly, I think there is not a lot of optimism that Congress will be successful at getting much of anything done these days."

Swanson: "So, we're putting it... as I see it, we're putting Illinois at risk of this when it is actually, in my opinion and many of the colleagues on this side of the aisle, and as previous speakers on your side spoke too, it appears this is a federal issue not a state issue. And..."

Guzzardi: "You said we're putting Illinois at risk of this."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Rosenthal extends his two minutes."

Guzzardi: "At risk of what exactly, Representative?"

Swanson: "Well, could this end up in the courts? Where is this going to be? Are the... are the current people residing in these

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

homes, are they going to file lawsuits because they're going to lose their property the way that..."

Guzzardi: "No, they're not, Representative. I'm sorry to interrupt you. I'm sorry. But the whole purpose of this Bill is to provide security to those homeowners because the... the nation has agreed that if we reach this deal that's before us on the board today, they will not pursue their legal claim to the homeowners in this area. So, the... the idea that the homeowners' claim to their title might be in peril, the best thing you can do to provide more security to those homeowners is to pass the Bill before us. If we don't, those homeowners' titles will be further... will continue to be in this legal limbo. So, if you want to provide them security, vote 'yes'."

Swanson: "Yeah. My... a great concern is that title on my property. Banks don't loan money on a cloudy title, and I see that as being a potential... I'm not an attorney, but I've owned property. I own my house. And those titles take a long time to search and all it takes is a little bit. And I know we've got other experience in here on title searching, but that would be my big concern. And I certainly would have encouraged that this continues at the federal level and not here at the state. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Blair-Sherlock."

Blair-Sherlock: "Oh. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates he will."

Blair-Sherlock: "Okay. Just a couple quick questions. I want to bring us back to some things you said at the beginning to make sure I'm clear. So, it's my understanding that you said

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

that the federal government had taken and sold their land. Is that accurate?"

Guzzardi: "That's correct. I think it's the General Land Office of the federal government, if I recall."

Blair-Sherlock: "Right. And then when the state park was given to the state, that purchase was made with federal dollars. Is that also correct?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, it is."

Blair-Sherlock: "So, it wasn't state money that purchased this park. Is that accurate?"

Guzzardi: "That's correct. Yes."

Blair-Sherlock: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Blair-Sherlock: "I think it's important and I'm very happy that this chamber passed legislation teaching Native American history in the schools because it's something that I think a lot of people don't know about. And if we forget about history, we're destined to repeat it. If we look at the history, back then, we were the immigrants coming into this country with no controls and we were taking and seizing the people's land. We committed genocide. I'd be happy outside the chamber to have discussions about the history of the Indigenous nations, but I... I find it disturbing when Members of this chamber say the people should go to the courts or they encourage litigation. In fact, Abraham Lincoln is famously known for many quotes about not stirring up litigation. In fact, one of those quotes has never stirred up litigation, 'A worse man can scarcely be found than one who does this.' Courts are not here to constrain the Legislature

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

or other branches of the government. Courts exists as a coequal branch of the government to interpret and not make laws. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

Windhorst: "Parliamentary Inquiry."

Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Windhorst: "House Rule 41(b) provides that no Bill authorizing or directing the conveyance by the state of any particular interest in real estate to any individual or entity other than a governmental entity or agency may be voted upon in committee or upon Second Reading unless a certified appraisal of the value of the... value of the interest has been filed. The appraisal shall be filed with the Clerk of the House and shall be part of the permanent record for that Bill. The inquiry is, is there an appraisal, and has the appraisal been filed with the Clerk?"

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi."

- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are trying to resolve a clerical issue around this matter. I appreciate the... the Leader bringing it forward. In... as we wait to resolve that, I would ask that the Bill be pulled from the record so we can work on this issue. Thank you."
- Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please pull the Bill out of the record. House Bill 890, Representative Rita. Leader Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 890, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Representative Rita on Amendment 3."

Rita: "I'd ask to adopt the Amendment and then we'll explain it on Third Reading. The Amendment becomes the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Rita moves for the adoption of Floor #3 to House Bill 890. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 890, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Rita."

Rita: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 890's a trailer Bill for a Bill that we will be passing regulating drones and giving local governments or local park districts the authority to regulate the use of drones. What this does is puts some exemptions in for the engineers, the land surveyors and puts up so that critical infrastructure and different exemptions that we promised when we did the original Bill. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Keicher."

Keicher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Great Bill, but I'm here to say that Representative Caulkins is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Manley: "Thank you, Leader. Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "He indicates he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, this Bill will apply if and only if we pass Senate Bill 2849. Is that accurate?"

Rita: "Yes. That is very accurate."

- Windhorst: "And that is currently on Third Reading in... awaiting our debate and vote here in this Body. Is that correct?"
- Rita: "That is correct. It's on the Calendar. It's on Third Reading. We wanted to send this House Bill with the… being today with the… due a time, but I don't see any issues that going to be called before we adjourn."
- Windhorst: "And there is some... a piece of this legislation dealing with critical infrastructure and drones. How does the critical infrastructure piece apply as it relates to... to this Bill?"
- Rita: "That's like railroads. It's... it's a definition that they would use for... that we wouldn't be regulating federal government. It's come from the Railroad Association dealing with the railroads."
- Windhorst: "So, it's designed to keep us in compliance with federal law or not be contradictory with federal law. Is that my... the correct understanding?"
- Rita: "Well, that... yes. That's what the... the Senate Bill 2849 spells out what that would be, that we wouldn't mess with federal law. And it also, then, would revert back to that if IDOT files a rules and makes rules that it would revert back to what the Illinois Department of Transportation rules were. But this Bill here is just a trailer Bill giving some exemptions for the land surveyors, engineers, spells out critical infrastructure. I think that's all of it. And... and

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

then the FAA regulations that... that drones don't interfere with their regulations. That's what this House Bill does."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Rita to close."

Rita: "I'd be happy for an 'aye' vote. I thought Keicher was going to ask questions, but I'd... we get a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 890 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 in 'favor', 0 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11, under Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 1996, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1996, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read a second time previously.

 Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 6 and 7 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment...

 Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman on Floor Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1996."
- Hoffman: "Yes. I would ask that we adopt Floor Amendment #6 and then debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1996. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #7 is offered by Representative

Hoffman."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I would withdraw Floor Amendment #7."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, please draw (sic-withdraw) Floor

Amendment 7. Mr. Clerk, are there any other Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1996, a Bill for an Act concerning

employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill.

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This deals with the issue of workers' compensation, and it makes sure that the Illinois Workers' Compensation is ... Commission is properly funded. It would provide for an increase in the surcharge in order to fund workers' compensation. It'll also provide for a very small increase of Workers' Compensation Commission Operation Fund fee. Finally, it would give... in addition to the other items in the Bill, it would give transfer authority of up to \$2 million to the... the chair of the Workers' Compensation Commission in order to make ends meet, if need be, and then he would have to pay that loan back. Finally, it provides enforcement mechanisms to the Department of Insurance and it adds time and... it adds time that the Department of Insurance can make sure that you... you validly have workers' compensation insurance and how they enforce that... that mechanism. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Ugaste."

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

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Ugaste: "Representative Hoffman, I have a few questions for you just to get to the intent of... of this Bill. Is Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1996 an agreed Bill between business and labor?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it is."

Ugaste: "As part of this agreement, did business and labor agree to meet again early next year for a broader discussion on potential positive Amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Ugaste: "Are you, Leader Hoffman, committed to meeting again next year with the four caucuses of the General Assembly in the agreed Bill process for workers' compensation?"

Hoffman: "Yes. I can hardly wait."

Ugaste: "Thank you, Leader Hoffman."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "This is an agreement between business and labor, and I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1996 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's 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 79 voting in 'favor', 29 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5, Bills on Third Reading, Senate Bill 693, Representative Chung. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 693, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chung."

Chung: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm presenting here today Senate Bill 693. Last year, we passed unanimously Senate Bill 46, which created the Illinois Waterway Ports Commission. So, this Bill is a sort of trailer Bill cleanup so that we're amending the language about... that created the Illinois Ports... Waterway Ports Commission so that we can be in line with language that we can... that the Illinois Waterway Ports Commission can be eligible for federal programs and/or opportunities. And I ask for your favorable vote today. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, just have a few questions about the commission and how it will... will work with those different port authorities..."

Chung: "Sure thing."

Windhorst: "...coming together. I've had some questions from other port authorities other than those named, and I want to make sure I have a... an understanding of... of what the commission is... is doing. What is the ultimate intent of the commission? What is the point?"

Chung: "Is that your question? I'm sorry."

Windhorst: "Yeah. What is... what is the point of the commission?" Chung: "So, the... so, the commission... I'm so sorry. So, what we're doing here... it's... that the Waterway Ports Commission, last

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

year, what we did was that they brought together five individual different ports. And so, the… you know, it doesn't really… so that they're… before they were able to operate under different sort of memorandums of understanding, you know, sort of intergovernmental agreements. So, this brings it all together. This doesn't change anything that… what we passed last year, necessarily. It's just language so that federal… federal funds can be then used to help, you know, just sort of help out the… the Port Commission itself."

- Windhorst: "And the areas that are included within these port districts that are forming the commission, what entity will have the ultimate authority over those ports? Will it be the commission or the... the originating port district?"
- Chung: "So, the Port Commission, the Waterway Ports Commission, is the sort of overall body that's over... oversees and brings together these ports."
- Windhorst: "And what... then this commission... we'll call it a commission. Would it be considered a unit of local government, then? Is it new governmental unit? Would it function in that way?"
- Chung: "Let's see here. Yeah. So, it's a sort of coalition, I guess, of governments then."
- Windhorst: "Does it independently have taxing power, the commission?"
- Chung: "I don't believe it does, and I believe that this came up in... in committee. And... and I don't believe it does."
- Windhorst: "Most of the public ports in... port districts, rather, in Illinois have at least a few members appointed by the Governor. It appears that this commission's members are

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

appointed by the chairman of the board of the public ports, and maybe a few others, and members that were not even on current port boards. Do I have that correct that you don't have to be a member of a current port board to be a member of the… appointed to the commission?"

Chung: "So, let's see here. The ... so, the ... the commission, it has one member each from the Seneca Regional Port District, Ottawa Port District, Illinois Valley Regional Port District, Heart of Illinois Regional Port District, and Havana Regional Port District appointed by the respective chairperson. Oh, and then, sorry, two member... two members from nonprofits that assist in local government planning, one each from the northern and southern portions of the commission's territory. And each member shall be appointed by the majority vote of the five port district chairpersons under the commission's jurisdiction. And then... oh, sorry, we also have more. One member from the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission appointed by that planning commission, and then one member recommended by the Heart of Illinois Regional Port District but appointed by a majority vote of the five port district chairpersons under the commission's jurisdiction."

Windhorst: "And just... just a few other kind of basic questions..."
Chung: "Sure. Absolutely."

Windhorst: "...that relate to units... or functions of government.

Who is ultimately responsible for a local match if a grant is received by the commission? Would the commission be responsible or the separate ports?"

Chung: "I... I guess where... if you could clarify what you mean by grant matching, Leader."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Windhorst: "If the commission were to apply for a grant that had a matching requirement, would that ultimately be the responsibility of the commission?"
- Chung: "Yes. Oh, yes. Sorry. Thank you so much. I... I needed a little more clarification on your question. Thank you."
- Windhorst: "That's okay. Where does the commission's funding come from?"
- Chung: "Well, I guess, you know, with this... what we're trying to... what we're trying to do here with this legislation today is to be eligible for federal funds. So, we have the... there's the Mid-America Port Commission, which is another different port commission and the... this language is sort of modeled after what they have so... because they're eligible for federal funds and have been able to get them. So, this port commission, the Illinois Waterway Ports Commission, is trying to do that as well. So, no, what this does is open up the ability to get federal funds."

Windhorst: "Are the commission's board members paid?"

Chung: "No."

- Windhorst: "The legislation references air, rail, roadways. What are... what is the purpose of including things beyond waterways in the port commission's jurisdiction?"
- Chung: "I suppose that, you know, I guess we're... we're sort of talking about infrastructure here. Maybe they... you know, I think that it's just sort of included in when we have strong infrastructure all together, strong ports, strong everything. You know, I think it's a great win for the area and our state."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "Paragraph (d) says that the commission may not exercise control over the operation of port districts established by any other law other than the ones creating the commission, except by voluntary agreement between the port district and the commission. So, it appears to me that other port districts throughout the state, if they wanted, could join this commission. Is that accurate?"

Chung: "Yes."

Windhorst: "If a port district decided to join the commission, can they later leave the commission? Is there any provision in statute for them to leave the commission?"

Chung: "So, there's no mechanism as to how to leave, but there's also no prohibition that they can't… can't leave, I guess, if that makes sense."

Windhorst: "I appreciate you answering my questions."

Chung: "Yes."

Windhorst: "It addresses some of the concerns I heard. Thank you."

Chung: "Thank you so much, Leader. I appreciate the questions."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Spain."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Spain: "Representative Chung, we initiated this process last year to take some of the smaller port authorities along the Illinois River and create some larger momentum by having them working with collective action, that's correct?"

Chung: "Yes."

Spain: "And one of the things we learned... we initially began with some limited and more reserved powers for this coalition,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

this... this commission. But what we've learned is those limitations actually, in the eyes of the federal government, precluded the opportunity for federal funding, right?"

Chung: "Correct."

Spain: "So, your legislation is correcting of that technicality. I mean, really, we're continuing what we did last year. We are creating additional technical enablements for this ports commission, but really it's for the purposes of accessing federal funds. Each of the individual port authorities will continue to exist on their own. There is no new taxing authority, no new responsibilities, but just making sure that in the eyes of the federal government that... that this ports commission, ports coalition, is recognized for... for opportunity to engage for future funding. Is that correct?"

Chung: "Yes. That's correct, Leader."

Spain: "Great. I want to thank you for your leadership on this issue. I know that there are many places through the State of Illinois, our inland river system, where all of this work is very important. In fact, I was just talking to one of our former Leaders here in the chamber. I know perhaps you'd have interests we could work on. Future opportunities on not just the Illinois River, but the Rock River, the lock and dam system. This is an important issue that we should all be interested in. I... I assume you'd be interested in continuing those conversations."

Chung: "Yes. I... I would love that. Thank you so much."

Spain: "Great. I appreciate your work on this and urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Friess.

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Friess: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. How many times has this commission applied for federal funds and been denied?"
- Chung: "I believe that it... it has not yet because, again, this...
 the language was not in place. And so, we were really... and
 the commission just created last year, through..."

Friess: "Okay."

- Chung: "...legislation that we passed last year. So, again, we're just trying to get all our ducks in a row. I don't why I keep saying all our. I'm like, it's not my commission. But all their ducks in a row so that they can, you know, hopefully then be able to pursue federal funding."
- Friess: "So, how did it come to the commission's attention that they could not apply or receive federal funds?"
- Chung: "I don't know exactly the history of all that happened. I do know that Senator Koehler was... Leader Koehler was the one that sort of took this on in the Senate first and passed it on to me. But my understanding was it was something they were trying to do. It didn't really come together in the way they wanted it to, I think. And so, that's why we had to pass this legislation here today."
- Friess: "Okay. The... the individual ports, though, themselves, they can still apply and receive federal funds, correct?"
- Chung: "I don't think... I don't think so, Representative."
- Friess: "Okay. How are they funded then? Okay. You don't have to look. I can tell you they receive grants from the federal government and state government, okay."
- Chung: "All right. Well, thank you very much."
- Friess: "So, that's the point. These individual ports get... earning and receive and apply for grants from both the federal and

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the state government. I don't know why this commission was started, and I don't know why they... they want to grant these powers... or receive these powers now to receive federal funds. So, I question that. And also, at the... at the end of this, one of the things that they're asking for is to be able to dam up inland waterways. Are you aware of that?"

Chung: "So, this... I... that's not... I mean, I guess, again, that's not what I... was here... what's here today in the Bill. You know..."

Friess: "Yeah."

Chung: "...the Bill... again, we're here to sort of be able to get the language so that they have strong... we have stronger ports, be able to get federal funding, and then, you know, again, I... and then be able to move things throughout the waterway, such as corn."

Friess: "Sure."

Chung: "The Farm Bureau is very supportive of this."

Friess: "No, and I... and I understand what you're saying, but you're pushing the Bill. And in the Bill, they're asking for authority to dam up inland waterways. Why is that?"

Chung: "Do you... do you mind pointing to exactly where that is, Representative?"

Friess: "Sure. It's paragraph (c). 'The Commission may acquire,' and it lists all kinds of things. And in the bottom towards the end... line 11."

Chung: "I'm not sure... I can't see. There's a... there's a glare in my eye."

Speaker Manley: "I'm not in charge of the sun. I'm sorry. But you do look like a glowing angel, just so you know."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Chung: "Oh, thank you so much. I can... I'm sorry, Representative, we're trying to find it. Do you mind saying the page..."

Friess: Sure. It was line... line 11."

Chung: "Line... on which page?"

Friess: "That's going to be, was it 6?"

Chung: "I see here in my... in my language here, it says, 'The Commission may perform other... any other act that may be useful in performing it's'... is that where you're referring to?"

Friess: "Yeah. Yeah, it starts on (c). 'The Commission may acquire, purchase,' and then it goes on to the next page, line 11, 'the damming of inland waterways.'"

Chung: "Again, it says here that these things may happen. Again, it's not saying that they're going to. But I think it's just sort of could be things that could be under... done under the commission. Again, it's not saying that they're going to."

Friess: "Well, and... but they're... but they're asking. So, whoever drew up this... this legislation and asked for this authority, they're asking for specifically to dam up inland waterways.

Is there any other port authority that has that authority?"

Chung: "I... I don't know the answer to that, Representative."

Friess: "No, they don't... don't. Thank you. To the Bill. It's a bad Bill. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Chung to close."

Chung: "I... I respectfully disagree. I think this is a great Bill.

Strong ports are great for our state. That's the bottom line.

I ask for a 'yes' vote today. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 693 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting in 'favor', 21 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3237, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3237, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This deals with the School Construction Program. And as you know, that in FY, you may know, 2004, 2005, and 2006, there were lists in the schools construction program and then the program ended. Those lists still exist, and we, a few years ago, indicated that... that they would get priority and they could be reimbursed the amount that they were supposed to be reimbursed if they hadn't finished the project or if there was a new project, if we ever get a school construction program up and running again. That said, that the first... first round of grant applications, that they would be get... getting that priority. This just simply says that the first three round of grant applications, they would get that priority for new... new or the... the completion of a project that was on the books."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman. The... on this question, 'Shall Senate Bill 3237 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 859, Leader Buckner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 859, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Buckner."

Buckner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill H59... sorry, Senate Bill 859 is identical to HB5606 of the 103rd General Assembly. It creates the Office of Economic Equity and Empowerment within the Department of the Commerce Economic Opportunity to assist minority-owned businesses, women-owned businesses, veteran-owned businesses, businesses owned by persons with disabilities, and eligible nonprofit corporations in other underserved communities and constituencies throughout targeted programs, resources, outreach, and promotional activities. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, as you stated, this is the same Bill as House Bill 5606. Is that correct?"

Buckner: "Yes, Sir. It is."

Windhorst: "And we had a vote, I believe, of 88 to 19 on that Bill. So, to Members on my side of the aisle, you may want to check your vote on House Bill 5606. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Buckner to close."

Buckner: "Urge a 'aye' vote."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 859 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Meier. Ugaste. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting in 'favor', 23 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1102, Leader McCombie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have the pleasure to, on behalf of Shelby County, to introduce... or ask for support to allow the Shelby County Board to operate a volunteer rescue squad to assist law enforcement, firefighting, emergency disaster response services in Shelby County. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1102 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2285, Representative Olickal. Representative Olickal. Oh, there you are. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2285, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Olickal."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Olickal: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today, I present a Senate Bill 2285, which is an initiative of the Alliance for Automotive Innovation that seeks to address a growing concern over counterfeit airbags. Over the past few years, tens of thousands of counterfeit airbags have been confiscated by federal agents in raids across the country. Unfortunately, law enforcement agencies have limited authority to combat the problem. As a result, several thousand dangerous airbags were able to enter the stream of commerce and installed in vehicles unknowingly to Illinois... for Illinois motorists, putting their lives at risk. Current state law is limited on just the installation or reinstallation of airbags. This legislation would expand the definition of airbag fraud and close loopholes, allowing law enforcement to deal with bad actors who knowingly and intentionally import, manufacture, sell, or offer these products for sale to unknowing consumers. Thirty other states have similar legislation. There's no known opposition to this Bill. I'm happy to answer any questions." Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2285 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 110 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', voting 'present'. The Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 13, Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 3421, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3421, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3421, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3421 deals with the issue of power of attorneys. And specifically, it deals with the issue of when... when a third party can refuse a power of attorney, under what circumstances, and when a third party must accept a power of attorney under those circumstances. This is an initiative of the National Academy of Elder Law. I know of no known opposition. I believe it passed overwhelmingly through the Senate. And the Illinois Bankers Association, Community Bankers Association of Illinois, and the Illinois Credit Union League are... are all okay with the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader Hoffman, does this only apply to powers of attorney related to property?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Windhorst: "And so, not health care power of..."

Hoffman: "Not health care."

Windhorst: "And what issue has arisen this is designed to address?"

Hoffman: "I think what... what was happening is sometimes institutions, third parties, were refusing to... were refusing

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

to accept powers of attorney for a variety of reasons, reasons that didn't really deal with the… the fact that they were valid powers of attorney. So, this really lays out specifically under what grounds you… you can't refuse a power of attorney and under what grounds you can refuse to honor a power of attorney."

Windhorst: "Are there any remedies available for an inappropriate or improper refusal of the power of attorney?"

Hoffman: "I think you could... you could... I don't believe that it specifically says that there is... is a remedy. But there is the ability then to, I guess, unfortunately, have to go to court to enforce it."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3421 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Margaret. Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed, 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5, Bills on Third Reading, Senate Bill 2617, Representative Wilhour. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2617, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an issue that was brought to me by a constituent that operates a cottage food

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

operation. Basically, current law requires that in order to sell at these farmers markets and things of that nature, you have to get a license from your local health department. The problem is all local health departments don't provide this license. This is just saying that local health departments that don't provide it need to get with an adjacent health department that does and, you know, basically, it just allows everybody the opportunity to do this in a safe and legal manner. It has no opposition, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2617 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 109 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar, Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bill 3687, Leader Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3687, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Manley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3687, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the agreed Bill with the... with the credit

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

unions and the Department of Professional Financial Institutions and Regulations. This is identical to House Bill 5372 that I believe we passed out of the House unanimously. I think that the... the Senate had passed their Bill first, so we're utilizing the Senate Bill. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3687 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Swanson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to be a 'no' vote on SB859, if you could correct the record, please."

Speaker Manley: "The record will reflect that."

Swanson: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "On page 5, Senate Bill 2690, Representative Huynh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2690, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Huynh."

Huynh: "Thank you, Madam Chair... Madam Speaker. Today, I presenting Senate Bill 2690 to allow for transcripts evaluation fee waivers at public colleges and universities during the admissions process for refugees in Illinois. This Bill passed out of the Senate with bipartisan support. It passed out of

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the Higher Education Committee as well with 12-0. And I know of no opposition, and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Huynh: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. This provides transcript evaluation fee waivers for refugees. Is that correct?"

Huynh: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "How is refugee defined in the Bill?"

Huynh: "It is defined as newly arrived refugees from Afghanistan and Iraq."

Windhorst: "And why were those two countries chosen?"

Huynh: "This was a Sponsor initiative of... this was a Senator Porfirio Bill, and he had served with folks in Afghanistan and Iraq when he was in the military and... and these were the folks who provide translation during the... during the wars for the American military. And so, this is a way for us to make sure that the folks who are coming here have... have an opportunity to be successful."

Windhorst: "And about how much... or what's the range of a typical fee for... for the transcripts?"

Huynh: "So, it ranges from \$50 to \$60."

Windhorst: "We show that there may be some for the University of Illinois that may be little more than that, a hundred to a hundred and fifty. I don't know if that's accurate or not, but you're saying it's..."

Huynh: "It... it depends on... on the institution of higher learning." Windhorst: "I appreciate you answering my questions. Thank you."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, can you tell me, on this particular request, why only these two are being described as being able to be reimbursed for transcript evaluation fees?"

Huynh: "So, the transcript evaluation fees are... are fees that's...
that's used to assess foreign transcripts, right? These are
used to assess equivalent grade point averages,
accreditations of the institutions in which they come from.
We know from some of these countries, Afghanistan and Iraq as
well, that these institutions may not exist based on what
happened in those countries. And so, this is a way for us to
see whether or not folks are able to get that waived."

Ammons: "So, if... if people are from other communities or African countries that are wanting to go to our universities, do they have to pay the same fee?"

Huynh: "It... it depends if they're refugees from that country because it's... it... it's only if you're coming from a different country and you're trying to apply for public university or institution."

Ammons: "And... and why should we waive these fees?"

Huynh: "Again, this... you know, we've seen an influx of refugees coming from Afghanistan and Iraq. These are folks who served with the United States military during the war. They served as translators, you know, and... and this is a way for us to make sure that folks have the opportunities to be successful in the United States and in Illinois."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Ammons: "Would you agree that there are people in the State of Illinois who also cannot afford to pay some of the fees at the higher education institutions?"
- Huynh: "So, again, this fee is applicable because, if you are a refugee from these countries, sometimes these countries don't actually have the institutions at this moment in time, right? These institutions may have been, you know, destroyed due... due to the wars that they had. So... so, that's why this is way for us to fee... to waive that fee."
- Ammons: "And can you tell me, as you worked on this Bill, what the cost and how often this is happening, how many people this would effect?"
- Huynh: "Sure. We have approximately a thousand folks who may be eligible for this. So, if you do the math, \$50 times by a thousand, that's \$50 thousand. But you're going to see maybe every year you might have a hundred people apply to these public universities, right? So, a hundred times 5... 50, that's \$5 thousand. And it's a fee that, again, the universities of Illinois and the public universities have said that they will waive. So, there's no opposition on this Bill."
- Ammons: "And would you support a process that would do this exact same thing for low-income people in Illinois who cannot afford to pay transfer fees or transcript fees?"
- Huynh: "There is already a process in place right now for the folks who are low-income, students who are low-income, students who are from first-generation background where they do get those fees actually also waived as... as well."
- Ammons: "Can you share with... I don't know... I don't know what that is. I've been the chair of Higher Ed, and I have no idea what

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

you're referring to that would provide this same opportunity for residents of Illinois."

Huynh: "What... when you apply to a public university or an institution, you can apply and... and you can get your fee waived. If you look at the College Board, the ACT or SAT, you can also get your SAT scores. Those... those scores can also be waived as well. As in, you know, you can have them sent to the universities of your choice and it'll be free, provided by the College Board, as long as you provide your income eligibility."

Ammons: "Okay. This is a new one for me. So, I'm... I'm not familiar with this, and I'm not sure if we've applied that to several people who've written me, and I'm not familiar with the fee waiving process here. I... I can't support this. I have no idea why we would do this anyway in the State of Illinois. And we certainly have not offset, and I believe in a free college tuition, which we have not done yet for the people of Illinois. And so, I'm going to have to be a 'no' vote on this action."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Huynh to close."

Huynh: "I urge an 'aye' vote, and thank you so much for your time."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2690 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; 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. There are... on this question, there are 87 voting in 'favor', 22 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

9, Bills on Third Reading, Senate Bill 3679, Leader Buckner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3679, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Buckner."

Buckner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. SB3679 aims to revitalize economic and physical aspects of business districts... districts in cities with populations exceeding 500 thousand. The law facilitates the funding of business-related activities and improvements through levies on property owners who benefit from these enhancements. This approach is intended to foster job creation, to attract and retain businesses to increase public safety, and to stimulate investments within these designated business improvement districts. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, these business improvement districts will be allowed in basically Chicago. Cities exceeding 500 thousand. Is that correct?"

Buckner: "Yes, Sir. So..."

Windhorst: "How... go ahead."

Buckner: "Yeah. The... the current Bill would make these possible within the City of Chicago. Our hope is that this will be able to be an example of how to do this around the state. So, the... the sister type of entity that these are... are SSAs, which exist across the state. This is a more focused and more targeted version of... of that tool."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "And just for our edification, how are these districts created? What's the mechanism to create them?"

Buckner: "Yeah. So, these... these bid districts will be created by the property owners within a certain space, a certain lineated space. They will have full authority of the tax levy rights. They're taxing themselves. And unlike the SSAs, they're also in control that what happened in that... in that space, right? So, the SSAs are a... a pseudo government entity that, you know, they put their... the rules and parameters out. But this is actually happening to folks who are being taxed, right? Those business owners in that area, giving them the ability to have say-so on what happens in that space."

Windhorst: "For the creation of the district, is it done by a referendum, a vote of those in the area?"

Buckner: "It would be. Yes, Sir."

Windhorst: "Affected area and the, I guess... I'm assuming a majority vote is sufficient to create the district?"

Buckner: "Yes, Sir."

Windhorst: "And then it would be governed by a board?"

Buckner: "A board, yes."

Windhorst: "That will establish by-laws, expend the money as you referenced. If the district is created by referendum, do they then have the opportunity to tax, or is that a separate vote on an additional tax?"

Buckner: "Repeat that for me. I want to make sure I understand what you're saying."

Windhorst: "I'll be a little clearer. I'm sorry. So, the district is created by vote. Once it is created, does the board levy

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

the tax, or... or is there a separate vote to authorize the tax?"

Buckner: "The board does it. Yeah, all that would be done within the board and the… kind of the governing structure of the… of the board as presented."

Windhorst: "Is there an area within the city that is looking to do this?"

Buckner: "Yeah. So, the... the area I represent that is... is extremely pivotal to right now is the Magnificent Mile, who is currently under a SSA. The SSA is expiring very shortly. And talking with the Mag Mile Association, who is the... the main entity that I've been dealing with in this space, as well as the Chicago Loop Alliance, which represents much of State Street in the Central Business District in Chicago, these are tools that they really need post-pandemic to revitalize this business footprint. Also, will just say to put on the record, Leader, that this is a result of number of conversations over the summertime with BOMA, the Business Owners and Managers Association; Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce; IRMA; and both the Mag Mile Association, the Chicago Loop Alliance in the City of Chicago. And we found a way to get to peace at ... peace in the valley on this to ... to give this tool a chance."

Windhorst: "And, as you alluded to, this is supported by the City of Chicago, Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce, IRMA, the Loop Association, Illinois Chamber, Hospitality Business Association of Chicago. Is that correct?"

Buckner: "Yes, Leader, it is."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Wilhour."

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

Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."

Wilhour: "Yeah. So, I'm... I'm looking at this and I'm just... I'm just wondering what would... what prevents these property owners from doing this as an association outside of creating a... basically a new government taxing body? Is there anything that keeps them from forming an association and doing this without this legislation?"

Buckner: "Well, I mean, I guess currently the way... the way the law is written, they would have to form, under the... the tent of a SSA, which... which as I said, doesn't give them the flexibility to literally be in charge of where the money goes and how it works, right? And so, what... what this is is when, you know, these business owners came to us and said that they wanted more flexibility and more autonomy, and so this tool gives them the ability to do that."

Wilhour: "But business owners that don't want to be part of this would still be... they would still be levied the... the tax in this... in this district?"

Buckner: "If they're (unintelligible) that delineated area..."

Wilhour: "And any future business that would come into that area during that period of time?"

Buckner: "If they're within that area. What they... once again, they'll... there's a process leading up to this. This is not something that's going to be... that's going to work for every area in Chicago. I have named the two that have asked for it, and this does not get... do away with the SSA process either.

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

That still exists. You have to pick one. You have to either be a bid or SSA, but both of them can... can still exist."

Wilhour: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Buckner to close."

Buckner: "Thank you. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3679 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's 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 96 voting in 'favor', 14 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: approved for consideration, referred to the Order of Second Reading is House Bill 567 and House Bill 4604."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I meant... can you have the record reflect that I meant to be a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 693?"

Speaker Manley: "The record... the record shall reflect that."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "On page 6, Senate Bill 2743, Representative Ann Williams. Representative Williams. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2764, Representative Gill. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2764, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gill."

Gill: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2764... 64, excuse me, amends the Automatic Contract Renewal Act. Any business that offers a free trial or promotional period of a product or service that lasts 15 days or longer, and the contract will automatically renew unless the consumer cancels the contract, the business must notify the consumer no less than three days prior to the auto renewal or the cancelation deadline. The business must send a notice to the consumer about the pending auto renewal. The... the notice must be in the form or method in which the consumer is accustomed to interacting with the businesses, either a phone call, email, or written correspondence. I would like to add that the Gillbillies love to do this to me. So, I am happy to have a written notice when any free trial is up. I'm happy to take any questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Windhorst."
Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, it appears that there were four different Amendments that were filed on the Bill. Have those been adopted or were those tabled?"

Gill: "That's such a Gill thing to do, isn't it? Tabled."

Windhorst: "Tabled. Okay. So, were dealing with the underlying Bill, as you outlined."

Gill: "Correct."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Windhorst: "What... what form does the notice take that the company must provide?"
- Gill: "However they typically do. So, an email, a phone call, or written correspondence."
- Windhorst: "Does... does it matter how the free trial was started?

 If it was started by written correspondence, then the notice must be written..."
- Gill: "I believe that's how they're going to... they would have to respond."
- Windhorst: "And it appears that TechNet is an opponent of the Bill. Have they expressed that opposition?"
- Gill: "I believe they... I thought... I have no idea. I didn't think there was any opponents to this anymore."
- Windhorst: "But, as you outlined, this is designed to deal with situations for free trials leading to automatic renewals that may occur without the notice to the consumer. Is that correct?
- Windhorst: "And this is designed as a consumer protection initiative?"
- Gill: "Yeah. Just to let people know. Really, it is just a notice.

 That's all that it is, to let you know when a free trial or...

 is expiring so that you don't automatically get charged again."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Gill: "Yes."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Weber."

Weber: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Weber: "Representative, can I ask, I... I've had a lot of these short-term free trials that were seven days, two weeks. Why...

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

why 15 days? Because something that was seven, you know, one week or two weeks would not fall under this at all? Is there a reason why?"

Gill: "I don't know the answer to that. Senator Turner worked this out. I believe most trials are at least two weeks."

Weber: "And that would fall under the 15 weeks. You... you understand that, right?"

Gill: "Or 15 days, I'm sorry."

Weber: "That would fall under... 2 weeks would fall under 15... well, all right. Do you have any idea... so, these are going to be like everything from apps on your phone to all kinds of different things? Is that correct?"

Gill: "Yes."

Weber: "Okay. So, how... how exactly would all these apps know that you're from Illinois since you're creating a special law that, only in Illinois, do they have to remind us?"

Gill: "From the information when you sign up for the free trial."

Weber: "Most of the time, I just... you know, my experience is I click 'yes', enter credit card information. I know people can... you know, necessarily don't maybe have their home address or, you know, whatever on their card. And is there a way to enforce this with companies that are outside of the State of Illinois? Or outside of the country, for that matter?"

Gill: "I mean... yeah. We're just concentrating on the State of Illinois, not concerned about..."

Weber: "Okay. Well, not every business and every app and everybody that provides a free trial resides in the State of Illinois.

To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Weber: "Good intentions. However, the State of Illinois does not regulate, you know, federal laws to regulate the Internet across the United States. I don't see how this is actually going to effectively work. People will be expecting something that they may not get from a company that does not reside in the State of Illinois. It's going to be too hard to control. I recommend a vote of 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gill to close."

Gill: "I appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2764 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 93 voting in 'favor', 16 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2743, Representative Ann Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2743, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams."

Williams, A.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill simply creates the State Water Plan Task Force Act establishing the State Water Plan Task Force. This is an interagency task force with state government and universities that coordinates a concise plan for addressing critical water issues facing the state. As you may know, they have developed already their initial water plan, and it's something we expect to provide every 10

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

years. And happy to answer any questions about details of this task force."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, does this task force currently exist?"

Williams, A.: "It does not. This is the creation of the task force."

Windhorst: "Our analysis shows that there may have been a water...

State Water Plan Task Force established by Executive Order?"

Williams, A.: "Yes. This will codify that. So, the state… the task force that you're referencing published the first State Water Plan. And by using this, codifying in statute, we ensure that it continues every 10 years."

Windhorst: "So, it's a continuation of that effort by Executive Order make... placing this in statute?"

Williams, A.: "Yes."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield for ... "

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Ammons: "...just a clarification on the water plan. Thank you.

Representative, thank you for doing this. Clearly, this is an important part of the work, and I've been emailing you about water in the State of Illinois over the last several months.

I wanted to just find out from you if the task force composition will include the Prairie Research Center also at

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- the University of Illinois. I see the State Water Survey there."
- Williams, A.: "The task force members include 10 state entities. They include DNR; Public Health; EPA; Transportation; Agriculture; Pollution Control Board; State Water Survey from University of Illinois, which I think is the same thing you're referencing; and Water Resource Center at the University of Illinois. So, they have two components that deal with... that are from... stem from the University of Illinois."
- Ammons: "And... and the work that they'll do, I just want to clarify, we have a State Water Plan already..."
- Williams, A.: "Yes."
- Ammons: "...that is in place. What would their job be under this task force?"
- Williams, A.: "Sure. This is an update to the plan that's required every 10 years. As you know, the issues change from time to time. The needs change as we're dealing with the ongoing and worsening climate crisis. Certainly, they'll be more issues about water resources, scarcity, quality, et cetera. So, the idea here is to not make this a one-off but a continuing process for evaluation of our water needs as a state."
- Ammons: "Will they be able to look at issues of protection of water resources?"
- Williams, A.: "Absolutely. It's a very broad charge. They do have specific items that they are delegated to do, but they, I think, are broad enough to cover our areas most... that are most critical."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Ammons: "And then after the convening of this particular task force, because of course this is an ongoing issue, will this... is this a permanent task force now..."

Williams, A.: "We..."

Ammons: "...of the water plan? It would make it permanent?"

Williams, A.: "We've created it. Now that we're codifying it, it will be a permanent..."

Ammons: "I'm sorry, I... I just can't hear you at all."

Williams, A.: "Yes. It is a little loud. Yeah. It will be a permanent part of our... our water assessment program in Illinois and will be required to do a report every 10 years. Similar to the one you referenced, which I'm sure you reviewed extensively, which is... if anyone hasn't read it, I'd recommend it. It's a very comprehensive look at all of our water needs as a state."

Ammons: "I think there's a issue that we were looking at in the Central Illinois region that deals with the Mahomet Aquifer, which is really important, certainly, to the State of Illinois and the aquifers across the state. We went to the, literally, the State Water Conference about a week and a half ago, and one of the issues that came up is that we, in the critical water infrastructure, like a Mahomet Aquifer for instance, this task force, hopefully, will be able to make recommendations to the General Assembly to protect those water resources from pollution, toxic run-off, and all those things. Will they have the ability to look at that and make recommendations to us?"

Williams, A.: "Absolutely, Representative. It includes recommendations on issues related to state programs,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

legislation, amending legislation and programs, proposals or designs for construction, funding requests, et cetera. So, again, it's charge is specific to water but very comprehensive in terms of what areas it can review."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you so much for ... "

Williams, A.: "Thank you."

Ammons: "...doing this. This is a big issue."

Williams, A.: "I know..."

Ammons: "...we've talked about this over and over. I'll certainly come over and join you on this Bill."

Williams, A.: "Great."

Ammons: "And I urge an 'aye' vote for it."

Williams, A.: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams, A.: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2743 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 in 'favor', 0 'opposed', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Keicher, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Keicher: "Madam Speaker, if you could please let the record reflect that Representative Randy Frese is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Manley: "The record shall reflect. Representative Benton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Benton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can you please let the record reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on House Bill 890? My switch doesn't like to recognize a 'yes', must be a Republican one. The 'no' works just fine."
- Speaker Manley: "The record shall reflect your request. Senate Bill 2781, Representative Huynh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2781, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Manley: "Representative Huynh."
- Huynh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today, I'm presenting Senate Bill 2781, which creates the Healthy Forest, Wetlands, and Prairies Grant Fund within the Department of Natural Resources. This Bill passed the Senate in a bipartisan way, and it passed out of the Environmental Committee unanimously.
- I know of no opposition, and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

 Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Rep... Leader Windhorst."
- Windhorst: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Manley: "He indicates that he will."
- Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative Huynh, what is the... the goal of... of this plan that's being established?"
- Huynh: "Thank you, Leader. Leader, so we... we are trying to make sure that the Department of Natural Resources are... are able to provide grants for the purpose of restoring degraded forest lands and native prairies and promote the... the growth of native vegetation throughout... of the... the state."
- Windhorst: "So, it'll be on the units of local government to submit their grant proposal and then potentially be awarded

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- grants by the Department of Natural Resources. Is that correct?"
- Huynh: "That is correct. Units of local government, you have nonprofits as well, and any entities that's determined by the department."
- Windhorst: "Do we know approximately how much this will cost, this grant program?"
- Huynh: "Yes. It's subject to appropriations and the grant program could cost \$5 million, but there is a federal match. So, by doing this, it allows us to qualify for the federal match from the Department of the Interior."
- Windhorst: "So, the federal match would bring the state's obligation down to 2 and a half million, or will it be a 10 million..."
- Huynh: "It could be a \$5 million match to the \$5 million."
- Windhorst: "And do... do you know this will be appropriated in this year's budget?"
- Huynh: "It's subject to appropriation... appropriation. So, there is another Bill, as well, that... that's making its way through.

 But..."
- Windhorst: "The Illinois Farm Bureau had, I believe, expressed some concerns early on about conservation easements. Was their concerns addressed?"
- Huynh: "Yes. There is no opposition. So, there was an Amendment that was filed in the Senate, and that Amendment brought them to no opposition, to neutral."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Indicates it."

Wilhour: "Yeah. I'm just wondering would this... would these grants...
would it allow these organizations to purchase land, or is it
just for improvements?"

Huynh: "It's for improvements."

Wilhour: "So, there's nothing in here that would allow them to acquire land or real estate?"

Huynh: "No. These are project for vegetation, for trees, for the planting of trees."

Wilhour: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Huynh to close."

Huynh: "I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2781 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's 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 86 voting in 'favor', 22 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2850, Representative Mason. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2850, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Mason."

Mason: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to present Senate Bill 2850, which updates statute to allow for compensation increases for members and chairs of the Fox Waterway Agency and the 11 river conservancy... conservancy districts in the state. They have not been updated since 1995. It further adds

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

a... an index with the Consumer Price Index to allow for increases in the future without having to make legislative changes. It's important to note that the Bill only allows for increases. It doesn't require them. It just sets a limit as well. And the funds that we're talking about to pay these salaries are not Illinois state funds but rather agency funds, whose decisions to increase board and chairman salaries remain at their discretion. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2850 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's 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 in 'favor', 36 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2931, Representative Johnson. Senate Bill 2931, Representative Johnson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2938, Representative Gong-Gershowitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2938, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2938 modernizes requirements under the Illinois Mosquito Abatement Act to allow for a district to expand and cover additional territory if residents choose to do so. I know of no opposition and happy to answer questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Windhorst: "Representative, the Mosquito Abatement District will have powers relating to the surveillance and monitoring of ticks as well as the surveillance, monitoring, and extermination of mosquitos and rats. Do I have that correct?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "I believe that is the existing description of what the mosquito abatement district has the jurisdiction over currently, yes. And all this changes is the ability of a resident to expand the boundaries of... of a mosquito abatement district. In... in my case, Glenview, when the mosquito abatement district was originally adopted, it did not cover currently more rural areas that are now no longer rural but would like to be incorporated into that district. And so, this just modernizes the rules with respect to doing so, if residents choose to... to be included."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Swanson: "Thank you, Ma'am. Is there any cost to this expansion?

Any time we talk about expansions and things like that, usually involves cost. Are there any costs involved with this?

Sounds like admission change too."

Gong-Gershowitz: "I'm being told it's the same actions but it just expands the... what they can monitor and the kind of animals. So... and, again, you know, if there were an additional cost, again, this would be a decision for the residents in that district. So, this is... this is still leaving it up to the residents in order to decide if they want to expand the

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

boundaries. This just modernizes the way in which residents would be able to make that decision."

Swanson: "Okay. So, there are no increased costs?"

Gong-Gershowitz: "Not that I'm aware of."

Swanson: "Okay."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Gong-Gershowitz to close."

Gong-Gershowitz: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2938 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting's 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 100 voting in 'favor', 6 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3151, Representative West. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3151, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative West."

West: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 3151 amends the School Code and the safety education, driver education course. The highway construction and maintenance zones portion of the course will codify workers' safety within the curriculum. It passed unanimously out of the Senate and out of committee, and I ask for the same in the House."

Speaker Manley: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3151 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

this question, 107 are voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2931, Representative Johnson. Mr... out of the record. Senate Bill 3203, Representative Faver Dias. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3203, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Faver Dias."

Faver Dias: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to present Senate Bill 3203 which caps the cost of out-of-pocket copays for prescription inhalers at \$25 per inhaler per 30-day period. More than 1.4 million people in Illinois have chronic lung diseases, including 160 thousand children with asthma. In 2021, there were 124 asthma-related deaths, the sixth highest rate in the nation. The death rate for African Americans with asthma is five and a half times higher. Prescription inhalers are medications for people living with acute respiratory conditions and chronic lung diseases, like asthma and COPD. People with chronic lung disease often need two to three inhalers. Financial barriers to inhalers include... increase, I'm sorry, chronic lung disease patients exacerbated symptoms and risk of death. It also increases the state's health care costs, especially for hospitalizations. According to a CDC funded study nationwide, the annual per person medical cost of prescription inhalers is \$1,830 for people with asthma. For children with asthma especially, research has found associations between higher copays for asthma medications and higher rates of

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

hospitalizations. Senate Bill 3203 seeks to address this issue of access and affordability by capping the copay of inhalers to \$25 per inhaler in a 30-day period. There is no opposition. I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Hauter."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Hauter: "All right. So, we've had a couple conversations about this. Why \$25? Where did that come from?"

Faver Dias: "I have appreciated your engagement on this issue, and I have appreciated you taking the extra time to meet..."

Hauter: "You don't have..."

Faver Dias: "...to meet with me and health care experts."

Hauter: "Yes."

Faver Dias: "Twenty-five dollars, we, you know, looked at other states. We looked at other medications, copay caps that we have done. We went with \$25. It's an accessible amount for people. Currently, you know, my office has received emails that people pay from \$188 a month to \$645 a month. So, we determined \$25 and the insurance is neutral."

Hauter: "Okay. Who... who exactly is this helping, because who is the insurance companies that you're targeting for the \$25 copay? Who does it apply... is it commercial insurance or, is it... is it... what..."

Faver Dias: "It's all the plans that are regulated under... that we can regulate under State of Illinois statute."

Hauter: "So, it does not include high-deductible plans?"

Faver Dias: "It does include high-deductible plans."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Hauter: "It does."

Faver Dias: "Yes."

Hauter: "So, they... so, high-deductible plans will also be included. They can only pay \$25?"

Faver Dias: "Correct. And we worked with DOI to make sure that any federal penalties that exist withheld savings accounts on high-deductible plans, that they're... they will be able to, in rulemaking authority, make sure that there aren't any issues and that we are in compliance with federal law."

Hauter: "Prior mandates on limits to medications has always centered on one medication. This is, I think, novel, and maybe this is being done in other states, or is it? Is it... is this the first state to do it?"

Faver Dias: "No. We are not. Minnesota and New Jersey have also passed similar legislation for inhalers."

Hauter: "Okay. So, who pays now? Who pays?"

Faver Dias: "Who pays the copay?"

Hauter: "No. Who pays... so, the... you were saying that people paid 600, a thousand dollars..."

Faver Dias: "Six-hundred and forty..."

Hauter: "...and now they're paying \$25."

Faver Dias: "I'm sorry."

Hauter: "So, who pays?"

Faver Dias: "So, I've... I've received emails that when... that people have to pay their out-of-pocket costs are up to \$645."

Hauter: "Who's paying that now?"

Faver Dias: "People."

Hauter: "So, who... so, who are those people?"

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Faver Dais: "It... it is the insured person who has been paying up to \$645 out of their own pocket. And we have found that it is cost prohibitive. And when we see that there are these high copays, people aren't adhering to their medication. Typically, as I'm sure you know, there are two types of inhalers when people have asthma or COPD. There's their emergency relief haler and then there is their maintenance inhaler. And that maintenance inhaler, in adherence to that treatment plan, keeps them out of the emergency room. And so, when the... they are paying... when the insured is paying out-of-pocket copays at such a high rate, they don't adhere to their treatment plan because they cannot afford it, and then we see them ending up in the ER more."

Hauter: "I get all that. They paid a thousand dollars a month, now they pay \$25 a month. Who pays 975 now? You don't think insurance companies are just going to pay that, right?"

Faver Dias: "I'm sorry, can you rephrase the question?"

Hauter: "They paid for their medication. To get their medication, they paid a thousand dollars."

Faver Dias: "Six-hundred and forty-five. Yes."

Hauter: "Okay. Well, I mean some of them... some people pay up to a thousand dollars for their... they're getting Advair. They're getting combination medication. Some of these combination medications are very expensive, and the point is, somebody's now paying for that. You don't think that just the... the insurance company is eating that?"

Faver Dias: "It... you know, I appreciate your concern, but as I've said, insurance is neutral on this."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Hauter: "Yeah. Because they're paying... everyone else in the... in the plan is now paying a higher premium."

Faver Dias: "So, we have not... so, we have not... we have not heard a concern from them. And, you know, as we hear many... multiple insurance Bills in this Assembly, we hear from insurance when they are concerned about raising premiums. On this Bill, they have said they are neutral. They're not concerned about premiums. The... when the New Jersey Legislature passed this, the New Jersey Legislature, there... there were inquiries into, you know, what would it... would it... what would the increase to premiums be. And they... and they determined that they could not find it. They could not determine if there would be an increase. When there are increase to premiums, there are many factors that go into that, some of which is the legislation we do here, and we hear about that. But insurance has not presented a concern with having to increase their premiums."

Hauter: "They don't care about... they don't care about anything to do with raising premiums. They're not going to eat it. What they're going to do is... I'll tell you. This is what they're going to do. Number one, raise premiums if they have to. Number two, step therapy. Number three, reduction and elimination from formulary of those medications that cost way... way more than others. Number four, whatever I'm on right now. Yeah. They're going to just eliminate from formulary or they're going to have you do the combination medication that's... that's separate. Number five, no more advanced dry powder inhalers or anything that's new or cost more that's not generic. They have a process that they're going to go through. When they went from a thousand dollars of your copay

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

to now \$25, we are all paying more or they're going to go through their tactics that they use. They're going to eliminate expensive drugs from formulary. We're all going to pay for this, and that's been my argument the whole time. The unintended consequences of this, this is... I'm astonished at this because this is, I mean... other Representatives have worked for years to get insulin as a mandate and a copay... or a... or a capped expense. You got every medication delivered by an inhaler \$25. That's dozens and dozens of medications with all kinds of price points you got for \$25. It's actually quite amazing, and I... I have to congratulate you. And you got insurance to say they're not opposed because what they're going to do is their usual tactics, and we're all going to pay more. There's no doubt everyone that's a premium payer is going to pay a lot more. You say that there's been no, you know, visible evidence that they're raising. They are not going to go from 500 to a thousand dollars to 25 dollars and just eat it. We're all going to pay more. That's ... that's been my only point. Thank you."

Faver Dias: "I have appreciated Rep. Hauter's engagement. A couple of points. One, again, when we hear insurance Bills that the insurance industry thinks are going to raise premiums, we hear about that and they lobby us on those issues. Two, as I have worked with health experts in this field, the Respiratory Health Association, American Pharmacists Association, American Lung Association, Northwestern Medicine, Lurie Children's Hospital, they do not share that concern. We have also recently passed those copays on EpiPens and insulin and we have not seen, yet, insurance industry dropping coverage

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

of drugs. So, we've not seen this evidence. And then we can also look to the two other states that it has passed in and we also do not see evidence. I appreciate the theoretical concerns, and I am committed, along with the health advocates, to looking for unintended consequences. But this Bill specifically addresses a very real problem right now. I also wonder, you know, if insurance... the industry is taking into account that this reduced copay will actually help their bottom line. If people are adhering to their maintenance inhalers, then they are going to stay out of the hospital, which is ultimately going to save them money."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Morgan: "I want to thank the Sponsor for this legislation. If we use the metric that was just raised by my colleague on the other side of the aisle, we literally would have no requirements about insurance in the State of Illinois. And the point is, in Illinois, just like every state, we decide what our priorities are with regards to the values of what insurance should cover. Everything is part of an insurance pool. That's what insurance is. And the insurance companies always have the opportunity to raise their rates or lower their rates and include profit in that. So, the real question is, if you're being charged \$900-plus for an inhaler, is it because the inhaler costs that or because the insurance company is looking for more profit? And I think we all understand the answer to that. So, this is important. This impacts thousands of people that cannot afford noncovered

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

insurance products, like inhalers, that are lifesaving products. So, great work, Representative. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

"I... I appreciate the Gentleman from the other side Guzzardi: referencing the hard work that we did on passing an insulin copay cap. I was really proud to lead that work here in the House, along with many of the folks who are in this chamber today. And... and we heard some of the same discussion at the time that it might lead to fewer products available or higher costs for people. And I think, as... as Representative Morgan just said, and as... as you said, Representative Faver Dias, we just haven't seen that borne out. We've seen folks continue to be able to access the same medicines that they were. And, of course, premiums go up and down as a result of a wide variety of factors. But the thing I said then and the thing I'll say today, fundamentally insurance is about everyone paying instead of just sick people paying. The whole point of insurance is that we all choose to pay a little bit a month into a big pool so that when someone is really sick, they don't have to bear the entire cost of it themselves. That's what insurance is, as my colleague just said. And so, the idea that we might lower costs for really sick people and that might push out the cost to everybody else in the pool, that's why we have insurance. That's the whole point of this, is so that people who have chronic illnesses don't have to go bankrupt trying to afford their medications. I think this is

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

a really important piece of legislation, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Representative McLaughlin."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

McLaughlin: "Thank you. Just one thing, it's amazes me in this chamber. You've got a professional, who is a doctor, that's dealt with insurance companies his entire life. To the Bill. It..."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

McLaughlin: "People, utilize the expertise of people in this chamber. You have specialists, you have pension experts, you have police, you have fire. The reason the State of Illinois is on such a horrific path is we ignore the experience, the professionalism, and the expertise and we roll bad ideas down the throat of the taxpayers of this state. Doctor Hauter has one objective, which is to take care of patients and keep costs down. My friends on the other side of the aisle, none of which are insurance specialists, none of which are handling of multi-billion-dollar the balance sheets insurance companies, suddenly have become experts because they sat in a committee hearing and were lobbied. Please, for God's sake, listen to people on either side of the aisle when they stand and they speak and they bring private expertise to the floor. And if you listen, you may learn something and you may craft legislation that'll actually help the people of Illinois instead of ignoring what their needs are. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Keicher."

Keicher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Manley: "To the Bill."

Keicher: "Representative, I... I admire your bringing this. We had a chance to talk about it in committee. Your heart is in the right place. I absolutely support that. One of the challenges by... by some of the commentary that we've had up to this point in time that... that it fails to account for is when we have plans, like high-deductible health plans ... excuse me, guys. When we have high-deductible health plans and things in place, that helps the consumer decide for themselves up front what type of risk they want to take on. And when we have a highdeductible health plan, that is a proactive consumer-friendly mechanism where a consumer is saying I'm going to take a little bit more of the cost burden on myself because I know that I'm going to use that up in other expenses over time. And what we've done by picking an arbitrary number, that my peer on the committee had referenced, is we are now driving those costs in the plan. And so, we are taking away from the consumer the right and the ability for them to pick a product that matches their life, their illness, their treatments, and we fall down consistently by continuing to mandate year after year. And we've all done it. We've all done it. We've all voted for things that mandate into insurance. The sad thing is that only impacts 20-some-odd percent of the policies in the State of Illinois, and those costs are generally borne by small individuals or small group plans. And those costs are going to be spread upon the people who don't have large employer plans and need to bear that month in and month out,

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

taking bread from their table. So, while I appreciate the arguments that were there, they don't hold water over time because of the volume that we've done. And we've all done it. But we need to be careful because what we have in front of us today is for the first time, we are taking a vote on how we consume the medication. Not the ailment. Not the medication itself. It's as if we are saying for any injected medication you are limited to \$35. The description in the Bill is the methodology of consumption and that covers anything. We've got to be careful. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Faver Dias to close."

Faver Dias: "Thank you for this robust conversation, both in committee, both outside of committee, with the health experts. I have appreciated the conversations that I have had with doctors from Northwestern, from Loyola, who have supported this, the American Lung Association. Last year, 5,541 children alone had to go to the ER for asthma attacks, which cost on average per visit to the ER \$1,548, which was over \$8 million last year. When people have access to affordable medication, trips to the ER are reduced. This Bill specifically refers to inhalers that are prescribed for lung health conditions, not just for anything, but specifically for lung health conditions. This Bill improves people's quality of life and makes financial sense. I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3203 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And 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.

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

On this question, 87 are voting in 'favor', 21 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3219, Representative Harper. Representative Harper. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3284, Representative Costa Howard. Representative Costa Howard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3284, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Take your time. Representative Costa Howard."

Costa Howard: "Madam Speaker, it's my cat-like reflexes here.

Association. It is cleanup language to the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. It basically does six things. It references court-ordered counseling subject to Mental Health and Developmental Disability Codes and HIPAA. It adds clarifying language regarding relocation and mileage... and that the mileage... when determining mileage intent, mapping services must use a... use surface roads in that calculation. It discusses if a case is dismissed, any parenting plan or allocation judgement is unenforceable. There's a citation reference that is corrected. Repeals maintenance language for individuals while incarcerated for paying maintenance. And it includes recommended language changes for Illinois Child Support Advisory Committee to comply with federal rules. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative, for the explanation of the Bill. Was this suggested by the State Bar Association?"

Costa Howard: "Yes. It's a State Bar Association initiative."

Windhorst: "And so, this cleanup language is something that they've worked on to improve the..."

Costa Howard: "Yes, Leader. The Family Law Committee."

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Costa Howard to close."

Costa Howard: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3284 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And 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 in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5, Senate Bill 2697, Leader Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2697, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. SB2697 requires that any policies of accident or health insurance provide coverage for clinical genetic testing when inherited genetic mutation of individuals with a family history of cancer. In such, the test is recommended by health professionals based on evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. There will be an

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

out-of-pocket cost that's capped at \$50. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Leader, I just want to cover a couple things on... on the Bill. This will require coverage... insurance coverage for clinic... clinical genetic testing for an inherited gene mutation for individuals with a personal or family history of cancer as recommended by a health care professional. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "And that will begin January 1 of 2026?"

Lilly: "Effective January 1, 2026."

Windhorst: "And we are... this Bill will also limit copays to \$50, except for high-deductible plans. Is that accurate?"

Lilly: "That is."

Windhorst: "And it will also require coverage in the event of a hot... a positive test for evidence-based screenings?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Windhorst: "And does... did the Illinois Life and Health Insurance Council and America's Health Insurance Plans express a position on the Bill?"

Lilly: "They are neutral at this time, and yes."

Windhorst: "Are there any opponents to the Bill?"

Lilly: "Not that I'm aware of."

Windhorst: "And it looks like it was unanimous in the Senate and in committee. Is that right?"

Lilly: "It was."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Windhorst: "Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Lilly to close."

Lilly: "Please, 'aye' vote is necessary. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2697 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; 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 106 voting in 'favor', 0 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3285, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3285, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. In 2015, the General Assembly passed the Domestic Violence Resentencing Act under Chief Sponsor, then Senator, Kwame Raoul, in a unanimous vote. We wanted survivors of genderbased violence incarcerated to be who were Unfortunately, only five survivors benefited from that Act in the following seven years, in large part because of a lack of clarity regarding whether or not the law was retroactive. Last year, the Act was amended after two years of work from the General Assembly, DV advocates like ICADV, the Network, and ICASA, and the State's Attorneys Association. This was to ensure that more survivors of gender-based violence, which includes domestic violence, trafficking, stalking, and sexual assault, were able to make use of the law. And I want to be

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

clear, this is folks who were not able to use evidence of their abuse in mitigation at their original trial. That Bill also passed unanimously. During the discussion of the Bill, I was asked if the Gender-Based Violence Resentencing Act included all types of convictions, including plea deals. And in some legislative intent we did establish that that was our intention. And, in fact, since 2015, the question of whether or not plea deals were included was never even in contention with supports from the state's attorneys and unanimous votes. In November of 2023, the Illinois Supreme Court held in a decision that plea deal... deals were not included under the GBV Resentencing Act, despite the very clear legislative intent. They said, and this is a quote from the decision, 'If the Legislature had intended to provide sentencing relief to defendants who had negotiated guilty pleas, we believe it would have been... we believe it would have used language that plainly expressed such a purpose.' So, this is a cleanup Bill to do exactly as the Illinois Supreme Court has instructed us to do, to use language that plainly expresses such a purpose. I don't believe the Supreme Court would be telling us to do something unconstitutional. A few things that are important to note. If a petition for resentencing is granted, which is not automatic, it allows for the sentence portion to be reconsidered, not vacate the underlying conviction. While the sentence may not increase, nor may the judge consider below the mandatory minimum, it is up to the judge's discretion whether a lower sentence is appropriate after a full hearing and nothing whatsoever presents... prevents the exact same sentence from being ordered. In one case, which was featured

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

in the... in an 'Associated Press' story in February of this year, a judge stated, 'Can it truly be a fully negotiated plea, in reality, when the court is not aware of the genderbased violence the defendant has experienced?' Other judges have also expressed concern that they cannot use the Gender-Based Violence Resentencing Act when they believe it to be appropriate. This is extremely important for survivors of gender-based violence. We know that many people take pleas. In fact, some... the... the number is somewhere around 85 percent of cases are settled with pleas. And for survivors who have been abused, raped, or trafficked, it's easy to see how they learn how to not fight back. It sometimes takes time for them to truly realize and understand the impact of the abuse that has kept them terrified. What we are doing in Senate Bill 3285 is exactly what the Supreme Court has instructed in their own plain language. I do hope that this is the last time we are back on the Gender-Based Violence Resentencing Act. I remain committed to this because survivors deserve to be heard, believed, and their experiences considered. I look forward to your questions."

Speaker Manley: "Chair recognizes Leader Windhorst."

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

Speaker Manley: "She indicates that she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you. Representative, I believe, maybe late in the process, the State's Attorneys Association expressed opposition to the Bill. I believe they may have supplied you with a legal memo, which outlined their opposition. My understanding, their opposition first is just on principle. Plea agreements are just that, agreements between two

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

parties, the prosecutor and the defense. And that that information, given the defendant's background, can be taken into account during the plea agreement, and then allowing a collateral attack is not justified in the plea agreement context. If you could address that concern?"

Cassidy: "Well, as I... I would start by saying that there are multiple state's attorneys who do have... are in support. And the reality of what you've described, I think, is addressed by the judge who was quoted in February as pointing out that it can't really be a legitimate plea agreement if all factors weren't taken into account. Keep in mind, the underlying premise is when evidence of abuse was not explored."

Windhorst: "Well, I think the... the distinction would be, in a sentencing hearing, the judge is setting the sentence based on what the judge hears from the prosecutor and the defense. And it may be in that situation that evidence as outlined is not disclosed to the judge to consider the sentence. But in a plea agreement, the defense attorney can provide that information to the prosecutor in the agreement discussions as part of the negotiations. So, I think that would be a... a distinction..."

Cassidy: "I think, once again, I need to make clear, we are talking about folks who have experienced horrific abuse and trauma, who may not have any idea that this is something that might help them, who may not believe that they are worthy of having this considered. And it is only after they have been convicted and only after they have, in some cases, received treatment for their trauma that they realize that this should have been an option for them. We are talking about folks who

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

were not given an opportunity to present the evidence of their abuse to mitigate the... the harms that they... that they caused."

Windhorst: "And I... the response to that is, during a plea agreement, that evidence of... of any mitigation is not presented to the court or aggravation is not presented to the court because..."

Cassidy: "But in a plea negotiations, if the defense attorney is not bringing it up either..."

Windhorst: "...the reason it's not presented... I'm sorry, I don't interrupt you. I'd appreciate you not interrupting me."

Cassidy: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry."

Windhorst: "The reason that is evidence of aggravation or mitigation is not presented to the court because it's an agreement. When there is no agreement, aggravation and mitigation is presented to the court, and that is the distinction the state's attorneys are making. I appreciate your work on this Bill. You have worked very hard, and I know you've tried to address their concerns. And I... I believe they came... the state's attorneys came late to the game, in essence."

Cassidy: "Extremely, yes."

Windhorst: "Yeah. They have also expressed constitutional concerns, which you addressed in your argument. You feel that the Supreme Court's statement about our ability as a Legislature to add this language addresses any constitutional concerns. But the state's attorneys have raised a contractual concern that, basically, there is a right... a constitutional right of contract and that's what plea agreements are. If you want to address that I'll... I'd appreciate it."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Cassidy: "Absolutely. I would start by making clear, yes, this is something that has been going on for more than a decade with the partnership of the State's Attorneys Association. It is, I would say, beyond late in the game to say that, at this point, they have brought... come up with this concept. Secondly, in addition to relying on the very plain language from the Supreme Court concerning this, I would also add the... that the Illinois State Bar Association is enthusiastically in support of this as well. I don't think they're in the habit of pursuing unconstitutional laws as... either."

Windhorst: "Thank you for answering my questions. This is not..."

Cassidy: "Just a minute."

Windhorst: "Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me."

Cassidy: "And I would also add that you can have a collateral attack on a contract when there are material facts that are not included in the negotiations."

Windhorst: "Appreciate you..."

Cassidy: "And I will say this is very much part of the foundation of this law, is that this is when someone has not had an opportunity to present this evidence."

Windhorst: "Thank you for answering my questions. I think I... I made the position of the state's attorneys as clear as I could, and I will not be supporting this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Manley: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "I ask that we continue to hold the dignity and lives of survivors centered. I ask that we believe survivors. I ask that we care about survivors. I feel like the theme of my Session this year has been believe survivors. As a survivor myself, I ask you to vote 'yes'."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

- Speaker Manley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3285 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's 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's 71 voting in 'favor', 30 'opposed', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Keicher, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Keicher: "Madam Speaker, the Republicans would request an immediate caucus in Room 316. Approximate duration two hours."
- Speaker Manley: "Leader Keicher, your request is noted.

 Representative Huynh, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Huynh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Manley: "Please proceed."

Huynh: "Thank you. As we come to the last two weeks of Asian American and Pacific Islander Month in May, we want to raise a couple points. Recently, a new 2024 study by the Asian American Foundation found that 52 percent, 52 percent of those surveyed could not name an Asian American figure. Fifty-two percent. Another 55 percent said that nothing comes to mind when it comes to naming an event or policy related to the history or lives of Asian Americans in the United States. Fifty-five percent cannot name a significant Asian American event. One of the best ways to break this stereotype and status quo is to advocate and celebrate AAPI stories during Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month. And our Asian American Caucus will be highlighting members throughout

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

this week and next week. Hopefully, towards the very end of ... beginning of next week and not towards the very end. Today, we're highlighting one of Chicago's daughters, Michelle Wu. Michelle Wu was born on the South Side of the City of Chicago to Taiwanese American parents. She was raised with Mandarin Chinese as a first language and often interpreted between English and Mandarin for her parents. In 2003, she graduated as the valedictorian of her class, received perfect test scores, and was selected as a Presidential Scholar from Illinois. Michelle moved to Cambridge to attend Harvard University, from which she graduated in 2007, and later worked in management consulting. She moved back to Chicago to take care of her Asian mother and started a tea house small business right in my community on the north side lake front of the great City of Chicago. She later earned her law degree from Harvard Law School, where she became involved in local politics and community activism in Boston. In 2013, she made history by becoming the first Asian American woman to serve on the Boston City Council. And in November 2021, Michelle Wu made history again by winning the mayoral race in Boston, becoming the first Asian American mayor of Boston at age 36. Michelle Wu's public service career is marked by dedication to progressive values and a commitment to serving the people of Boston. From all of us in the Asian American Caucus, nine strong as of right now, her leadership as Boston mayor is a symbol of progress in Asian American representation in American politics. Thank you so much for observing Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month with us. And tomorrow, or the next day, we'll have other Members of the

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

caucus present as well. And hope... and, hopefully, we'll... next week, not hopefully next week. But maybe next week, we'll see, who knows. But I'm not... I'm not going to jinx it. But thank you so much, everyone, for your time and enjoy the rest of your night."

Speaker Manley: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting at 9:00 tonight: Agriculture & Conservation will meet in Room 115; Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools will meet in Room 122B; Judiciary - Criminal will meet in C-1; Human Services in D-1; the Executive Committee in Room 118. Meeting at 9:30 is State Government Administration in Room C-1, Police & Fire in Room 122B, and Transportation: Vehicles & Safety in Room 115."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 815, offered by Representative Windhorst. House Resolution 816, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 820, offered by Representative Costa Howard. And House Resolutions 821, 822, and 823, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer."

Speaker Manley: "Leader Gabel moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; 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 stand adjourned until Thursday, May 23, at the hour of 11 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5853, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of this House Bill. Committee Reports. Representative Harper, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends... recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 255. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter Schools reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 998; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 305. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3... 3552; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 4828. Representative Moeller, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment(s) 3 to Senate Bill 1779. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 125. Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 457. The Chairperson from the Committee on Police & Fire reports the

110th Legislative Day

5/22/2024

following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3201. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2024: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment(s) 1 to House Bill 5189; Floor Amendment(s) 2 to Senate Bill 898. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 125, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 426, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 457, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 998, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2779, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3098, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3201, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3552, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. They'll be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."