

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CO-CHAIR:
SEN. BILL CUNNINGHAM

CO-CHAIR:
REP. KEITH R. WHEELER



700 STRATTON BUILDING
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62706
(217) 785-2254

SEN. JOHN F. CURRAN
SEN. DONALD P. DeWITTE
SEN. KIMBERLY A. LIGHTFORD
SEN. ANTONIO MUÑOZ
SEN. SUE REZIN
REP. TOM DEMMER
REP. MICHAEL HALPIN
REP. FRANCES ANN HURLEY
REP. STEVEN REICK
REP. CURTIS J. TARVER, II

MINUTES

September 14, 2021

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The Joint Committee on Administrative Rules met on Tuesday, September 14, 2021, at 11:00 a.m. in Room C600 of the Michael A. Bilandic Building, Chicago. Co-Chair Wheeler called the meeting to order and announced that the policy of the Committee is to allow only representatives of State agencies to testify orally on any rule under consideration at Committee meetings. Other persons are encouraged to submit their comments to the JCAR office in writing.

ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL

X Senator Bill Cunningham	Representative Tom Demmer
X Senator John F. Curran	X Representative Michael Halpin
X Senator Donald DeWitte	X Representative Frances Ann Hurley
X Senator Kimberly A. Lightford	X Representative Steven Reick
Senator Antonio Muñoz	X Representative Curtis J. Tarver, II
X Senator Sue Rezin	X Representative Keith Wheeler

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 18, 2021 MEETING

Sen. Lightford moved, seconded by Sen. Rezin, that the minutes of the August 18, 2021 meeting be approved. The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

CONSIDERATION OF OTHER RULEMAKINGS/ISSUES

Secretary of State – Procedures and Standards (92 Ill. Adm. Code 1001; 44 Ill. Reg. 17902) and Certificates of Title, Registration of Vehicles (92 Ill. Adm. Code 1010; 45 Ill. Reg. 6641)

Rep. Halpin moved, seconded by Rep. Tarver, that JCAR, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, extend these rulemakings for an additional 45 days. The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

AGENCY RESPONSES

Department of Revenue – Leveling the Playing Field for Illinois Retail Act (86 Ill. Adm. Code 131; 45 Ill. Reg. 9625)

Rep. Hurley moved, seconded by Rep. Reick, that JCAR remove the suspension issued at its August 18, 2021 meeting contingent upon, and effective with, the Department of Revenue filing the modifications to this rule it made in response to the suspension.

REMOVAL OF SUSPENSION ROLL CALL

Y Senator Bill Cunningham	Representative Tom Demmer
Y Senator John F. Curran	Y Representative Michael Halpin
Y Senator Donald DeWitte	Y Representative Frances Ann Hurley
Y Senator Kimberly A. Lightford	Y Representative Steven Reick
Senator Antonio Muñoz	Y Representative Curtis J. Tarver, II
Y Senator Sue Rezin	Y Representative Keith Wheeler

The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

Department of Financial and Professional Regulation – Cannabis Regulation and Tax Act (68 Ill. Adm. Code 1291; 45 Ill. Reg. 9586)

Sen. DeWitte moved, seconded by Co-Chair Wheeler, that JCAR remove the suspension issued at its August 18, 2021 meeting contingent upon, and effective with, the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation filing the modifications to this rule it made in response to the suspension.

REMOVAL OF SUSPENSION ROLL CALL

Y Senator Bill Cunningham	Representative Tom Demmer
Y Senator John F. Curran	Y Representative Michael Halpin
Y Senator Donald DeWitte	Y Representative Frances Ann Hurley
Y Senator Kimberly A. Lightford	Y Representative Steven Reick
Senator Antonio Muñoz	Y Representative Curtis J. Tarver, II
Y Senator Sue Rezin	Y Representative Keith Wheeler

The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

CONSIDERATION OF OTHER RULEMAKINGS AND ISSUES

Department of Public Health – Skilled Nursing and Intermediate Care Facilities Code (Emergency) (77 Ill. Adm. Code 300; 45 Ill. Reg. 10847)

Justin DeWitt, Chief of Staff, represented IDPH.

Rep. Halpin: This is the renewal of the emergency rulemaking for nursing homes and intermediate care facilities, correct?

Mr. DeWitt: That is correct.

Rep. Halpin: Are there any changes in this set of emergency rules from the one previously adopted or the one before that?

Mr. DeWitt: I don't believe so, other than perhaps dates or technical changes. This is required as the previous emergency rule expired on the 18th and we are waiting for the Long-Term Care Advisory Board to act. So we needed to renew this rule.

Rep. Halpin: Has there been any consideration of revising the rules for these facilities given the knowledge and data we now have about vaccinations and how that affects transmission and severity of illness?

Mr. DeWitt: The Department is constantly evaluating the emergency and regular rules to ensure that they are in keeping with the most current information we have about vaccination rates, case rates, etc., and will continue to do this. For this particular rulemaking, we felt like we needed to get the emergency rule back in place, but we are committed to continually looking at those and making them as minimally stringent as possible.

Rep. Halpin: Thanks. The reason I bring it up is the vaccination rates —particularly among residents of these facilities—are actually pretty high, and justifiably so, and I think the staff—at least in the homes near me—those vaccination rates are increasing as well. I've certainly been a strong supporter of the administration when it comes to following the science on these restrictions and mitigations. But the data shows if you are vaccinated the risk of transmission and severity of the illness is significantly reduced. It doesn't exclude it, of course, but it is significantly reduced. And so we find it difficult to strike a balance between preventing outbreaks and the severity of outbreaks while also avoiding the continued isolation of our seniors in some of these homes. I think it was certainly justifiable at the start of this pandemic, especially prior to the vaccine, that we cut off all family visitation if there's an outbreak and make sure that the disease isn't spreading further in the community. But at this point, if the risks are significantly lower, I think it may be worth considering changing some of those absolute mitigations, perhaps dependent on the vaccination rate in the facility among residents and staff. The other thing I would raise is that not just family visitation, isolation procedures, lack of group activities, but also the testing protocols among nursing homes with high vaccination rates might need to be revisited because there may be some facilities around the state that closed their doors because they simply cannot afford those stringent requirements, especially when there are only outbreaks limited to one or two residents because they are doing the right thing when it comes to vaccination and their other protocols. I would strongly urge the Department of Public Health as this rule presumably comes up in another 150 days, to really look at those issues and see if there are ways that we can use a scalpel instead of an axe with these facilities. I appreciate your time today; thank you for answering my questions.

Mr. DeWitt: We appreciate your input. We'll do that. Thank you.

State Board of Education – Nonrecognition of schools due to noncompliance with ISBE mask policy

Jennifer Saba, Executive Director for Regional Services, Jeff Aranowski, Executive Director for Safe and Healthy Climate, Justin DeWitt, IDPH Chief of Staff, and Kristen Kennedy, Deputy Legal Officer, represented ISBE.

Sen. DeWitte: I have a brief statement. First of all, I would like to thank representatives from ISBE and IDPH for being here today. To begin with, I want to reiterate that as members of this bipartisan and bicameral committee on administrative rules I believe it is our job to oversee the rulemaking process by state agencies, making sure they abide by the original intent of legislation

or, in this case, what appears to be a mandate handed down by the administration. It is important to get into the record that just because we are questioning ISBE's authority to take financially punitive steps against school districts that choose to exercise local control with regards to the mask issue it doesn't mean we don't recognize the benefit that masks provide. Personally, I have no issues wearing a mask. It's how I can protect myself and those around me. I was also vaccinated as soon as the vaccine was readily available to my age group. And I have encouraged others to also get vaccinated as evidenced by two vaccine clinics I hosted in my district in partnership with IDPH. Having said that, I do have concerns with government overreach, and those who act outside their authority. That is the purpose of our questions today. As one member of JCAR, it is incumbent upon all of us to ask questions to ensure government is acting within its authority and in line with State statute. The focus of our questioning today centers around this primary issue: does ISBE have the authority simply under a Governor's executive order to enforce a mandate for funding without legislative cause, and does the heavy hand of State government have the legislative authority to dictate rules or regulations for private schools? Specifically, under what authority does ISBE believe they have the ability to restrict funding to school districts that choose not to abide by the mask mandate? I would like to see the statute that grants ISBE this authority. To the best of my knowledge, I don't believe that authority exists. When a House representative files legislation after the fact that does give ISBE that authority, in my view it's a veiled admission that perhaps ISBE had stepped beyond its authority. And by the way, I find it very interesting that the bill was filed yet not heard or voted on, even though the House was in session last week and could very well have considered this legislation. I look forward to hearing from representatives from ISBE so we can all gain clarity on this issue.

Sen. Curran: Thank you to the members of ISBE and IDPH for appearing today. First, the Committee promulgated two questions in advance that were sent to you and we have not received a response yet. Question #1: Does the Board plan to file administrative rules to implement E.O. 2021-18 or the revised public health guidance for schools supporting the full return to in-person learning for all students? If plans are in motion, then when should this Committee expect to see a rulemaking? If plans are not in motion, then please aid the Committee in understanding the Board's legal reasoning for not filing administrative rules. Under the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, a rule means "each agency statement of general applicability that implements, applies, interprets, or prescribes law or policy" and all rules of agencies shall be adopted in accordance with Article 5 of the Act.

Ms. Kennedy: ISBE does not currently plan on filing rules. ISBE is relying on the court's decision in *Hutsonville*, a case that was decided last year; the final order came out in December of 2020. The court in *Hutsonville* found that the Governor's Executive Orders requiring schools to comply with certain health measures associated with in-person instruction, including requiring face coverings in schools, and guidance issued jointly by ISBE and IDPH detailing those measures, were lawfully issued and enforceable. Further, the court found the Governor's executive order and IDPH-ISBE guidance were statutorily issued and constitutional.

Sen. Curran: In 2020 and 2021, IDPH implemented through emergency rulemaking face covering policies in public spaces, businesses, and schools that were authorized and reauthorized by various Executive Orders. If emergency rules will not be filed to implement EO 2021-18, then please explain the Board's authority to implement and enforce face covering policies in schools authorized by an executive order without administrative rules and the legal reasoning for departing from the precedent set by IDPH which did, in fact, follow the rulemaking process and issued an emergency rule.

Ms. Kennedy: I can't speak for IDPH there, but as it relates to ISBE, ISBE is relying on the court's decision in *Hutsonville*. ISBE is doing as it has been directed in Executive Order 2021-18, which was reissued by 2021-19. That Executive Order requires ISBE to issue joint guidance. This follows past precedents as they relate to ISBE, as that was what was required of ISBE under the prior executive orders and the joint guidance that was the subject of the *Hutsonville* case.

Sen. Curran: I want to talk about the first instance of recognition status being revoked, and that was Timothy Christian School, and the timeline on that. In the administrative rules, Title 23, Section 1.20, has the process for recognition status as well as revocation of recognition status. My understanding of the timeline with Timothy Christian is that the governor issued EO 2021-18 on August 4, 2021. The superintendent of Timothy Christian posted a video on August 11 indicating they would make masking optional and a parental choice. Immediately that same day the school was notified in a letter, according to the *Chicago Tribune*, that its recognition status was being immediately revoked because it declined to affirm it would comply with EO 2021-18. So the determination of revocation was made the same day. When I look at the process in the administrative rules, it states a step-by-step process for how a school becomes non-recognized. First the school is placed on probation. Were Timothy Christian Schools placed on probation?

Ms. Kennedy: No, they were not. Nonpublic school recognition is dealt with in Part 425 of the rules. Part 1 is public school recognition. Nonpublic recognition follows a different regulatory process than public school recognition. The nonpublic recognition process allows for immediate nonrecognition without a probationary period in instances in which the State Superintendent determines there is an emergency situation present at the school. And that is pursuant to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425.60.

Sen. Curran: What due process was Timothy Christian afforded in the decision that was made the same day to pull the recognition status?

Ms. Kennedy: ISBE has a few pending lawsuits relating to masking, including the enforcement, and we are unable to answer certain questions pertaining to the pending litigation.

Sen. Curran: Is the lack of due process for an allegation afforded to these school districts a subject of any of the pending litigation?

Ms. Kennedy: I would need to review it, but I believe it may be.

Sen. Curran: Well, I would say it's not surprising that you are now dragged into court again because this, on its face, is a very heavy-handed tactic that does not afford any due process. You have a process in the rule under Sec. 1.20 that lays out a due process timeline that allows for meaningful discourse between a school district and the department and really that also allows cooler heads to prevail—which is why you have certain time markers in a process. I would certainly encourage the department, in making these decisions, to follow 1.20 whether a school is public or private. You should have due process in place for all schools, all parents who are invested in those schools, whether public or private, and, most importantly, the children that attend. And the process that's in the rule—and I understand your point that it doesn't apply to a certain subset of schools—seems to be a lot more thoughtful than how the department has gone about handling this situation which has caused spillover into the courts and quite frankly a lot of hostility amongst parents and school administration.

Rep. Reick: Can you give me a synopsis of the ruling in *Hutsonville*, please?

Ms. Kennedy: It had to do last year with similarly issued executive orders and those executive orders directed ISBE and IDPH to release joint guidance related to certain health measures associated with in-person instruction, which included the requirement of face coverings. The court found in that case that the Governor's executive orders requiring schools to comply with certain health measures associated with in-person instruction and the guidance issued jointly by ISBE and IDPH detailing those measures were lawfully issued and enforceable, and the court also found that the governor's executive order and IDPH-ISBE guidance were lawfully issued both statutorily and constitutionally.

Rep. Reick: Did the *Hutsonville* court extend that ruling to the enforcement by virtue of nonrecognition and withholding of funds to schools that chose not to comply?

Ms. Kennedy: I do not believe that was an issue in that case.

Rep. Reick: So that is an issue that is still on the table.

Ms. Kennedy: Yes, sir.

Rep. Reick: So what I'm asking is if you're relying on *Hutsonville* for the purpose of justifying the actions of ISBE, where do you go to give ISBE further authority to enforce through nonrecognition and withholding of State funds?

Ms. Kennedy: ISBE has authority under the existing rules. 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1 for public schools and 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425 for nonpublic schools. And that's the existing rule that ISBE is using for enforcement.

Rep. Reick: Is nonrecognition and withholding of State funds encompassed within the parameters of that rule?

Ms. Kennedy: Yes, we believe it is.

Rep. Reick: "We believe it is"?

Ms. Kennedy: It is the subject of pending legislation right now, so I'm not able to say any more on that.

Rep. Reick: So, reasonable people can disagree. Thank you.

Sen. Rezin: Along that same line of questioning: Is it your intent to use this approach for all public schools or private schools that choose to go a different route currently or in the future?

Ms. Kennedy: ISBE has been using its authority under the Illinois administrative rules related to nonrecognition and I believe that is the current path.

Sen. Rezin: So ISBE will continue to use this approach in handling the issue with private schools?

Ms. Kennedy: Yes. ISBE's main goal is to get all of the districts in compliance with the current mask mandate.

Sen. Rezin: And I understand that, and we're not here to have a debate on mask mandates. We're here to understand if ISBE has overreached with their authority. And I know you continue to cite a court case, so there are people who believe that you have overreached your authority. My colleague talked about his concern for lack of due process. And I know that you're citing different statute for the public schools vs. private schools, but again it's very difficult to explain why they are treated differently in this situation and why there isn't due process, especially in the circumstance for the private schools. Do you plan on filing any kind of emergency rule to clarify this or do you feel at this moment that the statute you have cited is sufficient to allow ISBE to determine whether they can withdraw their recognition status or not and withhold their funds?

Ms. Kennedy: I am not aware of any plans to file emergency rules related to this.

Co-Chair Wheeler: Thank you all for being here. I've got a question regarding the executive order, but more importantly the court case you cited a moment ago. You refer to guidance in the interchange with Rep. Reick. Is there a difference between guidance and rule?

Ms. Kennedy: I think there's a difference in the process, but ISBE was directed in the executive orders to issue joint guidance.

Co-Chair Wheeler: But guidance is guidance. Guidance is not a rule. A rule is enforceable. A statute is enforceable. I don't believe that an executive order is enforceable to the same degree that statute and rule are. So I want to understand how your agency is seeing rulemaking vs. guidance.

Ms. Kennedy: Again, we're relying on the court's decision in *Hutsonville* that found that the executive order, along with the joint guidance by ISBE and IDPH, was lawfully issued and enforceable. And that it was lawfully issued both statutorily and constitutionally.

Co-Chair Wheeler: So what you are effectively saying is every citizen in Illinois is subject to guidance at the same level that they are to rule? There's a difference between those two things. There's a different process for both of those things. There's an oversight process that you're sitting here in the middle of regarding rulemaking. There is no such process for guidance. So how is the public protected from government overreach if we're going to all live by guidance alone and not by rule?

Ms. Kennedy: So again this is the subject of pending litigation. All I can say is ISBE is relying on the Court's decision in *Hutsonville* and that is specific to health measures associated with in-person instruction, which includes requiring face coverings at schools and joint guidance related to that, along with the executive order requiring it.

Co-Chair Wheeler: I'm going to go back to the fact that how you enforce something that is guidance goes beyond every part of the Administrative Code. I looked at the particular reference you made to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425.60 regarding changes in recognition status, and I don't see where it says that the State Board can arbitrarily choose what measures will be set for compliance so that the State Superintendent can at any time change the recognition status. If you're relying on the Illinois Administrative Code to change the recognition status of these different schools, what else changed in the Administrative Code that allowed you to do that? I don't see the authority anywhere else in the IAC that lets you change it based on something that arbitrarily was chosen either by executive order or the department to affect that authority. I don't

see the statute. I want to see something specific to that so that I'm comfortable with the fact that we're following the process as the IAC affords us.

Ms. Kennedy: ISBE has been utilizing 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.2(b)(2)(A), which establishes the recognition process for public schools. "A school or district will be placed on probation if it exhibits deficiencies that present a health hazard or a danger to students or staff." We will continue to act swiftly with both nonpublic schools and public schools that have confirmed they are not implementing universal indoor masking as required by Executive Order 2021-18. ISBE will not compromise students' health and safety. Masking is a safe, easy, and effective way to ensure that all students can attend school in person this fall, where they can learn and grow to their fullest potential.

Editorial note: The citation is actually 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.20(b)(2)(A).

Co-Chair Wheeler: From what part of the IAC are you reading that?

Ms. Kennedy: 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.2(b)(2)(A) is "A school or district will be placed on probation if it exhibits deficiencies that present a health hazard or a danger to students or staff." So that is in current Administrative Code.

Co-Chair Wheeler: And you're saying you are applying it based on words that were given in the executive order.

Ms. Kennedy: Yes, based on the executive order.

Co-Chair Wheeler: But you couldn't have put that in rulemaking? Why wouldn't that be appropriate to put in an emergency rulemaking?

Ms. Kennedy: ISBE is complying with the executive order which directed ISBE to issue joint guidance with IDPH related to that executive order.

Co-Chair Wheeler: I think that very same executive order also referred to rulemaking as something that could have been done. Why wouldn't that have been the most appropriate place to put this measure?

Co-Chair Cunningham: Are you going to offer a response?

Ms. Kennedy: No, I was trying to look at the executive order, but if we could have time to look at that and maybe provide a response on that.

Co-Chair Wheeler: Let's go on to other questions first and then during a recess potentially we can come back to that.

Rep. Halpin: I first wanted to address something that one of my colleagues had mentioned. Obviously I've gotten a lot of emails from constituents on both sides of the policy issue, but without getting into the actual policy itself one of the arguments that's been raised is that a bill had been filed—HB 4135—that would specifically grant this authority to ISBE. I think the argument that was made was that this must mean that current law doesn't allow it. And I just wanted to clarify that that's not always what a bill means. In fact, there's a bill filed by another of our colleagues—HB 4803—which specifically prohibits ISBE from implementing this type of

policy. Using the same logic, this must mean that the sponsor of that bill believes ISBE already has the authority and therefore wants to prohibit it. So I want to focus the discussion not about pending legislation, because neither of those bills has been called or voted upon, and just really get to the heart of what ISBE is relying on for executing this authority. I think I heard an answer just now. You are relying at least on existing rule at least when it comes to enforcement of the policy with respect to recognition and funding. Is that correct?

Ms. Kennedy: Yes, Representative.

Rep. Halpin: And then, connecting the executive order to the existing rule, so the executive order identifies the health threat and directs the agencies to issue guidance. It's my understanding based on your testimony that that's essentially what also happened in the *Hutsonville* case, where the executive order directed the agency to issue guidance. The authority to issue guidance was upheld, is that right?

Ms. Kennedy: Yes, sir.

Rep. Halpin: So then here I think the argument that ISBE is making is that the authority is granted in the executive order to cover this subject matter. ISBE already has the authority under existing rules to withhold recognition based on health risks. And that's essentially the connection that you're making in this case, is that right?

Ms. Kennedy: Yes.

Rep. Halpin: And that's where the argument that we don't need additional rules because we already have the authority in existing rule. Is that fair?

Ms. Kennedy: And in the court's ruling in the *Hutsonville* case.

Rep. Halpin: When you train those together, then you have the authority. OK. I just wanted to clarify and distill what the argument was.

Co-Chair Wheeler: I wanted to go back to the difference between guidance and rule. If we rewind back to last year, there was a point in time when an executive order was posted that my friends at IDPH followed up with emergency rulemaking. They did it for a reason. The executive order really had no teeth. You can't say "You need to do this because the Governor says so." There has to be something that goes along with it to make it enforceable. We went through lots of iterations and hours and hours of discussion trying to land on something that was better than what we started with, and I think we actually did that last year. But it was all done by emergency rulemaking. When it comes to how you direct things toward the public, guidance says "should" and rule and law say "shall". And rarely can you cross over those two. Otherwise there's no point in us having a legislature to oversee these things—to set the policy. Our job in the Legislature—, in this case JCAR, is to oversee what's done to make sure it has legislative intent behind it. That it meets those same criteria for protecting the public from arbitrary application of guidance. I know you've referenced 425.60 a few times. All that is the mechanism by which you can say "we're changing the recognition". You're not talking in anything other than guidance about what the thresholds are to change that. That can be done and should be done by rule, not by executive order and not by guidance issued by an agency. Those are things that affect the general public. That goes before the Legislature. That's the process we've chosen in this state so we have a balance and separation of powers. We don't have that here, in my opinion, and what you've

referenced so far is a court case that says executive orders can hold up under any circumstance actually frightens me a little because it means that any agency can take it to any level they want to. I have real concerns about that. We have an oversight responsibility in this committee to look at policy outside of rule. And by everything you have said so far this is clearly policy outside of rule.

Co-Chair Cunningham: So you said that the Board does not intend to promulgate any emergency rules related to the mask issue. Is that correct?

Ms. Kennedy: Yes, sir.

Co-Chair Cunningham: Do you plan to promulgate emergency rules related to any other part of Executive Order 2021-18?

Ms. Kennedy: Not that I'm aware of.

The Committee took a brief recess.

Co-Chair Wheeler moved, seconded by Rep. Halpin, that JCAR adopt the following motion:

There is a concern that policy outside of rule may exist and JCAR encourages ISBE to place all policy and guidance in administrative rule. JCAR recommends ISBE provide an update to the committee on this point within 30 days. Additionally, JCAR recommends that ISBE propose additional amendments to 23 Ill. Adm. Code 425 expanding and clarifying the school recognition process to include a better defined process prior to revoking a school's recognition.

RECOMMENDATION ROLL CALL

Y Senator Bill Cunningham	Representative Tom Demmer
Y Senator John F. Curran	Y Representative Michael Halpin
Y Senator Donald DeWitte	Y Representative Frances Ann Hurley
Y Senator Kimberly A. Lightford	Y Representative Steven Reick
Senator Antonio Muñoz	Y Representative Curtis J. Tarver, II
Y Senator Sue Rezin	Y Representative Keith Wheeler

The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

Illinois Gaming Board – Riverboat and Casino Gambling (86 Ill. Adm. Code 3000; 45 Ill. Reg. 6565)

Co-Chair Cunningham announced that consideration of this rulemaking would be postponed until the October meeting.

CERTIFICATION OF NO OBJECTION

Rep. Hurley moved, seconded by Sen. Lightford, that the Committee inform the agencies to whose rulemakings the Committee has not voted an Objection or Extension, or did not remove from the No Objection List, that the Committee considered their respective rulemakings at the

monthly meeting and, based upon the Agreements for modification of the rulemaking made by the agency, no Objections will be issued. The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SEPTEMBER MEETING DATE

Co-Chair Cunningham announced that the next JCAR meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 10:30 a.m. in Room C-1 of the Stratton Office Building, Springfield, IL.

ADJOURNMENT

Sen. Lightford moved, seconded by Rep. Halpin, that the meeting stand adjourned. The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

Min2021-09.docx