

# 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

February 15, 2022

### MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The Joint Committee on Administrative Rules met on Tuesday, February 15, 2022, at 10:30 a.m. in Room C-1 of the Stratton Building, Springfield. 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	X Representative Tom Demmer
X Senator John F. Curran	X Representative Michael Halpin
X Senator Donald DeWitte	X Representative Frances Ann Hurley
Senator Kimberly A. Lightford	X Representative Steven Reick
X Senator Antonio Muñoz	X Representative Curtis J. Tarver, II
X Senator Sue Rezin	X Representative Keith Wheeler

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 18, 2021 MEETING

Rep. Tarver moved, seconded by Sen. Rezin, that the minutes of the January 18, 2022 meeting be approved. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

### AGENCY RESPONSES

*Illinois Housing Development Authority – COVID-19 Affordable Housing Grant Program (Emergency) (47 Ill. Adm. Code 369; 45 Ill. Reg. 11866)*

Due to the appropriateness of the agency's response, no further action was taken.

*Department of Human Services – Child Care (Emergency) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 50; 45 Ill. Reg. 13098); Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 121; 45 Ill. Reg. 6881); Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) (Peremptory) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 121; 45 Ill. Reg. 13125)*

Due to the appropriateness of the agency's response, no further action was taken.

## **REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKINGS**

***State Board of Education – Public Schools Evaluation, Recognition and Supervision (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1; 45 Ill. Reg. 12250)***

Rep. Demmer moved, seconded by Senator Muñoz, that JCAR, with the concurrence of the State Board of Education, extend the 2<sup>nd</sup> notice period for this rulemaking for an additional 45 days. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

***Department of Employment Security – Recovery of Benefits (56 Ill. Adm. Code 2835; 45 Ill. Reg. 13805)***

Sen. DeWitte moved, seconded by Rep. Halpin, that JCAR, with the concurrence of the Department of Employment Security, extend the 2<sup>nd</sup> notice period for this rulemaking for an additional 45 days. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

***Department of Financial and Professional Regulation – Consumer Installment Loan Act (38 Ill. Adm. Code 110; 45 Ill. Reg. 6086); Payday Loan Reform Act (38 Ill. Adm. Code 210; 45 Ill. Reg. 6117); Predatory Loan Prevention Act (38 Ill. Adm. Code 215; 45 Ill. Reg. 6137); Retail Installment Sales Act (38 Ill. Adm. Code 216; 45 Ill. Reg. 6146); Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act (38 Ill. Adm. Code 217; 45 Ill. Reg. 6151)***

Sen. Curran moved, seconded by Rep. Hurley, that JCAR, with the concurrence of the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation, extend the 2<sup>nd</sup> notice period for this rulemaking for an additional 45 days. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

## **CONSIDERATION OF OTHER RULEMAKINGS AND ISSUES**

***Department of Children and Family Services – Licensing Standards for Child Welfare Agencies (Emergency) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 401; 46 Ill. Reg. 1101); Licensing Standards for Group Homes (Emergency) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 403; 46 Ill. Reg. 1120); Licensing Standards for Child Care Institutions and Maternity Centers (Emergency) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 404; 46 Ill. Reg. 1137)***

Shontee Blankenship, Acting Deputy Director of Licensing, and Dallas Chrome represented DCFS.

Rep. Reick: I have a couple of questions and I want to preface my comments by saying that nothing I am going to say today should be construed as criticism of what you're trying to accomplish, but I'd like to get you on the record as explaining several things about this rule that hopefully will ameliorate some concerns down the road. As we all know, DCFS has had some issues lately with congregate care, children in psychiatric hospitals beyond their expected release times, and a general issue with finding foster homes for children who have been taken away from their families and put into these settings. According to this rule, you are providing for people to be brought on board, both in a public and a private setting, with credentials that are generally less than are normally required under your own guidelines. Can you explain, please, why the agency is moving toward lowering the credentials of people who are going to be in charge of seeing to the welfare of children in congregate and foster settings?

Ms. Blankenship: The changes are still within our accreditation, so we have not gone beyond the process of accreditation. This is to address the shortage of staff and their recruiting and hiring child welfare supervisors and child care supervisors within the private agency sector.

Rep. Reick: So this is specifically for supervisory personnel and not people on the ground, so to speak?

Ms. Blankenship: That's correct.

Rep. Reick: You're saying you're hiring supervisory personnel who do not currently have the certification or credentialing that is normally necessary for that position. Is there anything in this rule that provides a requirement that these folks attain, at some point, the certification or credentials that are in place under the normal child welfare rules?

Ms. Blankenship: The emergency rule (establishes) a panel of 7 committee members, 5 from DCFS and 2 from the private sector that will review degrees that have not been identified as human service degrees, and those degrees are subject to conditions as mentioned in the emergency rules.

Mr. Chrome: Persons who do not meet the educational credentials are required to apply within 6 months to a college program to meet those credentials and within 18 months be enrolled in that college program. And that would be monitored by agencies and institutions licensing them, so if their credentials did not meet the approval of the committee, we would require them to enroll in programs meeting those requirements.

Rep. Reick: Do you have an idea of how many people you are looking to hire under the requirements of this emergency rule?

Ms. Blankenship: No. It's on a case-by-case basis, as requests are submitted to the Department for review.

Rep. Reick: So you don't know what your current shortage is?

Ms. Blankenship: I do not have those numbers as they relate to the private sector.

Mr. Chrome: The Child Welfare Agency Council did identify this as the primary issue that directors of those agencies basically requested and worked on it for a long period of time, because every child welfare agency across the State cannot fill their required staffing because they couldn't find the people who met those specifically credentials, but they had experience and they did have a certain level of education.

Sen. Curran: Will the people who are hired be DCFS employees or employees of private-sector agencies?

Ms. Blankenship: These are all private agency employees.

Mr. Chrome: Yes. They are all private agency employees.

Sen. Curran: Would any employees hired under this rule by these private agencies who are ultimately being credentialed, if they don't meet the 6-month threshold to apply or 18-month threshold to enroll, what is going to be the effect?

Mr. Chrome: The effect would be that they would have to leave that position and fill a position that they did qualify for. In other words, if they were a child care worker instead of a child care supervisor before this period of time, then they would have to go back to being a child care worker and not keep the position of supervisor.

Sen. Rezin: Along that line of questioning, what is the time frame that they would have to get their degrees?

Mr. Chrome: There would be 6 months to apply, and once they apply and are accepted then they would have to actually enroll in that program within 18 months of the start or 12 months from the time they applied and were accepted.

Sen. Rezin: How long do they have to complete their training?

Ms. Blankenship: They have three years from enrollment to acquire their graduate degree.

Sen. DeWitte: Who will be covering the cost of the employees' additional required education/expertise? Will that be borne by the employee, or will it be borne by the Department?

Mr. Chrome: My understanding is that unless money is appropriated for that purpose the Department would not be funding that education.

Sen. DeWitte: This is something we'd like to have a handle on, as to whether or not the Department will be absorbing this cost. I would also be interested to know if there will be any clawback provisions regarding their early exit from the agency. Any way to gather that information?

Mr. Chrome: Are you asking whether the Department is going to subsidize private agency employees' education?

Sen. DeWitte: Correct.

Mr. Chrome: We can certainly ask that question, but we would have to ask that question of someone in policy and legislative affairs to see what's been proposed and going on regarding any money that has been appropriated.

Sen. DeWitte: Ok. Could you provide that information to the staff here at JCAR, Please?

Mr. Chrome: Yes. Any information we can get, yes.

Sen. DeWitte: And I'd also like to know, if in fact the Department will be subsidizing any of this educational expense, will there be any clawback provisions of the employee if they were to leave the agency's employment within a certain period of time?

Mr. Chrome: In other words, the employee would be responsible for paying us back if they don't complete it?

Sen. DeWitte: That is my question.

Mr. Chrome: Ok.

***Department of Children and Family Services – Licensing Standards for Group Homes (Emergency) (89 Ill. Adm. Code 403; 46 Ill. Reg. 1120)***

Rep. Reick moved, seconded by Sen. Muñoz, that JCAR object to DCFS' refusal to respond to requests for clarification of certain group home staffing requirements in this emergency rulemaking. DCFS justified its refusal to respond based on Sec. 5-165 of the IAPA, which sets requirements governing ex parte communications in the rulemaking process. However, Sec. 5-165 does not prohibit such communication. It simply requires that it be reported and made part of the official record. DCFS responded to comments concerning this emergency rulemaking which has been in effect since December 22, 2021 on February 10, 2022. Affected parties should receive prompt responses from agencies regarding emergency rules so they may determine whether they are in compliance with rules that take immediate effect. It is unlikely that the intent of Sec. 5-165 was to allow agencies to use concerns about ex parte communications to avoid talking to the public and it is even more improbable that the intent was to enable an agency to avoid clarifying compliance requirements for an emergency rule it enacted to address a threat to the public health, safety or welfare. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

***Department of Labor – Health and Safety (Peremptory) (56 Ill. Adm. Code 350; 46 Ill. Reg. 1668)***

Sen. Rezin moved, seconded by Rep. Tarver, that JCAR recommend that DOL take care to use peremptory rulemaking only in instances when it is clear that the agency's exercise of discretion was completely precluded by the federal requirement as to the content of the rule it was required to adopt. Sec. 5-50 of the IAPA explicitly states that peremptory rulemaking means rulemakings that are required as a result of federal law, federal rules and regulations, an order of a court, or a collective bargaining agreement, and those rules must be filed within 30 days after a change in rules is required. It was not clear that peremptory rulemaking is appropriate in this case because USDOL gave states the discretion to accept the federal standard or propose their own equally protective standard and the requirement to adopt the standard by the January 7, 2022 date was provided in guidance, not regulation. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

***Department of Public Health – Control of Communicable Diseases Code (Emergency) (77 Ill. Adm. Code 690; 46 Ill. Reg. \_\_\_\_)***

Justin DeWitt, Chief of Staff, represented DPH.

Sen. Curran: We asked that you appear with regards to reissuance of the emergency rules that pertain to masks in schools and vaccination and testing requirements for staff. The Department and the State are defendant parties in litigation currently on appeal from the Sangamon County Circuit Court. In that ruling, the State was enjoined from violating the due process rights of students and staff in the prior iteration of this identical emergency rule.

Mr. DeWitt: There are a lot of different readings of that order. I agree that we are a party to that litigation.

Sen. Curran: As I read it, the circuit court of Sangamon County found that students have due process rights to object to masking requirements and they found your rule to be null and void in court because due process rights are owed to objectors. It therefore ruled against the State. As I read it, that seems pretty clear. So I guess my question is, if you're a party to the litigation and received that order of the court, it seems like you're pretty far afield to reissue the same order that violated the ruling of the judge currently being appealed. What is the Department's rationale for the reissue?

Mr. DeWitt: I'm not an attorney so I won't talk about legal process here. We refiled the rule in the best interests of the people and tried to preserve the status quo. As the appeal is before the 4<sup>th</sup> District Appellate Court, we assume that we will get a ruling soon. The rule was unfortunately expiring on Sunday and we thought that refiled the rule was the best way to maintain the status quo and provide guidance to school districts that were not named defendants in that court case.

Sen. Curran: But you didn't issue guidance. You issued a rule. You are directing school districts to act in a manner that is opposite to the court ruling you are currently a party to. You are bound by that ruling. You may not like that ruling, and the appellate court may soon weigh in, but until the appellate court weighs in that circuit court ruling is the law of the case. It would be different if you were not a defendant. But you are actually in the litigation. I think I am very bothered by this, and to me it is an irresponsible action of government to essentially thumb your nose at another branch of government that has properly ruled. Now on appeal you may overturn it, but during this short period of time that it's on appeal you are a party to this litigation, and I don't think you clarified that you are offering guidance to non-party school districts. I think you injected further chaos into their daily process of trying to manage this situation. Certainly the rule you could have issued would have taken into account the ruling of the circuit court. It could have afforded due process rights to staff and students that object. That ruling did not say that you couldn't require masks. It didn't say that you couldn't require quarantine. It just said that you had to have a due process right in place for anyone to object. So to issue these rules without any more acknowledgment that just a footnote seems to be one branch of government at war with another branch of government when we should be working together and respecting each other's processes and working through those processes, which you are on the other hand by appealing that ruling. I guess I would offer this: if you changed the facts there, if you think about maybe due process rights of employees in another context, if the employer is sued by an individual employee alleging that they have a rule or personnel policy in place that violates due process rights and the court rules that it does in fact violate due process rights, you may want to appeal that but to continue to enforce that policy while that appeal is going on is highly irresponsible. What you are doing now is directing those school districts from the State of Illinois to violate a constitutional right – the due process rights of those students and staff. I would certainly encourage the Department to rethink this as a party in the litigation. If you are not going to respect the processes of the judicial branch in this instance, is it ok to not respect the processes of the judicial branch in other instances? I think you are sending a bad message not only to citizens but also to school districts. I think we have to respect law, and right now that law is that due process rights must be afforded to students and staff. And to reissue this rule without acknowledging or affording these due process rights – I think you're really missing the mark.

Sen. Rezin: Along that same line of questioning from Sen. Curran: Does your Department have any efforts to have any thoughts about repealing this rule?

Mr. DeWitt: Along with everyone else, we are anxious to hear what the appellate court says and, of course, depending on that ruling we'll absolutely rethink our position. Our effort here is to act

in good faith in the best interests of the people, which is to refile the rule, and once we have the appellate ruling it will become much clearer what the next steps are.

Sen. Rezin: In the ruling, though, the judge says that the due process of the people was violated, and as the previous speaker said, instead of acknowledging that decision your only answer was to refile this emergency rule. I think there are other avenues that could have been taken. Who does this rule apply to given that there is a TRO in place?

Mr. DeWitt: It is our belief that the rule does apply to the non-defendant schools that can make their own decisions as to whether the TRO applies.

Sen. Rezin: Do you feel that it is even enforceable?

Mr. DeWitt: I think that's a legal question I can't answer.

Sen. Rezin: Are there any attorneys on the phone that are willing to answer our questions?

Mr. DeWitt: I'm the only person from the Department here.

Sen. Rezin: Anyone else?

Co-Chair Wheeler: I know of no other people who are here from the Department.

Sen. Rezin: And from the governor's administration? No one here? I guess given all the uncertainty and chaos school districts are currently facing, doesn't doing the rule right now just further add to the chaos that we are experiencing? You have an opinion from the court saying that the due process of parents and staff are being violated, but yet we're seeing the same rule that the judge ruled on.

Mr. DeWitt: The rule is based on the current CDC guidance. These are the best practices that the CDC recommends for K-12 schools across the country. We are not diverging from those best practices and so it's our belief that the rule is an appropriate set of instructions for schools that are not affected by the ruling and want to effectively control COVID in their schools.

Sen. Rezin: I appreciate that. We talked about best practices often when we were dealing with the pandemic, but we have a court order here. We talked about it in the past dealing with other departments too, when the administration has overreached and not allowed due process to take place. And that's why we have this opinion, and we're waiting for a ruling. It just seems to me that it would make more sense for the administration to wait until we have an answer from the appellate court judge as opposed to doubling down on a rule that the courts have said violates due process of these staff.

Mr. DeWitt: All I can tell you is that the Department thought that it was better to not have a gap in the rule than to guess when the appellate court might rule and leave schools that are not part of that lawsuit to question what they should do. So that is our rationale for why we filed the rule.

Rep. Reick: We're talking about the plaintiffs in the case, but I don't think enough attention has been paid to the fact that the State and the agency are defendants in this case. Rather than reissue a rule,-and I think some of this confusion results from the fact that the rule expired on Sunday and you reissued it on Monday- I think, however, a better response from the agency in this place

would have been for the agency to say "we understand that we are a defendant in this case and we are bound by whatever the court decided in that case to the extent that we are defendants and that there are named plaintiffs who are affected by this ruling, and therefore it is our position that to the extent that we still have jurisdiction over the non-plaintiff schools, the rule, whether the rule that expired on Sunday or the new rule promulgated yesterday, applies only to those and we will not go any further than that and take this rule out of consideration until the appellate court tells us exactly what its finding is going to be." Because, face it, I know you probably feel there is a good chance that you're going to prevail on appeal, but if you don't you've sown a lot more confusion, because where do we go from here? Is the decision that the rule is null and void in its entirety against those plaintiffs, or will it be further appealed and delayed while we wait for a final outcome? These are questions that we may argue as lawyers from the standpoint of trying to balance a thousand people on the head of a pin, but there are school districts out there that are probably listening to us right now saying that nothing that happened yesterday with the reissuance of that rule gave them any better guidance than if you were just to say that "we acknowledge the fact that we are in this case as a defendant and thus are going to abide by the temporary restraining order within the context of what it provides." I guess I would strongly urge you to look at the issuance of this rule and maybe pull it off until the appeals court gives its opinion, which could come any day now. Would the agency be open to something like that?

Mr. DeWitt: I appreciate your comments. We acknowledge in our note that the TRO exists and that there are districts impacted by the TRO, so we are acknowledging that same thing—that we are subject to that. Even so, it is in the best interest not to have a gap in this rule.

Rep. Reick: I guess we can agree to disagree.

Co-Chair Cunningham: Justin, you just mentioned a footnote. That's an unusual thing I don't know that I've seen in the 26 or so months I've been a member of JCAR—that an agency file a rule with a footnote referencing a court case. Could you drill down a little deeper and tell us why that footnote was included?

Mr. DeWitt: Senator, I've been coming here for 17 years, and I've never experienced anything like this, so we are definitely breaking new ground every day around COVID. It was purely for DPH to acknowledge the TRO exists and is being appealed, and we want everyone to know that this is not an end run or a work-around, but that we acknowledge that we are impacted by that. And honestly school districts have their own standards and they're working this out one by one. But for us, it's to clearly acknowledge the impact of the TRO.

Co-Chair Cunningham: And part and parcel with that acknowledgement, is the Department currently enforcing this rule? To the best of your knowledge, if a school district based on the judge's ruling has decided to end or modify their mask mandate, has the Department stepped in to enforce the rule?

Mr. DeWitt: As with a lot of this, the Department doesn't have a police force that administers a lot of these rules. Some of them, yes, like long-term care where we clearly have a group of folks who go out and enforce these rules. Relative to schools, though, that is often left to local health departments and I don't think that there have been any citations issued across the course of COVID for violations of these rules.



Co-Chair Cunningham: So you are unaware of any enforcement, the Department is not currently enforcing it, so the Department is essentially honoring the circuit court's ruling and waiting for the appeal process to play out. Is that a correct summation?

Mr. DeWitt: In a manner of speaking, I think that's correct.

Co-Chair Cunningham: Again, more of a process question. Obviously the Department throughout the pandemic has issued numerous emergency rules and reissued them. Unlike every other agency, the Department of Public Health has the ability to reissue emergency rules. Is that correct?

Mr. DeWitt: Correct.

Co-Chair Cunningham: So, as you stated, this particular order expired on Sunday, you reissued it on Monday, you explained one of the reasons why—that you didn't want a regulatory gap in place. By virtue of refileing it, has that helped preserve the Department's standing in the appellate court process?

Mr. DeWitt: Again, we refiled the rule in the best interests of the people and made our best good faith effort to assist the non-plaintiff schools in handling COVID. Preserving the status quo is what was on our mind. I can't comment on the legal strategy around what's going on with the appellate court.

Sen. Rezin: This is more of a comment. It was referred to that there was a footnote in our packets today regarding the acknowledgment of the TRO. I would just like to say that a footnote is entirely different than this rule which is doubling down on an executive order that according to legal opinion is violating staff and parents' due process.

Co-Chair Wheeler: The question about enforcement comes to mind here. Because we're talking about an emergency rule which has the effective weight of law in the State of Illinois. I understand that there's a point where you want school districts to do the things that you feel are safe and will keep students and staff healthy, but at the same time we can't enforce that rule because it's been declared void by a court. But we reissued it anyway. Wouldn't guidance have worked just as well in this case while we're waiting for this appellate court ruling to actually occur? Just trying to understand the perspective of those who really want to comply and do right by the public they are obligated to serve. This just creates more confusion. Is this a rule? Is it guidance? Is this enforceable? Where do we stand on that?

Mr. DeWitt: I appreciate the question. I've appeared before this body numerous times and heard lots of lectures about the Department's issuing guidance that looks like rulemaking and so, Chair Wheeler, that's really the effort here: to not be creating rules by issuing guidance or something else. We respect the import of JCAR, always have, I've been here for quite some time. It is a rulemaking, it is something that should be a requirement, and we're waiting on the 4<sup>th</sup> district to tell us otherwise.

Co-Chair Wheeler: The circuit court has told us the answer; we're waiting for the appellate court to give us a different decision potentially, but they may not. And my concern is that we've got a rulemaking in a place where we already had one court ruling.

The Committee stood at ease for further deliberation.

Sen. Rezin moved, seconded by Rep. Reick, that JCAR object to and suspend this emergency rule it does not meet the criteria for emergency rulemaking in 1 Ill. Adm. Code 230.400(a)(1)(E) and (G) and the rulemaking meets the criteria for emergency rule suspension in 1 Ill. Adm. Code 230.550(a)(1)(C). DPH has not taken steps to make this rule known to the parties directly affected by it. After reviewing the text of the emergency rule, the accompanying notice page, which notes the Department's initial emergency rule on this Part is subject to review in the consolidated appellate case *Graves v. Pritzker*, (No. 4-22-0090, 4-22-0092, 4-22-0093, and 4-22-0094), and the Temporary Restraining Order subject to review in the consolidated appellate cases, DPH failed to clearly state whether this rule is intended to apply to all K-12 schools in Illinois, or only to schools and school districts that were not parties to that legal action. DPH has not clarified this point either in the rule itself or in the Notice of Emergency Rulemaking. JCAR finds that this unlawfully inhibits the equitable free exercise of the rights of citizens of this State and poses a serious threat to the public interest.

### **SUSPENSION ROLL CALL**

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

Reps. Halpin, Hurley, and Tarver explained their yes votes.

Rep. Halpin: We are currently in a situation where the TRO says this rule is not enforceable. It's possible, if not probable, that this may change on appeal, but for now as we sit here for that reason I will vote yes.

Rep. Hurley: Agreeing with Rep. Halpin, I vote yes.

Rep. Tarver: Agreeing with Rep. Halpin, I vote yes.

The motion passed 9-0-2.

### ***Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity – Data Center Investment Program (14 Ill. Adm. Code 521; 45 Ill. Reg. 2530)***

Co-Chair Wheeler noted that this rulemaking has been removed from the No Objection List and would not be considered at this meeting.

### ***Department of Public Health – Control of Communicable Diseases Code (Emergency Amendment to Emergency Rule) (77 Ill. Adm. Code 690; 46 Ill. Reg. 1956)***

Co-Chair Wheeler noted that this emergency amendment has been removed from the No Objection List because it has expired.

### **CERTIFICATION OF NO OBJECTION**

Rep. Halpin moved, seconded by Sen. Curran, 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 (11-0-0).

### **ANNOUNCEMENT OF FEBRUARY MEETING**

Co-Chair Cunningham announced that the next JCAR meeting will be Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 10:30 (**Update: March 22, 2022 at 10:30**) in Room C-1 of the Stratton Office Building, Springfield, Illinois.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Co-Chair Cunningham moved, seconded by Sen. Rezin, that the meeting stand adjourned. The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

*Min2022-02.docx*