

| Bill   | Description  | Our Take  | Position | Witness Slip/Status  | More Info                   | More Info                  |
|--|--|---|----------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Illinois General Assembly:</b>  |  |   |          |  |                             |                            |
| <b>Illinois - Select "Opponent" in section "III. POSITION" of Witness Slip</b> |  |   |          |  |                             |                            |
| <a href="#">SB0031</a>   | Requires RSOs to register the business name and address where he or she is employed for a period of time of 5 or more days or for an aggregate period of more than 30 days in any calendar year to the jurisdiction responsible for registering RSOs at that employment location. All currently employed registrants must report initially on or before March 1, 2016. | Local police departments don't have a list of registered sex offenders that work in their jurisdictions so this is a "quick fix" way to push this task to each and every registrant to inform them and criminalizes those who don't perform this task. This is unnecessary since the state already knows where an offender is employed since this information is already in the ISP registration database. What purpose is served by requiring the RSO to register employment more than one time? It's really not clear as to the timeline required by this bill for registering with the secondary jurisdiction(s). If a registrant doesn't know he/she will be working in a particular location for more than 30 days in a calendar year due to the temporary nature of some jobs but then ends up working 30 days then is he/she in violation since registration did not occur within 3 days of starting that job or does the registrant register prior to the time that he/she reasonably expects to reach that 30 day threshold? This is apparently an effort to parallel the requirement for an RSO to register in the jurisdiction where he/she attends college. | Opponent | 10/10 Pursuant to Senate Rule 3-9(b) / Referred to Assignments | <a href="#">News Gaze</a>   | <a href="#">IL Assoc.c</a> |
| <a href="#">HB0224</a>   | Makes it illegal for a child sex offender (CSO) to operate a taxi or limo. Amendment 1 adds "transportation network company driver" like Uber and Lyft.<br><br>ON WITNESS SLIP MARK "OPPONENT" FOR BOTH ORIGINAL BILL AND HCA1   | UNNECESSARY<br>As noted in the May 2013 NBC Chicago investigation, an individual already has to pass a background check to obtain state permits to drive school children. Why not fix deficiencies in their background check process by targeting the school bus and cab companies rather than creating another criminal offense for a CSO? It is our understanding that Uber and Lyft already have policies in-house that prevent them from hiring RSOs. The Uber driver who was charged with sexually assaulting a female passenger in Chicago last November wasn't a registered sex offender, so adding this restriction wouldn't have helped. This bill is just adding to the public hysteria over sex offenses when in fact most of the offenses are committed by people not currently on any sex offender registry since recidivism for sex offenders is <5% nationally. Employment restrictions for sex offenders are counterproductive to public safety since studies have shown that sex offenders who have jobs are less likely to reoffend.  | Opponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee               | <a href="#">Chicago Tri</a> | <a href="#">Reuters -</a>  |

|                        |  |   |                 |   |                         |  |
|------------------------|--|---|-----------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| <a href="#">HB0307</a> | <p>Makes it illegal for most everyone convicted of a felony sex offense to purchase, own or possess body armor for personal protection - includes these offenses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10-1 Kidnapping</li> <li>10-2 Aggravated Kidnapping</li> <li>11-1.20 Criminal Sexual Assault</li> <li>11-1.30 Aggravated Criminal Sexual Assault</li> <li>11-1.40 Predatory Criminal Sexual Assault of a Child</li> <li>11-1.50 Criminal Sexual Abuse</li> <li>11-1.60 Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse</li> <li>11-11 Sexual Relations within Families</li> <li>11-19.2 Exploitation of a Child</li> <li>11-20.1 Child Pornography</li> <li>11-20.1B Aggravated Child Pornography</li> </ul> | <p>"Crime of violence" definition in 740 ILCS 45 is overly broad since many of these offenses are often non-violent by the common understanding of that term. A felon already can't own a gun so why can't a sex offender own body armor to protect him/herself from vigilantes who do have guns? Why not let a judge have discretion on whether this restriction should apply on a case-by-case basis rather than create another overly broad restriction?</p>   | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |                         |  |
| <a href="#">HB0400</a> | <p>Extends the county fair restriction in 720 ILCS 5/11-9.3 (c-5) that prohibits CSOs from operating, managing, being employed by or being associated with any county fair to all "amusement enterprises", carnival or fairs including a county fair when persons under the age of 18 are present. Increases monetary fines for an amusement operator that hires or permits any individual to volunteer for that operation (in any capacity) who has ever been convicted of a sex offense or is currently a registered sex offender.</p>   | <p>Employment restrictions are an ineffective means to manage registrants after they have completed probation/parole and prevent them from fully reintegrating and becoming a meaningful part of society. This restriction further prevents the ability of CSOs to find a job. This is so broad it could potentially prevent CSOs from selling beer at a Cub's game, working at a bowling alley, selling merchandise at a flea market, or working at a movie theater. Since employment restrictions have not been shown to improve public safety they amount to ex-post-facto punishment and are therefore unconstitutional.</p> <p>PLEASE SUBMIT BOTH WITNESS SLIPS TO THE RIGHT FOR THE MAIN COMMITTEE AND THE BUSINESS LICENCES SUB-COMMITTEE &gt;&gt;</p> | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> | <a href="#">SW News</a> |  |

|               |   |   |                 |   |  |  |
|---------------|---|---|-----------------|---|--|--|
| <b>HB0401</b> | Retroactively requires sex offenders who have been on parole/supervised release or who are currently on parole/supervised release to wear a GPS tracking device for the rest of his/her life.   | The parole statute (730 ILCS 5/3-3-7) currently requires RSOs on parole who have committed certain offenses on or after 8/11/2009 to wear a GPS tracking device during parole or supervised release. This bill is proposing ex-post-facto punishment of offenders and is unconstitutional since it retroactively increases the penalty on people who have already completed parole by requiring them to start wearing a tracking device again. Sex offenders have a very low risk of re-offense so applying this to all offenders without considering risk of re-offense is a very costly proposition. Given all of the legal disabilities imposed by the state, most offenders can't find jobs so the cost of funding this program would likely end up coming out of the state budget. | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |  |  |
| <b>HB0733</b> | <p>Makes it a class 3 felony for a person convicted of certain sex offenses to not disclose this information on an application to be a park district volunteer. If a current volunteer with a park district the volunteer is required to immediately disclose the conviction to the park district upon enactment. Requires park districts to not knowingly employ any volunteer who has been found to be the perpetrator of ANY sex offense and to immediately terminate the services of any such person upon discovery of this information.</p> <p>This was filed as an amendment to a shell bill.</p> | Most people convicted of any sex offense are already prohibited from being present in any Illinois park anyway and probably would be excluded from park district jobs from a simple criminal background check. If a sex offender is no longer required to register and has completed his/her sentence then what is the point of criminalizing his/her attempt to obtain employment? This is the state's attempt to further criminalize a non-criminal, non-violent activity. Legislation that prevents employment of former offenders does little to protect the public and actually has an adverse effect on public safety by helping to keep former offenders unemployed, poor and bored out of their minds.  | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>4/24 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |  |  |

|                        |   |   |                 |   |                           |                           |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">HB1590</a> | <p>Provides that any registered sex offender (RSO) who loses his or her employment must register this in person within 3 days of loss of employment.</p> <p>This was filed as an amendment to a shell bill and is a repeat of SB2912 from last year which passed the Senate on a vote of 047-002-003 but died in the House Judiciary Sex Offenses Subcommittee.</p> | <p>This bill clarifies the existing registration statute and was motivated by a decision in May 2013 in which the Fourth District Appellate Court tossed out a conviction for failure to register an employment change since they ruled that job loss did not constitute a change in "place of employment" pursuant to the Sex Offender Registration Act. State Senator Jason Barickman who co-sponsored SB2912 last year claimed the bill was only clarification rather than a "get tough" bill. This bill means more registration requirements for RSOs at a time of job loss which can be a frequent occurrence for some. The ACLU of Illinois pointed out that SB2912 just layers on more laws and does nothing to improve public safety.</p> | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>4/24 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> | <a href="#">ACLU Opin</a> | <a href="#">Appellate</a> |
| <a href="#">HB2941</a> | <p>Provides that it is a Class A misdemeanor for a CSO to transport a non-familial minor without the consent of the minor's parent or guardian.</p>   | <p>LAYERS ON MORE LAWS AND DOES NOT IMPROVE PUBLIC SAFETY</p> <p>There may be legitimate reasons for a CSO to transport a non-familial minor without explicit consent from the minor's parent or guardian like to bring that minor to a hospital for emergency treatment. Also, since 720 ILCS 5/12-21.6-5 states that it is "unlawful for a parent or guardian of a minor to knowingly leave that minor in the custody or control of a child sex offender, or allow the child sex offender unsupervised access to the minor", technically that parent or guardian can't legally give such consent anyway.</p> <p>NOTE: The same bill has been filed 4 years in a row by Rep. Brown.</p>  | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |                           |                           |
| <a href="#">HB3608</a> | <p>Creates a new restriction in 720 ILCS 5/11-9.4.2 that makes it a Class 4 felony for anyone convicted of a sex offense to be employed by a public or private university, college, or community college.</p>   | <p>Employment restrictions are an ineffective means to manage registrants after they have completed probation/parole and prevent them from fully reintegrating and becoming a meaningful part of society. This restriction further prevents the ability of CSOs to find a job. Since employment restrictions have not been shown to improve public safety they amount to ex-post-facto punishment and are therefore unconstitutional.</p>   | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>3/18 Tabled</b>                                      |                           |                           |
| <a href="#">HB3634</a> | <p>Requires schools to notify the parent of each student at a school when a registered sex offender lives within 500 feet of a school bus stop. This bill was HB2852 last year.</p>   | <p>Registrants are not abducting children from school bus stops and not attacking children on their way to school bus stops so what's the point of this bill? Registrants and their families are already shamed and endangered by having their names and addresses posted on the public registry. This bill serves nothing but political purpose and further feeds the public fear about registered sex offenders.</p>  | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |                           |                           |

|                        |   |  |          |  |  |  |
|------------------------|---|--|----------|--|--|--|
| <a href="#">HB3675</a> | Makes it illegal for a CSO to be present at a county fair or to loiter within 500 feet of a county fair.  | FURTHER OSTRACIZES REGISTRANTS This bill would do little to increase public safety since we know that few sex offenses are committed by strangers and the recidivism rate for registrants is very low. It would add to a growing list of places where registrants are not allowed to go and further ostracize registrants and their families. The need for this bill is questionable since it is based solely on one incident where a CSO was found to be at a county fair in Whiteside County dressed in a costume. Apparently that CSO could not be prosecuted for being there since what he was doing was not against the law. What's next? Do we need laws to ban CSOs from shopping at stores and eating at restaurants since there could be children there too?  | Opponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee |  |  |
| <a href="#">HB3717</a> | Requires that sex offender registration information include the license plate number of any vehicle not registered in the name of the sex offender that the sex offender will operate more than 10 days in a year.  | When will this end? The state keeps adding more and more items to be registered and if a registrant fails to register any of the required information he/she can be found guilty of a felony offense and sent to prison. This is ex-post-facto punishment and needs to be stopped. It may only be a matter of time before the courts srike down added registration requirements as ex-post-facto punishment with a disguise that it is intended to improve public safety.  | Opponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee |  |  |
| <a href="#">HB3742</a> | Provides that the Illinois Student Assistance Commission is authorized to deny and shall immediately revoke a scholarship or grant to any person who has been convicted of a violent crime, as defined under the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act.           | The definition of "violent crime" in the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act is too broad and currently includes all felony sex offenses. What's the point of revoking a scholarship or grant to a person convicted of downloading child pornography or for a 19-year-old having a consensual relationship with a 15-year-old girlfriend? Would it really serve the best interest of the public for this person to not finish a college degree? This would appear to be a counterproductive penal bill rather than something that looks out for the best interest of the public.   | Opponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee |  |  |
| <a href="#">HB3960</a> | Requires that all sex offenders would have to wear a GPS tracking device for 10 years after release from parole rather than just during parole. Those who are current and former street gang members would be required to wear a GPS tracking device while on parole. | This bill casts too wide of a net and would be very expensive to implement. The state would spend a ton of money monitoring mostly boring, unemployed people just to catch maybe one or two people doing something they are not supposed to do. Rather than applying this requirement to all sex offenders for 10 years it would be prudent to consider the formation of a review board that would assess the risk level of each offender (for those to be released from parole) to determine whether he/she poses a risk that would warrant such intensive monitoring. This bill is similar to the other sex offender laws including presence restrictions, residency restrictions and sex offender registration/notification that take a costly and ineffective "one-size-fits-all" approach that doesn't consider risk levels of individual offenders. By narrowly tailoring this bill to only high risk offenders it would be possible to save the state a lot of money while improving public safety. | Opponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee |  |  |

|   |   |   |                  |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|------------------|---|--|--|
| <a href="#">HB4091</a>  | <p>AWA/SORNA compliance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More offenses would qualify for registration.</li> <li>2. Retroactive increase of registration frequency/duration: "sexual predators" - every 90 days for life<br/>other felony offenses - every 6 months for 25 years<br/>misdemeanor offenses - 15 years annually</li> <li>3. More information to register:<br/>Land, air and watercraft owned or operated by the offender<br/>Passports, immigration documents and professional licenses</li> </ol> | <p>This bill would do little to increase public safety and would cost Illinois far more money than it would save in lost Byrne funds from the Federal government. Making RSOs register more frequently or for a longer duration than when the RSO was sentenced is an EX-POST FACTO or RETROACTIVE form of PUNISHMENT and is prohibited by clause 1 of Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution. When applied to NON-VIOLENT offenders who have a LOW RISK of re-offense, registration and the public notification that goes with it is PUNISHMENT for the offender and the offender's family. The landmark U.S. Supreme Court case of Smith v. Doe had determined back in 2003 that sex offender registration laws in Alaska were non-punitive and its retroactive application did not violate ex post facto provisions. However, in light of the additional collateral damage inflicted on registrants and their families by public notification, presence/residency/employment restrictions and now international travel difficulties it is not likely that the U.S. Supreme Court would find today that sex offender registration is non-punitive.</p> | <b>Opponent</b>  | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b>           |  |  |
| <b>Illinois - Select "Proponent" in section "III. POSITION" of Witness Slip</b> |   |   |                  |   |  |  |
| <a href="#">HB0494</a>  | <p>Helps certain individuals with a criminal history to find jobs working for schools 7 years after a felony conviction. Under the changes made to 105 ILCS 5/21B-80, most sex offenders are disqualified from employment but those convicted of Public Indecency (11-30, unless punished as a Class 4 felony) or Prostitution (11-14) will no longer be automatically barred from working for a school.</p>  | <p>This is a step in the right direction. This was a very narrow tailoring of the existing law but may have opened some eyes to what's possible and needed to open up employment opportunities to those with a criminal record.</p>   | <b>Proponent</b> | <b>9/9 Bill Dead - No Positive Action Taken - Amendatory Veto</b> |  |  |

|                        |   |   |           |  |  |  |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| <a href="#">HR0498</a> | <p>Urges the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice and Sentencing Reform to study issues and permit, to the extent that such a determination is appropriate, the mentioned members of the vulnerable population to have a chance to relieve themselves of the stigma of being convicted felons and to have a chance to obtain jobs by having their records sealed</p>   | <p>What's encouraging about this resolution is that it does not exclude sex offenders. It actually states that a review board should review a sex offender's situation to determine if sealing of a criminal record is appropriate after a certain number of years. Presumably any sealing of the record would be accompanied by removal of a sex offender from the registry or at least removal from the public registry.</p>  | Proponent | 5/30<br><b>RESOLUTION ADOPTED</b>                |  |  |
| <a href="#">HB2549</a> | <p>Requires private employers to consider people for employment even if they were previously convicted of one or more criminal offenses. Prohibits discrimination unless the conviction renders the individual unfit or unable to perform one or more of the duties related to the job.</p>   | <p>This is a good bill if it is not eventually amended to exclude sex offenders. Wisconsin has a similar law. This bill is the same as last year's HB2846 (amendment 7) and was co-sponsored by 11 House Democrats. Assuming that this bill may have support from Governor Rauner and with the passage of HB5701 ("Ban the Box") last year, this bill could have a fighting chance. Let's get this bill passed and stop job discrimination against people with criminal records. This bill won't allow sex offenders to work in locations that would prohibit the presence or licensing of someone with a sex offense like parks or schools but it could help to employ people previously convicted of a sex offense.</p>   | Proponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee |  |  |
| <a href="#">HB3212</a> | <p>Permits health care employers to employ those convicted of a felony sex offense 10 years or 25 years after the date of conviction depending on the type of conviction. Most offenses fit into the 25 year category.</p> <p>(Keep in mind that all offenders are eligible to apply for a waiver pursuant to 225 ILCS 46/40. This bill would supersede the need for a waiver 10 or 25 years after the date of conviction.)</p> | <p>This bill is a step in the right direction since 225 ILCS 46/25 currently dictates a lifetime prohibition against hiring those convicted of sex offenses (and many other felony convictions) into the health care field. However, 25 years is a very long time to wait to be employed again and may mean many offenders are too old or have already passed away by the time they are qualified to work again in the healthcare field. Will employers really hire people back into the healthcare field after being out of the field for such a long time?</p> <p>All one-size-fits-all lifetime employment bans (and there are several) should be eliminated from the state statutes since in most cases they do little to actually improve public safety. These bans often mean that ex-offenders have to settle for a lower paying job outside of their field of expertise or no job at all given the stigma of a felony conviction and a lifetime on the public registry.</p> | Proponent | 3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee |  |  |

**Illinois - No Position**

|                        |  |   |                    |   |                                 |                            |
|------------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <a href="#">HB2548</a> | "Stephanie's Law"<br>Gives the courts discretion to require a person convicted of battery to register as a sex offender if the court finds that the battery was sexually motivated.  | Illinois Voices does not support adding more people to an already bloated and ineffective registry that continues to punish people who have already served their time. The collateral consequences of registration and the public notification that goes along with it endangers sex offenders and their families. The current public registry in Illinois includes too many offenders who pose little-to-no public risk, it is too broad to be used as an effective public safety tool, and is a poor use of scarce law enforcement resources. | <b>No Position</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> | <a href="#">Chicago Tribune</a> | <a href="#">Plainfield</a> |
| <a href="#">HB3394</a> | Increases charge for CSO communicating via internet or other digital media for other than a lawful purpose with a minor defined in 720 ILCS 5/11-9.3 (b-20) from a Class 4 felony to a Class 3 felony.                       | Illinois Voices does not believe that lengthening prison sentences will do anything to improve public safety or to prevent such crimes from occurring in the first place. Money would be better spent on educating parents and children on how to best identify and prevent sexual abuse.   | <b>No Position</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |                                 |                            |
| <a href="#">HB3506</a> | Increases the minimum penalty for predatory criminal sexual assault of a child from 6 years to 30 years. Changes Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse of a child under 17 by an adult from a Class 2 felony to a Class X felony. | Illinois Voices does not believe that lengthening prison sentences will do anything to improve public safety or to prevent such crimes from occurring in the first place. Money would be better spent on educating parents and children on how to best identify and prevent sexual abuse.   | <b>No Position</b> | <b>3/27 Rule 19(a) / Re-referred to Rules Committee</b> |                                 |                            |

**City of Chicago:**

|                         |  |  |                 |                       |                                   |                           |
|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">O2014-8</a> | Prohibits RSOs from entering any Chicago Public Library from June-August. Signs would be posted and the penalty would be a fine of \$500-\$1000 for each day the RSO is found to be present. | If enacted, this ordinance would probably face a lawsuit on grounds that it violates the 1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Public Libraries are a fora the state has opened for use by the public as a place for expressive activity. As a result of this designation, the government is limited to imposing only content-neutral time, place and manner restrictions that: (a) serve a significant government interest; (b) are narrowly tailored to advance that interest; and (c) leave open ample alternative channels of communication. An absolute ban on being present in a library for 3 months out of every year may not be considered "narrow" enough tailoring to serve a "legitimate" government interest of protecting children. According to the alderman proposing this ordinance he just wants to protect kids but where's the evidence supporting this bill which indicates that RSOs are harming children at Chicago's public libraries? | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>Failed to Pass</b> | <a href="#">City News Service</a> | <a href="#">Sun Times</a> |
|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|

**U.S. Congress:**

|                        |   |  |                 |  |                             |                           |
|------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">SB1867</a> | International Megan's Law: Senate Version   | See comments below for HR515. This bill apparently would also add an identifying mark to the US Passport of each Child Sex Offender to indicate this information in case it is not effectively communicated to the admitting country in advance of travel.<br><br>Bill was filed on 7/27/2015 - write to Illinois Senator Kirk to ask him to withdraw his support for the bill.  | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>7/27/15 Senate: Read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations</b> | <a href="#">July 27 Sen</a> | <a href="#">Submit Co</a> |
| <a href="#">HR515</a>  | International Megan's Law: Grants the Department of Homeland Security (Angel Watch Center) the authority to provide advance notice to countries when CSOs have plans to travel there and requires DHS to notify registrants in advance when they might be denied travel to those countries based on this notice. Requires the center to establish a mechanism to receive complaints from CSOs affected by these notifications.. | This bill appears to legitimize activities that Department of Homeland Security is already doing. At least there is some decency in this bill to add a complaint process and a notification to the CSO when he/she is likely to be denied entry to a destination country. Most CSOs do not travel with ill intentions and have a low risk for re-offense so to subjecting all CSOs to this law regardless of risk of re-offense makes this law too broad and therefore unconstitutional. | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>2015-12-18 - Message on Senate action sent to the House.</b>                      | <a href="#">Wikipedia</a>   | <a href="#">Govtrack</a>  |
| <a href="#">HR52</a>   | Grants the Department of Homeland Security the authority to deny an RSO who petitions for a visa for a spouse or child if that offender was incarcerated following conviction for 1 year or longer or if in the opinion of DHS granting the petition would put the spouse or child in danger of being sexually abused.  | This bill would prevent some RSOs who have served their time from being able to see their spouse and children again by preventing them from obtaining visas to come to the U.S. On the positive side this is discretionary authority and not a mandate.  | <b>Opponent</b> | <b>1/23/15 Referred to the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security</b>          |                             |                           |