

Page 12, line 19. The first thing that I would do is deal with this 36-months provision. Under the bill as it's written, the designation of a project area would remain open for 36 months. My amendment would reduce that to 18 months, and I think that's an excessive amount of time. But when you're negotiating with these hard, tough capitalists then it's...you got to take what you can get. And here is the philosophy behind what I'm offering. None of these designations, in my opinion, should be made by the city or the joint entity unless some project is envisioned. If one is in fact envisioned at the time that a project designation is going to be made, that company has 18 months to begin doing something about getting its act together, so to speak. I wanted to reduce the time to 12 months, the other side wanted 24 months, so in the spirit of negotiating we agreed on 18 months, Senator Janssen, we kind of met in the middle, if you know what I mean. So that's the first part of the amendment. The second part, in line 19, would strike the zero...the period and would add this language, "provided that at the time of any project application being submitted, the project area continues to fit within the definition of blighted and substandard relied on in making the original designation". As I had mentioned the other day, the definition for blighted and substandard is very broad. So if one of those was selected out, let's say they had said there has not been any development of new business enterprises and during this now 18-month period businesses had begun to spring up. The city or joint entity could not then switch the definition of blighted and substandard and still take that property. I want to avoid the situation where development by small operators is discouraged because they are under the hammer for 18 months, which is what would be the case if you adopt this amendment. If you have any questions, I will answer them. But here is an additional part which is not on your amendment, and I know nobody is paying attention, and that's the way I like it when I'm offering an amendment. I would also amend the Coordsen amendment which was AM556. At page 1, line 19, after the word "entity" would be inserted these words, "the date, time and location of the public hearing". So what I am doing by that amendment is saying that when that notice is given, in the way that Senator Coordsen's amendment required, it will include for those people receiving it the date, time and location of the public hearing which is required to be held. And I think that's only reasonable. Everybody is working rapidly and some things will slip past us. I just know that some things far more significant than this have not slipped past us, they have