

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

WAYNE: [RECORDER MALFUNCTION] --Affairs Committee. My name is Justin Wayne, I represent Legislative District 13, which is north Omaha and northeast Douglas County. I serve as Chair of Urban Affairs. We will start off by having committee members and committee staff to self-introductions, starting on the right with Senator Blood.

BLOOD: Good afternoon, Senator Carol Blood, representing District 3, which is Papillion and Bellevue.

TREVOR FITZGERALD: Trevor Fitzgerald, committee legal counsel

M. HANSEN: Matt Hansen in District 26 in northeast Lincoln.

ARCH: John Arch, District 14: Papillion, La Vista and Sarpy.

LOWE: John Lowe, District 37: Kearney, Gibbon, Shelton, still.

ANGENITA PIERRE-LOUIS: Angenita Pierre-Louis, committee clerk.

WAYNE: Thank you. Also assisting us is our committee page, Caroline Hilgert, from Omaha, who is a political science major at UNL. This afternoon, we will be taking up two interim study resolutions, and will take them up in the order listed outside. In light of the recent CDC revised guidance, we respectfully request that you wear your mask and face covering while in the hearing room. Testifiers may remove their mask during testimony to assist committee members and transcribers from clearly, clearly hearing and understanding your testimony. On the table in the back of the room, you will find blue testifier sheets. If you are planning to testify today, please fill out one of those and hand it to Angenita when you come up. This will make sure we keep the record accurate and for testimony. If you do not wish testify, but would like to have your-- to record your presence at the hearing, please throughout the gold sheets in the back of the room. Also, I would note that it's Legislature's policy that all letters for the record must be received by the committee by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the hearing. Any handout submitted by testifiers, we asked you to include them-- if you asked to include them as part of the record, they will be part of the exhibits. We ask that you have 10 copies. If you don't have 10 copies, please hand it to the page before you come up so we can get copies made for the committee. Testimony for each and interim study will begin with the introducer's opening statement. After the opening statement, we will take testimony from the public. Since this is an interim study, there will be no proponents or opponents. We ask that you begin your testimony by giving us your first and last name, spelling, spelling both of them

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

for the record. We'll be using the four-minute light system today. When you begin your testimony, you-- the light will be green. One minute marker, it will be yellow. And the red, we will ask you to wrap up your final thoughts. I'd like to remind everyone, including senators, please turn off or silence your cell phones. With that, we will begin with today's hearing with LR123. Welcome to your Urban Affairs Committee.

TREVOR FITZGERALD: Good afternoon, Chairman Wayne and members of the Urban Affairs Committee. My name is Trevor Fitzgerald, T-r-e-v-o-r F-i-t-z-g-e-r-a-l-d, and I'm introducing LR123 on behalf of the committee. In 2018, the Legislature passed the Occupational Board Reform Act, or OBRA, which became operative on July 1, 2019. The purpose of OBRA was to establish a process for ongoing review and analysis of occupational regulations in Nebraska, with the primary responsibility for such reviews assigned to the 14 standing committees of the Legislature. Although I will note most of that responsibility fell on the Health and Human Services Committee. Under OBRA, an occupational regulation is defined as a statute, rule, regulation, practice policy or other state law requiring an individual to possess certain personal qualifications or to comply with registration requirements to use an occupational title or work in a lawful occupation. Beginning in 2019, each standing committee is required to annually review and analyze approximately 20 percent of the occupational regulations within the jurisdiction of the committee and prepare and submit an annual report to the Clerk of the Legislature by December 15. The report shall include the committee's recommendations regarding whether the occupational regulations should be terminated, continued or modified. There are currently four occupational regulations that have been identified as under the jurisdiction of the Urban Affairs Committee. The committee conducted its first occupational regulation review in 2020, but did not hold a public hearing on last year's review due to the COVID-19 pandemic. LR123 was introduced by the committee in order to facilitate the review this year of the occupational regulations for radon specialists and technicians. A copy of a draft report is included in committee materials for your consideration, and I will briefly highlight the findings of that draft report at this time. Radon is a cancer-causing colorless, odorless gas that is the leading cause of lung cancer among nonsmokers. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, Nebraska has the third-highest rate of radon in the country. Nebraska has required the licensure of individuals and businesses involved in the measurement and mitigation of radon since 1988. General rules and regulations authority to require licensure related to radioactive

Rough Draft

material was added to the Radiation Control Act in 1987, with specific authorization for the registration or licensure of persons providing measurement and mitigation services of radon or its decay products added in 1990. While the Radiation Control Act contains a number of other provisions related to radioactive materials, X-rays, medical, medical radiography and nuclear power plants, the licensure provisions for radon professionals have, have only been substantively amended three times. Most notable among those three substantive changes, the act previously provided for two separate classes of licensure related to radon measurement and mitigation specialists and technicians. The licenses for technicians were eliminated in 2008 as the licensing requirements for both specialists and technicians had become indistinguishable. As a result, Nebraska currently requires licenses for two radon-related professionals: radon measurement specialists and radon mitigation specialists. Under Nebraska Revised Statutes Section 71-3507 the Department of Health and Human Services should require licensure of persons providing measurement and mitigation services of radon or its decay products in order to protect the occupational and public health and safety and the environment. Rules and regulations establishing education, experience, training, examination and continuing competency requirements for radon measurement specialists and radon mitigation specialists can be found in the Nebraska Administrative Code Title 180, Chapter 11, and these rules and regulations are also included in your materials. The department currently employs 3.25 full-time equivalent, or FTE, support staff to oversee the licensing of radon measurement specialists and radon mitigation specialists. The annual budget for the licensing program, which is funded using cash funds and federal grant dollars from the U.S. EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, was \$316,475 in fiscal year 2021. Over the past five years, the department has issued a total of 761 radon licenses, including 160 new radon measurement specialist licenses, 387 radon measurement specialist license renewals, 64 new radon mitigation specialist licenses, and 150 radon mitigation specialist license renewals. During the same period of time, the department has only revoked two licenses, and no license applications have been denied during that time. Currently, 25 states and the District of Columbia have some form of radon licensure certification. The state of Colorado also recently passed legislation to introduce radon licensure in their state, which would bring the total number of states with either licensure or certification to 26, and a map showing states with radon licensure is included in the, in your draft report. Dr. Anthone from the Department of Health and Human Services is here to testify behind me, but I would also be happy to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

answer any questions the committee may have about the report or the OBRA process at this time.

WAYNE: Any questions from the committee? I don't care if we ask staff questions, he's used to it after redistricting so. Seeing none. OK, thank you. Again, since this is an interim study, we don't have proponents or opponents, so we'll invite our first testifier from the public, if there is any.

GARY ANTHONE: Good afternoon, Chairman Wayne and members of the Urban Affairs Committee. My name is Gary Anthone, G-a-r-y A-n-t-h-o-n-e, I'm the director and chief medical officer for the Division of Public Health within the Department of Health and Human Services. I'm here to testify in a neutral capacity to LR123. The Nebraska radon program manages licensure of radon measurement specialists and radon mitigation specialists under the Radiation Control Act. Radon is a cancer-causing colorless, odorless gas that is the leading cause of lung cancer among nonsmokers. Radon problems can be diagnosed and mitigated to lower Nebraskans' exposure to this carcinogen, and the professionals who work in this industry make a significant impact on public health. The Nebraska radon program has been active since 1988. In the previous five calendar years, the program has issued 160 new measurement specialist licenses, 387 measurement special-- specialist license renewals, 64 new mitigation specialist licenses and 150 mitigation specialist license renewals. Licenses must be renewed every two years. The program also licenses businesses in the radon industry. The program does not receive any general funds. It's funded through a combination of cash funds from licensing fees and federal grants from the EPA Agency's State Indoor Radon Grant. In order to be licensed as a radon mitigation or radon measurement specialist, individuals must be at least 19 years of age, be a citizen or lawful resident of the United States, and have completed a training course and pass an examination approved by DHHS. Applicants for licensure must also possess any combination of relevant postsecondary education or work experience. Nebraska's regulations ensure work practices remain fair and safe, and that professionals in the industry are held to appropriate standards. However, there is room for improvement and regulations and statutes affecting the radon measurement and mitigation professionals, and I'm looking at these in light of your review. For example, radon measurement businesses, as well as mitigation businesses, should be able to file their reports online now. This would ease the administrative burden of filing required reports. Additionally, we are looking at revising 180 NAC 11, which governs both radon measurement and radon mitigation specialist to adopt national consensus standards and protocols for radon measurement

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

and radon-- and mitigation compiled by the American National Standards Institute for the American Association of Radon Scientists and Technologists. This will make it easier for radon professionals to work across multiple states and jurisdictions. Additionally, for both radon measurement and radon mitigation specialists, the combination of relevant education and work experience could be reduced to two years from one year, and the age obtain-- to obtain certification could be lowered from 19 to 18 to reduce barriers to entry. Both our neighboring states of Iowa and Kansas have an age requirement of 18 for these professions. Additionally, Kansas simply requires a 16-hour course for radon measurement specialists and a 24-hour course for radon mitigation specialists instead of two years of relevant education experience. These are just some recommendations to reduce the regulatory and statutory burdens on these professions. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

WAYNE: Senator Blood.

BLOOD: Thank you, Chairman Wayne, and thank you for coming in today. I just have a general question, and it may not be something you know the answer to. But I'm curious, we're looking in Nebraska that we recommend two years of education as opposed to 16 hours or 24 hours. What is the difference in what they learn, because that seems like a huge gap to me, do you know?

GARY ANTHONNE: Thank you, Senator Blood. It is a huge gap, and we're thinking about reducing it from a one-year combination of either postsecondary education or one year of work experience from the two years that are now required. So it's still a decrease in the amount, but it's still enough that we think is enough to do to obtain that license.

BLOOD: So when we say work experience what you really couldn't have without education, then like an apprenticeship wouldn't be something that they could do or--

GARY ANTHONNE: Yes. And I do have the guidelines, and I can get these to the senators of what that work experience or postsecondary education requirements are. But just for brief work experiment-- experience means being in the design, construction or renovation industry, heating, HVAC, air conditioning systems, things of that nature for work experience.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

BLOOD: And we did get a really nice history because Trevor is really great about stuff like that. Do you know, kind of off the top of your head, why we decided originally to do the two years?

GARY ANTHONE: I do not.

BLOOD: OK. I told you it might not be something you knew the answer to, but--

GARY ANTHONE: Yes.

BLOOD: --those are the questions that are in my head right now.

GARY ANTHONE: Like, like I mentioned in the testimony, you know, some states have none of the work or experience or postsecondary education requirements.

BLOOD: Which seems weird because it's so important. I mean, I understand some requirements, but I like that you want to lower the age and some of the other suggestions you gave us. But I was really curious why such a wide spread? I find that part concerning.

GARY ANTHONE: Thank you

BLOOD: Thank you.

WAYNE: Any other questions. I have a general question. It has really nothing to do with this. But since you're here, I'm going to ask it. Do you think the COVID vaccinations are safe?

GARY ANTHONE: I do think they're safe. I mean--

WAYNE: What is your office doing to help spread that positive message that this is safe and should be done?

GARY ANTHONE: You know, we've been recommending vaccination since the day they came out, so we've been trying to promote that.

WAYNE: Thank you. Any other questions from the committee? Seeing none, thank you for being here today. Any other public? This is so weird, because I usually do proponents and opponents-- who's for or against this? I need to know. But any other public testifiers? OK. Going once, going twice, three times, nobody. Trevor, would you like to close on your LR? OK. All right, that closes the hearing on LR123 and we will move to LR126. Senator Blood, would you chair this interim, this part of the interim study?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

BLOOD: Sure.

WAYNE: Because I'm doing the LR126 opening. It doesn't really matter a whole lot, because I don't know if I'm asking questions, but we'll see. All right, good afternoon. I usually go there, but I'm not because of COVID. It will just keep from moving around so much and having people wipe down things. Good afternoon, my name-- Sandra Blood, the "interim study vice chairwoman", Senator Blood. My name is Justin Wayne, J-u-s-t-i-n W-a-y-n-e, and I represent Legislative District 13, which is north Omaha and northeast Douglas County. LR126 is the final of three interim study resolutions that I've introduced this year, taking a look at different provisions of the Community Development Law with an eye toward potentially making some clarifying changes to the law this upcoming legislative session. LR126 is designed to examine the process of how areas designated as blighted or extremely blighted would actually become unblighted. This has been interesting for the last four years, having this conversation. If the point of tax increment financing is to develop substandard and blighted property, then at some point, if they're being successfully-- they are properly used and it's successful, it would obviously make sure that it should be unblighted at some point. Historically, there has been a handful of instances in which municipalities have removed the blighted designation, but there's not actually a process spelled out in our community development law, primarily because we've been working on other things with Senator Groene, so we haven't got to this point. But we will work on it this year. While some city attorneys will likely argue that it can be logically can be undone and they do have the authority to do so, the Dillon's Rule makes it a little confusing for everybody to remove blighted designations if the city lacks the legal authority to do so. My office has asked representatives from several cities that have removed blighted designation in the past to testify this afternoon or to discuss the process they utilized to make sense of how we can codify it this upcoming session to put it in statute. Aside from simply giving municipalities the statutory authority to remove the blighted designation, one of the issue I also wanted to start discussing as part of the study is the regular review of areas that have been designated as blighted. Central-- certain neighborhoods in Omaha, like Aksarben, midtown are prime examples of TIF success stories, but many Nebraskans can't legitimately question whether the area should still qualify for TIF after they, if you drive through them and you see the success that has been done. At the same time, TIF project repayment period can only last 15 years or 20 years in extremely blighted areas. We have to be careful that we do not inadvertently jeopardize the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Urban Affairs Committee October 22, 2021

Rough Draft

financing of TIF projects since if they get removed or removed from the blighted designation. Part of the discussion also includes that we review the process we would like to use and how to do it, the initial process. So with that, I hope the individuals who are here to testify can help us codify this process to make sure it's clear that you have the authority to unblight areas. And with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

BLOOD: Does anybody have any questions for Senator Wayne? OK. With that, we ask that our invited testifiers come up and speak.

CHAD NABITY: We'll try not to all run up here at once.

BLOOD: Welcome to the Urban Affairs Committee.

CHAD NABITY: Thank you very much. And there's my blue sheet. Senator Wayne, thank you for bringing this matter before the Legislature for study and review. Committee members, thank you for your time and consideration. My testimony will address the four main points of LR26. And I moved my name and address to the bottom of this, so I will go back and introduce myself. I'm Chad Nabity. I am-- that's Chad Nab-as in boy-i-t as in Tom-y, and I am the planning director for Grand Island and Hall County and also the CRA director for the City of Grand Island. One of the primary concerns with. And so I'll be addressing all four items. Item one One of the primary concerns with the blighted designation is terminology. Area residents and property owners are always concerned and sometimes insulted when the city considers declaring their home business or neighborhood blighted and substandard. It would be better to designate better to be able to designate them as a redevelopment area and to refer to them as redevelopment areas. That name change, if it could be done, would reduce the stigma attached to the declaration, and the property owners are less likely to take offense. The second issue I have with the process in determining the purpose-- is determining the purpose of sending a blight study to the Planning Commission for review. The Planning Commission has a direct role in the approval of a redevelopment plan to review the plan for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan for the City. All comprehensive plans call for redevelopment of areas that are deteriorating, so a blight study by definition is consistent with the comprehensive plan. It would make sense to me that a blight study could be presented to the council and they could choose to set a hearing date or not for them to make a decision on whether to declare an area blighted and substandard. As prices, especially for housing, continue to rise and the lack of housing, available housing is impacting communities' ability to grow

Rough Draft

and employers ability to hire employees and expand, many communities are using TIF to directly support the development of housing: affordable, low-income, workforce and market rate. This has pushed developers and communities to push for more greenfields blight designations and governing bodies to allow designations that technically meet the requirements. A review of the ways to allow TIF to be used, possibly for a shorter time prior or time period in these greenfield areas would be appropriate. Maybe with a moderate blight designation, the numbers of four extremely blighted areas are updated annually as a five year rolling average of the ACS, American Community Survey, is released. It is my opinion that the designation as extremely blighted needs to be confirmed each year based on updated numbers. I have provided examples and they're included with this of how this would have worked in Grand Island between 2015 and 2019. The 2020 ACS numbers are not yet available. There is-- back and forth designation on an annual basis is a disincentive to adopting this tool. It would make more sense if there were a three or five-year period after first qualifying that an area can be considered extremely blighted. Any census tract that is on the bubble of that 20 percent number is likely to change from year to year. Item two. There is not a statutory process specific to removing a blighted designation. The times that I have been involved in removing a designation, it has been done using the same process as declaring an area, including public hearings before the Planning Commission council and ultimately council passing a resolution to remove or redraw the area. If changes were to be made, I would suggest a single resolution process by the governing body and a provision that allows any existing projects to continue to receive, receive the ad valorem payments based on contracts that were approved prior to the removal of the designation. The question of whether an area can be deblighted with an active project is one that no community wants to be the test case for in court, so it is easier not to deblight an area that has active projects. Would the community likely to continue with three and four? Or you do have my testimony before you.

BLOOD: Mr. Nabity, why don't you just give us a smaller version of it and we'll let you wrap it up.

CHAD NABITY: OK, thank you very much. I have included the May 1 TIF report from 2021 for the City of Grand Island. With that are my staff does review all of our blighted and substandard areas. We look specifically to whether there are active projects and if that area is at least five years old. If it's newer than five years old, we make the assumption that there's still the likelihood that something will happen there. We did make a-- we did suggest that council rescind one

Rough Draft

of those. They have not done that because it's such a small area that it just doesn't make a whole lot of difference. But and then if you're going to regularly review blighted and substandard areas, especially the oldest ones, I hope we can agree that those older ones were probably the most blighted areas of the community in the most need. And in Grand Island, for example, that would be our downtown area and northeast Grand Island. And all of those properties, or virtually all of those properties, are 25 years older than when they were first designated, the infrastructure is 25 years older. There are still blighted conditions there, and they're likely to continue, and it was a large area that was designated all at once as opposed to a smaller area. So I hope that that would be taken into consideration if review is required. Thank you for your time and consideration. I'd be happy to take any questions and to work with the committee should you choose to make any specific changes to the program.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. Nabity. Let's see if there's any questions. Senator Arch.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Blood. I, I have a question on, on if this, if this-- if there's a process for deblighting or unblighting, I'm not sure which is the appropriate term.

CHAD NABITY: Whichever.

ARCH: It-- could you then reblight? Could you, in other words, do you, do you ever see where an area could, could move out of that blighted category and then move back into it? If, if these numbers are done annually, do they vary that much?

CHAD NABITY: Extremely blight-- are we talking extreme blight?

ARCH: Well, I'm not sure.

CHAD NABITY: OK.

ARCH: I'm not sure. I'm just wondering, I'm just wondering if you're doing it on an annual basis, are you sometimes one year you will be over that line and the next year you won't be?

CHAD NABITY: Yes, with extreme blight, that is very much the case. And if you look at the information that I provided as backup to my testimony, you will see that there are two census tracts that over the past five years, one of them has been-- would, would have qualified as extremely blighted in four of the five years. In 2019, it did not. And one of them would have qualified as extremely blighted in 2018, the

Rough Draft

only year of those five years and not in 2019. And it's because the poverty, it's based on poverty rate in that census tract of more than 20 percent based on the five-year rolling average that rolling average changes. If you're at 20.1 percent this year, what are the odds that you're at 19.9 percent the next year? Reasonably good. If you're at 30 percent, you're probably not going to drop below 20, but if you're on that bubble, it will make that difference.

ARCH: OK, thank you.

BLOOD: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Nability. It's nice to see you again.

CHAD NABILITY: Good to see you.

BLOOD: Next, invited testimony, please. Thought you'd all be running and pushing each out of the way to get up here.

JENNIFER TAYLOR: [INAUDIBLE] anyone else besides me.

BLOOD: Welcome to the Urban Affairs Committee.

JENNIFER TAYLOR: Thank you, Senator Blood. Good afternoon, Senators, my name is Jennifer Taylor, J-e-n-n-i-f-e-r T-a-y-l-o-r, and I am assistant city attorney for the city of Omaha. This is not my first trip in front of this committee, so I think you're well aware of the fact that I, I spent a fair amount of time working with the city of Omaha administering our tax increment financing program. So I was invited to appear today primarily to explain the one time the city of Omaha has removed a blight designation. I also don't know if it's deblight, unblight. I tend to use the phrase remove a blight and substandard designation from an area, the process for which we used to do that and to answer any questions I might be able to provide for the committee if you have questions. So as has been discussed, probably in more than one hearing on TIF in front of this committee, the city of Omaha designated an area around TD Ameritrade Park or TD Ameritrade, the building near Westroads several years ago as blighted and substandard. Subsequently, the city of Omaha did pass, city council passed a resolution that removed that designation from that area. What the city determined at the time was that if the city had the authorization via the city council to establish, to determine and establish a blighted and substandard designation for a particular area, then the city should, in theory, have the right to remove such designation by the same process. We did not go back through planning board, but we did go through a public hearing at the city council

Rough Draft

level, passed a resolution that removed that designation from the area because the designation was given, implemented by resolution. So that was our, that was our logic there, and I think it's a defensible position to take that the city would have the right to do that. To Senator Wayne's point, though, there could very well be an argument made that because the State Legislature has so completely entered the fray when it comes to community development law that if that right is not given to them specifically within that law, that we do not have that right. So as to whether or not some communities would argue we do or we don't, I think to the extent that the State Legislature sees fit to provide specifically within the law that right to communities to remove a said designation, I don't think there's really an issue with that. And if that's what the Legislature chooses to do, I think that makes sense, so as to clear up any confusion that there might be. So then that would lead us to how you go about doing that. Is that a process to which you want to give some discretion to communities as to how they see how best to implement said right? Or do you want to give some guidance in that respect? And I think at least most communities, Omaha in particular, is open to a dialogue and a conversation and options as to what those options would be. I have some concern about a program that would require proactive, regular review of all areas simply because, at least for the city of Omaha, that's a fairly significant amount of area to proactively undertake. A review could be difficult for staff to actually undertake, especially on an annual or even every five year basis. But the city would be more than happy to try and come up with a program where we would identify areas that maybe appear to, at least in general, have met the qualifications that would no longer be deemed to be substandard and blighted, such as maybe Aksarben, review those areas and embark upon possibly removing that designation. But there is a lot of different issues, as were brought up by the gentleman from Grand Island, that you want to make sure you don't somehow negatively impact existing redevelopment agreements, existing financing agreements or existing projects as well. So I think there's a number of things that we should probably consider and discuss as we try to go forward in giving this right to the communities. And I'm happy to answer any questions I can.

BLOOD: Thank you, Ms. Taylor. Are there any questions? Senator Arch.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Blood. When you removed that blighted designation to that area out there at the Old Mill did that, did that affect tax increment financing?

JENNIFER TAYLOR: There was only one project in that area, and that was the TD Ameritrade building. And actually, at the same time the city

Rough Draft

council removed the designation, we also rescinded the redevelopment agreement because the terms of the agreement had been completed. So what the city did at that time was it terminated and rescinded the redevelopment agreement so that we were no longer obligated to remit excessive ad valorem taxes because the provisions of what we had wanted to do under that agreement had been completed. And then the resolution by which we removed the designation indicated that the purpose for implementing the designation was substandard street infrastructure. And because of the project that we undertook, the substandard street infrastructure had been addressed and so that evidence of blight no longer existed. And therefore it was reasonable for us to remove the designation. And that's actually another thing that needs to be considered if we look into how we would do this, you also, I think logically need to look at the reasons a community establishes a designation for a particular area. And then in removing that designation, I think it's only logical that you must be able to state that those reasons probably no longer exist. And for some areas, especially larger ones, you may have places where in parts of the redevelopment area, maybe those conditions don't exist anymore, but in parts of that redevelopment area, they still exist. So is there an opportunity to remove a designation from a portion of a redevelopment area that was established, but not all of it? Again, another thing that we probably need to consider as we move forward.

ARCH: Thank you.

BLOOD: Thank you, Senator Arch. Are there any other questions? I do have a question. During your testimony, you talked about proactive reviews. Can you better define that for me, what you're thinking when you say that?

JENNIFER TAYLOR: That would just be my concern of, for example, requiring a community or a city to review all of its community redevelopment areas on an annual basis.

BLOOD: OK.

JENNIFER TAYLOR: So if we were required to proactively go out, get new numbers and make new reviews of each one of those areas. For some communities that have a smaller area that might be possible. For the city of Omaha that would be almost prohibitive.

BLOOD: That, that would be another unfunded mandate for you, wouldn't it?

JENNIFER TAYLOR: Yes.

BLOOD: All right. Thank you so much for defining that for me.

JENNIFER TAYLOR: No problem.

BLOOD: Again, any other questions? No? Thank you so much for coming today, Ms. Taylor.

JENNIFER TAYLOR: Thank you for your time.

BLOOD: Would anybody else like to come forward? Calling once. No? All right, would you like to close, Senator Wayne?

WAYNE: Yes. Basically, we would be looking at trying to figure out how to do this. And I mean, the simple answer is maybe [INAUDIBLE] as TIF is 15 years and extremely blighted is 20 years, maybe just every 15, 20 years there has to be a review of those areas, might be the simplest solution. I don't know how people feel about that, but we will be looking at legislation in this upcoming session and so just be, be aware of it. Thank you.

BLOOD: Thank you, Senator Wayne. With that, we're going to close the hearing today on LR126.

WAYNE: That closes-- that concludes our entire hearing for the interim study and see everybody in January. Thank you.