

probably would happen, but just to make it absolutely clear that these have to be public parking facilities as opposed to some sort of private parking lot for commercial facility use only is to insert the phrase "public". Then comes the striking of the phrase "pedestrian shopping mall or plaza". Again I am not sure that it would be constitutional or legal to use these types of bonds to fund these types of things, but just to make it absolutely clear I move to strike this language. I think that it opens the door for perhaps broader use of tax increment financing than I feel is necessary, and would move for the adoption. The final amendment deals with the question of relocation of people and building of replacement housing. Now tax increment financing is to be used only when an area is blighted, and interestingly enough in the proposed area that Senator Nichol mentioned that may be a use of tax increment financing, there are people living in a housing authority house or apartment complex there, renovated all their apartment complex, and I guess it looks like that may be blighted if this area is going to be used for tax increment financing. In any case, there are people on the block. It is my feeling that if we are going to give powers for tax increment financing for government to utilize this mechanism and if this power is going to be used to tear down housing in which people are living, that there is some sort of responsibility, we have a responsibility and the redevelopment authority has a certain responsibility first to the individuals living in those houses or small businesses, or whatever there might be there, to provide some sort of relocation assistance. If the power of the state is going to come in and basically take the block over to clear it for development, I think those people have the right to expect that the government would assist them in finding new property. So that is the first part. We cite state law with regards to relocation such as in other public projects such as roads and so on and indicate that that should be followed in this procedure as well. The second part of this is that if again these projects are going to destroy existing housing, feel that the community development authority has some sort of responsibility in its plan to make sure that a replacement housing is built in the community so that the tax increment financing projects do not decrease the amount of housing available in a community. We just heard yesterday very passionate statements about that there is a shortage of housing, that that there is real problems in the housing market. Well, I don't think we want government to move in and even further reduce the amount of housing. So this is kind of a general statement that if a project calls for demolition of occupied housing, that