Approved: March 20, 2001

Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Senator Karin Brownlee at 8:00 a.m. on March 08, 2001 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present: April Holman, Legislative Research Department

Bob Nugent, Revisor of Statutes

Lea Gerard, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Don Mohler, League of Municipalities

Don Seifert, City of Olathe

Neil Shortlidge, City of Roeland Park

Others attending: See attached list.

The Committee proceeded to work **SB 298** and **HB 2034** with the proposed amendments (<u>Attachment 1</u>).

Senator Emler moved, seconded by Senator Steineger, that HB 2034 be amended on Page 2, Line 2 thru Line 6 to strike that wording state, county, political subdivision, state department, board, bureau or fraternal organization, nonprofit organization, estate, trust, business or common law trust, receiver, assignee for the benefit of creditors, trustee or trustee in bankruptcy or any other service user. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

<u>Senator Steineger moved, seconded by Senator Jenkins that the balloon amendments be accepted in HB 2034, Page 1 and 2. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.</u>

<u>Senator Steineger moved, seconded by Senator Emler to approve the balloon language on the third sheet.</u> The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

<u>Senator Jenkins moved, seconded by Senator Steineger that HB 2034 be amended to accept the balloon amendment on Page 3, Line 16 that sunsets the advisory board on July 1, 2005. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.</u>

Senator Emler moved, seconded by Senator Kerr, that HB 2034 be conceptually amended to address the issue of a centralized fund does not mean a state-wide dispatch at one location. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Senator Jenkins moved, seconded by Senator Emler that SB 298, will be amended on Page 4, Line 23, Section (1); Line 29, Section (2); Line 37, Section (3) by adding "necessary and reasonable." The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Senator Emler moved, seconded by Senator Barone, that SB 298 to approve the balloon amendments on Page 5 that addresses liability. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

<u>Senator Wagle moved, seconded by Senator Emler to conceptually amend that the administrator would be required to report to the appropriate Senate and House Committees every two years. Voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.</u>

Senator Emler moved, seconded by Senator Wagle to make this a Senate Substitute Bill for HB 2034. Voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

<u>Senator Kerr moved, seconded by Senator Emler, that HB 2034 be recommended favorable for passage. Motion carries.</u> <u>Senator Jordan, Senator Steineger and Senator Barone wish to be</u>

recorded as passing.

HB 2005

Bob Nugent, Revisor of Statutes, gave a brief overview to Committee members of <u>HB 2005</u> stating it is a product of the joint committee on Economic Development's summer study regarding tax increment financing statutes.

Don Mohler, League of Municipalities, testified in support of **HB 2005** stating the TIF law is a tool for economic development purposes. It has been in existence for a quarter of a century and in that time, approximately 38 TIF projects have been under taken by a small number of cities. The reason for this is the TIF law is incredibly complex. The League under took this project through volunteer hours and interim studies to improve the existing language to help facilitate TIF projects in the future. (Attachment 2).

Don Seifert, City of Olathe, testified in support of **HB 2005** (Attachment 3).

Neil Shortlidge, City Attorney, Roeland Park, testified in support of **HB 2005.** The City of Roeland Park was one of the first cities in the state to use TIF. The city has three redevelopment districts and all three were formed prior to the 1998 amendments. Two of those three districts are multiple project areas. The problem with the amendments made in 1998 is that there was no way of determining what the base year is when you have different project areas that come in different years. This takes it back to the pre 1998 time so it is the establishment date of the district that is the base year throughout the life of the district.

Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting scheduled March 09, 2001 at 8:30 a.m.