

This Document can be made available in alternative formats upon request

State of Minnesota
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FIFTH
SESSION

HOUSE FILE NO. **822**

February 12, 2007

Authored by Clark, Kahn and Mullery

The bill was read for the first time and referred to the Higher Education and Work Force Development Policy and Finance Division

1.1 A bill for an act
1.2 relating to economic development; extending the expiration date for the
1.3 neighborhood revitalization program; amending Minnesota Statutes 2006,
1.4 section 469.1781.

1.5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

1.6 Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 2006, section 469.1781, is amended to read:

1.7 **469.1781 REQUIRED SPENDING FOR NEIGHBORHOOD**
1.8 **REVITALIZATION.**

1.9 (a) The provisions of this section apply to a city of the first class if the following
1.10 conditions are met:

1.11 (1) the city refunded bonds and revenues, derived from increment from a district for
1.12 which certification was requested before August 1, 1979, were pledged to pay the bonds;

1.13 (2) the refunding bonds were issued after April 1, 1988, and before April 1, 1990;

1.14 (3) the refunded bonds' obligations were due and payable in full by the calendar
1.15 year 2002 and the refunding bonds' obligations are payable, in whole or part, during the
1.16 calendar years 2001 through ~~2009~~ 2029; and

1.17 (4) the city had in place during 1989 an ordinance providing for excess increments to
1.18 be distributed under section 469.176, subdivision 2, paragraph (a), clause (4), and the city
1.19 modified the ordinance to eliminate all or part of the distributions of excess increments.

1.20 (b) For calendar years 1990 through 2001, in each year the city must expend for a
1.21 neighborhood revitalization program, as established under section 469.1831, an amount
1.22 of revenues derived from tax increments equal to at least:

1.23 (1) the amount of the additional principal and interest payments that would have
1.24 been due for the year on the refunded bonds, if the bonds had not been refunded; and

- 2.1 (2) the amount of money which would have been distributed as excess increments
- 2.2 under the city ordinance had it not been modified.