

didn't need the property. Now I have handed out for your perusal a letter signed by Mr. Ferguson who is a member of the Natural Resource Board out there who said they don't need the property. Now I have been told, and I know that nothing is very often certain, but I think it is about a 9 to 4 vote, 9 in favor, 4 against, on the NRD board as to the taking of the property so it is not a unanimous consideration. Secondly, there has been some discussion as to what would happen if the NRD did not get all the money they needed to develop the property. They said the first part they would drop the development of is the Singleton land. That is what they would develop last, in other words. Another thing that they have discussed is there is an implication that if this bill becomes law that there would be no further use of that property. That is not true. The condemnation now covers all the land to the high water line. In some instances that is 200 feet from the Singleton property, to the present water line. There is a difference, I believe, of four feet in elevation. Some places it is only a few feet but the public will have access to shoreline all around this area including the Singleton property. They will have access to shoreline. They will have total access to the lake. If Mr. Singleton develops the property, he cannot sell the land to the waterline, to the complete waterline. The shoreline allows public access. The public can fish. They can walk on the beach. They can do all those things. Now there is some real concern relative to some of the statements that have been made as to whether or not the money will be lost. The money is not going to be lost, and on the contrary, I believe they were going to pay the Singletons \$80,000 for that land. The NRD will get \$80,000 back. They will get \$80,000 back. Now we have many instances, I am sure, where we have public development and private development working side by side. Is it all wrong that there be some private development on some of this land adjacent to the public area? I don't think so. It may well be, again, that it might be developed better. Now if you say we are afraid it is going to be developed improperly, then the zoning laws can apply. The county zoning laws can apply and regulate that. If you are concerned with improper development of that property, and that may be a definite concern, then certainly the zoning laws can be adjusted so as to develop that in line with the county board's thinking. The principal argument I want to advise you here is this.

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have one minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Haberman is justly concerned about it impacting upon a project that has been started. Well,