

there was of it along the railroad right-of-way, did not seem to provide much of an impetus. That particular story had a happy ending in that the investor ultimately decided to parcel out the land at a rather onerous price, but nonetheless to the adjoining landowners, or whoever would want to take that upon themselves. I think that we have ample opportunity in the State of Nebraska to provide to the citizens of Nebraska recreational activities in sites that do not, do not provide problems for adjoining landowners.

SPEAKER BAACK: Time. Thank you, Senator Coordsen. We'll now go to Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I rise to support the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill, and it's not just the money. I had the motion this morning to strike the funds from the bill. I readily admitted that I made a mistake when I voted to advance the bill from committee. But let me talk about the bill just a little bit. What this bill does is give the people that want to ride trails the advantage over the adjoining landowners. Now under the current situation, we have had many railroad tracks abandoned in this state. And what usually happens is that the landowners form an association, they buy that abandoned track, then they divide it up amongst the adjoining landowners, and then they farm it again, and they don't have the problems they have now of going around to get on the other side of the track. They farm right across it. And so we've all...we've been reading in the paper recently about this, I think it's just out east of Lincoln where there's a trails group interested and the farmers are interested in it. So what we have is a situation here where we have two entities bidding for it. I say that's the way it should be. This bill pushes the advantage over to the trails people when you look at the intent language in the bill, when it says the Legislature further finds that it is in the public's interest to develop abandoned railroad rights-of-way and to do so through fostering public and private cooperation. See, the intent language in here pushes it over in the other direction, instead of being on a level playing field, these two competing entities are no longer equal and you have the state on the side of the trails people. I don't think that's the way it should be. Also, if you look over on page 4, if you have the bill before you, in Section 6 it talks about eminent domain. I don't know what Section 6 means exactly. It says, the Trail Development Assistance Act shall not be construed to limit the power of