

at this particular point in time. So a second piece of information that we don't have is how much is the property worth, to begin with? The next piece of information that we do not have is, what is the state of the title of this property? Are there any mortgages on the property? Are there any liens on the property? Are there any significant encumbrances on the property? Is this water agreement incorporated into easements on the property which should be considered? Are there any boundary line disputes or other problems that a survey would denote? Has there been a survey? It's my understanding that there has not been a survey of this particular property. What if, for example, this property had an \$80,000 mortgage on it? We don't know if it does or it doesn't. If it does and then there is a water agreement that may cost us something, how do we know what we're getting in this particular proposition? Now, as Senator Johnson and others well know, there are also problems with the environment that can cost an awful lot of money. Has there been any sort of agricultural refueling station on this property? If so, are there any environmental problems? Has gas leaked, soaking through the ground? Is there \$100,000 worth of cleanup that we may need to do there? How does that relate to the value of the property? Is this all worthwhile? We haven't had an environmental audit of this particular piece of property. What is the cost of maintenance once you get this particular piece of property? There has been no evidence, for example, that even for the value that, if even for the purpose for which it is being taken that it's a good piece of property for that purpose. Game and Parks has given us nothing in writing saying that. We assume that they believe that, but if they're asking for legislative approval, it would seem to me that they ought to make some case to us that it's a worthwhile taking of the property. No such affirmative showing has been made by Game and Parks. There has been no public hearing on this particular bill. It would seem to me that when we're going to approve property that maybe it would be good to add to our processes the fact that there should be a public hearing. In fact, I was surprised that the whole authority for taking this land was in an appropriations bill. If you look at the various statutes, at least the ones I could find relating to Game and Parks and relating to the accepting of gifts, it's a little unclear whether under the statutes they could actually accept this property, but if it's in an appropriations bill, I guess that would work. My question would be, why don't we have this down in statute permanently for not just this year but for future reference with regard to how we're going to handle the accepting