

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But all the property surrounding it would not have been annexed. So what we have, we could have a blight, an area designated blighted and substandard. Within that blighted area is a blighted project area which is smaller. All the rest of the area other than that blighted project area could belong to one person or several people. And when the city decided that it's going to annex, that would not be considered an easement for the city. They would have to condemn that property and take it if the owner did not want to sell it. Would that be correct?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, I think I lost you on the last couple of sentences. I mean, when the city annexes they don't, obviously as you know they don't need eminent domain. That's...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's what I want to make clear.

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's making it a part of the city, that's not taking the property.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right. So the ownership of that land that would be annexed still remains with whoever the owner is.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Oh, absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And the annexation changes nothing as far as ownership of the land.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Changes nothing as to the fee ownership of the land. Obviously it changes some of the rights and privileges of the landowner with respect with who it deals in terms of utilities and some things like that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, and it would create duties on the person who owned the land which had been annexed?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: To the city. Like if the city levies some kind of fee, then that land which now is annexed would be subject to every duty or burden that any piece of property that had been a part of the city would be burdened by.

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's correct.