

take a look at this between now and Select File, Senator Fisher, to make sure that when read in the context of previously enacted legislation that we haven't created something that was not your intention. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I think Senator Coordsen has struck an interesting chord because I happen to be a supporter of LB 830 and I think that 494 has a good deal of overlap with that, Senator Coordsen. I think you're right to point that out. And, Senator Coordsen, let me quote to you a provision in this measure on page 3. If you'll take a look at lines 14 through 20 because it is in an intent section and I don't think it's a grant of authority, but if you'll take a look at line 20 on page 3, the word eminent domain does appear in this statute. Subsection 3 says "to relocate in or around the same local political subdivision in this state, projects to replace projects all or a major portion of which have been acquired for one or more public purposes by the United States of America, the State of Nebraska, or any branch, arm agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision of either, whether by purchase, through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, or by other means." Now that citation of eminent domain is in the intent section, not the list of powers. I, too, need to take a look at the rest of that. I don't find the eminent domain otherwise used in the bill. What I generally find are corporate powers and bonding powers for the purposes of taking over this land. The point you raise is a good one, that is, this is not about Grand Island. This is about the State of Nebraska. This is not one project, this is a mechanism for any number of projects which could be done in a wide number of locations in the state. I think your line of questioning is fair and reasonable because it takes us out of the context of the Grand Island ammo dump and puts us into the proper perspective. Now I happen to be a supporter of LB 830 and I think the idea of being able to use land, clear it, redevelop it, put it in the hands of private ownership and getting it back on the tax rolls is a wise one, but it's fair to say that the question that you raise has some implications here. This, through a second mechanism, would achieve some of the same goals and it would use this revenue bond mechanism, but with the approval of the county board to use this. There is that reference on eminent domain, I've not found another one in the bill and I don't think that one is a grant of authority of