

April 15, 1983

LB 410

investigation of NPI and checked further into UNO and how desperate these poor people are with these homes that are going to sell at maybe \$400,000 apiece. I may change my mind on 410 but until I have more personal knowledge of exactly what the money is going for, I am going to oppose it since I have been asked by a friend to look into it. Thank you.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President, colleagues, let me just make a couple of brief remarks to clarify some of the things that have been said, particularly about the desires of the property owners and particularly about the amendment that I intend to present on Final Reading. Now with respect to the property owners, the problem is that by purchasing these four properties, in many respects we are simply moving the problem further west. Now in my opinion it is not entirely correct to say that all these people want to sell their land. I mean I have met with those four couples that own those four houses. I have met with each of the...and talked to each of the eight of them and each of them has a slightly different view on what they would like to see. Some of them would like to stay there indefinitely and some of them would like to move, some of them aren't sure what they want to do. Among those eight people there are even some splits spouse to spouse and some, in one case, a husband feels significantly differently than the wife and I hear from both of them, so you can't really say that all of them want to move because that, I don't think, is a correct statement of fact. Now, secondly, even if they did want to move, why all you are doing is pushing the problem west. Right now many of those want to move because they have the University in their back yard or in their front yard or side yard. Well as soon as you buy four lots or eight lots then another line of houses is going to have the University in their front yard or back yard or side yard and their property is going to be equivalently depreciated. Now the University's answer to that and Senator Goodrich's answer to that is, well this new boundary is going to be permanent. Those people that are on the firing line after this next move are going to know that they are going to be, that the University has no designs on their property in the indefinite future. Now the problem with that argument is that the University cannot contractually bind itself to that and history has shown that those kinds of assurances have not necessarily been borne out. So all we are going to do is, as I indicated before, the likely result is to transfer this devalued property problem, the problem of people being locked into houses they would like to sell, a couple of lots further to the west. We are not going to solve it permanently by any means. As the Univer-