

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings
June 27, 2019
Part of
Public Record

AB 749-1

James W Watt
2322 E Desert Pueblo Pass
Green Valley AZ 85614-5521

jameswwatt@comcast.net

My understanding of the history here. Railroad ("RR") acquires one of the following from a property owner: an easement for RR purposes, title in fee simple or fee simple determinable. When no longer needed for RR purposes, RR does not file for abandonment, but instead, the right-of-way ("ROW") is railbanked when a trail sponsor ("Trail Sponsor") agrees to assume full managerial responsibility and tax and legal liability for the ROW for use as a trail. Rail use is terminated, but not abandoned, because of a change in the law that was likely not in effect at the time the acquisition of the ROW was negotiated. Because of the change in the law, the RR now has the added opportunity to negotiate with the Trail Sponsor for compensation for its ownership of the fee title parcels, probably some kind of payment as a continuity factor made possible as a result of its less-than-fee held parcels, and entitlement to all the compensation paid for future crossings and longitudinal encroachments of the ROW by third parties. The current reversionary interest holders/underlying fee owners as original grantors or successors in interest to the original grantors have even fewer property rights than those with which they began; while the RR, in the absence of an operating rail line, has even more rights than those it acquired initially. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose, by consenting to an agreement with a Trail Sponsor. And now we are witness to an intent to further dilute and confuse the said underlying interest holders' title by tagging onto this limiting extension issue, the qualifying phrase "good cause". Is the objective here to insert a clause so vague in its description that its effect will be to neuter the stated purpose of limiting the number of NITUs for trail use to a maximum of three years? I think not as the expectation associated with STB is that of a much higher standard. "Extraordinary circumstances" is the more appropriate, defining text for this occasion. I support one-year extensions up to a maximum of three years unless extraordinary circumstances for additional extension(s) is shown.