

248134

Docket #: EP -749 -1 -

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings
July 5, 2019
Part of
Public Record

Elizabeth Lyons
184 Riverview Drive
Susquehanna, PA
18847
dood6262@yahoo.com

NARPO

in regards to the limiting of NITU extensions past the 3 year limit, it is not in the best interest of landowners who properties butt up against these abandoned rail beds. Trail organizers go to great lengths to conceal their intentions to property owners. they leave them out of the loop of what they are doing and when they meet resistance or push back they just file for another extension to wait out the property owner(s). Good cause is not reasonable as it gives an unfair advantage by the very nature of being ambiguous. Rails to Trails can then paint an incomplete picture of their ultimate intentions. It creates anxiety for property owners, leaving them uncertain of the outcomes. Clarity and finality are necessary as part of the judicial system. Not giving finality hinders due process. Good Cause is open to interpretation and by its very nature is ambiguous. This defeats the objective of limiting NITU. Rails to Trails can simply wait out the adjacent property owners or other pockets of resistance to the trail. The Rails to Trails already has an unfair advantage in that they have more money available to fight off the resistors to having trails come through their properties. For instance they will use stalling tactics, bullying letters (of which we as property owners have received from rails to trails) and they will just wait us out. In the meantime owners are left with little resources unless we want to drain our bank accounts to fight a semi-quasi government institution. Limits are necessary to provide equity .