

March 26, 1981

LB 59

I rise to support the advancement of this bill. As I can testify from personal knowledge that it will cost one county, and you guessed right, the county is in my district, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars if we do not pass this bill. And the bill is noncontroversial. The legislation is permissive. Kansas has the same type of a bill, as Senator Carsten said, so does Colorado. So I would ask that you do support this and we move the bill on as quickly as possible. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vickers, do you wish to speak to the motion?

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. Speaker and members, I would like... I wonder if Senator Carsten would respond to a question, please.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: I will try to, Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Senator Carsten, in order for me to more clearly understand the intent of LB 59, would it be fair to say that part of the reason for LB 59 is to shift somewhat the burden onto the landowner or the owner of the mineral rights that have been severed from the land to keep track of the amounts as opposed to the county assessor? Would that be fair to say? At the present time the county assessor is the one that is supposed to determine where those dollars...where those amounts have gone.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Yes, and it is the intent that it would be on a cooperative basis. It would be the mineral right or the landowner in cooperation, yes, with the assessor, right.

SENATOR VICKERS: So that right now, if I understand it correctly, right now the burden is on the county assessor to determine how much has been severed and where and so forth. Is that right?

SENATOR CARSTEN: Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, thank you. I rise to also support LB 59 since part of my district is in the area of the State of Nebraska that has a considerable amount of oil in it, unfortunately not in the immediate area where I live, however. But I think this is an important piece of