

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 18, 1999

LB 176

it, I'd say, I want a legal fence. It would be a four-strand barbed wire fence, with posts not more than one rod apart. And that is considered to be a legal fence in most of the range country of this state. And it's the practical kind of fence that we would want along a trail like that. It's the type of fence you would build to keep cattle confined in a pasture situation, in a range situation. We have determined there's two kinds of fence. There's a fence that divides the prop...a landowner's property. In other words, the landowner owns property on both sides of the trail, and if it were not for the trail, there would need not be any fence. And this amendment says that Game and Parks shall not only be responsible for building that fence, but it shall be responsible for maintaining that fence. Another part of this issue says that where it is just a border fence and does not divide a property owner's property, then Game and Parks shall be responsible for building that fence, but they shall...but the landowner shall be required to maintain that fence. Now, another part of this that is important is, a lot of that trail is already fenced. And where Game and Parks and landowners can agree, that fence will not need to be replaced. But it also says that the Legislature or the Game and Parks can only build as much fence as is appropriated by the Legislature. So I believe this trail is 325 miles long, but if we only appropriate enough money to build 20 miles of fence, that's all that can get built. And certainly, the Game and Parks, in consultation with the landowners, would determine who gets new fence and who doesn't. But being that the case, if it does divide property, Game and Parks will be responsible for the maintenance of that fence where it does divide a landowner's property. We think that this is a good legislation for the landowners who have property that is alongside, or have property that's divided by Game and Parks. And, from that standpoint, it had considerable discussion in the committee. I lost out on one provision, because I thought the landowner should be responsible for 25 percent of the cost of building a fence where it didn't divide the person's property. But, as is the occasion, you win some battles and you lose some battles. I lost that one. They thought Game and Parks should pay for 100 percent of the replacement cost of the fence. I thank Senator Tyson for bringing this issue forward. I think this is an appropriate place to put this amendment, and I am fully supportive.