

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

February 3, 2000 LB 701

landowner the maintenance. And then it goes on to provide the type of fence may be, and then it defines a legal fence or any other type of fence as agreed on by the commission and the adjoining landowner. That language is out of the current legal fence statute. What this amendment provides, that even in the event that the railroad right of way crosses, divides, private property, that the adjoining landowner has the ability to ask the commission for a different fence, or no fence at all. I believe Senator Schrock was accurate when he said that he did not believe there had been any railroad type fence built to date by the NRDs in their cases or, in the case of the Cowboy Trail, on a state-owned trail. I doubt that that situation will change in the future, but by maintaining the...maintaining that underlying responsibility I believe that we've maintained a couple of points in there which are guaranteed access for divided property and some protection from liability for the landowner in the event of an accidental or purposeful trespass that results in injury to the trespasser. It does something a little bit different than what the Schrock amendment provided with respect to the request, is that the request must be a positive step taken by the landowner. And I would bet you money, marbles and chalk that Game and Parks will not be reluctant to inform a landowner of their rights under this...this particular situation. They may not...they may or may not under the other provision, which puts the burden on the landowner in a different...different fashion, sort of a discovery type mechanism. So I would encourage, quite frankly, adoption of what is, in my mind, the Cattlemen's amendment, the people that are actually impacted by the Cowboy Trail that must live along the Cowboy Trail, and know what they want with respect to their relationship with Game and Parks as to fencing, that we give to them the ability to modify the statutory requirements at their request. And I would suspect that two things happen: one, a much greater degree of contentment on the part of the landowner in being given a choice; and a much significantly reduced cost for trail development to Game and Parks Commission. I don't know how we could go wrong, and I suppose somebody will explain to me how we could go wrong, but I really don't see how we could go wrong with adopting this particular amendment to the committee amendment as it currently exists, and that, Mr. President, concludes my opening.