

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

February 3, 2000 LB 701

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. For discussion on the Coordsen amendment, Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Schrock, Tyson, Jones, and Coordsen. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the Legislature, this amendment, as I read it, would destroy the whole compromise that's been worked on for the last year and a half and, Senator Coordsen, let me tell you what I...what I think it means and you tell me if this is accurate or not accurate. As I read the amendment, it deals with two different things. It deals with the type of fence, but it also deals with the responsibility for construction and maintenance. And with regard to the type of fence, it says the landowner can say if he doesn't want a railroad type, animal-tight fence. And probably you're right, most of them would say we don't mind having a regular four-strand fence. So, in that regard, there's nothing detrimental about the amendment, as I can see it. However, the other part of it completely destroys the compromise that was sought by Game and Parks and those interested in the development of the Cowboy Trail for this reason. It puts the power totally back in the landowner as to what type of fence he wants and who is responsible for construction and maintenance. It says, this amendment says, the landowner can choose to have a railroad fence, not the type of fence, but the railroad law apply in each and every case. And why wouldn't he have the railroad law apply? Because the railroad law is the law that we sought to compromise. The railroad law is the one that requires both construction and maintenance be on the trail's developer. So in every case the landowner can choose either to have construction and maintenance be entirely on the railroad...on the trail development, Game and Parks in other words, or the landowner can choose to have the construction be paid by Game and Parks but the maintenance be his responsibility, which is what this new law...which is what the compromise is in what is provided. So, if that's accurate, then what...it eliminates all...all compromise that was made, because the landowner obviously will choose, in every case, to put upon Game and Parks the burden that they're seeking to be released from in part now, and will place upon Game and Parks the burden, both of construction and maintenance, for all time at 100 percent. What Game and Parks has been arguing is for the compromise. That is, they will pay