

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

February 10, 2000 LB 701

it leaves it up to the landowner to decide what kind of a fence he wants. Senator Coordsen mentioned that if you didn't want no fence at all, well, that'd be okay, but I do have one person along it that wanted a sheep-type fence and that's still okay under Coordsen's amendment, because they can ask for the type of fence that they want. So if they have a big operation and they happen to have their calving corral right along the side of this and they want a woven fence there for maybe just a short distance they can request that too. So I think it fits everybody's thinking on it and I sure hope that it can be voted on and put on the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Jones. Senator Beutler, on the Coordsen amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the Legislature, it seems to me, in reading the amendment, that there's been a really good faith effort on the part of Senator Coordsen and on the part of Senator Schrock and Game and Parks to come up with something that's reasonable. It's a little different in structure than the original Coordsen amendment, but I'm not sure that it puts either side at any significant greater or lesser advantage. It seems to be a win-win situation. Senator Crosby, I haven't talked to the trails people, since this amendment was just drafted this morning, but I know they supported the original LB 701 and I assume that they would now support, with this amendment, the Coordsen amendment simply because, if for no other reason, it represents a vast improvement from the part...from the perspective of those who would like to see the trail develop under reasonable circumstances. So I...it seems to me that this is one of those situations that we can all count as good. I'm a little taken aback by Senator Jones' interpretation and maybe, Senator Coordsen, I would...I would direct a question your way.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR BEUTLER: There's a certain type of fence that's identified in the...in your new amendment and I assume that a landowner could not both ask and require Game and Parks to pay for a fence that was more expensive or complicated than that type of identified fence. Isn't that correct?