

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

March 28, 2006 LB 898

The meetings, executive sessions of the Omaha School Board, were held March 7, 21, and June 1. Now the announced reasons for these three executive sessions were to discuss the student assignment plan, which governs the students attend what schools within the Omaha Schools, a lawsuit filed in 2003 by the OPS state officials. Those were the reasons. The law also allows executive sessions for strategies on how matters such as labor negotiations, real estate purchases, and pending litigation. This was a comment by their attorney. There are no pending lawsuits involving the student assignment plan, and when the takeover proposal was announced, Peterson emphasized that it was separate from the funding lawsuit. So what I did, this caused me to take a look at the web site of the Omaha Public Schools. So what I did is we pulled up the different minutes of the different board meetings that were held in the spring. On your desk, you should have a copy of these meetings, and I'll just go through. I just pulled up some of them. On March 7, if you look at their executive session, they talked about negotiations, school funding, student assignment plan. April 4, if you look at it, it's the same agenda item. May 2, it's the same agenda item. Now, on June 6, if you turn it over to the back page, you will see on this agenda they did talk about the organization of schools and school districts in the Omaha metropolitan area. That is when they voted on it. Nowhere can I find that this thing was discussed before, no of the agenda items that I can find. So what that did, that caused me to contact the Attorney General's Office. I issued or I lodged a complaint. The Attorney General sent that complaint to the Omaha Public Schools. They said I was unclear in what I was requesting. I thought I was, but they said...so that letter was sent back to the Attorney General.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR PAHLS: And this is part of that letter. It seems to us...this is the Attorney General's response to them. It seems to us our letter of February 3, 2006, and the various complaint materials which we provided to your firm, made the nature of the open meeting complaint an issue very clear. Needless, we will attempt to provide you with further clarifications of those allegations under the open meeting law. And they did. It was