

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

March 29, 2006 LB 940

provision on the report, and I was frantically searching the budget bill, (b) on line 21 on page 5 talks about the report on activities and the developments and the coordination efforts between the Office of Homeland Security and the United States Department of Homeland Security. That would be language in addition to the language that generally could be found as intent language in the budget. Is that correct?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I believe that's correct, yes.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Under the...and just so we're clear, the only actual new part that we would be adding to law or intent language would be the part of the Exec Board appointing members and this report to the Executive Board.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Well, actually, yes, that would include both the activities and the funding. Those are not statutory, either one of them, right now.

SENATOR ERDMAN: True in the sense of statutory, you are correct. The funding request is in the appropriations bill, which is an A bill, which is a budget bill, but it's not a statutory requirement...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Correct.

SENATOR ERDMAN: ...of anybody at this point. Here's my only concern as I see it. It's not necessarily on the Executive Board appointing members. I think that's appropriate. Again, we're already doing this now so I don't want people to assume that we're not doing any of this now. This is just saying we're already being prepared for terrorists attacks or other responsibilities that the department has currently through the Lieutenant Governor. My concern is that in line 21-24 it talks about the policy group reporting semiannually to the Executive Board regarding its activities and the developments in the coordination efforts between the Office of Homeland Security and the United States Department of Homeland Security. And I'll lay this out and then I hope there's time for you to respond; and if there's not, I will press my light again. The policy group itself is not subject to the Open Meetings Act. And, therefore,