

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

April 4, 2006

LB 1024

statutes that have essentially protected the suburban districts go away; is that not the case?

SENATOR RAIKES: Right, right.

SENATOR BROWN: And in exchange for that, what are the suburban schools essentially...what has been the deal with the suburban schools?

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, I think the dominant interest of the suburban school districts is border protection, border security. So I think...for example, if you mention Westside, the Westside exception, so to speak, is eliminated. Also, there's a provision of statute that--net option funding--that has served Westside well, and in its new place in the learning community, that would no longer be available to Westside. But in exchange for that, Westside and Millard, Ralston and Elkhorn would receive assurance that their borders would remain, which I think, at this point, is the main interest.

SENATOR BROWN: In a newspaper article that talked about times in the past when there was an opportunity, actually an offer, I think, that Senator Redfield has talked about it, an offer by Ralston to take over a part of...to let OPS have one of the schools, the Karen subdivision, the OPS attorney claimed that Karen did not become a part of OPS simply because the city annexed the area. The statute plainly provides that in an adjacent high school district or any part thereof shall remain a separate and independent district, and that was what was being argued then. And so, we have arrived at all of this, as an accommodation to a change in OPS' legal philosophy about what the laws meant; is that not the case?

SENATOR RAIKES: I'm not sure that I followed your question as well as I need to.

SENATOR BROWN: Well, that OPS...we are doing your bill primarily to address the One City, One School District, which is in absolute contradiction to what they previously had said about whether the city followed the...the school district followed the city boundaries, and what they had argued legally in the past.