SPONSOR'S REBUTTAL TO FISCAL NOTE

Bill Number: SB 270 **Date Prepared:** February 11, 2011

Short Title:

Sponsor: Senator Wittich

Fiscal Note Version and Date: Version #1, February 10, 2011

Generally, why do you disagree with the fiscal note?

While I agree that the passage of Senate Bill 270 will have no impact to the general fund (as reflected in the fiscal note) I disagree with many of the assumptions.

Specifically, what in the fiscal note do you feel is flawed?
REASONS:

- Assumption #2: While the Federal Department of Labor sets certain percentage and time criteria for handling UI claims, the Department of Labor still has not provided me what their actual performance is on processing these claims. No one has verified that they themselves are now meeting the Federal goals.
- Assumption #3: I disagree that people opting for district court decisions "would" result in increased trials in the judicial system. Approximately 95% of the cases are resolved prior to trial.
- Assumption #4: If people are opting into district court, there will be no administrative record for the Department of Labor to forward.
- Assumption #6: While the department believes it will take some time to create a tracking

Technical Note #1

- The Department of Labor believes it "would" be out of conformity with the federal guarantee of "simple, speedy and inexpensive" resolutions. Unfortunately, there is currently no guarantee for "fair" processing of these claims between the parties. Hence the reason for the bill. In addition, as an employer, there is nothing "simple, speedy, and inexpensive" about the current process.

What is your estimate of the fiscal impact?