

PREPARED BY: Doug Nichols  
 DATE PREPARED: February 5, 2009  
 PHONE: 471-0052

**LB 51**

Revision: 00

**FISCAL NOTE**  
 LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST ESTIMATE

ESTIMATE OF FISCAL IMPACT – STATE AGENCIES *				
	FY 2009-10		FY 2010-11	
	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE
GENERAL FUNDS				
CASH FUNDS				
FEDERAL FUNDS				
OTHER FUNDS				
TOTAL FUNDS				

\*Does not include any impact on political subdivisions. See narrative for political subdivision estimates.

This bill would provide for confidentiality of Nebraska Workers' Compensation Court documents and information.

The Workers Compensation Court notes that this bill could reduce expenditures, but any reduction may be offset by additional workload. See the following response from the Workers Compensation Court regarding the impact of this bill:

LB 51 could result in a significant fiscal impact for the Workers' Compensation Court, although this is impossible to determine or quantify at this time.

The Nebraska Workers' Compensation Act establishes a number of administrative and regulatory duties for the court that require or allow the sharing of information with outside parties which would be deemed confidential under LB 51. However, the bill includes no exception to permit the court to release the information for such purposes, and the intent of the bill is unclear in this regard. Should LB 51 in fact prohibit the release of information for such purposes then court expenditures would decrease substantially due to the inability to perform duties currently required or allowed by statute.

There would also be a reduction in the workload of some court staff due to a decrease in the number of record requests fulfilled by court, but this would likely be offset by additional workload in processing written authorizations and in responding to requests that cannot be honored.

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

REVIEWED BY	Joe Wilcox	DATE	2/6/09	PHONE	471-2526
COMMENTS					
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: Concur with agency analysis. NEBRASKA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT: No basis to dispute agency analysis.					