

# Ohio Civil Rights Commission

**House Higher Education Subcommittee**

*Jamie L. Slotten, Budget Analyst*

*Legislative Service Commission*

*February 26, 2003*

*Additional copies are available on our website at [www.lsc.state.oh.us](http://www.lsc.state.oh.us)  
Click on 'Fiscal Publications' then 'Ohio Budget'*

# **LSC Redbook**

## **for the**

### **Ohio Civil Rights Commission**

**House Higher Education Subcommittee**

*Jamie L. Slotten, Budget Analyst*

*Legislative Service Commission*

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Overview.....</b>	<b>A1</b>
<b>Analysis of Executive Proposal.....</b>	<b>A4</b>
<b>Additional Facts and Figures.....</b>	<b>A6</b>
<b>Permanent and Temporary Law .....</b>	<b>A8</b>
<b>Requests Not Funded.....</b>	<b>A9</b>
<b>Catalog of Budget Line Items .....</b>	<b>COBLI 1</b>
<b>Attachment: LSC Budget Spreadsheet By Line Item</b>	

*February 26, 2003*

Note: The estimated General Revenue Fund (GRF) spending for FY 2003 used in this LSC Redbook reflects the 2.5% reduction made as a result of the Governor's January 22, 2003 budget cut order. The executive reduction was applied across-the-board to FY 2003 GRF appropriations, subject to certain exceptions. Subsequent to such reductions (and not reflected in the Redbook), state agencies were permitted to reallocate the amount that each of their GRF appropriation line items was reduced, while still absorbing the 2.5% budget cut within the total amount of their GRF appropriations.

# Ohio Civil Rights Commission

---

- Heavier reliance on federal funding continues
- Series of budget reductions mean one out of every four staff positions eliminated in five years
- Alternative Dispute Resolution and Workforce Development initiatives save time and money

## OVERVIEW

The Ohio Civil Rights Commission is charged with enforcing Chapter 4112. of the Revised Code, which prohibits discrimination in the following areas:

- (1) Employment on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, ancestry, or disability;
- (2) Places of public accommodation on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, ancestry, or disability;
- (3) Housing on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, ancestry, disability, or familial status;
- (4) Granting of credit on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, ancestry, disability, or marital status;
- (5) Higher education on the basis of disability.

The Commission was established in 1959 with the enactment of Am. SB. 10 of the 103rd General Assembly. The Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints five members to the Commission, not more than three of whom can be of the same political party, and at least one member of whom must be at least 60 years of age.

The Commission is a single-program series agency with two major activities. First, it investigates complaints and adjudicates discrimination charges filed by citizens of Ohio pertaining to discrimination in employment, housing, places of public accommodation, credit, and admission to, and participation in, activities sponsored by institutions of higher education. Second, in addition to its enforcement responsibilities, the Commission is mandated to conduct educational and public outreach programs.

The Commission receives approximately 5,000 official charges of discrimination each year, and thousands of inquiries from the public with questions and/or concerns regarding discrimination. State law mandates that investigations must be completed within one year. Over two-thirds of the Commission's GRF budget is allocated for staff that investigates and resolves charges of discrimination. Additional funding is provided with federal funds through contracts with two federal agencies: the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

### **Governor's Funding Recommendations**

The Commission has historically relied on the GRF for around 80% of its annual financing. The total GRF funding level recommended by the Governor in each of FYs 2004 and FY 2005 is \$8.1 million. In order to maintain its current level of services, the Commission had requested a total GRF budget of: (1) \$9.4 million in FY 2004, which would have represented an increase of 12.8% from an adjusted FY 2003 appropriation of \$8.4 million, and (2) \$9.7 million in FY 2005, an increase of 2.7% from the FY 2004 requested amount. The executive recommended levels of GRF funding are \$1.3 million and \$1.6 million in FYs 2004 and 2005, respectively, less than what the Commission requested for the sole purpose of maintaining its current level of services.

The implications of the executive recommended levels of GRF funding are twofold. First, the Commission will not be able to support its current number of staff over the course of the next biennium. This likely means that the Commission will have to find a way to cut up to around 30 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff positions, presumably through some mix of attrition, early retirement incentives, and job abolishments. Second, the Commission will have to continue to rely more heavily on its federal funding and restrict maintenance and equipment spending in order to cover the payroll costs associated with its labor intensive duties and responsibilities.

### **The Task Force Initiative**

After decades of performing work using the same approach, the Commission applied for and received a \$70,000 grant from the state's Workforce Development Fund to initiate the first phase of a project designed to reengineer its work processes. The Commission's intake process, which was handled differently in each of its six regional offices, was studied first with an eye towards identifying what are the "best practices." This undertaking was in effect the first major work redesign of the investigative process in the history of the Commission. The resulting redesigned investigative process, referred to as "The Task Force Initiative," uses a team of investigators, in concert with an assistant attorney general, to evaluate the merits of a discrimination charge before the investigation begins. The purpose of this preliminary evaluation is to try to ensure that the Commission expends only the amount of time and resources necessary to resolve a particular charge. The Commission began implementation of the redesigned investigative process in March 2002.

### **Attorney General's Civil Rights Section**

The Commission provides funding for legal services performed by the Office of the Attorney General's Civil Rights Section. Under section 4112.10 of the Revised Code, the Civil Rights Section handles all litigation in which the Commission participates as a party pursuant to Chapter 4112. of the Revised Code. The Commission enters into an annual inter-agency agreement with the Office of the Attorney General to reimburse the Civil Rights Section's for its legal services. Historically, these reimbursement payments have covered approximately 30% of the Civil Rights Section's operating expenses, with the remaining 70% being covered by Office of the Attorney General's GRF line item 055-321, Operating Expenses. The total number of staff in the Civil Rights Section is around 12, most of who are attorneys.

As of this writing, Attorney General Jim Petro, who just took office in January is conducting an officewide assessment of all civil legal services and criminal justice activities currently being performed by the Office of the Attorney General. Although the Commission expects that its current working relationship with the Civil Rights Section will remain unchanged, alternative strategies for funding the provision of legal services may be reviewed in the future.

In addition to the legal services payments it makes to the Civil Rights Section, the Commission disburses over \$100,000 annually to cover other litigation-related expenses, e.g., deposition costs and expert witness fees.

### **Mediation Services**

The Commission offers mediation services as an alternative means of resolving a discrimination complaint. Mediation brings both the charging party and respondent together in an attempt to settle disputes short of a full-scale investigation. Whereas the investigative process for a case can take between six months to a year to complete, mediation requires only 30 to 45 days to complete. Most successful mediations are resolved within one day. Discrimination complaints that cannot be successfully mediated are then investigated. Of the 865 mediations conducted by the Commission in FY 2002, 649, or 75%, were successfully mediated.

Each of the Commission's six regional office employs one mediator. According to the Commission, one mediator in each regional office is an adequate level of staffing to meet the current demand for its mediation services.

### **Education and Outreach**

In addition to its enforcement responsibilities, the Commission is mandated to conduct educational and public outreach programs. In order to meet the requirements of the mandate, when possible, the Commission partners with the federal government (HUD and EEOC), which allows it to get maximum use of the state moneys available for education and public outreach. According to the Commission, it has been involved in "close to 300 educational and outreach activities" since November 2001, including, but not limited to, joint forums with the EEOC, fair housing conferences, and hate crime forums.

### **Cost-Cutting Actions**

Based on information provided by the Commission, it has taken the following notable cost-cutting actions over the course of the current biennium in response to GRF funding reductions:

- (1) Abolished 11 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff positions;
- (2) Left 11 vacant FTE staff positions unfilled;
- (3) Suspended its practice of employing college interns;
- (4) Implemented an early retirement incentive plan;
- (5) Transferred the FY 2003 payroll costs associated with 20 FTEs out of the GRF by tapping into a surplus of federal funds built up over time;
- (6) Postponed indefinitely a major computer database project;
- (7) Reduced legal research expenditures;
- (8) Eliminated costs associated with public records storage and retrieval;
- (9) Significantly reduced out-of-state travel.

## ANALYSIS OF EXECUTIVE PROPOSAL

### Ohio Civil Rights Commission

**Purpose:** To enforce state and federal laws against discrimination and to promote education of civil rights.

The following table shows the line items that are used to finance the Ohio Civil Rights Commission's operating costs, as well as the Governor's recommended funding levels.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2004	FY 2005
GRF	876-100	Personal Services	\$ 7,188,198	\$ 7,188,198
GRF	876-200	Maintenance	\$ 822,131	\$ 822,131
GRF	876-300	Equipment	\$ 92,668	\$ 92,668
<b>Subtotal – GRF</b>			<b>\$ 8,102,997</b>	<b>\$ 8,102,997</b>
FED	876-601	Federal Programs	\$ 3,965,000	\$ 3,790,000
SSR	876-604	General Reimbursement	\$ 20,951	\$ 20,951
<b>Total funding: OHIO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION</b>			<b>\$12,088,948</b>	<b>\$11,913,948</b>

The Commission is a single-program series agency. Specific areas within the Commission's budget that this analysis will focus on include:

- **INVESTIGATION & EDUCATION**
- **FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT**

#### Investigation & Education

**Activity Description:** The goal of the Commission is to enforce the mandates contained within its enabling statute, Chapter 4112. of the Revised Code. This focus involves two major activities: (1) investigation and adjudication of discrimination charges filed with the Commission, and (2) education and outreach. Annually, the Commission receives approximately 5,000 official charges of discrimination. Some of the specifics on these charges are displayed in the *Additional Facts and Figures* section of this analysis.

**Funding Source:** (1) GRF, (2) federal reimbursement, and (3) payment for the provision of various goods and services, including copies of Commission documents

**Line Items:** 876-100, Personal Services; 876-200, Maintenance; 876-300, Equipment; 876-601, Federal Programs; 876-604, General Reimbursement

**Implication of the Executive Recommendation:** The Governor's recommendations for the next biennium will require the Commission to keep a close reign on expenditures. Under the Governor's budget, the Commission received \$1.3 million and \$1.6 million in FYs 2004 and 2005, respectively, less than what the Commission requested for the sole purpose of maintaining its current level of services.

As a result, the Commission will have to find a way to cut up to around 30 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff positions, continue its heavier reliance on federal funds, and restrict other GRF spending on maintenance and equipment items in order to fund its labor intensive operation for the next biennium.

### **Federal Reimbursement**

**Activity Description:** The Commission receives reimbursements from the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which are then used to offset the costs of investigating cases. These reimbursements do not cover the full cost of processing the cases; the remainder of the cost must then be absorbed by GRF funds.

**Funding Source:** FED

**Line Items:** 876-601, Federal Programs

**Implication of the Executive Recommendation:** Starting with the current biennium (FYs 2002 and 2003), the executive recommended budget implemented its intent that the Commission place a heavier reliance on its federal funding. Although the Commission requested and the Governor recommended levels of federal funding for FYs 2004 and 2005 at \$3.9 million and \$3.8 million, respectively, are somewhat lower than the adjusted FY 2003 appropriation of \$4.3 million, the Commission will continue its heavier reliance on federal funding in the next biennium. The more relevant frame of reference than the adjusted FY 2003 federal appropriation of \$4.3 million is federal spending prior to FY 2002 when the Commission rarely disbursed more than \$2.0 million in federal funding annually.

From the Commission's perspective, the strategy, however, has proven problematic for several reasons. First, the Commission cannot predict with any degree of certainty the availability of federal funds. Second, the amount of federal funding fluctuates from year-to-year based on available funding and the number of contracted cases. Third, the timeliness of the federal government's reimbursement payments is unpredictable. Finally, there is no guarantee that federal funding will remain available at current levels, or at all for that matter.

Further complicating this fiscal reality with regard to its federal funding is the fact that federal reimbursement covers only a portion of the Commission's cost involved in handling discrimination charges as follows:

- (1) For EEOC cases, the federal reimbursement covers approximately \$500 per case for a fixed number of cases established at the beginning of the federal fiscal year. If the number of cases is higher than what the EEOC has anticipated funding, then the Commission underwrites the difference.
- (2) For HUD cases, the federal reimbursement covers approximately \$1,800 per case based upon the number of eligible cases processed during the previous year. The Commission must, however, investigate all discrimination charges. It does not have the option of refusing to process any charge. These federal reimbursements often do not cover the actual cost of investigations.

## ADDITIONAL FACTS AND FIGURES

Ohio Civil Rights Commission Staffing Levels*							
1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003*	2004*	2005*
203	200	199	189	179	162	154	150

\*The staffing levels displayed in the above table represent full-time equivalents (FTEs). The number of FTEs for FYs 2003, 2004, and 2005 are estimates.

As can be seen from the above table, the Commission's annual staffing level, as measured by the number of FTEs, remained relatively steady at around 200 between FYs 1998 and 2000. In subsequent fiscal years, as a result of budget reductions and various related actions taken to reduce costs, the Commission's number of FTEs has declined annually. Based on the Governor's budget recommendations for the next biennium (FYs 2004 and 2005), the Commission will be able to employ an annual workforce of around 150 or so FTEs. This means that, in the period of four to five years, the Commission will have eliminated 25%, or one out of every four, staff positions. The Commission has made those staff reductions through a variety of mechanisms, including abolishing positions, implementing an early retirement incentive plan, downsizing by attrition, and ending the practice of using college interns.

Type of Cases Terminated							
Type of Case	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
Employment	4,787	4,707	4,766	4,379	4,543	4,014	4,258
Housing	403	475	434	333	344	505	526
Public Accommodation	174	168	124	201	183	183	209
Credit	5	14	12	14	11	3	3
Disability in Education	9	11	6	8	11	7	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,378</b>	<b>5,375</b>	<b>5,342</b>	<b>4,935</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>4,712</b>	<b>5,000</b>

Relative to the types of cases terminated by the Commission over the last seven fiscal years, as depicted in the above table, 85% to 90% involve charges of discrimination in matters related to employment. Over the same time period, the Commission has terminated, on average, around 5,100 discrimination cases annually.

Basis of Charges of Alleged Discrimination							
Discrimination Charge	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
Race/Color	2,654	2,837	3,522	3,532	3,786	3,157	3,360
Sex	2,054	2,074	2,221	2,071	2,207	1,893	2,041
Disability	1,406	1,602	1,634	1,124	1,592	1,352	1,382
Age	804	865	970	1,486	833	715	811
Retaliation	890	953	1,476	1,979	1,538	1,424	1,434
National Origin	237	207	235	240	336	269	278
Religion	70	104	170	163	178	131	133
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8,115</b>	<b>8,642</b>	<b>10,228</b>	<b>10,595</b>	<b>10,470</b>	<b>8,941</b>	<b>9,439</b>

The above table shows that, over time, the charges filed annually with the Commission have gone beyond allegations of discrimination based solely on a single factor, e.g., race, sex, or disability. According to the

Commission, filed charges more frequently allege that the complainant experienced discrimination as a function of multiple factors, e.g., their race and sex. Also of note is that the number of charges that have been filed annually on the basis that an individual has been “retaliated” against because of the filing of a prior charge of discrimination visibly increased in FYs 1998 and 1999 but have since leveled off.

<b>Charges Filed by Region</b>							
<b>Region</b>	<b>FY 1996</b>	<b>FY 1997</b>	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>
Akron	1,101	1,025	962	1,018	1,044	907	1,064
Cincinnati	540	744	722	691	707	682	697
Cleveland	552	759	644	930	1,007	860	873
Columbus	950	1,103	1,372	1,113	1,026	911	1,468
Dayton	507	482	459	524	538	552	551
Toledo	997	1,207	1,267	860	769	817	868
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,647</b>	<b>5,320</b>	<b>5,426</b>	<b>5,136</b>	<b>5,091</b>	<b>4,729</b>	<b>5,521</b>

The above table shows the number of discrimination charges that have been filed annually in each of the Commission’s six regional offices since FY 1996. Two things seem notable. First, between FYs 1996 and 1998, three regional offices handled roughly two-thirds of the discrimination charges filed annually with the Commission: Akron, Columbus, and Toledo. Second, starting with FY 1999, the number of discrimination charges filed annually with the Toledo regional office declined noticeably while the number of discrimination charges filed annually with the Cleveland regional office rose noticeably.

## **PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY LAW**

This section describes permanent and temporary law provisions contained in the executive budget that explicitly affect the duties, responsibilities, or fiscal operations of the Ohio Civil Rights Commission.

### **Permanent Law Provisions**

#### **General Reimbursement Fund (Fund 217)**

The executive proposed budget amends current law to require moneys received by the Commission, and moneys awarded by a court to the Commission, for attorney's fees, court costs, expert witness fees, and other litigation expenses be deposited into the state treasury to the credit of the Commission's existing General Reimbursement Fund (Fund 217). It appears that, under current law and practice, if a court awarded such moneys, the moneys would be awarded to the Office of the Attorney General, which provides legal services to the Commission. As of this writing, the amount of additional revenue that the amendment might generate annually for deposit to the credit of the Commission's Fund 217 is uncertain.

Under current law, Fund 217 receives all moneys collected by the Commission for copies of Commission documents and other goods and services furnished by the Commission, and all of the moneys deposited to the credit of Fund 217 are used to pay the Commission's operating costs. Since its establishment in FY 2000, Fund 217's annual revenue stream has been in the range of around \$15,000 to \$25,000 or so.

### **Temporary Law Provisions**

There are no temporary law provisions in the executive budget that explicitly affect the duties, responsibilities, or fiscal operations of the Commission.

## REQUESTS NOT FUNDED

The difference, or variance, between what the Ohio Civil Rights Commission requested for its biennial GRF budget and the Governor’s recommended funding level, is summarized in the table below.

<b>Continuation Services Funding</b>						
<b>Fund/ Line Item</b>	<b>FY 2004 Requested</b>	<b>FY 2004 Recommended</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>FY 2005 Requested</b>	<b>FY 2005 Recommended</b>	<b>Difference</b>
GRF/876-100	\$8,436,073	\$7,188,198	(\$1,247,875)	\$8,657,350	\$7,188,198	(\$1,469,152)
GRF/876-200	\$897,239	\$822,131	(\$75,108)	\$930,026	\$822,131	(\$107,895)
GRF/876-300	\$114,634	\$92,668	(\$21,966)	\$118,634	\$92,668	(\$25,966)
TOTALS	\$9,447,946	\$8,102,997	(\$1,344,949)	\$9,706,010	\$8,102,997	(\$1,603,013)

The above table depicts the difference between what the Commission requested for the sole purpose of maintaining its current service levels in each of the next two fiscal years compared to what the Governor recommended. Based on conversations with the Commission, the difference between its requested level of GRF funding and the Governor’s recommended level of GRF funding has two important implications. First, in the area of personal services funding, the Commission requested funding to support 179 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff positions to maintain its current service levels. Between the Governor’s recommended level of GRF and federal funding, the Commission has estimated that it will be able to support 150 FTEs in the next biennium. This means that the Commission will have to find a way to cut up to around 30 FTEs, presumably through some mix of attrition, early retirement incentives, and job abolishments.

Second, the Commission will have to continue to rely more heavily on its federal funding and restrict maintenance and equipment spending in order to cover the payroll costs associated with its labor intensive duties and responsibilities.

## General Revenue Fund

### GRF 876-100 Personal Services

2000	2001	2002	2003 Estimate	2004 Executive Proposal	2005 Executive Proposal
\$9,285,514	\$9,199,274	\$8,463,470	\$7,477,008	<b>\$7,188,198</b>	<b>\$7,188,198</b>
	-0.9%	-8.0%	-11.7%	<b>-3.9%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Source:** GRF

**Legal Basis:** Section 31 of Am. Sub. H.B. 94 of the 124th G.A. (originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 831 of the 103rd G.A., the general appropriations act covering FYs 1960 and 1961, and funded the Commission following its creation pursuant to Am. S.B. 10 of the 103rd G.A., effective July 29, 1959)

**Purpose:** This line item provides funds for the Commission's expenses associated with payroll, fringe benefits, and personal services contracts.

### GRF 876-200 Maintenance

2000	2001	2002	2003 Estimate	2004 Executive Proposal	2005 Executive Proposal
\$1,072,983	\$1,080,499	\$928,222	\$806,010	<b>\$822,131</b>	<b>\$822,131</b>
	0.7%	-14.1%	-13.2%	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Source:** GRF

**Legal Basis:** Section 31 of Am. Sub. H.B. 94 of the 124th G.A. (originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 831 of the 103rd G.A., the general appropriations act covering FYs 1960 and 1961, and funded the Commission following its creation pursuant to Am. S.B. 10 of the 103rd G.A., effective July 29, 1959)

**Purpose:** This line item provides for maintenance expenses of the Commission, which on occasion has included payments that partially support the Office of the Attorney General's Civil Rights Section.

### GRF 876-300 Equipment

2000	2001	2002	2003 Estimate	2004 Executive Proposal	2005 Executive Proposal
\$111,556	\$126,946	\$109,431	\$91,298	<b>\$92,668</b>	<b>\$92,668</b>
	13.8%	-13.8%	-16.6%	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Source:** GRF

**Legal Basis:** Section 31 of Am. Sub. H.B. 94 of the 124th G.A. (originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 831 of the 103rd G.A., the general appropriations act covering FYs 1960 and 1961, and funded the Commission following its creation pursuant to Am. S.B. 10 of the 103rd G.A., effective July 29, 1959)

**Purpose:** This line item provides funds for the Commission's equipment purchases.

**GRF 876-401 African American Males**

2000	2001	2002	2003 Estimate	2004 Executive Proposal	2005 Executive Proposal
\$128,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Source:** GRF

**Legal Basis:** Discontinued line item (originally established by Controlling Board on August 27, 1990)

**Purpose:** This line item was used for operating costs of the Commission on African American Males (CAAM), which oversees projects devoted to solving problems and advancing recommendations pertinent to African American males in the areas of unemployment, education, criminal justice, and health. Pursuant to Am. Sub. H.B. 283 of the 123rd G.A., in July 1999, CAAM became a free standing state agency and the oversight function that had been provided by the Ohio Civil Rights Commission was eliminated. As a result, the funding associated with this special purpose GRF line item was moved to a new state agency budget that exclusively supports CAAM (GRF line items 036-100, Personal Services, 036-200, Maintenance, and 036-300, Equipment).

## Federal Special Revenue Fund Group

**334 876-601 Federal Programs**

2000	2001	2002	2003 Estimate	2004 Executive Proposal	2005 Executive Proposal
\$2,086,432	\$1,727,386	\$3,148,960	\$4,284,113	\$3,965,000	\$3,790,000
	-17.2%	82.3%	36.0%	-7.4%	-4.4%

**Source:** FED: CFDA 30.002, Employment Discrimination; CFDA 14.401, Fair Housing Assistance Program

**Legal Basis:** Section 31 of Am. Sub. H.B. 94 of the 124th G.A. (originally established by Controlling Board in 1970)

**Purpose:** This fund receives reimbursements from the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which are then used to offset the costs of investigating cases. These reimbursements do not, however, cover the full cost of processing the cases; the remainder of the cost must be absorbed by GRF funds. For EEOC cases, the federal reimbursement covers approximately \$500 per case for a fixed number of cases, for HUD cases, approximately \$1,800 per case based upon the number of eligible cases processed during the previous year. It should be noted that the work sharing agreements between the Commission and these two federal agencies reduce duplication of effort, as the same cases are no longer simultaneously filed with both state and federal agencies. The Commission does not have the option of refusing to process these cases. Also of note is that the total amount of federal reimbursement earned by the Commission, as well as the timing of when it will be received, is fraught with some uncertainty. This uncertainty can create cash flow problems for the Commission as it forces them to rely more heavily on their rather limited GRF funds.

## State Special Revenue Fund Group

### 217 876-604 General Reimbursement

2000	2001	2002	2003 Estimate	2004 Executive Proposal	2005 Executive Proposal
\$0	\$0	\$29	\$20,951	<b>\$20,951</b>	<b>\$20,951</b>
	N/A	N/A	73412.3%	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Source:** SSR: (1) moneys received by the Commission for copies of Commission documents and for other goods and services furnished by the Commission, and (2) as proposed in the executive budget for FYs 2004 and 2005, all moneys received by the Commission, and all amounts awarded by a court to the Commission, for attorney's fees, court costs, expert witness fees, and other litigation expenses

**Legal Basis:** Section 31 of Am. Sub. H.B. 94 of the 124th G.A.; ORC 4112.15 (originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 283 of the 123rd G.A.)

**Purpose:** These funds are to pay operating costs of the Commission.

## LSC Budget Spreadsheet by Line Item, FY 2004 - FY 2005

Fund	ALI	ALI Title	2002	Estimated 2003	Executive 2004	% Change 2003 to 2004	Executive 2005	% Change 2004 to 2005
<b><i>CIV Ohio Civil Rights Commission</i></b>								
GRF	876-100	Personal Services	\$ 8,463,470	\$7,477,008	\$ 7,188,198	-3.9%	\$ 7,188,198	0.0%
GRF	876-200	Maintenance	\$ 928,222	\$806,010	\$ 822,131	2.0%	\$ 822,131	0.0%
GRF	876-300	Equipment	\$ 109,431	\$91,298	\$ 92,668	1.5%	\$ 92,668	0.0%
<b>General Revenue Fund Total</b>			<b>\$ 9,501,123</b>	<b>\$ 8,374,316</b>	<b>\$ 8,102,997</b>	<b>-3.2%</b>	<b>\$ 8,102,997</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
334	876-601	Federal Programs	\$ 3,148,960	\$4,284,113	\$ 3,965,000	-7.4%	\$ 3,790,000	-4.4%
<b>Federal Special Revenue Fund Group Total</b>			<b>\$ 3,148,960</b>	<b>\$ 4,284,113</b>	<b>\$ 3,965,000</b>	<b>-7.4%</b>	<b>\$ 3,790,000</b>	<b>-4.4%</b>
217	876-604	General Reimbursement	\$ 29	\$20,951	\$ 20,951	0.0%	\$ 20,951	0.0%
<b>State Special Revenue Fund Group Total</b>			<b>\$ 29</b>	<b>\$ 20,951</b>	<b>\$ 20,951</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>\$ 20,951</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Total All Budget Fund Groups</b>			<b>\$ 12,650,111</b>	<b>\$ 12,679,380</b>	<b>\$ 12,088,948</b>	<b>-4.7%</b>	<b>\$ 11,913,948</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>