## Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

122 nd General Assembly of Ohio

BILL: H.B. 348 DATE: June 12, 1997

STATUS: As Introduced SPONSOR: Rep. Schuck

LOCAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIRED: No — Minimal cost

CONTENTS: Discipline of classified employees who commit a felony; no felons on juries

## State Fiscal Highlights

STATE FUND	FY 1997	FY 1998	FUTURE YEARS		
General Revenue Fund and other state funds					
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -		
Expenditures	- 0 -	Potential minimal savings	Potential minimal savings		

• The bill could result in a small savings to the state for not paying back pay or other compensation to classified employees who are removed from their position because they committed a felony. The bill would probably apply only to employees who are not a member of a bargaining unit.

## **Local Fiscal Highlights**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	FY 1997	FY 1998	FUTURE YEARS		
Political Subdivisions					
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -		
Expenditures	- 0 -	Potential minimal savings	Potential minimal savings		

• The bill could result in a small savings to political subdivisions for not paying back pay or other compensation to classified employees who are removed from their position because they committed a felony. The bill would probably apply only to employees who are not a member of a bargaining unit.

## **Detailed Fiscal Analysis**

The bill makes conviction of a violent or drug abuse-related felony or a crime of moral turpitude a separate basis for reducing in pay or position, suspending, or removing a classified employee. The bill specifies that the employee has no right to appeal any disciplinary action taken by an appointing authority as the result of the conviction of a felony. In addition, the bill requires that a person convicted of one of those felonies be denied rights to tenure in any state employment. The bill is not clear as to the specific meaning of "rights to tenure", but it appears that a person who has committed a felony can keep their position until the appointing authority removes the person from their position, but if the person is removed, he or she cannot claim any rights to tenure. A person removed from their position because of a felony conviction is barred from receiving any compensation after their removal.

It appears that the bill could result in a small savings to states and localities for not paying back pay or other compensation to persons removed from their position because of a felony conviction. However, the bill as written would only apply to a limited number of state or local employees, as it could not be applied to employees who are members of a collective bargaining unit that has an agreement to specify terms for removal, rights to a hearing after removal, and compensation after removal.

In addition, the bill requires every juror selected for common pleas, municipal, or probate court or grand jury to sign a statement affirming that he or she has not been convicted of a felony. Those persons who have been convicted of a felony are disqualified from jury duty. The cost to local governments to implement these provisions should be negligible to none.

☐ LBO staff: Leslie J. Little, Budget/Policy Analyst

 $\SNDS\.ISIS\_VOL1.lbo\FN122\HB0348IN.DOC$