



OHIO LEGISLATIVE SERVICE COMMISSION

Joseph Rogers

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

Bill: S.B. 66 of the 132nd G.A.

Status: As Introduced

Sponsor: Sens. Eklund and Tavares

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: Yes

Subject: Sentencing, corrections, and conviction record sealing

State Fiscal Highlights

- The bill likely generates an indeterminate annual savings effect on the GRF-funded incarceration costs of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction by diverting offenders from being sent to prison or reducing their length of stay.
- The conviction record sealing expansion will likely generate a minimal at most annual gain in application fees credited to the GRF.

Local Fiscal Highlights

- The bill generates a mix of expenditure savings and increases for county criminal justice systems, the net of which could be a significant annual cost increase driven by the provision expanding the offenders eligible for conviction record sealing.
- The conviction record sealing expansion will likely generate for counties generally a minimal at most annual gain in application fee revenues.

Detailed Fiscal Analysis

The bill modifies numerous aspects of the law governing sentencing, corrections, and conviction record sealing, the fiscally notable of which are described in more detail below. From the state's perspective, the bill likely generates an indeterminate annual savings effect on the GRF-funded incarceration costs of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) by diverting offenders from being sent to prison or reducing their length of stay. From the county perspective, the bill generates a mix of expenditure savings and increases, the net of which could be a significant annual cost increase driven by the provision expanding the offenders eligible for conviction record sealing.

Community control sanctions

The bill removes the one-year minimum that currently applies when a court sentences an offender to a community control sanction for a fourth or fifth degree felony under the existing presumption for community control sanctions and expressly authorizes the court to impose a combination of community control sanctions under the

provision. This change may reduce the costs that a county otherwise may have incurred when community control sanctions are imposed on certain felony offenders by: (1) permitting the use of less expensive sanctions, and/or (2) reducing their duration.

The bill permits a court to impose a new term of up to six months in a community-based correctional facility (CBCF) or a local jail as a penalty for a felony offender who violates a community control sanction condition. Currently, if a felony offender who is sentenced to a community control sanction commits a violation, the sentencing court may impose one or more of three specified penalties: longer time under the same sanction, a more restrictive community control sanction, or a prison term. The placement of such offenders in a CBCF for up to six months, rather than a prison, will help DRC restrain the growth of institutional operating expenditures, although the magnitude of any spending reductions is uncertain. CBCFs are a less expensive alternative because the beds turn over faster. The average stay in a CBCF is approximately four months.

Intervention in lieu of conviction (ILC)

The bill provides the court with an additional sanction that it may impose when it has determined that a person who has already been granted ILC has failed to comply with an ILC term or condition. Under current law, upon determining that such a compliance failure has occurred, the court's only option is to enter a finding of guilty and impose a sentence in accordance with the Felony Sentencing Law, which may include the imposition of a prison term. The bill provides the court with the option of allowing the person to continue on ILC.

This provision may divert an uncertain number of offenders that have failed to comply with a term or condition of their ILC plan from being sent to prison and allow them to continue on ILC. The diversion of these offenders from prison may reduce DRC's incarceration expenditures, by an uncertain amount, and there would be a corresponding increase in county expenditures for the assessment and continued treatment of offenders that failed to comply with a term or condition of their ILC plan.

Eligibility for conviction record sealing

The bill expands the definition of offenders who are eligible to apply to the court for the sealing of the offender's record of conviction. Currently, for purposes of the Conviction Record Sealing Law "eligible offenders" includes only a person who has been convicted of an offense in Ohio or any other jurisdiction and who has not more than one felony conviction, not more than two misdemeanor convictions, or not more than one felony conviction and one misdemeanor conviction in Ohio or any other jurisdiction. Under the bill, the term "eligible offenders" also includes, regardless of the number of convictions, anyone who has been convicted of one or more offenses that are fourth or fifth degree felonies and none of those offenses are an "offense of violence" (a defined term) or a felony sex offense.

The definition expansion potentially makes thousands of offenders with multiple convictions for qualifying offenses eligible for conviction record sealing. Arguably, many of these offenders are likely to apply, as presumably it may remove an employment barrier.

When an application to seal a record is filed, the court sets a hearing date and notifies the county prosecutor's office. The prosecutor may object to the application by filing a formal objection with the court prior to the hearing date. The court also directs the relevant probation department providing services to that particular county to investigate and submit reports concerning the applicant.

The combined annual cost for the clerk of courts, sentencing courts, county prosecutors, and probation departments to perform the required work generated by this provision is indeterminate. Given the potential number of new applications, however, that cost could be significant, in particular for the state's larger more populous urban counties.

Upon filing an application with a court, the applicant, unless deemed to be indigent, pays a \$50 fee, of which \$30 is forwarded to the state treasury for crediting to the General Revenue Fund, and \$20 is paid to the county general fund. Thus, under the bill, the state and counties generally are likely to gain, at most, minimal annual revenue.

Post-release control violations

Under current law, if a person under post-release control commits multiple violations of the term of post-release control sanctions, the court must consider these violations in determining whether to impose a prison term, which may not exceed nine months. The bill eliminates the requirement that multiple violations be considered as a factor in determining such a sentence, and limits any prison term to no more than 90 days. These modifications will reduce the potential prison sentences for those offenders returned to prison for post-release control violations by up to six months. There would be a corresponding reduction, of uncertain magnitude, in GRF incarceration related expenditures.