



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee

Frederick E. Mills, Chair
Hon. Paula Brooks, Vice-chair

Part II

November 10, 2016

Ohio Statehouse
Room 017

OCMC Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee

Chair Mr. Fred Mills
Vice-chair Ms. Paula Brooks
Mr. Herb Asher
Sen. Bill Coley
Rep. Mike Curtin
Ms. Jo Ann Davidson
Rep. Robert McColley
Governor Bob Taft
Ms. Petee Talley
Sen. Charleta Tavares
Ms. Kathleen Trafford

For Internet Access in the Ohio Statehouse: select "oga" from the list of network options.
A passcode/password is not required.



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Resolution Analysis

Jennifer A. Parker

S.J.R. 1

131st General Assembly
(As Introduced)

Sens. Faber, Widener, Patton, Oelslager, Obhof, Williams, Seitz, LaRose, Bacon, Beagle, Hottinger

RESOLUTION SUMMARY

- Creates the Public Office Compensation Commission consisting of nine voting members.
- Requires the Commission, in each even-numbered year, to review the compensation of elected public offices in the state.
- Requires the Commission to create a proposed compensation plan and a report, and to present the plan and report at not less than three public hearings to receive public input.
- Requires the Commission to issue a final compensation plan and a report not later than December 31 of each even-numbered year.
- Allows the General Assembly to reject one or more of the final compensation amounts.
- Provides that the final compensation plan issued by the Commission takes effect July 1 of the following odd-numbered year except insofar as compensation amounts have been rejected by the General Assembly.
- Requires the Commission to create its *initial* final compensation plan not later than December 31, 2015, and provides that the compensation amounts therein take effect July 1, 2016, unless rejected by the General Assembly.
- Specifies that the creation and operation of the Commission does not affect the compensation of nonjudicial elected public offices in municipal corporations and charter counties having home rule.

- Removes the prohibition against General Assembly members receiving "allowances or perquisites" in addition to a fixed compensation.
- Limits the prohibition against General Assembly members receiving in-term increases in compensation to apply only when the General Assembly has, during a member's term, rejected the Commission's final compensation plan.
- Removes the prohibition against compensation of judges of courts of record being diminished during a term of office.
- Eliminates the prohibition against a member of the General Assembly, during the member's term or for one year thereafter, from being appointed to a public office the compensation of which was increased during the member's term.
- Eliminates the prohibition against executive officers' compensation being increased or decreased during the period for which the officer was elected.

CONTENT AND OPERATION

The joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Ohio Constitution that establishes a Public Office Compensation Commission to review and set the compensation of elected public offices, subject to rejection by the General Assembly. The proposal is to be submitted to the electors at the general election to be held on November 3, 2015.

Duties of the Public Office Compensation Commission

The Public Office Compensation Commission is required to meet each even-numbered year to review the current compensation of each elected public office in the state.¹ Currently, the General Assembly establishes, by law, the compensation of all officers,² of all executive officers,³ and of justices of the Supreme Court and judges of the courts of appeals, courts of common pleas, and divisions thereof, and of all courts of record established by law.⁴ Under the proposal, the Commission, instead of the General Assembly, is to establish the compensation of all elected public offices.⁵ When

¹ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(B)(1).

² Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20.

³ Ohio Const., art. III, sec. 19.

⁴ Ohio Const., art. IV, sec. 6(B).

⁵ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(B)(1).



reviewing the current compensation of elected public offices, the Commission must consider factors provided by law, including the amount of compensation paid to similarly skilled individuals in the private sector, the amount of compensation paid to individuals in comparable elected public offices in other states, and the current financial condition of and within Ohio.⁶

After completing its review, the Commission must prepare, by vote of at least five of its members, a proposed compensation plan that sets forth the compensation amounts for each elected public office in the state, and must prepare a report of the proposed compensation plan. The Commission must present the proposed compensation plan and the report at not less than three public hearings in the state to obtain public input regarding the plan. After conducting the public hearings, the Commission must issue, by vote of at least five of its members, a final compensation plan. The Commission must prepare a report of the final compensation plan not later than the last day of December in each even-numbered year. When a proposed or final compensation plan increases or decreases the compensation amount of an elected public office by more than the lesser of 3% or the percentage increase, if any, in the consumer price index,⁷ the Commission must include specific factors that support the increase or decrease in its accompanying report.⁸

Effective date of final compensation plan; rejection of compensation amounts by General Assembly

The compensation amounts set forth in the final compensation plan for each elected public office take effect on the first day of July of the following odd-numbered year unless, before that day, the General Assembly, by a three-fifths vote of the members elected to each house, adopts a concurrent resolution rejecting one or more of the compensation amounts. If the General Assembly rejects a final compensation plan or portion thereof, a member of the General Assembly who, at the time the plan was voted on, voted or would have been entitled to vote on it, is not entitled to an increase in compensation for the duration of the member's term of office.⁹

⁶ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(B)(1).

⁷ Measured over the 12-month period that ends on the 30th day of September of the immediately preceding year, rounded to the nearest $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1%.

⁸ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(B)(1).

⁹ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(B)(2).



Initial actions of the Commission

The Commission must meet in 2015 to review the current compensation of each public office. The proposed and final compensation plans and the accompanying reports must be issued not later than December 31, 2015. The compensation amounts in the initial final compensation plan are to take effect July 1, 2016, unless rejected by the General Assembly as described above. If the General Assembly rejects the initial final compensation plan, or a portion thereof, a member of the General Assembly who, at the time the plan was voted on, voted or would have been entitled to vote on it, is not entitled to an increase in compensation for the duration of the member's term of office.¹⁰

Membership of the Commission

The Commission is to consist of nine members appointed as follows: two by the Governor, two by the President of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one by the Minority Leader of the Senate, one by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and one by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The following individuals are not eligible to be appointed as a member of the Commission: (1) an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision of the state, or a family member, as defined by statute, of an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision of the state, (2) an individual who was a candidate for election to public office in the state within 12 months before appointment, or (3) an individual who engages during at least a portion of the individual's time to actively advocate legislation on behalf of another.

Members serve two-year terms and may not serve more than four consecutive terms. The Commission is to select its chairperson by a majority vote. Members do not receive compensation, but must be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of Commission duties. Vacancies on the Commission are to be filled in the manner prescribed for the original appointment.¹¹

Initial appointments

The term of an initial appointment to the Commission is to begin upon appointment and end December 31, 2017. If, by November 13, 2015, one or more appointments have not been made, a majority of the Commission members who have been appointed are to appoint, not later than November 15, 2015, a sufficient number of individuals so that the Commission consists of nine members. The Commission must give notice of the appointments to the Governor, President and Minority Leader of the

¹⁰ Schedule I.

¹¹ Ohio Const., art II, sec. 20a(A).

Senate, Speaker and Minority Leader of the House, and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.¹²

Compensation of charter county or municipal elected officer unaffected

The proposal specifies that the creation and operation of the Commission does not affect the compensation of a county officer elected under a county charter or the compensation of an officer of a municipality elected under the power of local self-government as exercised by a municipality under the Home Rule Amendment to the Ohio Constitution.¹³

Miscellaneous

The Constitution currently prohibits the compensation of a judge of a court of record from being diminished in term. The proposal removes this prohibition.¹⁴

The Constitution also prohibits the compensation of members of the General Assembly from being changed in term. The proposal removes this prohibition as well.¹⁵ But, as described above, it does specify that if the General Assembly rejects all or a portion of the Commission's final compensation plan, a member who, at the time the plan was voted on, voted or would have been entitled to vote on it, is not entitled to an increase in compensation during the member's term of office.¹⁶

The proposal eliminates the Constitutional prohibition against a member of the General Assembly being appointed to a public office, during the member's term or for one year thereafter, if the compensation of the office was increased during the member's term.¹⁷

The proposal eliminates the prohibition against certain executive officers, during the period for which the officers were elected, from receiving an increase or decrease in compensation. The proposal also requires the General Assembly to set the compensation of all nonelected officers not otherwise provided for in the Constitution,

¹² Schedule II.

¹³ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(C); Ohio Const., art. X, Secs. 3 and 4 (county home rule); Ohio Const., art. XVIII, secs. 3 and 7 (municipal home rule).

¹⁴ Ohio Const., art. IV, sec. 6.

¹⁵ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 31.

¹⁶ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20a(B)(2).

¹⁷ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 4.



and specifies that that salary cannot change during the officer's existing term, unless the office is abolished.¹⁸

HISTORY

ACTION	DATE
Introduced	02-02-15

SJR0001-IN-131.docx/emr

¹⁸ Ohio Const., art. II, sec. 20 and art. III, sec. 19.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Frederick E. Mills and
Members of the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee

CC: Steven C. Hollon, Executive Director and
Shari L. O’Neill, Counsel to the Commission

FROM: Hailey C. Akah, Legal Intern

DATE: March 2, 2015

RE: Comparing State Compensation Commissions

At the request of the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee, this Memorandum compares state compensation commissions for elected officials. First, it outlines the basic tenets of Senate Joint Resolution 1 (“SJR 1”), which would establish the Public Office Compensation Commission for Ohio. The memo then outlines the similarities often seen among state compensation commissions and, the key differences between states as they set compensation policy, and identifies how the proposed Ohio Compensation Commission compares to other state compensation commissions.¹

Summary of Senate Joint Resolution 1

SJR 1 would create the Public Office Compensation Commission (“Compensation Commission”). Proposed SJR 1 would create the Compensation Commission to set the compensation of elected officials in the state of Ohio. The Compensation Commission would consist of nine voting members who are to be appointed in the following manner: two appointed by the Governor, two appointed by the President of the Senate, two appointed by the Speaker of the House, one appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, one appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and one appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Members are appointed to terms of two years and may not serve more than four consecutive terms.

Membership on the Compensation Commission would be restricted. Officers and employees of the state, family members of officers and employees of the state, individuals who were candidates for election in the last 12 months, and lobbyists cannot be appointed to the Compensation Commission. The members of the Compensation Commission may not be paid for their work, but would be reimbursed for any Compensation Commission-related spending.

The Compensation Commission would meet in even-numbered years to consider factors relevant to the compensation of elected officials and to create a compensation plan proposal. Relevant factors include: (1) the salaries of similarly-skilled individuals in the private sector; (2) the salaries of individuals in similar public offices in other states; and (3) the current financial condition of and within Ohio. However, the Compensation Commission would not address the compensation of county officers elected under county charter, nor of officers of municipal corporations elected under the power of local self-government.

Once the Compensation Commission has prepared a proposed compensation plan, it must present that plan during at least three public hearings in Ohio. If the pay increase or decrease is either: (1) more than 3 percent; or (2) more than the percentage increase of the consumer price index, the Compensation Commission must include specific factors that support its decision.

Finally, the Compensation Commission, by a majority vote, would issue a final compensation plan no later than December 31 of that even-numbered year. This plan would be effective on July 1 of the following year unless the General Assembly overrides it by concurrent resolution. The General Assembly may reject one or more of the compensation amounts.

Reasons to Establish a Compensation Commission

Based on a survey of commentary by legislators in states with compensation commissions, compensation commissions are created for several reasons. First, it is politically unpopular for legislatures to raise their own wages. However, under most state constitutions, it is the responsibility of the legislature to set the compensation rates for public officials. Because it is a political challenge, most legislatures do not raise wages often. This leads to low compensation that, in many instances, does not continue to rise with inflation. Second, because compensation is low, public officials worry about lack of diversity in public offices. It may be the case that only the wealthy and retired, for example, are able to accept a legislator's salary.

Similarities among State Compensation Commissions

The compensation commissions of the following 16 states were surveyed²: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia.³ Among these states, there were notable similarities. For a side-by-side comparison, please see a comparison chart provided at Attachment A.

First, membership on compensation commissions is often approached in a similar way. Members are appointed, can be reappointed for a number of terms, and can be removed for cause. Additionally, members of compensation commissions typically cannot be elected officials and cannot be paid for their service. The notable exception is the Arkansas Independent Citizens Commission, which may elect to pay its members a stipend of \$85 a day or less. Thus far, it has not elected to do so, but it has only been in existence since November 2014.

Second, the system for recommending compensation rates is similar among the states. In most cases, pay rates are proposed at the end of the calendar year and go into effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year. This recommendation system, and the common aspects of membership, are also true of the proposed Compensation Commission.

Finally, the process of appointment is similar among a majority of the states. In most cases, states allow officials from each branch of government to appoint members to the compensation commission. Many states also have some bipartisanship requirement, whether in the members of the compensation commission or in the makeup of the appointers. The proposed Compensation Commission follows this pattern. However, there are two notable exceptions to this general rule. First, the compensation commissions in California and Michigan are entirely appointed by the governors of those states. Second, both Missouri and Oregon appoint citizen members to their compensation commissions. The Secretary of State in each of these states is charged with appointing one member from each congressional district. These members are chosen by lot from the state voter registration records. However, states that utilize citizen members are recent exceptions to the general rule.

Differences between State Compensation Commissions

The Legislature's Role in Setting Compensation

The policy choice most closely related to the goals of compensation commissions generally concerns the role of the legislature in setting compensation rates. One group of states vests the authority to set the salaries of public officials in the compensation commission entirely. This group includes Delaware, California, Maryland, Missouri, Utah, and Washington. In these states, the recommendations of the compensation commission go into effect without any action by the state legislature. In these instances, the legislature can disapprove the recommendations by joint resolution or the citizens can change the recommendations by referendum petition. The proposed Compensation Commission falls into this group.

This relationship between the legislature and the compensation commission resolves many of the problems that plague legislatures when they are required to pass their own salary increases. The press coverage of salary increases tends not to focus on political issues, but is neutral and factual, when the increases are implemented by an external compensation commission. A newspaper in Utah called a 2015 pay increase for its governor "long overdue."⁴ Maryland pay increases received similar positive press in 2013.⁵ In fact, in most instances, there is little press at all. The only extensive political press coverage of a state in this group occurred in Missouri when the Missouri General Assembly disapproved a pay increase by joint resolution.⁶

The other group of states, including Arizona, Connecticut, Michigan, and Minnesota, require the legislature to pass the compensation plan recommended by the compensation commission. The compensation plan in these instances has no authority until it is voted into law by the legislature.

These states experience fewer of the benefits associated with compensation commissions. Pay raises for public offices are still politically difficult and, therefore, happen rarely.⁷

Legal Authority: Constitution or Legislation

One key difference among the surveyed states is whether the compensation commission is established under the state constitution or by statute. Some states, including Arkansas, California, Washington, and West Virginia, have established their compensation commissions by constitutional provision alone. Arkansas is the newest member of this group, establishing its compensation commission in November 2014. It appears that the Compensation Commission would be in this group as well.

Other states have created their compensation commissions through legislation alone. These states include Connecticut, Delaware, Oregon, and Utah. Statutes, in comparison to constitutional provisions, tend to be longer and more detailed. While constitutional provisions use broader terms that leave more room for interpretation, statutes often include specific lists and exact definitions. One prominent example of this distinction occurs when defining the jurisdiction of the compensation commission, discussed further in the section below.

Still other states have created compensation commissions using a combination of a broad constitutional provision and enabling legislation. These states, including Hawaii, Idaho, and Michigan, have passed short, less-descriptive constitutional provisions. These provisions also contain language that calls on the legislature to pass additional legislation. For instance, Article IV, Section 12 of the Michigan Constitution states that the governor shall appoint seven members to the compensation commission and their qualifications “may be determined by law.” The legislature is then required to act. These statutes expound on the constitutional provision in definition and detail.

The Compensation Commission’s Jurisdiction: Specific or General

Another key difference between states is the specificity with which the source document explains the jurisdiction of the compensation commission. One group of states list specific offices over which their compensation commissions have jurisdiction. Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Oregon, Utah, and West Virginia are members of this group. These states fall into two subcategories. States in the first subcategory have established their compensation commissions legislatively. Statutes typically include more detailed information than constitutional provisions. Therefore, these statutes are explicit about which offices the compensation commission may include in its recommendation. In the second subcategory, states have limited the scope of the compensation commission, and therefore, the jurisdiction is clear and specific. For instance, West Virginia has enacted the West Virginia’s Citizens Legislative Compensation Commission, and the scope is limited to members of the Legislature. This is another way to establish a compensation commission with a specific jurisdiction.

Other states set out the jurisdiction of their compensation commissions using general phrases. These states include Arkansas, Michigan, Missouri, and Washington. General phrases are typically utilized in constitutional provisions. A common example was enacted in Washington. The Washington Citizens' Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials has jurisdiction over the "[s]alaries for the members of the legislature, elected officials of the executive branch of state government, and judges of the state's supreme court, court of appeals, superior courts, and district courts." These categories are not further expounded upon. However, in Michigan, the State Constitution does list a few specific offices, including the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, and Secretary of State. It may be inferred, however, that these offices are necessarily included in the phrase "elected officials of the executive branch," which other states in this group utilize. Although these offices are listed by name, they add little additional clarity to the jurisdiction of the compensation commission. If enacted in its current form, SJR 1 would establish this type of compensation commission, defining its jurisdiction using general phrases.

A third type of jurisdictional phrase exists in only one state surveyed: California. The source document for the California Citizen's Compensation Commission, Article III, Section 8 of the California Constitution, uses the phrase "state officer" throughout. This phrase is then defined in the text of the Constitution itself. The section defines "state officer" as "the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Treasurer, member of the State Board of Equalization, and Member of the Legislature." This approach to establishing jurisdiction is more similar in effect to the first group of states, which list specific offices in its source statute. However, California includes such a list in its Constitution.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to provide an overview of the different types of compensation commissions that exist throughout the United States. If the committee has any additional questions concerning compensation commissions, I am happy to follow up with additional research.

Endnotes

¹ Citations to the constitutional provisions and statutes that contain information on the compensation commissions for each state can be found in the chart provided as Attachment A.

² According to Senate Chief Legal Counsel Frank Strigari's testimony during the February Meeting of the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch Committee, there are 19 states with compensation commissions. In the interest of time, this review addresses most, but not all of these states.

³ Indiana has had a compensation commission in the past, but it has since been repealed. The Indiana General Assembly established the Public Officers Compensation Advisory Commission in 2004 by statute. Ind. Code § 2-5-1.5. That compensation commission was then repealed in 2011 as part of an omnibus bill that eliminated dozens of councils, commissions, and boards. Between its creation in 2004 and its termination in 2011, the compensation commission did not meet. In 2012, Indiana HB 1002 passed through the General Assembly and was signed into law.

It was another omnibus bill that eliminated dozens of additional councils, commissions, and boards, but in fact reinstated the Compensation Advisory Commission. Ind. Code § 2-5-1.6. However, the compensation commission was repealed again on March 24, 2013. The Indiana General Assembly now passes legislation to set compensation for elected officials.

The reasons for this tumultuous history are uncertain. No case law exists on the matter and little press was generated by the repeals and reinstatement. However, if this Committee finds it beneficial to understand the challenges faced in Indiana, more comprehensive research can be done.

⁴ Brad Wilson, *Pay Raise for Governor Long Overdue*, STANDARD EXAMINER, February 23, 2015.

⁵ Len Lazarick, *Next Governor Should Get 20% Pay Raise to \$180,000, Commission Recommends*, MARYLAND REPORTER, December 22, 2013.

⁶ Although Democrats in the legislature approved the pay increase, Republicans were concerned about the widening pay gap between legislators and legislative staff. Alex Stuckey, *Missouri Lawmakers Reject Pay Raise*, ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH, January 30, 2015.

⁷ For example, the current Connecticut General Assembly is taking steps to raise compensation by 10 percent for all elected officers statewide. Democrats wanted to implement the raises, but Republicans were against it. Senator Rob Kane, a Republican, felt that raising compensation showed concern for the General Assembly itself rather than for its constituents. This is a political issue that was not circumvented by the creation of a compensation commission.

Arizona faced a similar problem in 2014. Article V, Section 12 of the Arizona Constitution establishes a compensation commission that advises the governor, who reports recommendations to the legislature. The governor's recommendations become law without action by the legislature. However, the recommendations are submitted to the voters for approval at the next regular general election. Typically, pay increases are rejected by the voters. This relationship between compensation commission, governor, legislature, and electorate has retained the politicization of compensation for elected officials. It has also left Arizona legislators in a difficult financial position. An increase in legislature salaries from \$24,000 a year to \$35,000 a year was put on the ballot in November 2014, and it was disapproved by the voters.

Attachment A

Compensation Commission State Comparison Chart				
State:	Appointments Made By:	Source Document:	Jurisdiction:	Power to Enact:
Arizona Commission on Salaries for Elective State Officers	Three Branches 5 members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (2) • Speaker of the House (1) • President of the Senate (1) • Chief Justice (1) 	Constitution Ariz. Const. art. V, § 12	Vague “Those holding elective state offices” Ariz. Const. art. V, § 12	Voters The recommendations go before the voters for a vote.
Arkansas Independent Citizens Commission	Three Branches 7 members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (2) • Speaker of the House (2) • President of the Senate (2) • Chief Justice (1) 	Constitution Ark. Const. art. XIX, § 31	Specific List Ark. Const. art. XIX, § 31(d)	Compensation Commission Ark. Const. art. XIX, § 31(j)
California California Citizen’s Compensation Commission	Governor Only 7 members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (7) 	Constitution Cal. Const. art. III, § 8	Broad Term Defined “State officer” defined in Cal. Const. art. III, § 8(1)	Compensation Commission Cal. Const. art. III, § 8(g)

<p>Connecticut</p> <p>Compensation Commission for Elected State Officers and Judges</p>	<p>Two Branches</p> <p>11 members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (3) • Speaker of the House (2) • President of the Senate (2) • Minority Leader of the House (2) • Minority Leader of the Senate (2) 	<p>Statute</p> <p>Conn. Gen. Stat. § 2-9a</p>	<p>Specific List</p> <p>Conn. Gen. Stat. § 2-9a(2)(b)</p>	<p>The Legislature</p> <p>The recommended compensation plan will not go into effect without a vote from the General Assembly.</p>
<p>Delaware</p> <p>Delaware Compensation Commission</p>	<p>Two Branches + Private Sector</p> <p>5 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (2) • Speaker of the House (1) • President of the Senate (1) • President of the Delaware Business Roundtable (1) 	<p>Statute</p> <p>Del. Code tit. 29, § 3301 - 3304</p>	<p>Specific List</p> <p>Del. Code tit. 29, § 3303</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>Recommendations take effect unless the General Assembly passes a joint resolution to reject it at least 30 days before the end of its session.</p>
<p>Hawaii</p> <p>Commission on Salaries</p>	<p>Three Branches</p> <p>7 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (2) • Speaker of the House (2) • President of the Senate (2) • Chief Justice (1) 	<p>Constitution</p> <p>Haw. Const. § art. 16, § 3.5</p>	<p>Categories</p> <p>Haw. Const. § art. 16, § 3.5</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>Automatically becomes law unless the legislature disapproves, but new rate does not apply to the current legislature.</p>

<p>Idaho</p> <p>The Committee</p>	<p>Two Branches</p> <p>6 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (3) • Supreme Court (3) 	<p>Constitution + Statute</p> <p>Idaho Const. art. III, § 23 Idaho Code § 67-406b</p>	<p>Narrow Scope</p> <p>The Legislature Only Idaho Code § 67-406b</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>The Committee's rates will go into effect unless the legislature rejects or reduces them by concurrent resolution.</p>
<p>Maryland</p> <p>General Assembly Compensation Commission</p>	<p>Two Branches</p> <p>9 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (5) • Speaker of the House (2) • President of the Senate (2) 	<p>Constitution</p> <p>Const. art. III, § 15</p>	<p>Narrow Scope</p> <p>The Legislature Only</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>The resolution, with any reductions that shall have been concurred in by joint resolution of the General Assembly, shall take effect and have the force of law</p>
<p>Michigan</p> <p>State Officers Compensation Commission</p>	<p>Governor Only</p> <p>7 members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (7) 	<p>Constitution + Statutes</p> <p>Mich. Const. § art. 4, § 12 Mich. Comp. Laws §§ 15.211 – 15.218</p>	<p>Categories</p> <p>Mich. Const. § art. 4, § 12</p>	<p>The Legislature</p> <p>These recommendations only become salaries if the legislature adopts them by concurrent resolution.</p>

<p>Minnesota</p> <p>State Compensation Council</p>	<p>Three Branches</p> <p>16 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (8) • Speaker of the House (2) • President of the Senate (2) Minority Leader of the House (1) • Minority Leader of the Senate (1) • Chief Justice (2) <p>The Governor appoints one member from each congressional district.</p>	<p>Statute</p> <p>Minn. Stat. § 15A.082</p>	<p>Categories</p> <p>Minn. Stat. § 15A.082(2)</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>Minn. Stat. § 15A.082(3)</p>
<p>Missouri</p> <p>Missouri Citizens' Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials</p>	<p>Three Branches + Citizens Appointed by Secretary of State from Voter Roll</p> <p>21 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor with advice and consent of the Senate (12) • Supreme Court (1) • Secretary of State (1 per congressional district) 	<p>Constitution</p> <p>Mo. Const. art. XIII, § 3</p>	<p>Categories</p> <p>Mo. Const. art. XIII, § 3</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>Mo. Const. art. XIII, § 3</p>

<p>Oregon</p> <p>The Public Officials Compensation Commission</p>	<p>Three Branches + Citizens Appointed by Secretary of State from Voter Roll</p> <p>11 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (2) • Speaker of the House (1) • President of the Senate (1) • Chief Justice (1) • Secretary of State (6) 	<p>Statute</p> <p>Or. Rev. Stat. § 292.907</p>	<p>Specific List</p> <p>Or. Rev. Stat. § 292.930</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>Or. Rev. Stat. § 292.912</p>
<p>Utah</p> <p>State Elected Official and Judicial Compensation Commission</p>	<p>Two Branches, Members, and State Bar Commission</p> <p>6 voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (1) • Speaker of the House (1) • President of the Senate (1) • Members appointed by Governor, Speaker, and President (2) • State Bar Commission (1) 	<p>Statute</p> <p>Utah Code Ann. § 67-8</p> <p>Utah Elected Official and Judicial Salary Act</p>	<p>Categories</p> <p>Utah Code Ann. § 67-8-5</p>	<p>Legislature, Executive, and Judiciary</p> <p>The Commission shall “consult and advise with, and make recommendation to” each branch of government. It is unclear which branch has the final say on the recommendations.</p> <p>Utah Code Ann. § 67-8-5</p>

<p>Washington</p> <p>Washington Citizens' Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials</p>	<p>None Listed</p>	<p>Constitution</p> <p>Wash. Const. art. XXVIII, § 1</p>	<p>Broad Category</p> <p>Determines salaries for members of the legislature, elected officials of the executive branch of state government, and judges of the state's supreme court, court of appeals, superior courts, and district courts</p>	<p>Compensation Commission</p> <p>The Commission has the authority to set the salary of all public officials, and that salary can only be changed by referendum petition.</p>
<p>West Virginia</p> <p>The Citizens Legislative Compensation Commission</p>	<p>Governor Only</p> <p>7 members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor (7) 	<p>Constitution</p> <p>W. Va. Const. art. VI, § 33</p>	<p>Narrow Scope</p> <p>Legislators only</p>	<p>The Legislature</p> <p>The Legislature must enact the resolution into law and may reduce, but not increase any item established in such resolution.</p>

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

2016 Meeting Dates

December 8

2017 Meeting Dates

January 12

February 9

March 9

April 13

May 11

June 8

July 13

August 10

September 14

October 12

November 9

December 14