



---

## ***Detailed Fiscal Analysis***

The bill requires a person who wishes to operate a business that offers tattooing or body piercing services to apply for a permit to the board of health of the city or general health district in which the business is located. Under the bill's provisions, the duties of the local boards of health include adopting rules; providing and processing application forms; and conducting at least one inspection of a business prior to approval (the board is permitted to do additional inspections).

Fees are to be established by the board by rule and are to be deposited into the health fund of the district that the board serves. Although current law permits the district advisory council or the legislative authority of a city to disapprove a fee, it is unlikely to happen provided the fee is justified as the amount necessary to cover expenditures.

According to a spokesperson from the Association of Ohio Health Commissioners, the number of such businesses in Ohio is not known; however, it is estimated to range from 2 to perhaps 50 in an area as large as Cleveland, Columbus or Cincinnati. Additionally, some local boards are currently providing regulatory services if the local board has adopted local ordinances that provide for regulation. Current fees in these areas range from \$100-\$200 per approved business and cover the board's cost of regulation. This fee range is not expected to vary following the bill's implementation. Therefore, it is estimated that the bill's provisions will increase expenditures minimally for the local boards and that fees generally will cover a board's costs and generate a minimal amount of revenue.

The bill also provides that violations of certain provisions are a misdemeanor of the fourth degree, while others are of the first degree. For misdemeanors, prosecution and incarceration costs would be borne by the counties, while municipalities and counties would share adjudication costs. Fine revenue would go to the counties. Other violations of the bill's provisions require a fine to be levied or payment to be made by the performance of public work at a reasonable hourly rate established by the court. Since it is assumed that the occurrence of offenses would not be significant, prosecution costs and fine revenue are assumed to be minimal.

Any child who violates the provisions of the bill can be subject to misdemeanor provisions of Section 2151.355(A)(8)(a) of the revised code. Subjecting juveniles adjudicated delinquent to 2151.355(A)(8)(a) would potentially raise revenues to counties by imposing fines and costs under Section 2151.3512 (B) and (E). The table below shows fine schedule for various misdemeanor provisions of Section 2151.3512:

<b>ORC</b>	<b>Misdemeanor Level</b>	<b>Fine</b>
2151.3512(A)	Minor/Unclassified Misdemeanor	Up to \$50.0
<b>2151.3512(B)</b>	<b>M4</b>	<b>Up to \$75.0</b>
2151.3512(C)	M3	Up to \$125.0
2151.3512(D)	M2	Up to \$175.0
<b>2151.3512(E)</b>	<b>M1</b>	<b>Up to \$250.0</b>

The lack of data on the number of children falsifying identification documents and on current fine collections from delinquent youth makes it difficult to estimate the potential revenues to be collected under the fine schedule. This is compounded by the very high level of

indigence among juvenile offenders and their families, decreases the likelihood of collecting fine revenues. In addition, prosecution expenses are not likely to be offset by the fees and fines.

□ *LBO staff: Barbara Petering, Senior Analyst*  
*Ogbe Aideyman, Budget Analyst/Economist*

HB0025SR