
Detailed Fiscal Analysis

Provisions of the Bill

Currently, Ohio law allows the board of county commissioners, in any county in which there is a duly organized county agricultural society, to appropriate funds for the purchase and/or maintenance of land and/or facilities for fair sites. However, if the proposed expenditures will exceed \$50,000 in any year, Ohio law requires the county board of commissioners to submit a tax levy to the county's voters in order to pay for the proposed expenditures.

This bill amends the current law by removing the levy requirement for expenditures above \$50,00 in a year. It also authorizes a board of county commissioners to put on the ballot the question of a tax levy for purchasing, maintaining, or improving real estate on which to hold fairs.

Effects of the Bill

- According to an Ohio Department of Agriculture official, in FY 1995, 54 counties appropriated less than \$10,000 for fair expenditures and 28 counties appropriated more than \$10,000 but less than \$50,000. Six counties appropriated at least \$50,000 for fair expenditures in 1996. According to a state and a former county official, some counties have found methods for circumventing the current law in order to spend more than \$50,000 without submitting a levy. Under the bill, counties that have the funds and are not currently appropriating more than \$50,000 could choose to increase expenditures.
- Currently, there are 94 fairs operating in Ohio, excluding the Ohio State Fair. Eighty-seven of the fairs are run by the counties, and 7 are run by independent agriculture societies that often will receive county funds. In FY 1996, an average small fair generated \$30,000 in gross receipts, the average medium-sized fair generated over \$700,000, and a large fair generated between \$1 and \$2 million in gross receipts.
- Under this bill, counties that chose to appropriate more than \$50,000 in a year to build or improve fair facilities, could potentially increase their revenues a minimal or significant amount if it results in greater attendance and receipts.
- Under the bill, counties would have many of the same options as before; the main difference is that counties could choose to borrow money for expenditures above \$50,000, thereby giving counties more flexibility in financing large capital projects for which county commissioners did not want to submit a levy. The cumulative amount borrowed for a particularly large project may be increased. Depending upon short and long term interest rates, annual debt service payments could decrease. However, cumulative debt service payments will increase.
- Counties could gain revenues by the new option provided in the bill to put on the ballot a tax levy for purchasing, maintaining, or improving real estate on which to hold fairs.

□ LBO staff: Alexander C. Heckman, Graduate Researcher

hb0117hr