# *Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement*

*122 nd General Assembly of Ohio*

BILL: **H.B. 259** DATE: **April 23, 1997**

STATUS: **As Introduced** SPONSOR: **Rep. Lawrence**

LOCAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIRED: **No — Permissive**

CONTENTS: **Allows townships operating police departments to impose charges for false private alarms and includes alarms answered by police constables among the false alarms for which county sheriffs and certain township trustee boards may impose charges**

## *State Fiscal Highlights*

- No direct fiscal effect on the state.

## *Local Fiscal Highlights*

| LOCAL GOVERNMENT | FY 1997 | FY 1998 | FUTURE YEARS |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Counties and Townships** | | | |
| Revenues | Potential increase | Potential increase | Potential increase |
| Expenditures | Potential increase | Potential increase | Potential increase |

- Townships and counties could generate a potential increase in revenues by charging the fines allowed under the bill.
- Townships and counties could have increased costs if they chose to utilize the procedures set forth in the bill, for collecting the fines for false alarms.
- Counties could face additional costs in order enter unpaid fines as liens upon the tax duplicate.

## *Detailed Fiscal Analysis*

**Provisions of the Bill**

This legislation would include false alarms answered by township police constables, among the false alarms for which charges may be imposed, and among the false alarms that are counted in determining when bills for subsequent false alarms can be sent by township officials or county sheriff's departments. In addition, the legislation includes boards of township trustees that operate township police departments among those who can charge a fee for answering false alarms.

Current law allows for townships to take such action when other township law enforcement officers have answered three false alarms within a calendar year resulting from a malfunction of the same commercial or residential security alarm system, but does not include constables. The procedure for collecting the fine remains the same as in current law.

Under current law, the township trustees can have the township clerk send the manager of the commercial establishment or the occupant, lessee, agent, or tenant of the residence, a bill for twenty-five dollars for each subsequent false alarm after three false ones from the alarm system in order to defray costs incurred.

County sheriffs have similar power for collecting the costs for responding to false alarms occurring within the unincorporated area of the county. The township clerk is not allowed to send a bill for a false alarm if the county sheriff has already sent a bill for the same alarm and vice versa.

**Effects of the Bill**

Essentially, the bill expands the ability of townships and/or sheriffs to recover some of the costs of responding to false alarms. This could mean increased fine revenue for the townships and/or counties. If the number of fines charged for false alarms increased, then townships and/or counties could face additional costs in order to issue and recover the fines. However, it seems reasonable to assume that a township or county would not choose to collect additional fines unless it was advantageous to do so. However, counties would be required to enter unpaid fines from townships on the tax duplicate.

*LBO Staff: Alexander C. Heckman, Graduate Researcher*

hb0259in