

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

127th General Assembly of Ohio

Ohio Legislative Service Commission
77 South High Street, 9th Floor, Columbus, OH 43215-6136 ✧ Phone: (614) 466-3615
✧ Internet Web Site: <http://www.lsc.state.oh.us/>

BILL: **H.B. 30** DATE: **May 16, 2007**
STATUS: **As Introduced** SPONSOR: **Rep. R. McGregor**
LOCAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIRED: **No — Minimal cost**

CONTENTS: **To require any local authority that enforces any traffic law by means of traffic law photo-monitoring devices to erect signs on every highway or freeway that is part of the state highway system and that enters a local authority, informing inbound traffic that the local authority utilizes traffic law photo-monitoring devices to enforce traffic laws**

State Fiscal Highlights

STATE FUND	FY 2008	FY 2009	FUTURE YEARS
Highway Operating Fund (Fund 002) – Department of Transportation			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	Minimal administrative costs for approval and/or installation of signs	Minimal administrative costs for approval and/or installation of signs	Minimal administrative costs for approval and/or installation of signs

- **Sign installation/oversight.** In cases where signs and/or guardrails are to be posted (especially on interstate routes) the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) may be involved with the approval and oversight of installation of these devices. Any administrative costs associated with these duties are expected to be minimal.

Local Fiscal Highlights

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	FY 2007	FY 2008	FUTURE YEARS
Counties, Municipalities, and Townships			
Revenues	Potential loss in fine revenue if signs are not posted	Potential loss in fine revenue if signs are not posted	Potential loss in fine revenue if signs are not posted
Expenditures	Increase to install signs varying per local authority	Increase to install signs varying per local authority	Increase to install signs varying per local authority

Note: For most local governments, the fiscal year is the calendar year. The school district fiscal year is July 1 through June 30.

- **Potential loss in fine revenue.** The bill requires signs be posted indicating the local authority has photo-monitoring devices. Further, if the signs are not erected and tickets continue to be issued, the bill states the tickets are invalid. In cases where the tickets are considered invalid, the local authority would forgo the revenue generated from the fines.



- **Signage costs.** Counties, municipalities, and townships that choose to use traffic law photo-monitoring devices to enforce traffic laws may experience an increase in costs to post signs on every highway and freeway that is part of the state highway system that enters the local authority. In some cases some local authorities may already do this, thus incurring fewer costs compared to local authorities that currently do not. Smaller signs located on state routes may cost a few hundred dollars each, whereas larger signs located on the interstates could cost upwards of \$2,000 each.

Detailed Fiscal Analysis

The bill

The bill prohibits any local authority from using traffic law photo-monitoring devices to enforce any traffic law until after it has erected signs on every highway and freeway that is part of the state highway system, and that enters the local authority, informing inbound traffic that the local authority utilizes traffic law photo-monitoring devices to enforce traffic laws.

Past research

There is no readily available statewide source of information that lists which local authorities use traffic law photo-monitoring devices. Based on past LSC research from Sub. H.B. 56 from the 126th General Assembly, LSC determined that very few local authorities currently use traffic law photo-monitoring devices, commonly termed red light cameras (RLCs). The exceptions appear to be the cities of Cleveland, Columbus, Middletown, Norwood, Springfield, and Toledo, as well as Sylvania Township. The cities of Akron, Northwood, and Cleveland apparently also use cameras to detect speeding violations.

Signage costs

Cost factors. Counties, municipalities and townships that choose to use traffic law photo-monitoring devices to enforce traffic laws may experience an increase in costs to post signs on every highway and freeway that is part of the state highway system that enters the local authority. In some cases local authorities may already do this, thus incurring fewer costs compared to a local authority that does not. Ultimately, the costs to local governments will depend on (1) the number of locations where highways and freeways enter the local authority, (2) the number of signs already posted and that are in compliance with the bill, and (3) the costs to manufacture and install the signs.

Signage examples. Based on discussions with the traffic and engineering department at the City of Columbus, smaller signs located on state routes are estimated to cost between \$250 - \$350 each. Larger signs located on the interstates could cost between \$1,000 - \$2,000 each. At all locations where photo-monitoring devices are located the city already has signs posted. Whether the location of the signs are in compliance with the parameters specified in the bill is unknown at this time. However, if the city is required to post signs on interstates such as I-70, I-71, I-270, I-670, and several other state routes coming into the city, the city could experience a range of costs between \$25,000 to \$50,000.

However, this is not to say that all cities would incur similar costs or that other cities' costs to manufacture signs would be the same as those of Columbus. For instance, Springfield estimates that it will have to post very few signs, and in locations where new signs would be required, the cost is likely to be no more than \$100 per sign.

Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) involvement. Furthermore, ODOT may be involved with the approval and oversight of installation of signs, especially signs posted on the interstate highways. Any administrative costs associated with these duties are expected to be minimal. Also, in some cases guardrails may have to be installed in front of the signs for public safety purposes. Any costs associated with installation of signs and guardrails would presumably be paid for by the local authority.

Ticket revenue

The bill states that if the signs are not erected and tickets continue to be issued for such moving violations, the tickets are invalid. In cases where the tickets are considered invalid, the local authority would forgo the revenue generated from the fine. An estimate of how much this possible revenue loss may be is unknown.

LSC fiscal staff: Jonathan Lee, Senior Budget Analyst

HB0030IN.doc/rh