

# Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

127<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of Ohio

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

BILL: **Sub. S.B. 87** DATE: **March 12, 2008**  
STATUS: **As Passed by the House** SPONSOR: **Sen. Carey**  
LOCAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIRED: **No — Minimal cost**  
CONTENTS: **Missing persons**

## State Fiscal Highlights

STATE FUND	FY 2008*	FY 2009	FUTURE YEARS
<b>General Revenue Fund (GRF) and Other State Funds</b>			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	- 0 -	Negligible increase	Negligible increase

Note: The state fiscal year is July 1 through June 30. For example, FY 2008 is July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008.

\* This analysis assumes that the bill's state fiscal effects would occur no sooner than FY 2009.

- **State revenues.** The bill has no readily discernible fiscal implications for state revenues.
- **State expenditures.** Various state entities are already involved in the statewide emergency alert program to aid in the identification and location of abducted children. Given that, there may be, at most, negligible costs for the state to incorporate the bill's requirements into that existing program.

## Local Fiscal Highlights

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	FY 2008	FY 2009	FUTURE YEARS
<b>Counties, Municipalities, and Townships</b>			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	Potential increase, not likely to exceed minimal	Potential increase, not likely to exceed minimal	Potential increase, not likely to exceed minimal

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

- **Local revenues.** The bill has no readily discernible fiscal implications for local government revenues.
- **Local expenditures.** It seems likely that local governments would simply integrate the bill's requirements into their existing emergency alert program for locating abducted children. Assuming that were true, then the magnitude of the potential costs will be minimal.



---

## ***Detailed Fiscal Analysis***

### **Current law**

Effective January 8, 2003, Sub. S.B. 290 of the 124th General Assembly created the statewide emergency alert program to aid in the identification and location of abducted children, and required the program to be a coordinated effort of the Governor's office, the Attorney General, the Department of Public Safety, law enforcement agencies, and television and radio broadcasters. That act also established criteria for law enforcement agencies to apply to determine if the program can be activated and created the AMBER Alert Advisory Committee to provide ongoing review and evaluation of the program's operation and effectiveness.

### **The bill**

The bill most notably: (1) creates the statewide emergency alert program to aid in the identification and location of missing persons who have a mental impairment or are 65 years of age or older, and (2) requires the program to be a coordinated effort among the Governor's office, the Department of Public Safety, the Attorney General, law enforcement agencies, and public and commercial television and radio broadcasters. Arguably, these provisions of the bill largely mirror current law relative to the above-noted program to aid in the identification and location of abducted children. This would suggest that, rather than establishing and maintaining a new program specific to missing persons who have a mental impairment or are 65 years of age or older, the state and its political subdivisions would simply integrate these requirements into their existing emergency alert program for locating abducted children.

Additionally, the bill makes what appear to be relatively minor changes in the existing Missing Persons Law relative to when and where information reported to a law enforcement agency must be made available. Specifically, for certain missing persons, information must be made available: (1) immediately as opposed to a certain number of hours or days, and (2) through the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) as opposed to the Law Enforcement Automated Data System (LEADS).

### **State fiscal effects**

#### **State revenues**

The bill has no readily discernible fiscal implications for state revenues.

#### **State expenditures**

As noted, various state entities are already involved in the statewide emergency alert program to aid in the identification and location of abducted children. Given that, there may be, at most, negligible costs for the state to incorporate the bill's requirements into that existing program.

**Local fiscal effects**

**Local revenues**

The bill has no readily discernible fiscal implications for local government revenues.

**Local expenditures**

As noted, it seems likely that local governments would simply integrate the bill's requirements into their existing emergency alert program for locating abducted children. Assuming that were true, then the magnitude of the potential costs will be minimal.

*LSC fiscal staff: Sara D. Anderson, Senior Budget Analyst*

*SB0087HP.doc/rh*