



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Sara D. Anderson

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

Bill: [S.B. 342 of the 130th G.A.](#)

Date: May 28, 2014

Status: As Introduced

Sponsor: Sen. Seitz

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: Yes

Contents: Establishes certain conditions for the use of traffic law photo-monitoring devices by local authorities

State Fiscal Highlights

- No direct fiscal effect on the state.

Local Fiscal Highlights

- Stationing an officer at each of the approximately 250 traffic law photo-monitoring devices currently in use in the state and operating these devices continuously will cost about \$73.0 million per year. Given this cost, municipalities will likely decrease their use of the devices.
- If municipalities choose to decrease their use of the devices, they will see a reduction in the fine revenue generated by the devices, which has been approximately \$12.0 million to \$15.0 million per year statewide in the last few years.

Detailed Fiscal Analysis

Stationing an officer at each device

The bill establishes several conditions for the use of traffic law photo-monitoring devices by local authorities to detect certain traffic law violations.¹ Most significantly, the bill requires a law enforcement officer to be present at the site of the device at all times during its operation. According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and various media reports, there are approximately 250 traffic law photo-monitoring devices being used by at least 14 municipalities in Ohio. The bill's requirement that a law enforcement officer be present at the site of a device will have a significant fiscal impact on these municipalities. Operating the devices for 24 hours per day and seven days per week will require at least four officers for each device – a total of approximately 1,000 officers for all 250 devices statewide. The average annual salary and benefits of a police patrol officer in Ohio is about \$73,000, so, statewide, the annual cost of stationing an officer at each device is approximately \$73.0 million (1,000 officers x \$73,000 per officer).

It is likely that the municipalities will find that continuously operating the current number of devices under the bill's requirement is cost prohibitive, and, instead, will decrease the use of the devices. For example, a municipality may operate fewer devices or only operate them at peak traffic times. Alternatively, municipalities may completely eliminate the use of the devices. A reduction in the use of the devices will result in a reduction in fine revenue. In the last few years, annual fine revenue has ranged from tens of thousands of dollars to more than \$5.0 million per municipality, depending on the number of devices in that municipality. Statewide, annual fine revenue may be from \$12.0 million to \$15.0 million.²

Other conditions for use of devices

The other conditions for use of the devices that are imposed by the bill include requiring local authorities to (1) conduct a safety study of each location that is being considered for a device, (2) conduct a public information campaign, (3) publish notice of the intent to use the devices (including where the devices will be used and the date on which the devices will become operational), (4) refrain from imposing fines for violations detected by a device for at least 30 days after deployment of the device, and (5) erect signs leading up to each intersection where a device is located. These requirements may also increase costs for municipalities choosing to use the devices. It is

¹ Currently, the devices are used to detect instances of running a red light or violating the speed limit.

² There is no official record of fine revenues statewide. This estimate is based on media reports and contacts with municipalities currently using the devices.

probable, however, that many of the 14 municipalities who currently use the devices already meet many of these requirements.

State fiscal effects

As violations detected by traffic law photo-monitoring devices are not criminal convictions and do not go on a person's driving record, the bill will have no direct fiscal effect on the state.

SB0342IN.docx/jc