

Bills with Altered Local Impact

This section describes bills passed in 2002 that became law and were altered during the legislative process, so that the “As Enacted” impact on local governments was different from the “As Introduced” local impact.

Out of the 167 bills enacted in 2002, eight of the bills were altered after the initial determination so that the determination would have been different. Three bills were altered after the initial determination so that they no longer had a local impact “As Enacted.” Five bills with no impact “As Introduced” were altered so that they did have a local impact “As Enacted.”

Table 5 demonstrates these results compared to previous years. Overall the number of bills with an altered impact is second highest in 2002 compared to the past years’ figures.

Table 5: Local Effects Changing from Introduction to Enactment 1999-2002

| | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | Total |
|---|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Bills altered so that certain elements, which prompted a “Yes” local impact determination, were eliminated from the enacted bill. | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Bills with a “No” local impact determination altered so that the changes made created a fiscal impact on local governments. | 4 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 15 |

Over the past four years, the number of bills that were changed from a “No” local impact determination is somewhat higher than the number of bills that were changed from a “Yes” local impact determination. Sixty percent of the bills, whose impact changed, were altered so that they did have a fiscal impact on local governments “As Enacted.”

In 2002, three bills were introduced with a local impact, but the enacted version of the bill did not have a local impact. These bills are H.B. 70, H.B. 221, and H.B. 515. Five bills were introduced with no local impact, but “As Enacted” the bills are estimated to have a local impact. These bills are H.B. 150, H.B. 327, H.B. 510, H.B. 530, and S.B. 175.

Presentation of 2002 Bills with an Altered Local Impact

“Yes” to “No”

| BILL | PAGE |
|----------------------|-------------|
| ➤ Sub H.B. 70 ----- | 11 |
| ➤ Sub H.B. 221 ----- | 12 |
| ➤ Am. H.B. 515 ----- | 14 |

“No” to “Yes”

| BILL | PAGE |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| ➤ Sub. H.B. 150 ----- | 16 |
| ➤ Am. Sub. H.B. 327 ----- | 18 |
| ➤ Sub. H.B. 510 ----- | 21 |
| ➤ Am. Sub. H.B. 530 ----- | 23 |
| ➤ Am. Sub. S. B. 175 ----- | 25 |

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 70

Bill Contents: To include appurtenances to roads and bridges to enhance the safety of animal-drawn vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles in the types of projects for which local subdivisions may receive financial assistance through the Ohio Public Works Commission

“As Introduced” LIS Determination: Yes

“As Enacted” local impact: No – Permissive

Key changes affecting local impact: Removes a \$5 million earmark from the State Capital Improvements Fund for Amish buggy safety projects.

Fiscal effects of changes: The amount of grant moneys available to political subdivisions under the State Capital Improvement Program will remain unchanged by the bill.

Analysis of changes with fiscal impact:

The “As Introduced” version of H.B. 70 earmarked \$5 million from the State Capital Improvements Fund (SCIP) for Amish buggy projects. Political subdivisions with Amish communities located within their boundaries were eligible to receive these funds for road widening projects, constructing pull-off lanes, improving curves, placing warning signs, and conducting various studies and programs. However, by earmarking \$5 million in SCIP funds for Amish buggy projects, political subdivisions in other districts would have received reduced SCIP funding.

The “As Enacted” version of H.B. 70 removes the \$5 million earmark and expands the definition of a capital improvement project to include “appurtenances to roads and bridges to enhance the safety of animal drawn vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles.” This change does not limit the funds available under the State Capital Improvement Funds, and any administrative costs to political subdivisions that apply for such grants are permissive. Any political subdivisions choosing to construct these appurtenances may use the grant money for the same eligible activities as defined in the “As Introduced” version.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 221

Bill Contents:

Establish a drug repository program for the collection and redistribution of prescription drugs that are in their original unopened packaging

“As Introduced” LIS Determination:

Yes

“As Enacted” local impact:

No

Key changes affecting local impact:

In the As Introduced version of H.B. 221, local departments of health (LHDs) were designated to serve as the receiver of donated drugs. Once drugs were donated at an LHD, the local department would have been required to use a licensed pharmacist who is volunteering his services to distribute the drugs to eligible individuals or entities. These provisions were removed in the substitute version of the bill (LSC 124 0604-3). The As Introduced version of H.B. 221 also included a personal income tax credit for a portion of the value of drugs donated under the drug repository program. This provision was removed in the substitute version of the bill (LSC 124 0604-3).

Fiscal effects of changes:

There is no direct fiscal effect on political subdivisions in the As Enacted version of the bill.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

Local Departments of Health

In the As Introduced version of H.B. 221, local departments of health (LHDs) were designated to serve as the receiver of donated drugs. Once drugs were donated at an LHD, the local department would have been required to use a licensed pharmacist who is volunteering his services to distribute the drugs to eligible individuals or entities.

Under the original provisions of the bill, local health departments would have incurred some costs associated with administrative tasks involved with operating the drug repository program. Although many LHDs would have been able to utilize existing staff to perform these duties, it is likely that there would have been some departments that would incur added costs exceeding \$5,000 annually.

These provisions were removed in the substitute version of the bill (LSC 124 0604-3). Thus, there is no direct fiscal effect on political subdivisions in the As Enacted version of the bill.

Tax Credit

The As Introduced version of H.B. 221 also included a personal income tax credit for a portion of the value of drugs donated under the drug repository program. The tax credit would have reduced an individual's tax liability and therefore reduce the amount of tax collected. This decrease in revenue would have been borne entirely by the GRF in FYs 2002 and 2003. In future years, the loss in revenue would have been split between the GRF (89.5% of any loss), the Local Government Fund (4.2% of any loss), the Local Government Revenue Assistance Fund (0.6% of any loss), and the Library and Local Government Support Fund (5.7% of any loss).

This provision was removed in the substitute version of the bill (LSC 124 0604-3). Thus, there is no direct fiscal effect on political subdivisions in the As Enacted version of the bill.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 515

Bill Contents:

Makes changes relating to the board of township trustees' journal, meeting minutes, and publication of resolutions in a home rule township; and allows civil service townships that are urban townships to appoint any one of the three highest scorers on a police or fire department promotional exam

“As Introduced” LIS Determination:

Yes

“As Enacted” local impact:

No - Permissive

Key changes affecting local impact:

The enacted bill does not include the introduced provision that would have required urban township employees to be in the same occupational classifications as municipal employees for workers' compensation.

Fiscal effects of changes:

The provision placing urban township employees in the same workers' compensation classification as municipal employees could have increased or decreased costs to urban townships depending on whether they were placed in the same classification with cities or with villages.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

The “As Introduced” version of H.B. 515 would have placed urban township employees in the same occupational classifications as municipal employees for workers’ compensation benefits. At the time of the bill’s introduction, there were 15 urban townships subject to the provisions of H.B. 515.

| | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| * Hamilton County | Delhi, Springfield, Sycamore |
| * Clermont County | Miami |
| * Warren County | Deerfield |
| * Montgomery County | Washington |
| * Stark County | Jackson, Perry, Plain |
| * Mahoning County | Austintown, Boardman |
| * Lucas County | Sylvania |
| * Butler County | Fairfield, West Chester |
| * Trumbull County | Howland |

In addition, the introduced version of H.B. 515 contained a provision to permit a township that is both civil service and urban to appoint one of any of the three highest scorers on a police or fire department promotional exam instead of the current practice of promoting only the single highest scorer on the exam(s).

Third, the introduced bill made changes to the keeping of the limited home rule township journal, taking of minutes of board meetings, and publication of board resolutions such that the township trustees might designate any person, by majority vote, to keep its journal and take the minutes of board meetings.

The change in workers’ compensation occupational classifications could have increased or decreased expenses, while the authority to appoint any of three specifically qualified candidates in fire and police promotions would produce no direct effect on expenses, and the authority to designate anyone to handle the journal and minutes of township board meetings may or may not produce expenses, depending on what specific arrangements the board of township trustees chooses.

The “As Enacted” version of H.B. 515 eliminated the provision for reclassification of urban township employees from the bill and therefore, eliminated the potential for expense increase or decrease in workers’ compensation costs for urban townships.

In the enacted version of H.B. 515, the provision relevant to the appointment of an individual from one of the three highest scorers on the applicable exam(s) to police and fire promotions in urban townships, and the provision permitting the designation of any person to keep the board meeting minutes and journal for the trustees in a limited home rule township were retained. Of these two provisions, only the methods of keeping meeting minutes and the journal may create increased costs, depending on the specific choices the township trustees makes for accomplishing these tasks. Both of these provisions in the enacted bill are permissive.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 150

| | |
|--|---|
| Bill Contents: | Require a hearing screening for each newborn born in a hospital |
| “As Introduced” LIS Determination: | No – No local cost |
| “As Enacted” local impact: | Yes |
| Key changes affecting local impact: | Continuing law requires sickness and accident insurance policies and employee benefit plans that provide coverage for family members and benefits for children to include benefits for child health supervision services for children from birth to age nine. The benefits for child health supervision services that are provided to a child from birth to age one are not required to exceed a maximum of \$500. The act provides that child health supervision services include hearing screenings under the Department of Health's hearing screening program. The coverage for hearing screenings must not exceed \$75 of the \$500 maximum coverage limit. |
| Fiscal effects of changes: | The bill could lead to an increase in rates charged by health insuring corporations and by sickness and accident insurers as a result of the provision requiring hearing screenings to be covered. Any potential increase in HIC rates could be recovered from local government employees in whole or in part through higher employee share payments or through smaller wage increases. This could potentially increase local costs between \$350,000 and \$800,000. |

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

Continuing law requires sickness and accident insurance policies and employee benefit plans that provide coverage for family members and benefits for children to include benefits for child health supervision services for children from birth to age nine. The benefits for child health supervision services that are provided to a child from birth to age one are not required to exceed a maximum of \$500. The act provides that child health supervision services include hearing screenings under the Department of Health's hearing screening program. The coverage for hearing screenings must not exceed \$75 of the \$500 maximum coverage limit.

The bill could lead to an increase in rates charged by health insuring corporations and by sickness and accident insurers as a result of the provision requiring hearing screenings to be covered. To find the possible increase in HIC costs, the total number of children screened (150,916) is multiplied by the cost per test (range between \$30 and \$70 per test). The Legislative Service Commission is estimating that 11.2 percent will be covered by a government employer health insurance plan. The potential increase was determined by taking the percentage of government employer health plans that are covering both state employees and local employees (excluded federal employees). According to June 2001 Bureau of Labor Statistics data, of the 783,800 public employees in Ohio, 21.0 percent are state workers and 68.4 percent are local government employees.

| | Total No. of Newborns | Total Cost Statewide | Cost for Public Employees (11.2 % of total cost) | Cost to Employer |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|------------------|
| State Employees (@\$30 per screening) | 150,916 | \$4,527,480 | \$507,078 | \$106,486 |
| Local Employees (@\$30 per screening) | 150,916 | \$4,527,480 | \$507,078 | \$346,841 |
| State Employees (@\$70 per screening) | 150,916 | \$10,564,120 | \$1,183,181 | \$248,468 |
| Local Employees (@\$70 per screening) | 150,916 | \$10,564,120 | \$1,183,181 | \$809,296 |

Any potential increase in HIC rates could be recovered from local government employees in whole or in part through higher employee share payments or through smaller wage increases. This could potentially increase local costs between \$350,000 and \$800,000.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 327

Bill Contents:

Clarifies certain provisions of the Felony Sentencing Law, corrects the penalty provisions for illegal processing of drug documents, clarifies the eligibility criteria for intervention in lieu of conviction, requires applicants for nurse licensure and dialysis technician certification to have a criminal records check, expands the offense of unauthorized use of property, revises certain provisions of the law governing nurses and dialysis technicians as to licensing or certification, duties, and training, specifies that the members of the Ohio Council for Interstate Adult Supervision serve without compensation but are to be reimbursed for expenses, and extends until July 1, 2002, the date by which the State Criminal Sentencing Commission must recommend changes to the state's criminal forfeiture laws.

“As Introduced” LIS Determination:

No - No local cost

“As Enacted” local impact:

Yes

Key changes affecting local impact:

Clarifies that pleading guilty to a domestic violence offense will be treated identically, in terms of enhancing a future charge of domestic violence, to cases where a defendant enters a no contest plea or is convicted by trial.

Fiscal effects of changes:

It appears that a number of domestic violence cases, potentially a relatively large number, will shift from municipal and county courts to common pleas courts where the processing of felony cases is generally considered to be more expensive. The likely effect is that annual county criminal justice expenditures will increase, perhaps more than minimally in larger and more urban jurisdictions.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

Domestic violence

The bill clarifies that pleading guilty to a domestic violence offense will be treated identically, in terms of enhancing a future charge of domestic violence, to cases where a defendant enters a no contest plea or is convicted by trial. It appears that courts currently tend to consider a guilty plea as being a different process than a trial conviction, and repeat domestic violence offenses are widely charged as a misdemeanor of the first degree, which is the same as a first-time domestic violence offense. The net effect of this clarification is that all repeat offenders, including those who previously pleaded guilty to domestic violence offenses, will face a felony of the fifth degree and the more serious sanction intended for a repeat domestic violence offense. In determining the existence of a previous domestic violence conviction, the bill would also include cases in which there was a prior conviction for committing an act of domestic violence in another state or in violation of a similar United States law.

There are currently thousands of cases of domestic violence charges filed annually statewide as misdemeanors in municipal and county courts. The Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission (OCSC) has data suggesting an estimate of approximately 17,000 annual domestic violence cases. At this time, Legislative Service Commission's fiscal staff cannot precisely estimate the number of repeat offenders that previously pled guilty to a domestic violence offense, but have learned that the vast majority of domestic violence convictions, more than 90%, come as a result of a guilty plea, and that first-time offenders spend an average of eight days in a local jail. Additionally, the OCSC data suggests that, out of the 17,000 estimated annual cases, approximately 5.4%, or around 918 offenders, have evidence of a prior similar conviction. This does not include a small number of additional repeat offenders that migrate to Ohio from other states where they have prior domestic violence convictions. Based on a conversation with the Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association, such cases have been a problem in Ohio's counties that border other states.

It seems therefore reasonable to conclude that, as a result of the bill, a number of domestic violence cases, potentially a relatively large number, will shift from municipal and county courts to common pleas courts where the processing of felony cases is generally considered to be more expensive. While it is difficult to predict an exact shift in caseload, some county criminal justice systems' adjudication, prosecution, and indigent defense costs will increase in order to process and resolve additional domestic violence cases.

Local jail costs for counties will likely increase as well. If only ten additional offenders are convicted of a repeat domestic violence offense and are given double the eight-day average jail term of a first-time domestic violence offender, or 16 days, then the cost just for local incarceration (at about \$65 per day statewide) would be in excess of the \$5,000 threshold that LSC fiscal staff typically term "minimal local cost."

Cases shifting out of the misdemeanor system into the felony system also mean that counties will gain court cost and fine revenues. Although an estimate of that revenue is difficult to calculate with much precision at this time, it would appear that these revenue gains are unlikely to exceed minimal annually.

Conversely, municipal criminal justice systems will realize some expenditure savings as cases are elevated into county criminal justice systems, and also lose court cost and fine revenues that would otherwise have been collected. Although it is fairly difficult at this time to put a very precise annual price tag on these local fiscal effects for municipalities, the expected decreases in expenditures and losses in revenues appear unlikely to exceed minimal.

There is no presumption for prison on a felony of the fifth degree. The average time served for offenders actually sentenced to prison for the primary offense of a felony of the fifth degree is 0.69 years. Additional domestic violence offenders are also likely to be sentenced to prison as a result of the bill, thus increasing the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's incarceration costs. The annual increase in the Department's incarceration costs is difficult to precisely predict at this time, but could easily exceed minimal annually, which means in excess of \$100,000, if 20 or more additional offenders are sentenced to prison annually.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 510

Bill Contents:

Amends existing law relative to the operation of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, including the treatment of prisoners, the Adult Parole Authority, and the confidentiality of certain reports and information, expands the offense of sexual battery, creates the offense of illegal conveyance of a communications device onto the grounds of a detention facility, and provides for the auditing of community-based correctional facilities.

“As Introduced” LIS Determination:

No - minimal cost

“As Enacted” local impact:

Yes

Key changes affecting local impact:

Provides for the auditing of community-based correctional facilities.

Fiscal effects of changes:

It is unclear as to what entity would have to pay for the cost of conducting a performance audit, but appears likely to fall on either DRC or the local judicial corrections board, perhaps even if such an audit is undertaken under the Auditor of State’s own initiative. While the costs associated with a financial audit may not be significant, a performance audit is much more extensive in that it examines how well a CBCF meets its programmatic goals. A performance audit can typically take months to perform and potentially cost in the tens of thousands of dollars to complete.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

Auditing of community-based correctional facilities (CBCFs)

Under the bill, the Auditor of State will be required to: (1) conduct financial audits of CBCFs at least once every two years using Department of Rehabilitation and Correction-supplied quarterly financial reports, and (2) conduct a performance audit of a CBCF at the request of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) or the local judicial corrections board, or may undertake such a performance audit on its own initiative. A performance audit is much more extensive than a financial audit in that it examines how well a CBCF meets its programmatic goals. A performance audit can typically take months to perform and potentially cost in the tens of thousands of dollars to complete. Currently, there are 18 CBCFs located around the state.

Presumably, the Auditor of State will charge the appropriate state agency or local government for the performance of these mandated biennial financial audits and permissive performance audits. As of this writing, it is unclear as to whether the annual costs incurred by the Auditor of State in performing these audits will exceed minimal on an ongoing basis, meaning in excess of \$100,000 annually. It appears that any costs incurred by the Auditor of State in performing these audits are typically charged to one of two funds: (1) Fund 109 (Public Audit Expense-Intrastate) in the case of audits performed for a state agency, and (2) Fund 422 (Public Audit Expense-Local Government) in the case of audits performed for a political subdivision. Auditing service payments from state agencies and local governments are deposited in Fund 109 and Fund 422, respectively.

In terms of costs to DRC, the requirement that it provide the Auditor of State with quarterly financial reports should not generate any additional departmental expenses since it already collects and compiles such data under current accounting practices. In the matter of paying for the costs associated with the performance of financial audits, it appears DRC's intent is that it would ultimately pay for any financial audit costs. As of this writing, it is unclear as to what entity would have to pay for the cost of conducting a performance audit, but appears likely to fall on either DRC or the local judicial corrections board, perhaps even if such an audit is undertaken under the Auditor of State's own initiative.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

House Bill 530

Bill Contents:

Modifies the small county exception to the drawing, summoning, and service of jurors for a court of common pleas, allows the board of trustees of a fire district to issue bonds for certain purposes, allows municipal court judges and county court judges to be paid in biweekly installments, confirms creation of an additional term of the drug court judge of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas, creates the Brown County Municipal Court with one full-time judgeship and abolishes the Brown County County Court, continues the authority of the mayor of Georgetown to conduct a mayor's court, creates the Morrow County Municipal Court with one full-time judgeship and abolishes the Morrow County County Court, continues the authority of the mayor of Mount Gilead to conduct a mayor's court, and declares an emergency.

“As Introduced” LIS Determination:

No - No local costs

“As Enacted” local impact:

Yes

Key changes affecting local impact:

Creates the Brown County Municipal Court with one full-time judgeship and abolishes the Brown County County Court, and creates the Morrow County Municipal Court with one full-time judgeship and abolishes the Morrow County County Court.

Fiscal effects of changes:

The net fiscal impact on the state will be an expenditure increase of more than \$12,438 annually. The net fiscal impact on Brown County and Morrow County will be an annual expenditure increase of \$36,204 and \$27,535 or more, respectively.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

Brown County court changes

The bill creates the Brown County Municipal Court on February 9, 2003, establishes one full-time judgeship in that court, and simultaneously abolishes the Brown County County Court and its two part-time judgeships on that date.

Under the bill, Brown County will: (1) realize a \$15,046 annual savings in judicial salaries and benefits, and (2) incur an estimated annual increase of \$51,250 in compensation costs for a part-time magistrate. The net fiscal impact of these two expenditure effects on Brown County will be an estimated \$36,204 increase in annual spending. It appears that there will be no other collateral costs or operational expenses associated with the creation of the Brown County Municipal Court, the establishment of a full-time judgeship in that court, and the abolishment of the Brown County County Court.

Morrow County court changes

The bill creates the Morrow County Municipal Court on January 1, 2003, establishes one full-time judgeship in that court, and simultaneously abolishes the Morrow County County Court and its one part-time judgeship on that date.

Under the bill, Morrow County will experience a net expenditure increase of around \$27,535 annually associated with judicial salaries and other benefits. It appears that there will be no other collateral costs or operational expenses associated with the creation of the Morrow County Municipal Court, the establishment of a full-time judgeship in that court, and the abolishment of the Morrow County County Court.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact
Changed from the Initial Determination

Senate Bill 175

Bill Contents:

Revises the law regarding sexual predator hearings for offenders convicted of a sexually oriented offense but acquitted of a sexually violent predator specification, revises the law regarding Department of Rehabilitation and Correction employees' immunity for acts under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law, makes certain importuning violations a sexually oriented offense, expands the sex offender community notification provisions to give more neighbors notice and earlier notice, changes the law regarding sexual predators and certain habitual sex offenders providing a notice to sheriffs of an intent to reside at a premise, increases the amount of prior notice sex offenders must provide relative to changing residence, changes the relevant age of the victim and offender for the offense of importuning, and declares an emergency.

“As Introduced” LIS Determination:

No - Minimal cost

“As Enacted” local impact:

Yes

Key changes affecting local impact:

Expands the category of “neighbors” who must be notified of a sexual predator’s or certain habitual sex offender’s registration. “Neighbors,” which was formerly defined as those living adjacent to the sexual predator’s or certain habitual sex offender’s residence, was changed to those living within 1,000 feet of the residence.

Fiscal effects of changes:

The Buckeye State Sheriffs’ Association has indicated that this expansion of the category of “neighbors” could create significant costs in the state’s more urban jurisdictions. In a densely packed urban area, the Buckeye Sheriffs’ Association believes that the number of neighbors that would have to be notified could triple or quadruple.

Bills Passed and Signed into Law for which Local Impact Changed from the Initial Determination

Analysis of Changes with Fiscal Impact

Community notification

The bill expands the category of “neighbors” who must be notified of a sexual predator’s or certain habitual sex offender’s registration. The Office of the Attorney General’s Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, which maintains the State Registry of Sex Offenders, has reported that, as of February 25, 2002, of the 7,544 sex offenders registered statewide in Ohio, community notification applied to 965 (862 sexual predators and 103 habitual sex offenders).

In a conversation about the community notification duties of county sheriffs, the Buckeye State Sheriffs’ Association indicated that this expansion of the category of “neighbors” could create significant costs in the state’s more urban jurisdictions. As county sheriffs are generally only notifying neighbors directly adjacent to a sex offender’s residence, in a densely packed urban area, the Buckeye State Sheriffs’ Association believes that the number of neighbors that would have to be notified could triple or quadruple. Currently, this community notification process takes about two hours of a county sheriff’s time per sex offender. It has been suggested that this community notification expansion could increase that amount of time spent on community notification to up to 16 hours per sex offender.