



www.lsc.ohio.gov

OHIO LEGISLATIVE SERVICE COMMISSION

Office of Research
and Drafting

Legislative Budget
Office

H.B. 63
134th General Assembly

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

[Click here for H.B. 63's Bill Analysis](#)

Version: As Introduced

Primary Sponsors: Reps. Cutrona and Stoltzfus

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: No

Tom Wert, Senior Budget Analyst

Highlights

- Municipal councils and boards of township trustees that veto a proposed use of eminent domain to acquire property for a recreational trail might incur some small administrative costs for doing so.
- The bill declares an emergency and so goes into immediate effect.

Detailed Analysis

The bill may result in a small increase in administrative costs for municipal corporations and townships that exercise the authority to veto eminent domain. The bill allows the legislative authority of a municipal corporation or a board of township trustees to veto the use of eminent domain to appropriate property within their borders for a recreational trail used for hiking, bicycling, horseback riding, ski touring, canoeing, or other nonmotorized form of recreational travel. The authority to veto a proposed use of eminent domain would be triggered by a landowner's written request for such a veto. Indirectly, under a local veto, a public entity intending to construct a recreational trail may need to alter its planned route. Depending on the circumstances, such changes may or may not affect the costs of building the trail. The bill specifies that the local veto authority is not applicable in any county with more than one probate judge, the authority with jurisdiction over land appropriation cases. Currently, Cuyahoga County is the only county with more than one probate judge. The bill includes an emergency clause and would thus have immediate effect.