



www.lsc.ohio.gov

OHIO LEGISLATIVE SERVICE COMMISSION

Office of Research
and Drafting

Legislative Budget
Office

H.B. 212
(1_135_0275-15)
135th General Assembly

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

[Click here for H.B. 212's Bill Analysis](#)

Version: In House Civil Justice

Primary Sponsor: Reps. King and Klopfenstein

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: Yes

Tom Wert, Senior Budget Analyst

Highlights

- The bill would add to duties of county auditors, and potentially also of sheriffs and prosecutors, in connection with protected property, adding to county costs by indeterminate amounts. Court costs may also rise but would be covered by sale proceeds, if forced property sales result.
- Costs of the Secretary of State could increase as a result of additional types of threats to be considered in compiling a registry of foreign adversaries and other persons subject to the bill's restrictions.
- To the extent that the bill limits demand for Ohio real property, it may result in lower property values than otherwise, and in lower tax revenues.

Detailed Analysis

The bill would expand a law, called the Save Our Farmland and Protect Our National Security Act that is part of H.B. 33 of the 135th General Assembly, the main operating budget. That law prohibits certain governments, businesses, and individuals from acquiring agricultural land. The bill would extend the prohibition on ownership to other specified property, and would name this new law the Ohio Property Protection Act.

Key provisions of the bill

Under the bill, protected property includes, in addition to agricultural land, real property within a 25-mile radius of (1) an installation under United States armed forces jurisdiction, or (2) a critical infrastructure facility. Few if any areas of the state would not be within 25 miles of one or the other of these types of properties. Installations under armed forces jurisdiction include military bases, camps, or airports. Critical infrastructure facilities include a long list of types of

structures and properties spanning the state including but not limited to electric transmission and distribution lines and related facilities, railroad property, water or sewage treatment systems and piping, telephone poles and lines, freight transportation facilities, dams, and various types of manufacturing plants and utilities.

Ohio's Secretary of State currently is tasked with compiling a registry of persons that are a threat to agricultural production, to which the bill adds critical infrastructure, security, or military defense. The bill defines foreign adversary as a country listed on the Secretary of State's registry. It prohibits persons on the registry, governments of foreign adversaries, businesses headquartered in foreign adversaries, and businesses directly or indirectly owned or controlled by such persons or their agents, fiduciaries, or trustees from acquiring protected property, with certain exceptions. Such a person who owns protected property prior to the bill's effective date may continue ownership but may not acquire more unless an exception applies, such as situations where the person acquires protected property through device or descent. If the person acquires protected property under one of those exceptions, or if the person subsequently becomes subject to the bill's restrictions, they must divest of the protected property acquired after the bill's effective date within two years after acquisition or being made subject to the bill's restrictions, as applicable.

Fiscal effects

The bill creates duties for county auditors, sheriffs, and prosecutors, whose costs consequently may increase by an indeterminate amount. It provides that proceeds from sales by court decree of protected property are to be applied first to pay court costs.

The Secretary of State continues to incur costs to compile and periodically update the required registry. The addition of critical infrastructure, security, or military defense to agricultural production as property or subject matter threatened if acquired by foreign adversaries or other persons may increase these costs.

An H.B. 33 provision that was similar to this bill was vetoed by the Governor. The associated veto message stated, "including other non-agricultural real property in [the Save Our Farmland and Protect Our National Security Act] could have unintended economic development consequences."

In general, a restriction on ownership of property will reduce demand and thus could tend to lower property values. Lower property values would imply lower property tax revenues from inside millage. A property value increase that is smaller than it would otherwise be would result in a smaller increase in tax revenues for a school district at the 20-mill floor or a joint vocational school district at the two-mill floor. Given the subject matter of the bill, any such demand reduction may be quite limited in magnitude.