



www.lsc.ohio.gov

# OHIO LEGISLATIVE SERVICE COMMISSION

Office of Research  
and Drafting

Legislative Budget  
Office

S.B. 164  
134<sup>th</sup> General Assembly

## Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

[Click here for S.B. 164's Bill Analysis](#)

**Version:** As Introduced

**Primary Sponsors:** Sens. Hottinger and Yuko

**Local Impact Statement Procedure Required:** No

Terry Steele, Senior Budget Analyst

### Highlights

- The bill makes several modifications to both the definitions and accompanying penalties associated with the cruel and inhumane treatment of companion animals. Overall, these changes may result in some additional county court costs due to the penalty enhancements in the bill. A portion of the cost increases associated with the penalty modifications in the bill could be offset through increased associated fines and court costs.
- The bill specifies that first degree and felony penalties under the bill are classified as violent offenses, which could result in additional prison sentences under the bill.
- Certain animal shelters could incur one-time costs of up to a few thousand dollars to acquire the storage facilities for drugs used to euthanize domestic animals. Erie County appears to be the only county impacted.
- Animal shelters who would need to update their practices to comply with the bill could incur recurring costs of \$120 every two years to be licensed by the Ohio Board of Pharmacy. The license fees would be deposited into the Occupational Licensing and Regulatory Fund (Fund 4K90). Any facilities (county humane societies, dog pounds, or local animal shelters operated by a local governmental entity) that do not already euthanize domestic animals would incur ongoing costs to procure drugs for the euthanizing of domestic animals.

## Detailed Analysis

### Animal cruelty penalties

County and municipal courts could see increases in costs due to the penalty enhancements and new penalties in the bill. The LSC bill analysis contains a table that shows each specific penalty enhancement, as well as new animal cruelty penalty provisions in the bill. Generally, the bill enhances the existing penalties for animal cruelty, to fifth degree felony penalties in all cases, instead of first degree misdemeanors on first offenses and fifth degree felonies for subsequent cases. The bill establishes both fourth and fifth degree felony penalties for the new animal cruelty provisions of the bill. The penalty for fifth degree felonies is up to 12 months in prison with a fine of up to \$2,500. Fourth degree felony cases carry a penalty of up to 18 months in prison and a fine of up to \$5,000. It is unclear as to how many new cases will result from the newly created animal cruelty provisions in the bill. The increased county court costs resulting from penalty enhancements could be partially offset through the increased court costs associated with the penalty enhancements. Additionally, state court costs imposed on felony cases is \$60 per case, with \$30 being deposited into the Indigent Defense Support Fund (Fund 5DY0) and \$30 to the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 4020).

The bill also contains a provision that specifies that any violation of the Animal Abuse Law that is a first degree misdemeanor, or felony, must be classified as a violent offense. Therefore, a judge is not required to sentence an offender to a community control sanction, but instead must impose a prison term on the first offense. These violations would also not be expungable in the same manner as other violations in this penalty class. As a result, it is possible that violations under the bill may result in additional offenders being sentenced to prison time. The cost per day of housing an offender in prison typically ranges from \$60 to \$80 per day.

### Euthanizing of animals

The bill could result in a minimal increase in costs for animal shelters to comply with the bill's general prohibition against using a gas chamber to euthanize certain domestic animals.<sup>1</sup> As of this writing, the Erie County Dog Warden is the only entity that is known to use a gas chamber for euthanizing domestic animals. The Dog Warden has indicated that only (1) domestic dogs that cannot be placed for adoption due to illness, injury, or temperament, or (2) nuisance wildlife is euthanized using the gas chamber. Current law allows for the use of a gas chamber for nuisance wildlife; however, under the bill, the county would need to use an alternate method of euthanasia for domestic animals such as dogs.

The most commonly used and accepted alternative method of euthanasia is by injection. To carry out this process, the Dog Warden would incur a one-time cost to install a secure storage locker for the necessary injection drugs. There would also be recurring costs for biennial licensing under the Ohio Board of Pharmacy. The estimated costs of a required storage locker could range from a few hundred to upwards of a few thousand dollars, depending on the model of locker acquired. Licensing costs related to administering these drugs would be deposited into the Occupational Licensing and Regulatory Fund (Fund 4K90) and would be \$120 every two years.

---

<sup>1</sup> Continuing law allows the use of gas chambers for the slaughtering of livestock and certain other nuisance wild animals.

There would also be some new recurring costs for training staff on this new method, as well as for buying the requisite euthanasia drugs.

### **Prosecution of euthanasia violations**

Under the bill, violations of the prohibition of using gas chambers to euthanize domestic animals is a fourth degree misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of up to \$250, and a jail sentence of not more than 30 days. While certain municipal and county courts could incur additional costs related to this provision, there would appear to be very few new cases, and therefore any related costs would likely be negligible. Any new costs could be partially offset through fines imposed under the bill. Convictions that may result in jail time would appear to be extremely rare, and therefore, applicable county sheriffs would not likely incur new costs to house additional prisoners.