

**HB 50 Sponsor Testimony - Representative Todd Snitchler**  
**Local Government Committee**  
**February 15, 2011 - Room 017**

Chairman Blair, Vice-Chairman Boose, Ranking member Weddington and fellow members of the House Local Government Committee, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to provide sponsor testimony on HB 50.

This bill is a re-introduction of HB 580 from the 128<sup>th</sup> General Assembly. This legislation will require that a political subdivision owner be included in determining the number of owners needed to sign a petition for an expedited type-II annexation. As the law is currently written, a governmental entity, including a school district, is not permitted to participate in the annexation process unless they choose to agree to the annexation; otherwise their involvement is excluded and denies them the ability to participate in the annexation process. All this bill would do if enacted is permit the governmental entity to participate in the process, and if it objects, then the traditional non-expedited annexation route is still available to the entity seeking annexation.

The attached document from the County Commissioners Association of Ohio's Annexation Manual provides a detailed procedural description of expedited type-II annexations under current Ohio law. Should you have questions I am confident the CCAO will be happy to answer them at the committee's convenience.

This issue was brought to my attention by constituents in the last General Assembly. A city that is partly in my district first annexed a local technical learning center located in an adjacent township and then attempted to annex a second school property in another township my district by also annexing a contiguous mobile home park in order to meet the statutory requirements and also be able to 'grab' new tax revenues from school employees to bolster declining city revenues. If this would have occurred, those school employees, who would have

ended up paying the taxes, would not have had an ability to engage directly in the annexation process due to the manner in which the current statute is written. This bill will change the current statute, the spirit of which in this case was being abused, to ensure that all parties subject to such annexations have a voice in the proceedings so that this apparent loophole in the current statute cannot be used against them. In my communications with the Ohio Township Association and the County Commissioners Association of Ohio, no one recalls this type of annexation procedure being contemplated when the statute was passed.

Senator Bill Seitz introduced SB 297 in the 128<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, which addresses similar subject matter pertaining to the apparent loopholes in this type of annexation, and other annexation issues, and it is my understanding that he will reintroduce the bill in this General Assembly if he has not already done so. I am working with him now to improve the current law governing the aforementioned annexation process.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for giving me the opportunity to provide sponsor testimony on HB 50 and I would be happy to answer any questions that members of the committee may have at this time.