



May 21, 2025

Mike Crispen  
President



Jeff Spence  
Vice President



Mike Jones  
Treasurer



Eric Scott  
Secretary

**Chair Abrams, Vice Chair Miller, Ranking Member Thomas, and Members of the Public Safety Committee:**

On behalf of the Central Ohio Chiefs Association (COCA), representing law enforcement executives from across Central Ohio’s most populated and diverse counties, we write to express our strong opposition to House Bill 131, and to urge you to critically re-examine the testimony provided in support of this legislation—particularly the misleading focus on "ticket quotas" while sidestepping the bill’s dangerous inclusion of arrest limitations.

Much of the testimony we have reviewed—including that of the current President of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP)—continues to emphasize citation quotas and officer stress, portraying this as a fight against outdated management practices. While we agree that revenue-driven citation quotas are unethical and have no place in professional policing, we must be clear: House Bill 131 goes far beyond banning tickets—it imposes sweeping restrictions on proactive arrest expectations as well.

The intention of this legislation may be about ensuring officer well-being through the elimination of arbitrary performance standards. However, the downstream consequence is about whether police executives can reasonably expect all officers to carry a fair share of the enforcement workload, or whether leadership must allow underperformers to disengage entirely—protected by vague language such as “finite number,” which dangerously suggests that zero arrests is the only safe standard of expectation. This dynamic places an increasing burden on a smaller group of dedicated officers who are left to shoulder the workload their less active peers avoid. That imbalance is neither equitable nor sustainable. We urge the Committee not to prioritize the comfort of disengaged officers at the expense of those who consistently fulfill their responsibilities with diligence and integrity.

While the bill does allow supervision to assess the *proportion* of arrests and citations made by officers, it provides no guidance on how that assessment can be used. It is clear that we cannot hold officers accountable to the results of that assessment without risking violation of the statute itself. A performance measure without consequence or clarity is meaningless and only further undermines managerial oversight.

Moreover, the idea—repeated by some supporters—that officers are unable to investigate serious crimes because they are too busy writing traffic tickets is both *inaccurate and offensive*. This bill applies to arrests, not just citations. Arrests are often the direct outcome of investigations into violence, theft, drug trafficking, and firearms offenses. The suggestion that supervisors who expect arrests are demanding “quotas” is a misrepresentation of responsible leadership.

Franklin



Licking



Delaware



Pickaway



Fairfield



Union



Madison

Proponents of the bill appear to be looking at future employee expectations—focused on preventing the imposition of arbitrary future work expectations—while opponents are looking at past results, focused on assessing the actual work that has been done in comparison to their peers. Both perspectives aim to support officer and community well-being, but the divide lies in whether accountability for completed work can be maintained. While it may seem like a debate over semantics, it is one with serious operational consequences. We respectfully ask that you amend the bill to address both concerns: *eliminating coercive future quotas while preserving the ability to evaluate and respond to past performance.*

If this bill passes without significant amendment, it will:

- Disempower police leaders from managing officer performance effectively;
- Shield low-performing officers from legitimate oversight;
- Discourage proactive crime prevention in high-risk areas; and
- Undermine community safety at a time when serious crimes and repeat offenders demand more—not less—law enforcement engagement.

We are advocating for the ability to maintain accountability across our ranks, to ensure proactive enforcement is happening where needed, and to prevent a dangerous trend of depolicing that ultimately harms our most vulnerable communities. We respectfully urge the Committee to amend House Bill 131 to **exclude any reference to arrests**, and to preserve the ability of law enforcement leadership to set reasonable expectations for performance—not quotas, but fairness, consistency, and accountability.

Thank you for your time and for your dedication to balanced and effective public safety policy. We remain available to further discuss our concerns and stand ready to collaborate on meaningful reform that serves all Ohio communities.

Sincerely,  
Mike Crispen  
President, Central Ohio Chiefs Association

CC: Members of the Ohio General Assembly