

ISSUES FILED FOR THE NOVEMBER 4, 2008 GENERAL ELECTION

The *Who and What of Elections*, with candidate and issue information, will be available at all branches of the Hamilton County Public Library by mid-October. A copy is mailed to League members. Candidate information is also available online at: www.lwvcincinnati.org

STATE ISSUE 1 - PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR EARLIER FILING DEADLINES FOR STATEWIDE BALLOT ISSUES

(Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio)

To amend Sections 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1g of Article II of the Constitution of the State of Ohio

On the November ballot, State Issue 1 will ask: Shall the proposed amendment be approved? Voting YES means that you want Issue 1 to become law. Voting NO means that you do not want Issue 1 to become law. A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted. If approved, this proposed amendment will be effective immediately.

LWVO Explanation of Issue 1:

This proposed constitutional amendment seeks to make the petition filing deadlines earlier for statewide ballot issues. Currently, the deadlines are 90 days before the election for statewide initiative petitions (laws and constitutional amendments proposed by citizens) and 60 days for statewide referendums (citizen-initiated votes to repeal new laws). The amendment would change these deadlines to 125 days for both.

The proposal adds deadlines for public officials to act on the petitions. It requires the secretary of state to determine whether there are enough valid signatures on a petition by the 105th day before the election. Challenges must be filed in the Ohio Supreme Court not later than 95 days prior to the election. The Ohio Supreme Court must make its decision not later than 85 days prior to the election. If necessary, 10 additional days shall be allowed for the filing of additional signatures. The secretary of state shall check the additional signatures not later than 65 days before the election. Any challenges must be filed in the Ohio Supreme Court not later than 55 days before the election, and the court must rule on any challenges not later than 45 days before the election. If no ruling is made, the petition and signatures shall be presumed to be sufficient.

The proposed amendment would give the Ohio Supreme Court sole authority to consider these cases. Currently lower courts may hear these challenges.

Proponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- The earlier deadlines will allow more time to determine the validity of the petition and the signatures. This should reduce the number of invalid issues that appear on ballots and reduce voter confusion.
- If deadlines are met, absentee voters and election-day voters will know which issues were supported by sufficient valid petitions.
- The process should be more efficient because the amendment provides for specific deadlines for each step of the process.
- Having the Ohio Supreme Court as the sole arbiter of challenges expedites the process.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- The revised deadlines may still not allow time to print correct ballots.
- The revised deadlines decrease the time for each step of the review and may be difficult to meet.
- The earlier deadlines for referenda may result in long delays for voter consideration of challenged laws because laws challenged by the referendum process are suspended until approved by voters. Challengers have 90 days after a law is passed to file a referendum petition. Because this may not

be completed before the filing deadline for ballot issues, a vote on the challenged law may be postponed until the following general election.

- As sole arbiter of challenges, the Ohio Supreme Court will not have the benefit of a record from lower courts.

Websites: None

STATE ISSUE 2 - PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE STATE TO ISSUE BONDS TO CONTINUE THE CLEAN OHIO PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVITALIZATION AND CONSERVATION.

(Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio)

To adopt Section 2q of Article VIII of the Constitution of the State of Ohio

On the November ballot, State Issue 2 will ask: Shall the proposed amendment be approved? Voting YES means that you want Issue 2 to become law. Voting NO means that you do not want Issue 2 to become law. A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted. If approved, this proposed amendment will be effective immediately.

LWVO Explanation of Issue 2:

This ballot issue proposes a constitutional amendment that would add to funding for The Clean Ohio Program. The amendment is identical to the bond issue passed by the voters in 2000 and will provide the state with the authority to issue an additional \$400 million of bonds. These bonds could be used for the benefit of both governmental and non-governmental entities.

Conservation: Up to \$200 million in bonds could be issued for conservation purposes such as preservation of natural areas and farmlands, provision of recreation facilities, and natural resource management projects. Repayment of these bonds would be a general obligation of the state backed by the taxing power of the state.

Revitalization: Up to \$200 million in bonds could be issued for revitalization purposes such as environmental cleanup of publicly or privately owned lands. Repayment of these bonds would be secured by specific state revenues such as receipts from liquor taxes.

Limitations: The proposed amendment limits the amount that could be borrowed in any one fiscal year for either conservation or revitalization purposes to no more than \$50 million. In addition the state can borrow amounts which were authorized but not issued in prior fiscal years.

Reissuance: After a bond is repaid, another can be issued as long as the total amount outstanding does not exceed \$200 million for that type of bond.

Debt Service Expense: The Legislative Services Commission estimates that issuing \$400 million of obligations could increase the state's annual debt service expense by up to \$40 million. The Ohio Office of Budget and Management calculated that principle and interest payable in 2008 for all of the bonds already issued by Ohio is \$1,231,640,023.

This bonding authority must be approved by the voters because the Ohio constitution does not permit an appropriation being made for a period longer than two years.

Proponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- Bond monies could be used to improve drinking water, help keep rivers and streams clean, preserve and protect wildlife and farmland, and expand outdoor recreational opportunities for Ohioans.
- Bond monies could be used to reduce the number of polluted industrial sites and clean up brown fields
- Revitalization of public and private lands could stimulate economic development in urban areas and increase private investment in Ohio.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- Tax monies will be diverted to paying principle and interest, and this may limit the availability of state revenue for other state programs.
- This authority is not time-limited and permits new bonds to be reissued after the retirement of the original bonds without further vote of the people.
- Proceeds from the sale of the publicly funded bonds may be used to benefit private entities.

Websites: Websites not available for proponents and opponents.

STATE ISSUE 3 - PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION TO PROTECT PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IN GROUND WATER, LAKES AND OTHER WATERCOURSES

(Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio)
To adopt Section 19b of Article I of the Constitution of the State of Ohio

On the November ballot, State Issue 3 will ask: Shall the proposed amendment be approved? Voting YES means that you want Issue 3 to become law. Voting NO means that you do not want Issue 3 to become law. A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted. If approved, this proposed amendment shall take effect December 1, 2008.

LWVO Explanation of Issue 3:

This proposed amendment resulted from the Ohio legislature's passage of the Great Lakes Water Compact this past spring. Some lawmakers feared final approval of the Compact might limit private water rights. The constitutional amendment is intended to recognize that:

- Property owners have a protected right to the "reasonable use" of the ground water flowing under their property, and of the water in a lake or watercourse that is on or flows through their property.
- An owner has the right to give or sell these interests to a governmental body.
- The public welfare supersedes individual property owners' rights. The state and political subdivisions may regulate such waters to the extent state law allows.
- The proposed amendment would not affect public use of Lake Erie and the state's other navigable waters.
- The rights confirmed by this amendment may not be limited by sections of the Ohio Constitution addressing home rule, public debt and public works, conservation of natural resources, and the prohibition of the use of "initiative" and "referendum" on property taxes.

Proponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- This amendment, if approved, is intended to reaffirm the rights and expectations of Ohio landowners to have reasonable use of the water on or under their properties.
- The proposed amendment does not establish absolute private ownership of water.
- It reiterates the state's right to regulate water use and water quality.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- The amendment is unnecessary because current Ohio case law already recognizes property owners' interests in the reasonable use of surface and groundwater.
- The Ohio Constitution should be a body of fundamental principles, and should not be amended unless there is a compelling reason.
- The amendment could cause unexpected consequences and unintentional changes in current law.

Websites: None.

STATE ISSUE 4 - Withdrawn by petitioners' committee on September 4, 2008.

STATE ISSUE 5 - REFERENDUM ON LEGISLATION MAKING CHANGES TO CHECK CASHING LENDING, SOMETIMES KNOWN AS "PAYDAY LENDING," FEES, INTEREST RATES AND PRACTICES

(A referendum on Section 3, House Bill 545)

On the November ballot, State Issue 5 will ask: Shall Section 3 of H.B. 545 be approved? A YES vote will cap the annual interest rate on payday loans at 28% and allow only the new regulations to apply to payday lenders. A NO vote may allow payday lenders to charge up to 391% annual interest on a loan. Specifically, a NO vote may create a situation in which both the old and new laws coexist – thereby allowing payday lenders to choose to operate under either law. A majority YES vote will allow only the new regulations affecting payday lenders to be in effect. If approved, changes regulating payday lenders would go into effect immediately.

LWVO Explanation of Issue 5:

Voters are being asked if they want to uphold the legislature's repeal of lenders' authority to charge interest that could be as high as 391%. If the referendum is approved (the "yes" votes prevail), all short term lenders, including payday lenders, would be subject to the following limitations:

- Cap the interest that payday lenders can charge consumers at 28%.
- Limit the amount consumers may borrow from payday lenders to 25% of their monthly income, up to \$500 per loan.
- Limit consumers to four short-term loans per year.
- Provide for a minimum of at least 30 days for a borrower to repay a loan.

Proponents of the referendum argue that:

- The new regulations would cap the interest for payday loans at 28%, which effectively ends lenders' ability to charge up to 391% interest.
- Limiting the number of loans customers can take out annually would help break the cycle of debt in which many customers find themselves trapped. Data show that 99% of payday loans go to repeat borrowers who typically take out 12 or more loans a year.
- Passage of Issue 5 would give borrowers more time to repay a loan and by limiting the amount a consumer can borrow, would help insure that customers do not borrow more than they can afford to repay.

Opponents of the referendum argue that:

- The 28% ceiling on interest rates will not allow lenders to make enough profit to stay in business; lenders will be forced to close locations convenient for borrowers and jobs will be lost.
- The loans provide emergency assistance to cash-strapped borrowers who have no other credit options and the loans are more affordable, if repaid promptly, than bank overdraft fees and credit card late fees.
- A borrower's choice is limited if the number of loans available in a year and the amount of each loan are curtailed. Each borrower should have the right to make their own financial decisions without government restrictions.

Websites:

In support of placing new restrictions on payday lenders:

PROTECT HB 545 Committee <<http://www.yesonissue5.com>>

In opposition to placing new restrictions on payday lenders:

The Committee to Reject H.B. 545 <<http://www.ohioans4financialfreedom.com>>

STATE ISSUE 6 - PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION BY INITIATIVE PETITION FOR A CASINO NEAR WILMINGTON IN SOUTHWEST OHIO AND DISTRIBUTE TO ALL OHIO COUNTIES A TAX ON THE CASINO

(Proposed by Initiative Petition)

To add a new Section 6a to Article XV of the Ohio Constitution

On the November ballot, State Issue 6 will ask: Shall the proposed amendment be approved? Voting YES means you approve of amending the Ohio Constitution to permit one casino near Wilmington in southwest Ohio. Voting NO means you disapprove of amending the Ohio Constitution to permit one casino near Wilmington in southwest Ohio. A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted. If approved, the proposed amendment will take effect 30 days after the election.

League Explanation of Issue 6:

This amendment would authorize a privately-owned casino in Clinton County. The operator would be required to pay a tax of up to 30% annually on gross casino receipts. "Gross casino receipts" excludes payments to winners.

The tax would be allocated in the following ways:

- The Ohio General Assembly would have the authority to determine a reasonable amount to be used to fund a Gaming Regulatory Commission, and receipts will be used to pay the expenses of administering the tax.
- Up to 1% of the tax collected would be used to fund prevention and treatment programs for gambling addicts.
- Following those expenditures, 10% percent of any remaining casino tax receipts would be distributed to Clinton County, and the remaining receipts distributed among all 88 Ohio counties on a per capita basis, to be used as each county sees fit.

If another casino were permitted in Ohio, the tax on the Clinton County casino would drop to 25% of the gross casino receipts *or* the rate paid by the additional casino, whichever is less.

The casino operator must make a minimum initial investment of \$600 million for the development of a destination resort that would include the casino, a hotel and other related amenities. The state may establish an initial license fee not to exceed \$15 million, which will be credited against the first \$15 million of taxes on gross casino receipts. There can be no further licensing fees for the Clinton County casino.

The state may not limit the amounts of the wagers or the hours of operation.

The casino may conduct any type of card or table games, slot machines or electronic gaming devices permitted by the state of Nevada and states adjacent to Ohio, except bets on races or sporting events. Persons must be 21 years old to place wagers at the casino.

Proponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- Thirty-eight states – including Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, and Pennsylvania – have casino gambling. By authorizing a casino in Ohio, the profits could benefit our state rather than other states.
- All counties in Ohio may receive tax revenue generated by the casino, and each county can decide how to best spend its money
- The casino will also be required to pay all other applicable taxes.
- The casino will create jobs in Clinton County.
- The casino will stimulate the economy by adding restaurants, hotels and ancillary businesses.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

- The Ohio general revenue fund, which supports basic services for Ohioans, will get \$0 from the gross casino receipts tax.
- If an additional casino were an Indian casino, which is exempt from taxes, the Clinton County casino might not pay any taxes, either, on the gross casino receipts.
- Ohioans may spend money at the casino they would have spent at other existing Ohio businesses such as restaurants, movies, or sports events, adversely impacting those businesses.
- Ohio lottery profits, currently dedicated to education, may decrease because people will gamble at the casino instead of playing the lottery.
- The number of gambling addicts in Ohio would increase, and the tax receipts dedicated to providing treatment for addicts (0.3% of gross casino receipts) could be insufficient.

Websites:

In support of the proposed amendment:

My Ohio Now <<http://www.yesonissue6.com>>

In opposition to the proposed amendment:

Vote No Casinos <<http://www.votnocasinos.com>>

Full ballot language for the State Issues is available:

on the Ohio Secretary of State's website: www.sos.state.oh.us/ Click on Elections & Ballot Issues

or

as a downloadable pdf file on the Hamilton County Board of Elections website:

<http://www.hamilton-co.org/BOE/> Click on Current Election Candidates and Issues

CINCINNATI CITY ISSUES

ISSUE 7 - PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT CITY OF CINCINNATI

Shall the Charter of the City of Cincinnati be amended to limit the use of photo-monitoring devices to detect certain traffic law violations by adopting new Article XIV?

A majority YES vote is necessary for passage

Explanation: The proposed amendment would add an article to Cincinnati's City Charter which would limit the use of photo-monitoring devices to detect certain traffic law violations unless a law enforcement officer is present at the location of the device and personally issues the ticket to the alleged violator at the time and location of the violation. If this charter amendment is adopted by the voters, no ordinance contradicting the new Article XIV could be approved by Council. Photo-monitoring devices are cameras used as part of a red light enforcement program. Issue 7 was placed on the ballot by City Council as required by law in response to the collection of a sufficient number of valid signatures on a petition to submit the proposal to the voters.

Background: In a December 2007 motion, City Council directed the administration to design and implement a red light traffic enforcement program to enhance public safety by increasing compliance with traffic control devices and reducing the number of vehicular accidents in the City. The program was predicted to result in a minimum of \$1 million dollars in additional revenue. The City administration issued a Request for Proposals, selected a vendor, and recommended approval of an ordinance authorizing the City Manager to enter into contract negotiations to implement a photo red light enforcement program. At the August 2008 Council meeting, the motion to approve the ordinance failed, removing the issue from further Council discussion. In June 2008, a petition to amend the Charter to limit the use of red light cameras was initiated and gathered the required number of signatures to place the issue on the November 2008 ballot. Petition proponents want citizens to make the final decision on a red light camera program by submitting this proposed City Charter Amendment to voters.

For more than a decade, local governments across the country have installed automated photographic equipment at a limited number of intersections with high accident rates to increase compliance with traffic control devices and reduce the number of vehicular traffic accidents. A red light camera program includes a photograph of a vehicle and license plate entering the intersection after the light has turned red, review and processing, mailing a citation, and collecting fine payments. Increased traffic enforcement by the automated system was anticipated to add revenue, while reducing accidents and increasing compliance with traffic control devices.

Studies of red light safety programs are mixed regarding reducing traffic accidents. There is some evidence of reduced right angle collisions and fewer injuries; however, while usually less serious, there were more rear-end crashes. A Federal Highway Administration study concluded the red light cameras provided a modest benefit. The National Motorist Association recommended traffic engineering measures, e.g., proper signal timing, better signal design and improved intersection design as ways to prevent violations and reduce accidents. With red light programs, drivers tended to change behavior and approached intersections with cameras more cautiously. Fewer motorists ran red lights at the red light intersections which reduced the number of fines. Right angle collisions, so called "t-bone crashes," are more dangerous and cause more serious injuries than rear end crashes. However, in trying to avoid a ticket, motorists tend to slam on the brakes resulting in more rear end collisions.

Legal questions have been raised regarding red light camera programs. Such programs privatize enforcement of traffic violations which are criminal laws. The registered owner of the vehicle is held liable for a violation regardless of who was driving the car. A California Superior Court judge dismissed tickets issued under a camera program because the evidence was not gathered by an official police agency, and was inadmissible in court.

City Council is elected to make decisions on behalf of the community. Therefore, some argue a red light safety program should be discussed and debated by Council. This process of decision making provides opportunities for citizens to lobby Council and testify about proposed ordinances.

Arguments for Issue 7:

- Voters should have the final determination about automated photo-monitoring devices to detect traffic violations and not leave the issue for City Council to legislate.
- This charter amendment would send a strong message to city leaders that a red light camera program is not wanted in Cincinnati.
- In discussions about photo-monitoring devices at intersections, key information was not provided: numbers and locations of cameras and a plan for even distribution throughout Cincinnati neighborhoods.
- The City should not rely on motorists' violating traffic laws as a way to enhance revenue.

Arguments against Issue 7:

- The Charter should be a clearly stated body of fundamental principles that provide for the flexible operation of government.
- Arguments for or against a red light safety program should be discussed and debated by Council.
- A red light safety program should not be limited by Charter amendment because such a program can increase compliance with traffic control systems; can increase enforcement of traffic laws without jeopardizing the safety of officers or disrupting traffic flow; and additional revenue can result in fines from increased traffic enforcement.

ISSUE 8 - PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT CITY OF CINCINNATI

Shall the proposed amendment to the Charter of the City of Cincinnati to provide for a method of proportional representation for electing the members of Council whereby each voter ranks candidate choice in descending order from 1 through 9 on each ballot; to provide for the counting of ballots and the determination of results whereby the ballots that are not needed or cannot be used to elect a candidate are distributed to the next highest candidate choice on each ballot who remains eligible to be elected; to provide for the ballot language and direction to voters; to provide for the election of two candidates for mayor in a primary election who shall be eligible for the regular municipal election for mayor; to provide for the election of mayor in the general election; to provide for the choice of write-in candidates; to provide for the election of council and the mayor by ballot without designation of political party; to provide for the marking, sorting and counting of ballots and tabulating the results in a manner consistent with the charter and general election law for non-partisan ballots; to provide for the ongoing validity of Article IX should any provision of Article IX be amended or held unconstitutional or in violation of state law; to provide for the use of mechanical, electronic or other devices for vote counting; and provide other procedures to implement proportional representation by repealing existing Sections 5, 5a, 7, 8, 11 and 12 and enacting new Sections 5, 5a, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 13, be approved?

A majority YES vote is necessary for passage

Explanation: This proposed amendment to the charter of the city of Cincinnati would change the method of electing city council members. Now council members are elected under a 9X at-large system in which the voter selects up to 9 candidates without indicating preferences. The 9 candidates with the most votes are elected to council. If this amendment passes, city council members would be elected by proportional representation (PR), a preferential at-large system, whereby voters rank their choices for council. This amendment was placed on the ballot by initiative petition.

Background: From 1924 to 1957 PR was the method of electing Cincinnati city council members despite attempts in 1936, '39, '47, and '54 to change the method. In 1957, voters approved a charter amendment replacing PR with the current 9X system. In 1988 and again in 1991, charter amendments to reinstitute PR were defeated. In 1993 a charter amendment to replace 9X with cumulative voting was de-

feated. Some traditional at-large systems, like 9X, have been legally challenged, sometimes successfully, as being unconstitutional or illegal under the Voting Rights Act. Concerns for minority representation on council have led to these continued attempts to replace 9X.

Comparison of 9X and Proportional Representation (PR)

At-Large Elections - The current 9X system and the proposed proportional representation method are both at-large electoral systems meaning that representatives (council members) are elected from the entire government unit (the city of Cincinnati in this case) rather than from individual districts in the city.

Candidates under both methods run in a "field race," *i.e.* all candidates run for all the seats on council, not "head to head" for individual seats.

The Ballot - Candidates under either system would continue to be listed on the ballot without party designation (non-partisan ballot) and would be rotated on the ballot. Both systems provide for write-in candidates.

Marking the Ballot - In the case of 9X, each voter may vote for not more than 9 candidates by marking next to each candidate's name for whom the voter wants to vote.

In the case of PR, voters rank their choices of council candidates in order of preference from 1 through 9 by marking appropriate boxes. A voter may not vote for more than 9 candidates but may vote for fewer than 9.

Tabulating the Vote - The 9X ballot gives one vote to each of the candidates selected by the voter. The 9 candidates who receive the highest number of votes are declared elected.

The PR ballots are sorted and counted according to the voters' first choices. A quota to win is determined by dividing the total number of candidates to be elected plus one into the total number of ballots cast and then add one to that resulting number. Any candidate receiving the quota is declared elected. The number of first choice ballots beyond the quota are termed "surplus" ballots and are transferred by mathematical formula to subsequent choices as indicated by the voters on their ballots. If first choice ballots and transferred ballots do not reach the quota for any of the candidates, then the candidate with the fewest votes is declared defeated and that candidate's ballots are redistributed to the remaining candidates who have not been declared elected. A ballot is always transferred to the highest choice marked on it which will help elect a candidate. Eliminations and transfers are continued in this manner until 9 persons are declared elected.

Arguments for Proportional Representation:

- A PR election method is fair since voters with similar interests are represented on council in direct proportion to their voting strengths.
- PR assures that a majority of council represents a majority of the voters while providing representation for significant minorities based on demographics or interests. This representation will encourage more participation of minorities in government and the election process.
- Election by PR would enable council members to reflect the interests of politically cohesive minority groups without these groups having to be geographically concentrated.
- PR may reduce campaign costs because candidates can focus their message to a smaller group of voters.
- PR encourages higher voter participation than the current 9X method because more ballots count towards electing a council member.
- Encourages positive campaigning and coalition building as candidates can benefit from being a voter's second or third preference.

Arguments against Proportional Representation:

- The PR election method is unfamiliar to the American voter and not well understood.
- PR could encourage government by special and minority interests. Council members elected under this system would be more likely to feel responsible to those interests which elected them than to city wide concerns.
- PR may not reduce the cost of campaigning as candidates will want to reach the largest audience of voters to ensure a high ranking by those voters.
- Implementation of PR will add additional costs for voting equipment, software and training. State and federal certification will be needed for any new voting software.
- The PR vote count is complicated and it is unknown how long the vote count would take or how much it would cost.

Explanations for Issues 7 & 8 were prepared by the League of Women Voters of the Cincinnati Area.

CITY ISSUES

- Issue 9 CINTI 6-C LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Kroger - Wine And Mixed Beverages
10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 10 CINTI 10-F LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Market Wines - Beer, Wine And Mixed
Beverages 10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 11 CINTI 12-I LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Kroger - Wine And Mixed Beverages
10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 12 CINTI 24-I LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Kroger - Wine And Mixed Beverages
10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 13 CINTI 25-J LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Kroger - Wine And Mixed Beverages
10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 14 CINTI 26-Q LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Kroger - Wine And Mixed Beverages
10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 15 HARRISON E LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Bigg's - Wine And Mixed Beverages
10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 16 INDIAN HILL - Gas Aggregation.
- Issue 17 LOVELAND G LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Receptions Loveland Inc. - Wine,
Mixed Beverages & Spirituous Liquor 10 am - Midnight.
- Issue 18 NORWOOD - Gas Aggregation.
- Issue 19 READING - Gas Aggregation.
- Issue 20 WYOMING - Gas Aggregation.

VILLAGE/TOWNSHIP ISSUES

- Issue 21 GLENDALE - Tax Levy - Replacement & Decrease - 8.5 mills, 4yr - COE
- Issue 22 GOLF MANOR - Tax Levy - Renewal - 2 mills, 5yr - COE
- Issue 23 GREENHILLS - Tax Levy - Replacement - 2.5 mills, CPT - Fire & Emergency Medical Services.
- Issue 24 LINCOLN HGTS - Charter Amendment - Change Council Recall Provisions.
- Issue 25 LOCKLAND - Gas Aggregation.
- Issue 26 LOCKLAND E LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Wyoming Clark - Beer & Wine
1pm - Midnight.
- Issue 27 MARIEMONT - Tax Levy - Renewal - 1 mill, 5yr - Recreational Purposes of The Marielders,
Inc.
- Issue 28 MARIEMONT - Tax Levy - Renewal - 3.08 mills, 5yr - COE.
- Issue 29 WOODLAWN - Proposed Charter Revision.
- Issue 30 ANDERSON - Tax Levy - Addition - 2.7 mills, CPT - Fire, Police And Emergency Medical
Services.
- Issue 31 ANDERSON - Tax Levy - Addition - 1.9 mills, 10yr - Parks & Recreation.

- Issue 32 ANDERSON BB LOCAL OPTION -SUNDAY SALES at Clough Pike Marathon - Beer, Wine & Mixed Beverages 10am - Midnight.
- Issue 33 COLERAIN M LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Bigg's - Wine and Mixed Beverages 10am - Midnight.
- Issue 34 COLUMBIA - Unincorporated Area - Adoption of Home Rule Government.
- Issue 35 COLUMBIA D LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Bigg's - Wine and Mixed Beverages 10am - Midnight.
- Issue 36 DELHI M LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Bigg's - Wine and Mixed Beverages 10am - Midnight.
- Issue 37 GREEN - Tax Levy - Addition - 1.9 mills, 5yr - Fire, Police and Emergency Medical Services.
- Issue 38 GREEN JJ LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Bigg's - Wine and Mixed Beverages 10am - Midnight.
- Issue 39 MIAMI J LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Scoreboard Sports Bar - Wine, Mixed Beverages & Spirituous Liquor 10am- Midnight.
- Issue 40 SPRINGFIELD - Tax Levy - Addition - 1.5 mills, 5yr - COE.
- Issue 41 SYCAMORE - Gas Aggregation.
- Issue 42 SYCAMORE F LOCAL OPTION-SUNDAY SALES at Kroger - Wine And Mixed Beverages 10am - Midnight.

SCHOOL ISSUES

- Issue 43 LOVELAND SCHOOL - Tax Levy - Addition - 3.5 mills, CPT - COE.
- Issue 44 MILFORD SCHOOL - Tax Levy - Addition - 5.5 mills, CPT - COE.
- Issue 45 MT. HEALTHY SCHOOL - Tax Levy - Addition - 7.95 mills, CPT - COE.
- Issue 46 WINTON WOODS SCHOOL - Tax Levy - Addition - 7.95 mills, CPT - COE.
- Issue 47 THREE RIVERS LOCAL SCHOOL - Tax Levy - Renewal - 4.95 mills, 3yr - COE.
- Issue 48 GREAT OAKS SCHOOL - Tax Levy - Renewal - 2.7 mills, 10 years - COE.

OTHER DISTRICTS

- Issue 49 COLUMBIA TWP ROAD DISTRICT - Addition - 4 mills, CPT- Roads, Bridges, Sidewalks or Similar Improvements.
- Issue 50 RIDGE FIRE DISTRICT (Columbia Twp) - Addition - 2 mills, CPT- Fire & Emergency Medical Services.
- Issue 51 MIAMI TWP WASTE DISTRICT - Replacement -1.25 mills, 5yr - Waste Collection.

DEFINITIONS OF BALLOT TERMS

Referendum - A referendum is the right the Ohio Constitution reserves for Ohioans to vote to ADOPT OR REJECT LAWS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE.

Procedure - A referendum on a law already passed by the legislature may be requested by petition within 90 days after the law has been filed with the secretary of state. It may not be requested on an emergency law, tax levy or appropriations for current expenses. Signatures of six percent of the electors voting in the last gubernatorial election are required on the petition and must be obtained in at least 44 of the 88 counties. The law is submitted to the voters at the next general election 60 days after the petition if filed and cannot become effective unless approved by a majority of the voters.

(Reference: LWVO Education Fund. *Know Your Ohio Government, 9th Edition.* pg. 142. 2004)

Initiative - An initiative is the right the Ohio Constitution reserves for Ohioans to PROPOSE LEGISLATION OR AMENDMENTS TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION.

1. **Constitutional Amendments** may be initiated directly by the people, bypassing the legislature.

Procedure - A summary of the proposed amendment must be certified by the attorney general. The full text of the amendment and the summary are then filed with the secretary of state. The citizens who initiated the amendment must circulate petitions to collect enough signatures to equal ten percent of the electors voting for governor in the last gubernatorial election. Signatures must come from at least half of Ohio's 88 counties and represent five percent of the total vote cast for governor in that county in the last gubernatorial election. Signatures must be received by the secretary of state no later than 90 days prior to the general election, so that the secretary of state, with the assistance of the local boards of elections, can verify the validity of the signatures. The ballot wording, prepared by the Ohio Ballot Board, along with arguments for the amendment prepared by the initiating committee and arguments against it by persons named by the legislature, is published once a week for three weeks in a newspaper or general circulation in each county. If a majority of the voters approve the amendment it becomes part of the constitution.

2. **Laws** are initiated indirectly by the people since the petition must be submitted to the legislature first.

Procedure - Signatures of three percent of the electors voting in the last gubernatorial election are required to introduce the proposed law in the legislature. If the legislature does not pass the law in four months, or if an amended version is passed, the petitioners have 90 days to collect signatures of an additional three percent of the electors and place it on the ballot. Signatures must be obtained from half of the 88 counties. The law is voted on at the next general election 90 days after the petition is filed and becomes effective if approved by the voters. It is not subject to the governor's veto.

(Reference: LWVO Education Fund. *Know Your Ohio Government, 9th Edition*. pg. 142. 2004)

COE - Current Operating Expenses

CPT - Continuing Period of Time

Mill - The property tax is measured in mills; a mill is one tenth of a penny. A mill produces \$1 in tax revenue for every \$1,000 of taxable value of the property. The taxable value is 35% of the fair market value, which is determined by the County Auditor's Office. By state law, counties must revalue all real property every three years. The next reappraisal will be done in 2011.

Renewal Levy - A renewal levy is the CONTINUANCE OF AN EXISTING LEVY with the collection rate at the same dollar amount as when the levy was originally approved.

Replacement Levy - A replacement levy is a NEW LEVY FOR THE SAME PURPOSE AS THE EXISTING LEVY but with a different collection rate than the levy it replaces. The collection rate uses the assessed value of the property at the time of the replacement.

Gas Aggregation - Aggregation is the process in which energy is sold to consumers who have joined together as a group to buy a product, electric or natural gas. Local governments may aggregate the energy used by their residents and arrange for the purchase of electricity or natural gas as "governmental aggregators." Ohio law gives local governments the option to choose either an opt-in or opt-out form of aggregation. The "Opt-in" form requires that each consumer agrees to participate in the program before being included in the aggregation pool. It does not require voter approval at an election. The "Opt-out" form automatically includes each consumer in the aggregated pool unless the individual affirmatively decides not to participate. It requires approval by a majority of the voters at an election.

Gas aggregation issues typically read: "Shall the (name of local government) have the authority to aggregate the retail natural gas loads located in the (name of local government), and enter into service agreements to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of natural gas, such aggregation to occur automatically except where any person elects to opt out?"