

**ISSUE 1: PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE STATE TO ISSUE BONDS TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION TO VETERANS OF THE PERSIAN GULF, AFGHANISTAN, AND IRAQ CONFLICTS**  
**(Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio)**  
**To adopt Section 2r of Article VIII of the Constitution of the State of Ohio**

A YES vote means approval of the amendment.

A NO vote means disapproval of the amendment.

A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted.

If approved, this proposed amendment shall take effect immediately.

League Explanation of Issue 1: This ballot issue proposes a constitutional amendment that would provide compensation to veterans serving during the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq conflicts. The amendment is similar to the bond issues passed by the voters to compensate veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam conflict. It will provide the state with the authority to issue up to \$200 million of bonds. The Ohio treasurer has estimated that only \$106 million of the bond proceeds might actually be needed. All bonds must be issued by December 31, 2013. Repayment of these bonds would be a general obligation of the state backed by the taxing power of the state. Revenue from these bonds would be used to provide additional compensation as follows:

- Payment may be made to Ohio residents who have served on active duty in the United States armed forces between August 2, 1990 and March 3, 1991, which was the duration of the Persian Gulf conflict; between October 7, 2001 and the end of the United States' involvement in Afghanistan; and between March 19, 2003 and the end of the United States' involvement in Iraq.
- Veterans who served domestically or in foreign service in locations other than the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, or Iraq may receive \$50 for each month served up to a maximum of \$500.
- Veterans who served in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, or Iraq may receive \$100 for each month served up to a maximum of \$1000, or may receive \$1000 if medically discharged due to combat-related disabilities.
- If a person died as a result of injuries sustained in Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, or Iraq service, that person's family may receive \$5000.
- If a person is missing in action or held in enemy captivity, that person's family may receive \$5000.

The Legislative Services Commission estimates that issuing \$200 million of obligations could increase the state's annual debt service expense by up to \$18 million. The voters must approve this bonding authority 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:

1. Passing the amendment by vote of the people shows that Ohioans appreciate Ohio veterans.
2. The payments will ease veterans' transition back into civilian life.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

1. Tax monies will be diverted to paying principle and interest, and this may limit the availability of state revenue for other state programs during a period of financial crisis.
2. Future taxpayers will be responsible for the debt incurred for these payments. The payments should be paid for by revenues available in the current biennium.

**Websites: Websites not available for proponents and opponents.**

**ISSUE 2: PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CREATE THE OHIO LIVESTOCK CARE STANDARDS BOARD**  
**(Proposed by Joint Resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio)**

**To enact Section 1 of Article XIV of the Ohio Constitution**

A YES vote means approval of the amendment.

A NO vote means disapproval of the amendment.  
A majority YES vote is required for the amendment to be adopted.  
If approved, this proposed amendment will be effective immediately.

League Explanation of Issue 2:

- This proposed constitutional amendment would create the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board for the purpose of establishing standards governing the care and well-being of livestock and poultry in Ohio.
- The bipartisan board would consist of thirteen members:
  - The director of the state department that regulates agriculture
  - Ten members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, including:
    - One member representing family farms
    - One member knowledgeable about food safety
    - Two members representing statewide organizations that represent farmers
    - One member who is a veterinarian
    - The State Veterinarian in the state department that regulates agriculture
    - The dean of the agriculture department of a college or university in Ohio
    - Two members of the public representing Ohio consumers
    - One member representing a county humane society
  - One member appointed by the Speaker of the House who shall be a family farmer
  - One member appointed by the President of the Senate who shall be a family farmer
- The Board would have authority to establish standards governing the care and well-being of livestock and poultry in Ohio, subject only to the authority of the General Assembly.

Proponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

1. The board represents a balance of interests.
2. The board would establish standards governing the care and well being of livestock and poultry in Ohio.
3. Ohioans can have greater confidence in the safety of locally produced food.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

1. The board should be created by statute rather than by amendment to the Ohio Constitution.
2. Creating another regulatory board utilizes revenues best spent on basic services to Ohioans.
3. The amendment could prevent certain animal care reform proposed by national animal rights organizations.

**Websites: Websites are not available for both the proponents and opponents.**

**ISSUE 3: PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT  
TO AUTHORIZE A CASINO IN CLEVELAND, COLUMBUS,  
CINCINNATI, AND TOLEDO, OHIO  
(Proposed by Initiative Petition)**

To add a new Section 6a to Article XV of the Ohio Constitution  
A YES vote means approval of the amendment.  
A NO vote means disapproval of the amendment.  
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 3: This amendment would authorize four casinos, one each in Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo, located on particular parcels of land owned by private individuals.

1. The operator would be required to pay a tax of 33% annually on gross casino receipts. "Gross casino receipts" excludes payments to winners. The tax revenue would be allocated in the following ways:

- 51% to the 88 counties on a pro rata basis, with 50% of the county's distribution going to the county's most populated city if it had a population of greater than 80,000 as of the 2000 United States census.
  - 34% to public school districts in proportion to their public school district populations.
  - 5% to the host city where the casino that generated the revenue is located.
  - 3% to fund the Ohio Casino Control Commission.
  - 3% to a fund supporting purses, breeding programs and operations at existing horse racetracks.
  - 2% to fund a state law enforcement training program.
  - 2% to fund treatment of problem gambling and substance abuse.
2. The Ohio Casino Control Commission would license and regulate casino operators, management companies, key employees and all gaming. The commission would have 7 members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.
  3. Each casino operator must make a minimum initial investment of \$250 million.
  4. The initial license fee of \$50 million for each casino will fund state economic development programs.
  5. Each casino could operate 24 hours a day. Each casino may have a maximum of 5000 slot machines. Each casino may conduct any type of card or table games, slot machines or electronic gaming devices permitted by states adjacent to Ohio, except bingo, and horse racing where the pari-mutuel system of wagering is conducted.

Proponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

1. Thirty-eight states—including Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, and Pennsylvania—have casino gambling.
2. By authorizing casinos in Ohio, the profits could benefit our state rather than other states.
3. Counties, public school districts, and many cities will receive tax revenue generated by the casinos, and each can decide how to best spend its money.
4. The casinos will create 34,000 new jobs in Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo.
5. The casinos will stimulate the economy by adding restaurants, hotels and ancillary businesses.

Opponents of the proposed amendment argue that:

1. The Ohio general revenue fund, which supports basic services for Ohioans, will get \$0 from the gross casino receipts tax.
2. Ohio lottery profits, currently dedicated to education, may decrease because people will gamble at the casinos instead of playing the lottery.
3. Ohioans may spend money at the casinos they would have spent at other existing Ohio businesses such as restaurants, movies, or sports events, adversely impacting those businesses.
4. The number of gambling addicts in Ohio would increase, and the tax receipts dedicated to providing treatment for addicts could be insufficient.
5. The proposed amendment could be construed to mean that all games allowed at the casinos can be played only at the casinos, eliminating church-festival poker games and casino nights sponsored by charitable groups.

**Websites**

In support of the proposed amendment: Cops for Casinos <http://copsforcasinos.com/>

In opposition to the proposed amendment: Vote NO Casinos Committee, TruthPAC [www.truthpac.org/](http://www.truthpac.org/)

**ISSUE 4: LORAIN COUNTY SALES TAX INCREASE OF 1/2%  
SUPPORTING CRIMINAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**

The Board of County Commissioners of Lorain County imposed an increase in the rate of sales and use taxes in 2009 in the amount of ½% for criminal and administrative justice services. Shall the increase in the rate of tax be retained?

A YES vote means approval of the amendment.

A NO vote means disapproval of the amendment.

Explanation of Issue 4: Lorain County enacted a ½ % sales tax increase in 2009 to support criminal and administrative services. On Nov. 3, voters will decide on continuing the ½% safety issue. The cost is \$6.89/month per household. If the voters approve, the funds are only for the jail, sheriff, prosecutor, coroner and courts.

Points to Consider:

- In trying to be fiscally responsible, Lorain County has already cut \$6.8 million from its budget. This included large cuts in public safety, including eliminating 20 sheriff's deputies and patrols and putting the prosecutor's office on an 85% work week, eliminating over a dozen court employees.
- Our county is growing and so are our safety needs. In an average year, the County Jail holds 445 prisoners. The Sheriff arrests 5,164 suspects. The courts handle 17,000 cases. Without the ½%, our county will be forced to close part of the jail and further reduce Sheriff and Court operations.
- Lorain County's sales tax is below the state average.
- County revenues dropped 20% (from \$60 million to just \$48 million) in three years as a result of state cutbacks and reduced income.
- Although there have been job cuts, pay freezes, forced unpaid leave and reduced hours among county workers in several areas, the ½% tax increase would restore only safety and the most essential positions.
- Passage is important for the safety of our communities.
- Unemployment, pay freezes, and reduced hours are not only problems county government is facing, but many other businesses and industries in the county as well. These are difficult times to impose an additional sales tax.

**ISSUE 35: OBERLIN PUBLIC LIBRARY AND THE BRIDGE**

An additional tax for the benefit of the Oberlin Public Library for the purpose of current expenses at a rate not exceeding 1.5 mills for each \$100 evaluation which amounts to 15 cents for each \$100 evaluation for five years commencing 2009, first due calendar year 2010.

A YES vote means approval of the amendment.

A NO vote means disapproval of the amendment.

League Explanation of Issue 35: A 1.5 mills operating levy for the benefit of the Oberlin Public Library & The Bridge will be voted on by the residents of the library's legal service area, the Oberlin School District.

If passed, the levy will begin to create revenue for OPL on January 1, 2010.

- The levy is expected to generate \$295,000 annually during the five years it will be in effect.
- The levy will cost the owner of a \$100,000 (assessed value) home about \$46 a year.
- Currently, the same property owner is paying approximately \$35 a year to pay for the bond issued in 1990 to pay for the current library facility. That bond will be retired at the end of this year which means the net increase to that property owner is about \$11 a year in additional property taxes.

Points to Consider:

- State funding is shrinking due to a bad economy, a redistribution of state funds in Lorain County, and because Governor Strickland removed a large sum of money from the Public Library Fund in order to balance the State's budget for the next several years.
- State funding for public libraries is eroding. To maintain the quality services, materials, facility, programs, and staff that the community has grown to expect, then it is necessary to depend more on local money and rely less on state funding.
- Local property tax revenue has been reduced due to a poor economy and the library is expecting a 5% to 10% decrease in local tax revenue due to a revaluation of local property values.
- Passing the levy is important to avoid the staff cuts, shortened hours, cuts to the materials budgets, and all of the other bad things happening to public libraries around Ohio.
- An additional assessment on property is particularly difficult for people on fixed income or home-owners struggling in this troubled economy.