

BALLOT ISSUES – UPDATED MARCH 10, 2010

ISSUE 3

PROPOSED TAX LEVY
GREENON LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall an annual income tax of three-quarters percent (.75%) on the earned income of individuals residing in the school district be imposed by the Greenon Local School District, for a continuing period of time, beginning January 1, 2011, for the purpose of current expenses?

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 4

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (ADDITIONAL)
GREENON LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

An additional tax for the benefit of the Greenon Local School District for the purpose of current expenses at a rate not exceeding 3 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.30 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 5

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (SUBSTITUTE)
NORTHWESTERN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
CLARK AND CHAMPAIGN COUNTIES

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall a tax levy substituting for existing levies be imposed by the Northwestern Local School District, Clark and Champaign Counties, for the purpose of providing for the necessary requirements of the school district in the initial sum of \$1,689,657, and a levy of taxes be made outside of the ten-mill limitation estimated by the county auditor to require seven and eight hundred thirty-eight thousandths (7.838) mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to seventy eight and thirty-eight hundredths cents (\$0.7838) for each one hundred dollars in valuation for the initial year of the tax, for a period of six (6) years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011, with the sum of such tax to increase only if and as new land or real property improvements not previously taxed by the school district are added to its tax list?

If approved, any remaining tax years on any of the above two existing levies will not be collected after 2010.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 6

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (RENEWAL)
YELLOW SPRINGS EXEMPTED VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall a levy renewing an existing levy be imposed by the Yellow Springs Exempted Village School District, Counties of Greene and Clark, Ohio for the purpose of **PROVIDING FOR THE EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT**, in the sum of \$1,060,000 and a levy of taxes to be made outside the ten-mill limitation estimated by the county auditor to average 8.7 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.87 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for a period of 5 years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 7

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (RENEWAL)
CLARK COUNTY

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

A renewal of a tax for the benefit of Clark County for the purpose of providing and maintaining senior citizen services or facilities at a rate not exceeding 1 mill for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.10 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2010 first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 8

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (ADDITIONAL)
CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

An additional tax for the benefit of the Clark County Public Library for the purpose of current expenses at a rate not exceeding 1.32 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.132 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for a continuing period of time, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 9

PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ELECTRIC AGGREGATION
CLARK COUNTY, OHIO
(Unincorporated Areas)

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall Clark County have the authority to aggregate the retail electric loads located in the unincorporated areas of the County, and for that purpose, enter into service agreements to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of electricity, such aggregation to occur automatically except where any person elects to opt out?

YES

NO

ISSUE 10

PROPOSED ELECTRIC AGGREGATE
CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall the City of Springfield, Ohio have the authority to aggregate the retail electric loads located in the City of Springfield, Ohio, and for that purpose, enter into service agreements, with or without soliciting competitive proposals as the City Commission shall determine is in the best interest of the City and its residents and businesses, to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of electricity, such aggregation to occur automatically except where any person elects to opt out?

YES

NO

ISSUE 11

PROPOSED ELECTRIC AGGREGATE
VILLAGE OF CATAWBA, OHIO

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall the Village of Catawba have the authority to aggregate the retail electric loads located in the Village of Catawba, and for that purpose, enter into service agreements to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of electricity, such aggregation to occur automatically except where any person elects to opt out?

YES

NO

ISSUE 12

PROPOSED ELECTRIC AGGREGATE
VILLAGE OF TREMONT CITY, OHIO

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall the Village of Tremont City have the authority to aggregate the retail electric loads located in the Village of Tremont City, and for that purpose, enter into service agreements to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of electricity, such aggregation to occur automatically except where any person elects to opt out?

YES

NO

ISSUE 13

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (RENEWAL)
MOOREFIELD TOWNSHIP

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

A renewal of a tax for the benefit of Moorefield Township for the purpose of operating and equipping the Moorefield Township fire department and emergency medical program at a rate not exceeding 1.25 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.125 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 14

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (RENEWAL)
SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

A renewal of a tax for the benefit of Springfield Township for the purpose of fire operations at a rate not exceeding 1 mill for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.10 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 15

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (RENEWAL)
SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

A renewal of a tax for the benefit of Springfield Township for the purpose of providing emergency medical services at a rate not exceeding 2 mills for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.20 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 16

PROPOSED TAX LEVY (RENEWAL)
SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

A renewal of a tax for the benefit of Springfield Township for the purpose of road repair and maintenance at a rate not exceeding 1 mill for each one dollar of valuation, which amounts to \$0.10 for each one hundred dollars of valuation, for 5 years, commencing in 2010, first due in calendar year 2011.

FOR THE TAX LEVY

AGAINST THE TAX LEVY

ISSUE 18

SPECIAL ELECTION BY PETITION
LOCAL OPTION ELECTION
MR-5

A majority affirmative vote is necessary for passage.

Shall the sale of wine be permitted for sale on Sunday between the hours of one p.m. and midnight by Brandeberry Winery, LLC dba Brandeberry Winery, an applicant for a D-6 liquor permit, who is engaged in the business of manufacturing and sale of wine at 5118 W. Jackson Rd. Unit B Mad River Township, Enon, OH 45323 in this precinct?

YES

NO

03/16/2010