The League of Women Voters of Ohio, founded in 1920, is a non-partisan political organization that encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy. Complementing it is the League of Women Voters of Ohio Education Fund that provides nonpartisan information and educational services to citizens.

Prior to each state and national election, the League of Women Voters of Ohio Education Fund provides nonpartisan information on candidates and issues to its local Leagues. This information is used in Voter Guides which are distributed by local Leagues throughout the state.

All statewide candidates who filed their intent to run for office with the Ohio Secretary of State were sent two questions relating to the office they were seeking, as well as instructions on how to complete the candidate questionnaire. The League does not alter, edit, correct, or evaluate any candidate’s reply, and each candidate is solely responsible for the accuracy and truth of his or her statements. Each candidate is advised in writing to carefully note the word limitations listed on their questionnaire since no text beyond the word limit will be included.

A candidate’s answers are accepted and printed only with the understanding that the material will not be used in any way that may be deemed to be an endorsement by the League of his or her candidacy or views.

Deadline for Registration is October 6, 2008
Election Day is November 4, 2008
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STATE BALLOT ISSUES: 1, 2, 3, 5 AND 6

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 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 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.

PROONENTS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ARGUE THAT:
1. 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.
2. IF DEADLINES ARE MET, ABSENTEE VOTERS AND ELECTION-DAY VOTERS WILL KNOW WHICH ISSUES WERE SUPPORTED BY SUFFICIENT VALID PETITIONS.
3. THE PROCESS SHOULD BE MORE EFFICIENT BECAUSE THE AMENDMENT PROVIDES FOR SPECIFIC DEADLINES FOR EACH STEP OF THE PROCESS.
4. HAVING THE OHIO SUPREME COURT AS THE SOLE ARBITER OF CHALLENGES EXPEDITES THE PROCESS.
OPPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ARGUE THAT:
1. The revised deadlines may still not allow time to print correct ballots.
2. The revised deadlines decrease the time for each step of the review and may be difficult to meet.
3. 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.
4. As sole arbiter of challenges, the Ohio Supreme Court will not have the benefit of a record from lower courts.

ISSUE 2: PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE STATE TO ISSUE BONDS TO CONTINUE THE CLEAN OHIO PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL, REVITALIZATION AND CONSERVATION PURPOSES
(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

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 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:**

1. Bond monies could be used to improve drinking water, help keep rivers and streams clean,
2. Preserve and protect wildlife and farmland, and expand outdoor recreational opportunities for Ohioans,
3. Bond monies could be used to reduce the number of polluted industrial sites and clean up brown fields
4. 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:**

1. Tax monies will be diverted to paying principle and interest, and this may limit the availability of state revenue for other state programs.
2. 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.
3. Proceeds from the sale of the publicly funded bonds may be used to benefit private entities.

**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 198 of Article I 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 amendment shall take effect December 1, 2008.
**LEAGUE 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:**
1. 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.
2. The proposed amendment does not establish absolute private ownership of water.
3. It reiterates the state's right to regulate water use and water quality.

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

**Issue 5: Referendum on Legislation Making Changes to Payday Lending Practices**

As of September 23, 2008, this issue had not been certified to be on the Nov. 4, 2008, ballot.

(A referendum on Section 3, House Bill 545)

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.

LEAGUE 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:
1. The new regulations would cap the interest for payday loans at 28%,
  which effectively ends lenders’
  ability to charge up to 391% interest.
2. 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.
3. 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:
1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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 (www.ohioans4financialfreedom.com)

 ISSUE 6: PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE A CASINO IN CLINTON COUNTY, OHIO (PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION)
As of September 23, 2008, this issue had not been certified to be on the Nov. 4, 2008, ballot.

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 6: This amendment would authorize a privately-owned casino in Clinton County.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.
6. Persons must be 21 years old to place wagers at the casino.

**Proponents of the Proposed Amendment Argue That:**

1. 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.
2. All counties in Ohio may receive tax revenue generated by the casino, and each county can decide how to best spend its money.
3. The casino will also be required to pay all other applicable taxes.
4. The casino will create jobs in Clinton County.
5. The casino 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. 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.
3. 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.
4. Ohio lottery profits, currently dedicated to education, may decrease because people will gamble at the casino instead of playing the lottery.
5. 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:

In opposition to the proposed amendment:
Vote No Casinos ([www.votenocasinos.com](http://www.votenocasinos.com))
CANDIDATES: ATTORNEY GENERAL
TERM BEGINNING JANUARY 2009

RICHARD CORDRAY - DEMOCRAT
ADDRESS: 340 E. FULTON STREET
           COLUMBUS, OH 43215
PHONE: 614.227.3330

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION
HTTP://WWW.CORDRAYFOROHIO.COM/ABOUT/BIOGRAPHY.HTML

QUESTION & ANSWER

1) WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIONS SHOULD THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TAKE TO PROTECT CONSUMERS IN OHIO?

“OHIO’S ATTORNEY GENERAL SHOULD USE ALL THE POWERS OF THE OFFICE AGAINST ANYONE WHO TRIES TO SCAM OHIOANS OR USE ‘GOTCHA’ TACTICS TO TAKE THEIR HARD-EARNED DOLLARS. AS ATTORNEY GENERAL, I WOULD CARRY ON THE WORK BEGUN IN THE STATE TREASURER’S OFFICE TO EDUCATE CONSUMERS ABOUT PREDATORY PRACTICES AND MAKING INFORMED FINANCIAL DECISIONS. FINANCIAL EDUCATION HELPS, BUT THE RULE OF LAW IS THE CRITICAL TOOL TO PROTECT THE FINANCIAL SECURITY OF OHIOANS. SPECIFICALLY, WE WILL CONTINUE OUR WORK ON FORECLOSURE PREVENTION (TAKING ON PREDATORY LENDERS, APPRAISERS, FLIPPERS, AND FORECLOSURE ‘PREVENTION’ SCAMMERS); STAND UP FOR FAIR CONSUMER PRACTICES BY CREDIT CARD COMPANIES (INCLUDING MARKETING TO STUDENTS ON CAMPUS); INITIATE A SENIOR STRIKE FORCE TO PREVENT CONSUMER FRAUD AGAINST SENIORS; AND BATTLE EVERY KIND OF UNFAIR FINANCIAL PRACTICE THAT TAKES MONEY OUT OF OUR POCKETS OR JOBS FROM OUR HOMETOWNS.”

2) WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU PROPOSE IN THE AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL?

“AS THE ONLY CANDIDATE WHO HAS ACTUALLY WORKED IN THE ATTORNEY GENERAL’S OFFICE AS OHIO’S FIRST STATE SOLICITOR, I UNDERSTAND THE EXPANSIVE POWERS OF THE OFFICE AND DO NOT PLAN INITIALLY TO SEEK BROADER POWERS. INSTEAD, I INTEND TO EXERCISE MY AUTHORITY TO UPHOLD THE STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONALISM AND RESTORE PUBLIC TRUST IN THE OFFICE. I ALSO WILL PROTECT THE FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF OHIOANS AND BE A STRONG PARTNER TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT. I WILL RECONSTITUTE THE CRIMINAL LAW PROJECT TO HELP LOCAL PROSECUTORS Arguing IN THE OHIO SUPREME COURT TO KEEP CRIMINALS BEHIND BARS, ESTABLISH COMMISSIONS TO ASSIST ON BUDGETARY ISSUES FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND WORK CLOSELY WITH SMALL BUSINESSES TO PROVIDE AN EARLY WARNING SYSTEM AND DISPUTE MEDIATION TO REDUCE COSTS. IF THE STRUCTURE OR FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE PROVE INADEQUATE, I WILL WORK WITH BOTH SIDES OF THE AISLE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO ADDRESS THAT.”
**M I K E  C R I T E S -  R E P U B L I C A N**

ADDRESS: 211 S. FIFTH STREET  
COLUMBUS, OH 43215  
PHONE:  614.456.1224

**B I O G R A P H I C A L  I N F O R M A T I O N**  
[HTTP://WWW.CRITESFOROHIO.COM/BIOGRAPHY](http://www.critesforohio.com/biography)

**Q U E S T I O N &  A N S W E R**

1) **What specific actions should the Attorney General take to protect consumers in Ohio?**

   "As Attorney General I will make the protection of Ohio consumers one of my top priorities. I am a career prosecutor, not a career politician. I have 21 years of prosecutorial experience, more than the last seven Attorneys General combined. As United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio I prosecuted every type of criminal from members of the Mafia, to dangerous drug dealers to tax evaders. I pledge to use that experience to uphold the consumer laws of Ohio and to go after criminals, both individuals and businesses, who illegally prey on Ohioans."

2) **What changes would you propose in the authority of the Attorney General?**

   "I believe the Ohio Revised Code statutes that refer to the Office of Attorney General currently in place are well thought out and give the office an appropriate amount of authority. We have arrived at this special election not because of a failing in the authority of the office of Attorney General, but rather because of the personal failings of the last Attorney General. The office has worked very well under the last several Attorneys General and therefore I do not believe that sweeping new authority is needed.

   However, I have offered several policy proposals as to how I would improve the office, including the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to streamline the various ongoing investigations into the office, the creation of new fellowships to reward professionalism and improve morale, and a Public Corruption Commission to ensure that these types of scandals never again taint the office."

**R O B E R T  O W E N S - I N D E P E N D E N T**

ADDRESS: 46 N. SANDUSKY STREET SUITE 300  
DELAWARE, OH 43015

**B I O G R A P H I C A L  I N F O R M A T I O N**  
QUESTION & ANSWER

1) **What specific actions should the Attorney General take to protect consumers in Ohio?**

"Protecting consumers starts by sacreldly guarding their tax dollars, eliminating the "corruption tax," which by some accounts has been as much as $2,000 per family. This means changing the system that awards no-bid contracts to large campaign contributors representing special interests. It also means eliminating the current "slush funds" that are created by monies collected by the attorney general’s office through settlement and litigation. Those funds should be returned to the people’s treasury.

As attorney general, I will work to reduce regulation on small business (often falsely marketed as 'consumer protection'), while increasing focus on prosecuting fraudulent business practices.

Finally, consumer protection means fighting crime. I will work to expand capabilities for the Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) forensic lab in order to better support law enforcement across Ohio. I will also work to expand education to communities and law enforcement regarding citizen rights to self defense."

2) **What changes would you propose in the authority of the Attorney General?**

"The attorney general should not have the authority to unilaterally distribute hundreds of millions of dollars in no-bid contracts. I am the only candidate to propose, from the beginning of the race, that every contract be subject to a full, open competitive bid process.

All financial transactions of the attorney general’s office should be readily available (i.e. online), open to public and media scrutiny. The only way to restore integrity to the office of attorney general is through independent oversight and full transparency. I am the only candidate to sign the Buckeye Institute’s “Transparency in Government” pledge.

Let there be no more blind trust in politicians. The system itself must be changed. As an independent, I alone have the ability to make these changes without concern from party politics and big money special interest pressure."
CANDIDATES: JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
TERM BEGINNING JANUARY 2009

MAUREEN O’CONNOR - REPUBLICAN
ADDRESS: 211 S. FIFTH STREET
COLUMBUS, OH 43215
PHONE: 614.228.2481

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION
HTTP://WWW.OCONNORFORJUSTICE.COM/ABOUT.PHP

QUESTION & ANSWER

1) WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO RESEARCH INDICATING THAT JUDICIAL DECISIONS TEND TO FAVOR LARGE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTORS?


2) DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ALL OHIOANS HAVE ADEQUATE ACCESS TO LEGAL HELP AND THE LEGAL SYSTEM? IF NOT, WHAT CAN BE DONE TO PROVIDE WIDER AND BETTER ACCESS?

“OHIO HAS A GOOD SYSTEM OF REPRESENTATION FOR THOSE WHO ARE UNABLE TO AFFORD LEGAL REPRESENTATION. OUR MEMBERS OF THE BAR ARE GENEROUS IN THEIR EFFORTS TO PROVIDE SERVICES. HAVING SAID THAT I BELIEVE THAT ANY SYSTEM CAN BE IMPROVED UPON AND OURS IS NO EXCEPTION. THE BAR IN OHIO IS ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE IN RENDERING PRO BONO SERVICES. I BELIEVE THAT AN EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAM TO START IN LAW SCHOOL WILL ASSIST IN CREATING AND EXPANDING A CULTURE OF PRO BONO REPRESENTATION AMONG THE NEW LAWYERS.”

JOSEPH Russo - DEMOCRAT
ADDRESS: 3099 HUNTINGTON ROAD
SHAKER HEIGHTS, OH 44120
PHONE: 877.868.8300

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION
HTTP://WWW.JUDGERUSSOFORJUSTICE.COM/ABOUT.HTM

QUESTION & ANSWER
1) **What is your response to research indicating that judicial decisions tend to favor large campaign contributors?**

"I am very concerned by public surveys that find that 83% of voters believe campaign contributions influence the decisions of the Ohio Supreme Court. Numerous newspaper articles have pointed to a correlation between campaign contributions and the votes of members of our Court. The New York Times in the article ‘Campaign Cash Mirrors a High Court’s Rulings’ points to a correlation between campaign contributions and individual Ohio Supreme Court Justice’s votes in judicial decisions in Ohio. In that article, the Times states that Ohio Supreme Court Justices ‘routinely sat on cases after receiving campaign contributions from the parties involved’ and ‘on average . . . voted in favor of contributors 70 percent of the time.’ My opponent votes in favor of her contributors 74% of the time. I have proposed a rule that would force justices to disqualify themselves from cases involving their largest contributors. My opponent opposes this rule."

3) **Do you believe that all Ohioans have adequate access to legal help and the legal system? If not, what can be done to provide wider and better access?**

"Ohioans do not have adequate access to legal help. There are several ways to provide wider and better access. First, for simple cases, we must make forms and instruction available to the general public, as they have in Maricopa County, Arizona, where they have thrown open the doors of the courthouse to the general public with help from court staff and law school students to enable the general public to access the legal system and settle their simple disputes often without the help of a lawyer. In addition, I believe that we must properly fund our legal clinics throughout the state so that the public has access to attorneys to handle more intricate legal matters. Finally, a rule requiring every attorney in the state, as part of their Continuing Legal Education requirements, to provide pro bono services to the public should be considered."

**Term Beginning January 2009**

**PETER SIKORA - DEMOCRAT**  
**Address:** 10710 Edgewater Drive  
**Cleveland, OH 44102**  
**Phone:** 441.241.4537

**Biographical Information**  
[HTTP://WWW.SIKORAFORJUSTICE.COM/ABOUT.HTML](http://www.sikoraforjustice.com/about.html)
1) **What is your response to research indicating that judicial decisions tend to favor large campaign contributors?**

“I believe this portrays an inaccurate perception of the judiciary that is fueled by the media, not by reality. A New York Times article, published two years ago, reported that I had voted in favor of my contributors in 55% of the cases in which I participated through March 2006. This was the lowest percentage attributed to any justice identified. However, this also indicated that in 45% of those cases I had voted against those who had contributed to my campaign. The vast majority of the contributions to

EVELYN STRATTON - REPUBLICAN

**Address:** 211 S. Fifth Street
Columbus, OH 43215

**Phone:** 614.523.3231

**Biographical Information**


**Question & Answer**

1) **What is your response to research indicating that judicial decisions tend to favor large campaign contributors?**

“The strength of our judiciary rests in the confidence Ohioans have in the fairness and impartiality of the court. The legitimacy of the court is undermined when studies show people believe contributions influence decisions. There is a serious need to restore confidence in the court, based on the fact that Supreme Court Justices routinely sit on cases after receiving campaign contributions from the parties involved or from groups that filed supporting briefs. On average, they voted in favor of the contributors 70% of the time. This emphasizes the need for balance on the court – so that every citizen can be assured that all perspectives will be considered before decisions are made.”

4) **Do you believe that all Ohioans have adequate access to legal help and the legal system? If not, what can be done to provide wider and better access?**

“As a society we need to ensure that people have access to affordable quality legal assistance. It is incumbent upon all of us – as well as those in the legal profession – to come forward and assist those who can not afford representation. Specifically, this includes an increase in pro-bono efforts in the legal community.”

4) **Do you believe that all Ohioans have adequate access to legal help and the legal system? If not, what can be done to provide wider and better access?**

“As a society we need to ensure that people have access to affordable quality legal assistance. It is incumbent upon all of us – as well as those in the legal profession – to come forward and assist those who can not afford representation. Specifically, this includes an increase in pro-bono efforts in the legal community.”

**QUESTION & ANSWER**

1) **What is your response to research indicating that judicial decisions tend to favor large campaign contributors?**

“...
my last campaign were $100 or less. In addition, there are now campaign limits of $3000 per person and $5500 per political action committee. These limits greatly reduce the ability of a contributor to use the size of a contribution to influence a judge’s decision.”

5) **Do you believe that all Ohioans have adequate access to legal help and the legal system? If not, what can be done to provide wider and better access?**

“No. The availability of legal resources for those unable to afford an attorney is a problem in Ohio. In an effort to help persons gain access to the courts, the Supreme Court of Ohio supports the Legal Aid Society and provides financial assistance to the group. The Court is in the process of developing legal forms to assist persons in legal matters which should result in better access to the courts. I also have supported efforts to recruit and train attorneys to provide pro bono services to qualified homeowners in foreclosure cases. Attorneys should be encouraged to assist those who cannot afford an attorney in all areas of the law. I will also focus efforts on pro bono services for Ohio’s military veterans and reserve troops in my work on mental health court reforms.”
CANDIDATES: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
TERM BEGINNING JANUARY 2009

ANN JACOBS – DISTRICT 1
ADDRESS 1529 Shawnee Road
Lima, Ohio 45805

QUESTION & ANSWER

1) **WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PROPOSE TO ENSURE THAT COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND VOUCHER PROGRAMS ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PUBLIC?**

   "The State Board of Education should advocate a funding process wherein, charter and community schools should be held to the same data integrity requirements and reporting standards as are public schools. Charter and community schools need to be mandated, in order to issue a high school diploma, to meet the State Board’s minimum standards. There is a dire need for the legislature to enact laws, tightening administrative and financial oversight of charter and community schools."

2) **DO YOU BELIEVE CREATIONISM (INTELLIGENT DESIGN) SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?**

   "There has been historically a separation of church and state. I do not feel creationism should be taught in public schools. That is a subject appropriate for religious entities to teach within their respective private venues."

TRACEY SMITH – DISTRICT 1
Address 8944 Liberty Union Road
Van Wert, Ohio 45891

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*

RICHARD HOVIS – DISTRICT 5
Address: 188 N Washington Street
Millersburg, Ohio 44654
1) **WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PROPOSE TO ENSURE THAT COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND VOUCHER PROGRAMS ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PUBLIC?**

2) **DO YOU BELIEVE CREATIONISM (INTELLIGENT DESIGN) SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?**
RICHARD JAVOREK – DISTRICT 5
ADDRESS:  7410 LAKE ROAD  PO Box 295
          Chippewa Lake, OH 44215

QUESTION & ANSWER

1) What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?

   "The board should recommend that the community schools and voucher programs follow the same accounting practices mandated for the public schools, both in the financial practices and the attendance procedures. The same standards for highly qualified teachers must be followed. The same standards for curriculum assessment and student safety procedures must be followed. The Educational Management Information System must be in place at any school using public funds. Periodic on site visits, unannounced, should be a recommended practice. Criminal background checks should be required for all personnel, including non educational management, involved in the community school. In closing, anything that a public school is required to do should be done by any entity receiving public money."

2) Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?

   "As an adjunct faculty member at Bryant & Stratton College I have taught the Beginnings of Western Civilization and other courses in the Humanities. In these courses we investigate all the creation epics and theories. Eastern philosophies as well are covered. To attempt the inclusion of creationism, intelligent design, in the K/12 environment, would be an inappropriate use of limited time and resources available to the public schools. Proponents of creationism should deliver their message from the pulpit where it has been philosophized on historically."

JAMES MOYER – DISTRICT 6
Address  101 E. Fourteenth Ave. Apt. Y
          Columbus, OH 43201

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*

1) What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?

2) Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?
**KRISTIN MCKINLEY – DISTRICT 6**
Address: 3656 Cannongate Dr.
Columbus, OH 43228

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

2) Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?

**LARRY WOLPERT – DISTRICT 6**
Address: 6216 Clover Place
Hilliard, OH 43026

**QUESTION & ANSWER**

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

   “Accountability of Charter Schools is a major issue that I support. In the 127th Generally Assembly, in which I was a member, we passed House Bill 119 that added new accountability standards to charter schools. Under the new standards a charter school can lose its funding if their books are unauditible. Also under the new standards, the state will close the school if it is in Academic Emergency for three years. As a member of the State School Board I would work with the Governor, Department of Education and the Generally Assembly to support any additional changes to the law to ensure that our tax dollars are used wisely in the education of our children.”

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

   “I do not believe that creationism should be taught in schools, but I believe there should be critical analysis of the theory of Evolution.”

**HEATHER HESLOP-LICATA – DISTRICT 7**
Address: 480 Delaware Avenue
Akron, OH 44303
Phone: 330.864.1676
QUESTION & ANSWER

1) **WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PROPOSE TO ENSURE THAT COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND VOUCHER PROGRAMS ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PUBLIC?**

“There have been improvements of late to the Charter School Accountability system. We now have a closure provision that allows schools to be closed if they spend two out of three years in academic emergency or if they fail to make AYP in that same time frame. Charter schools that prove to have inauditable books are also subject to closure.

However, these measures do not go far enough. They only apply to those schools chartered on or after April 8, 2003. This means that all of the failing community schools that began in 1997 up until the April date are not subject to the same operational, fiscal or governance accountability.”

The State Board should recommend that ALL community schools, both first and second generation, must be held to identical standards of performance and accountability in all areas. The closure provision should be applied to all schools and we should institute** *(Candidate exceeded word limit for this question)*

2) **DO YOU BELIEVE CREATIONISM (INTELLIGENT DESIGN) SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?**

“Intelligent Design should absolutely not be taught in public schools. ID points to any gap in the evolutionary process and states the gap might possibly be filled by an unknown intelligence. However there exists no method of inquiry by which one might attempt to prove or disprove this claim. It is not empirical, observable or measurable. Intelligent Design is simply not good science and has no place in the classroom.

Additionally, Intelligent Design can not separate itself from Creationism; it is a religious belief statement. As such teaching it in the public school classroom is a violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment which prohibits state aid in promoting religion. Individuals are entitled to their beliefs. However, the public schools are under no obligation to promote those beliefs under the guise that they are science.”

**TAMMY O'BRIEN – DISTRICT 7**

Address 1625 Orchard Drive
Akron, Ohio 44333

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*
1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

“I would follow any recommendations that Ohio Auditor of State Mary Taylor believes is appropriate. Auditor Taylor, a CPA, has been very thorough in her position and is playing no political favorites. I am in favor of exempting special education students from the testing score formula for all school management types. This applies to the Autism Voucher program recipients as well.”

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

“This is an inappropriate question for the next term of the board. Text books are printed by subject in annual rotations, once every eight years. Science was printed in 2006 and will not be printed again until 2014. This term expires in 2012. The league should have centered it’s question on the issue of funding and spending that the board will deal with immediately after taking office.”

---

**Jeffrey Hardin – District 10**

Address 1088 Fox Run Road
Milford, Ohio 45150
Phone 513-831-2272
committee@hardin4ohio.com

**Question & Answer**

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

---

**John McHenry – District 10**

Address 299 Sugar Camp Road
PO BOX 240
South Webster, Ohio 45682
Phone 740-355-5355

**Question & Answer**
1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

“Any oversight role of the Board over ‘non-public’ education must have the support of statutory enactment. Assuming this occurs, the Board must require the highest standards of all educators and schools regardless of the forum of instruction. The array of choices should not deviate from the singular goal of graduating students who have fundamental academic skills and the basics of good citizenship. Vocational and technical schooling should receive a strong boost from the Board.”

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

“I believe creationism/intelligent design belongs in Sunday School and evolution belongs in science class. Trust in God and trust in science are not incompatible to me but instruction in each should occur in forums that do not overlap.”

---

**Jane Sonenshein – District 10**

Address: 6143 Kilrenny Drive
Loveland, OH 45140
Phone: 513.831.1870

**Question & Answer**

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

“The State Board has already recommended that the sponsors of all community schools be required to meet the evaluation criteria on their efforts to monitor and help address needs of the schools they sponsor. The legislation has not been acted on. This would help in the oversight of community schools. Also, management firms that provide services to community schools need to provide transparent fiscal reports. For-profit companies do not have to report how much they are making. If public money is going to be used for private education, schools accepting voucher students should be required to test all of their students with the same instruments (OAT and/or OGT) required of public schools. With this program, parents must be much more vigilant in assuring the academic success of their child. Without the same information that public schools are required to supply, the transparency required to maintain this oversight is extremely difficult.”
2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

"Science is a very limited discipline. Only that which can be observed or tested can be studied. Neither creationism nor intelligent design meets that test. Science is such an important subject for our students. The basics from K-12 prepare them for the rigorous college subjects that are required for many of our future jobs. There is no time to discuss ideas that are not science. I have no objection to introducing Philosophy or Comparative Religion courses where the origin of life could be discussed. Our students also need to know much more about the world religions as well as the basics of philosophical discourse."

**Angela Bennet – District 11**

**Address:** 1980 Standwood Road  
East Cleveland, OH 44112  
**Phone:** 216.410.4047

**Question & Answer**

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

"The State Board of Education currently has mechanisms in place to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, community schools are required to have highly qualified teachers who are trained and certified to teach their subject area. In addition, community schools are required to have background checks prior to the commencement of school. The issue is enforcement. The State Board of Education should ensure that there is a level playing field for all schools, including traditional public schools and community schools. If a school is failing to provide our children with high quality education after sufficient opportunity for improvement, then they should be closed."

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

"No. Intelligent design is not based in science, but in religion. Religion is a personal choice, one that parents should make for their children. While I am a Christian and have a strong faith in God, it is not my place to impose my religious beliefs into the classroom. The secular purposes..."
CLAIMED BY THE PROONENTS OF CREATIONISM (INTELLIGENT DESIGN) ARE MERELY A PRETEXT TO PROMOTING RELIGION IN THE CLASSROOM.

**JOCelyn CONWELL – District 11**

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

**MARY ROSE OAKAR – District 11**

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**

**EDWARD PARKER – District 11**

*Candidate Response was not received by publication deadline.*

1) **What recommendations should the State Board of Education propose to ensure that community schools and voucher programs are accountable to the public?**

2) **Do you believe creationism (intelligent design) should be taught in the public schools?**