## Resolution 2021- 09

Resolution authorizing adoption of an alternative method of apportionment of the undivided Local Government Fund (LGF) for calendar year 2022 that per Ohio Revised Code Section 5747.53 excludes the otherwise required approval of the legislative authority of the city wholly or partially in the county, with the greatest population

**WHEREAS,** Ohio Revised Code Section 5747.53 authorizes adoption of an alternative method for determining the amount to be apportioned from the Undivided Local Government Fund among the various political subdivisions within a county; and

WHEREAS, adoption of an alternative method of apportionment for the Undivided Local Government Fund requires the approval of the Board of County Commissioners, the legislative authority of the city, located wholly or partially in the county, with the greatest population, a majority of the Boards of Township Trustees, and legislative authorities of municipal corporations, located wholly or partially in the County; and

**WHEREAS**, Ohio Revised Code Section 5747.53 permits annual resolutions to exclude the approval otherwise required of the legislative authority of the city, located wholly or partially in the county, with the greatest population; and

WHEREAS, the VILLAGE OF NEW ACHUMN, in Clermont County, Ohio, desires to approve the alternative method for allocation of the Undivided Local Government Fund as proposed by the majority of township trustees and legislative authorities of municipal corporations for calendar year 2022.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the VILLAGE OF NEW RICHMOND, Clermont County, Ohio:

- **Section 1.** Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 5747.53, approval of the City of Milford, as the city located wholly or partially in the county with the greatest population, shall not be required to approve the calendar year 2022 allocation of the Undivided Local Government Fund.
- **Section 2.** That the distribution of the Undivided Local Government Funds be distributed for calendar year 2022 on the following basis:
  - 1. The County will receive 48.545 percent of the total allocation to be disbursed.
  - 2. The remainder of the funds (51.455 percent) after the County allocation outlined in item 1 above will be disbursed as follows:
    - a. Fifty (50%) percent of the remainder will be shared equally among all municipalities and townships.
    - b. Fifty (50%) percent of the remainder will be distributed to the municipalities and townships on a per capita basis and will be adjusted as necessary based upon the most current United States Census.
  - 3. A chart illustrating the proposed funds to be distributed is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.
- **Section 3.** That the Clerk of Council shall deliver a certified copy of this Resolution to the Clermont County Board of County Commissioners and the Clermont County Budget

## Commission.

**Section 4.** Council hereby finds and determines that all formal actions relative to the passage of this legislation were taken in an open meeting of this Council, and that all deliberations of this Council and of its committees, if any, which resulted in formal action, were taken in meetings open to the public, in full compliance with applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Section 5. That this resolution shall take effect from and after the earliest time allowed by law.

SECTION 6. That the VILLAGE BY A 3/4 MAJORITY WITE HEREBY DISPENSES WITH THE RECVIREMENT TO READ RESOLUTION ON THREE JEVENAGE RENDINGS AND AUTHORIZED MORNING.

Mayor

A the this resolution shall take effect from and after the earliest time allowed by law.

SECTION 6. That the VILLAGE BY A 3/4 MAJORITY WITE HEREBY DISPENSES WITH THE RECVIREMENT TO READ MAYOR.

MAYOR

Mayor

Approved as to Form:

SCOTT STUMANN, VILLAGE JOLICITOR

Passed: 4 13 2021

#iction 2109 LG.    Cold All   Co	Curr Townshij	Variance (Old to Current)  \$ 3,878.84 \$ \$ 3,615.16 \$ \$ (10,276.56) \$ \$ (35,479.18) \$ \$ (21,535.05) \$	Proposed Mayors Association Model	Variance (Current to Proposed)	Variance
(Old Alloca  LE  SOW  SOW  SOW  SOW  SOW  SOW  SOW  SO	Township 88 \$ 13 \$ 13 \$ 10 \$	(Old to Current)  \$ 3,878.84 \$ \$ 3,615.16 \$ \$ (10,276.56) \$ \$ (35,479.18) \$ \$ (21,535.05) \$	Mayors Association Model	(Current to Proposed)	
(Old Alloca  LE  COW  COW  COW  COW  COW  COW  COW  CO	Townshij 88 \$ 13 \$ 83 \$ 90 \$	Old to	Model	(Current to Proposed)	
LIE	· · · · · · · ·	w w w w w			(OLD to Proposed)
LIE \$ 10, 24, NSVILLE \$ 24, NS	<b>~~~</b> ~~	· w w w w	26.463.86	13.014.13	16 892 98
COW \$ 24  NSVILLE \$ 38,  ITY \$ 38,  NIA \$ 47,  D \$ 53,  ASHINGTON \$ 12,  AMSBURG \$ 33,  ILLIAMSBURG \$ 34,  EL \$ 84,  EL \$ 24,  ANKLIN \$ 5,  ONELICK \$ 26,  ANKLIN \$ 5,  ONELICK \$ 26,  TE \$ 26,  ONELICK \$ 26,  TE \$ 31,  ONELICK \$ 32,  ONELICK \$ 33,  ONELICK \$ 33,  ONELICK \$ 33,  ONELICK \$ 33,	<b>"</b>		26,591.77	\$ 12.950.18	16 565 34
NSVILLE \$ 52,  ITY \$ 38,  NIA \$ 47,  D \$ 53,  ASHINGTON \$ 12,  AMSBURG \$ 33,  RICHMOND \$ 76,  ILIAMSBURG \$ 24,  ANKLIN \$ 20,  ANKLIN \$ 26,  AN	w w	<b>⋄</b> ⋄	26,885.62	\$ 12.803.25	2,576.69
ITY \$ 38, NIA \$ 47, NIA \$ 38, NIA \$ 47, NIA \$ 47, NIA \$ 47, NIA SEL \$ 12, NIA SEL \$ 12, NIA SEL \$ 14, NIA SEL \$ 164, NIA	ζΛ.	⋄	28,990.97	\$ 11,750.57	\$ (23.728.61)
NIA \$ 47, D \$ 53, D \$ 53, ASHINGTON \$ 112, AMSBURG \$ 33, RICHMOND \$ 76, IIO \$ 14, IIO \$ 24, IIIAMSBURG \$ 26,			29,073.94	\$ 11,709.09	(9,825.96)
D	.12 \$ 20,948.10	\$ (26,994.02) \$	31,462.78	\$ 10,514.67	\$ (16,479.34)
ASHINGTON \$ 12,  AMSBURG \$ 33,  RICHMOND \$ 76,  IIO \$ 14,  EL \$ 83,  CKSON \$ 20,  ILLIAMSBURG \$ 24,  ANKLIN \$ 26,  JA \$ 67,  ANKLIN \$ 26,  TE \$ 31,  ONELICK \$ 32,  TE \$ 41,  TE \$ 41,  TE \$ 43,	1.34 \$ 23,188.28	\$ (30,326.06) \$	32,956.23	\$ 9,767.95	\$ (20,558.11)
AMSBURG \$ 33,  RICHMOND \$ 76,  410 \$ 14,  EL \$ 31,  EL \$ 20,  ILLIAMSBURG \$ 24,  ANKLIN \$ 26,  JA \$ 67,  ANKLIN \$ 26,  TE \$ 31,  ONELICK \$ 26,  TE \$ 41,  TE \$ 41,  SIRCE \$ 37,	75 \$ 23,457.94	\$ 10,588.19 \$	33,136.00	\$ 9,678.06	\$ 20,266.25
RICHMOND	7.62 \$ 26,035.18	\$ (7,542.44) \$	34,854.16	\$ 8,818.98	\$ 1,276.54
HO	ψ,	\$ (50,028.14) \$	35,172.21	\$ 8,659.96	\$ (41,368.18)
EL \$ 83, CKSON \$ 20, ILLIAMSBURG \$ 24, ANKLIN \$ 26, IA \$ 67, AVNE \$ 31, ONELICK \$ 26, TE \$ 164, ONROE \$ 37,	1.91 \$ 26,657.45	\$ 12,546.54 \$	35,269.01	\$ 8,611.56	\$ 21,158.10
CKSON \$ 20, ILLIAMSBURG \$ 24, ANKLIN \$ 26, IA \$ 67, AVNE \$ 31, ONELICK \$ 26, TE \$ 164, ONROE \$ 37,	<b>~</b>	\$ (56,016.71) \$	35,618.17	\$ 8,436,97	\$ (47,579.74)
ILLIAMSBURG \$ 24,  ANKLIN \$ 24,  LA \$ 26,  AYNE \$ 31,  ONELICK \$ 26,  TE \$ 164,  ONROE \$ 37,	1.58 \$ 28,576,12	\$ 8,187.54 \$	36,548.12	\$ 7,972.00	\$ 16,159.54
ANKLIN \$ 26,  JA \$ 56,  AYNE \$ 31,  ONELICK \$ 26,  TE \$ 41,  TE \$ 164,  ONROE \$ 48,	1.04 \$ 30,007.35	\$ 5,694.31 \$	37,502.27	\$ 7,494.92	\$ 13,189.23
JA \$ 67,  AYNE \$ 31,  ONELICK \$ 26,  TE \$ 41,  TH \$ 164,  ONROE \$ 48,  SRCE \$ 37,	.22 \$ 30,271.82	\$ 3,846.60 \$	37,678.58	\$ 7,406.77	\$ 11,253.36
AYNE \$ 31, ONELICK \$ 26, TE \$ 41, TE \$ 164, ONROE \$ 37,	.22 \$ 38,019.11	\$ (29,373.11) \$	42,843.44	\$ 4,824.34	\$ (24,548.78)
ONELICK \$ 26, TE \$ 41, TH	.49 \$ 38,454.70	\$ 7,017.21 \$	43,133.84	\$ 4,679.14	\$ 11,696.35
TE \$ 41,  DNROE \$ 164,  SIRCE \$ 37,	.46 \$ 39,548.86	\$ 12,691.40 \$	43,863.28	\$ 4,314.42	\$ 17,005.82
\$ 1 DNROE \$	.80 \$ 47,586.54	\$ 5,824.74 \$	49,221.73	\$ 1,635.19	\$ 7,459.93
w w	❖	\$ (116,226.82) \$	49,439.53	\$ 1,526.30	\$ (114,700.52)
φ.	\$	\$ 5,558.31 \$	53,307.99	\$ (407.93)	\$ 5,150.38
	ψ.	\$ 33,897.12 \$	65,010.16	\$ (6,259.02)	\$ 27,638.09
๙	.08 \$ 93,525.79	\$ 28,608.71 \$	79,847.90	\$ (13,677.89)	\$ 14,930.82
VIA	.05 \$ 117,384.74	\$ 52,593.69 \$	95,753.87	\$ (21,630.87)	\$ 30,962.82
TOWNSHIP-MIAMI \$ 132,292.25	.25 \$ 224,944.50	\$ 92,652.25 \$	167,460.37	\$ (57,484.13)	\$ 35,168.12
TOWNSHIP-UNION \$ 140,869.16	.16 \$ 253,817.93	\$ 112,948.77 \$	186,709.33	\$ (67,108.60)	\$ 45,840.17
WILLAGE-NEWTONSVILLE \$ 16,351.30	-30 \$ 05.	❖	1		

1,364,795.14

٠

1,364,795.14

₩