Election Proof:

NOVEMBER 5, 2024 COUNTY OF YAVAPAI

	STATE OF ARIZONA		
			2024-09-11 13:54:59 MST
SECTION ONE	STATE REPRESENTATIVE		COUNTY ATTORNEY
PARTISAN BALLOT	DISTRICT 30		
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTOR	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2  BIASIUCCI, LEO	(REP)	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  MCGRANE, DENNIS  (REP)
	GILLETTE, JOHN	(REP)	WRITE-IN
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  TRUMP / VANCE (REP)	TIMBERLAKE, MONICA	(DEM)	
GONZALEZ, ABEGAL; GREEN, LISA; JACKSON, NATHAN C.; LEWIS, THOMAS W.;	○ WRITE-IN		COUNTY RECORDER
LIZER, DOTTIE; LIZER, MYRON; MCEWEN, STEVEN R.; RODRIGUEZ, BELINDA; SMITH,			VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
TREVOR; SWOBODA, GINA; SWOBODA, ROBERT L.	WRITE-IN		BURCHILL, MICHELLE (REP)
HARRIS / WALZ (DEM)			○ WRITE-IN
BEJARANO, YOLANDA; DELARGE, CONSTANCE; EVANS, CORAL; FLORES,	CORPORATION COMMISSIONER	1	
AMELIA; GARCIA, MARISOL; GARLID, DOREEN; GRIJALVA, ADELITA; MCGOVERN,	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3	·	COUNTY SCHOOL
MOLLY; SUNDARESHAN, PRIYA; VALDEZ, MARIA; VASQUEZ, DORA	O LOPEZ, RENE	(REP)	SUPERINTENDENT VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
OLIVER / TER MAAT BLITZ, HOWARD; DEATON, THOMAS;	MARQUEZ PETERSON, LEA	(REP)	◯ KING, STEVE (REP)
DOPSON, KATIE; FOWLER, ERIC; GARCIA, ROMAN; GIVER, NICOLE; MASSIE,	○ WALDEN, RACHEL	(REP)	○ WRITE-IN
REBEKAH; MCFARLAND, MICHAEL; REID- SHAVER, SHEILA; TALLMAN, CORY;	AGUILAR, YLENIA	(DEM)	
THOMAS III, DAVID HURST	HILL, JONATHON	(DEM)	COUNTY SHERIFF
STEIN / WARE ADGER, STEVEN; BECK-JONES, AMEE;	O POLACHECK, JOSHUA	(DEM)	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
CEASE, MICHAEL; EASTWOOD, ATHENA; HANNAH, CODY; LUXENBERG, NINA;	CEASE, MIKE	(GRN)	RHODES, DAVID (REP)
MENOR, SCOTT; MONTANO, MICHAEL; OGOLA, KIRA; QUINTANA, EDUARDO;	C LUXENBERG, NINA	(GRN)	○ WRITE-IN
STEFANOW, JENNIFER	○ WRITE-IN		
○ WRITE-IN			COUNTY TREASURER
	○ WRITE-IN		VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
U.S. SENATOR			O DAVIS, CHIP (REP)
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1	○ WRITE-IN		○ WRITE-IN
LAKE, KARI (REP)			
GALLEGO, RUBEN (DEM)  OLINITANIA EDILARDO (GRN)	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT 1		CONSTABLE BAGDAD/ YARNELL
QUINTANA, EDUARDO ,	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1	(REP)	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
○ WRITE-IN	COMPTON, BROOKS WRITE-IN	(112.7)	RISEN, BILL (REP)
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN	WRITE-IN		WRITE-IN
CONGRESS DISTRICT 2	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS		SECTION TWO
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  CRANE, ELI (REP)	DISTRICT 2		NONPARTISAN BALLOT
NEZ, JONATHAN (DEM)	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  ○ GREGORY, JAMES	(REP)	JUSTICE OF THE ARIZONA
○ WRITE-IN	○ WRITE-IN		SUPREME COURT
			Shall <b>KING</b> , <b>KATHRYN H.</b> , Justice of the Arizona
STATE SENATOR	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS		Supreme Court be retained in office?
DISTRICT 1 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1	DISTRICT 3 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1		YES
FINCHEM, MARK (REP)	DRAKE, LORI	(REP)	○ NO
FOGEL, MIKE S. (DEM)	CHECK, NIKKI	(DEM)	JUSTICE OF THE ARIZONA
○ WRITE-IN	○ WRITE-IN		SUPREME COURT
			Shall <b>BOLICK</b> , <b>CLINT</b> , Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court be retained in office?
STATE REPRESENTATIVE	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS		Supreme Court be retained in onice:
<b>DISTRICT 1</b> VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2	<b>DISTRICT 4</b> VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1		○ YES
BLISS, SELINA (REP)	C KUKNYO, CHRIS	(REP)	○ NO
O NGUYEN, QUANG (REP)	○ WRITE-IN		JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
RUBY, JAY (DEM)			DIVISION I
SMITH, MARCIA (DEM)	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS		Shall <b>FURUYA</b> , <b>BRIAN Y</b> ., Judge of the Court of Appeals Division I be retained in office?
○ WRITE-IN	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1	/n=-:	
_	MALLORY, MARY	(REP)	YES
○ WRITE-IN	○ WRITE-IN		O NO
OTATE OFWATOR			JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION 4
STATE SENATOR DISTRICT 30	COUNTY ASSESSOR		VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  ANGIUS, HILDY  (REP)	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  SIMMONS, JUDD	(REP)	CARMAN, KRISTA  WRITE-IN
MORGAINE, J'AIME (DEM)	○ SIMMONS, JODD	· /	VVINIL-IIV
WRITF-IN	VVIXITE-IIV		

○ WRITE-IN

O WRITE-IN

HIDGE OF THE SUBERIOR COURT	CHINO VALLEY ILED #54	DI ACK CANVON CITY DIWLID
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION 5 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1	CHINO VALLEY U.S.D. #51 SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)	BLACK CANYON CITY D.W.I.D.  GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)  VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3
Elected candidate will serve remainder	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3	CLAYTON, ELAINE
of unexpired term ending in 2026.	ATONNA, PETER	HRABINA, RANDALL
SAVAGE, DANALYN	GRANILLO, BEVERLY	
○ WHITMER, HENRY	O JOHNSON, INGER	C REYLEK, MELINA
○ WRITE-IN	C LASSEN, DARYL	STRIZAK, TOM
	TRUJILLO-MORTENSEN, ANNIE	○ WRITE-IN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	○ WRITE-IN	
<b>DIVISION 7</b> VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1		WRITE-IN
BLUFF, MICHAEL	WRITE-IN	_
○ WRITE-IN		WRITE-IN
	WRITE-IN	_
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT		CROWN KING FIRE DISTRICT
DIVISION 8	PRESCOTT U.S.D. #1	GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1  PHELAN, DEBRA	SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD	VOTE FOR NOT MORÈ THAN 2  BECK, SCOTT
WRITE-IN	(4-YEAR TERM)	FERENCIK, TROY
William William	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3  BERGAMINI, JENNIFER	GARRETT, TODD
MINGUS UNION H.S.D. #4	CONN, LINDA	MORGAN, GERALD
SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD	FRAHER, ANDY	NORMAN, DAVID
(4-YEAR TERM)	MANGUM, J. BRETT	VAN CLEAVE, ERIC
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3	MOREY, KELLI	WRITE-IN
ARIOLA, JAMES	_ ,	WRITE-IIN
BELL, TAYLOR	RAY, PAMELLA WRITE-IN	WOITE IN
KOEPNICK, ASHLEY	WRITE-IN	WRITE-IN
NEVAREZ, FRANK		
TEAGUE, CAROL ANNE	WRITE-IN	TOWN OF WICKENBURG MAYOR (4-YEAR TERM)
WEGWERT, JOE	<u> </u>	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1
WRITE-IN	WRITE-IN	BRATCHER, BOBBIE "BG"
		HENSON, KRISTI
WRITE-IN	CAMP VERDE U.S.D. #28 SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)	WRITE-IN
○ WRITE-IN	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3	Grounds for the demand of recall of
	GERMAN, CAROL	Lisa DuVernay: On August 8, 2023, City
HUMBOLDT U.S.D. #22	GRESHAM, STEVE	Council Member, Lisa DuVernay, showed pornographic video at the Cottonwood City
SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)	C HAWK, PAUL	Council meeting. There were children present.
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3	◯ JAHNKE, MATT	She also appeared to threaten legal action agains the City if the Mayor did not instruct staff to draft a
DELLINGER, MARY ANN	○ WRITE-IN	city ordinance which had already been voted against by the majority of the Council. On October
GARFIELD, ZACK		3, 2023, when concerns were expressed about
MAXWELL-DRAKE, BONNIE	WRITE-IN	the appearance of nepotism if her husband sat the Planning and Zoning Commission, DuVernay
SPRAGUE, BRUCE		insisted she would abstain from voting on any issue on which it might appear inappropriate. She
UNVERRICHT, SUE	WRITE-IN	then voted her husband onto P and Z. Because
○ WRITE-IN		DuVernay does not appear to understand the policies and procedures of the Council and city
	MAYER U.S.D. #43	staff and because she does not appear to be concerned about wasting tax-payer dollars in
WRITE-IN	SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)	pursuit of her personal agenda, I request a recall vote of the citizens of the City of Cottonwood,
WRITE-IN	VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2  KING, MIKE	Arizona so the taxpayers can decide if she should continue to serve on the City Council.
	→ MCCANN, MICHELE	
ASH FORK J.U.S.D. #31	SPIGELMIRE, SUSAN	
SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD (4-YEAR TERM)	○ WRITE-IN	
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2	<u> </u>	_
BARNES, SUSAN	○ WRITE-IN	
MATSON, TERRI		
SHARP, BARRY	YAVAPAI COLLEGE DISTRICT 1	
○ WRITE-IN	SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD	

(6-YEAR TERM)

○ WRITE-IN

◯ KIEL, WILLIAM

SIGAFOOS, RAY

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

# Officer's justification of conduct in office:

- Good Governance and Transparency matter and aren't negotiable for our community and Cottonwood taxpayers.
- 2. **Truth Matters.** If seeing a video clip of a family-friendly all-ages "Drag Show" was inappropriate for children, then an actual show is also inappropriate. Let's work together to protect Cottonwood's youngest and most vulnerable citizens.
- 3. Commitment Matters. Offering to pay for an attorney myself, to draft an ordinance, is not the same as threatening legal action. A draft ordinance is not a law. Ordinances are reviewed and voted on. A Mayor who has been in office for 18 years should know better. What's he afraid of? 4. Cottonwood is our Home. My husband and I have no business interests in Cottonwood.
- 4. Cottonwood is our Home. My husband and I have no business interests in Cottonwood. Cottonwood is our home—the city benefits when experienced successful citizens get involved. Only 2 of 3 spots on Planning and Zoning are filled. We can't turn away folks with expertise who want to help. There is no law against a councilor's family serving on an advisory committee. We are both grateful for the opportunity to serve our community.

I've dedicated numerous hours studying our city codes to ensure compliance. I have consistently pushed for budgetary oversight, which regrettably is severely lacking.

# CITY OF COTTONWOOD COUNCIL MEMBER

## **VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1**

Elected candidate will serve remainder of unexpired term ending in 2026.

- O DOWELL, CHRISTOPHER
- DUVERNAY, LISA
- WRITE-IN

## CITY OF COTTONWOOD COUNCIL MEMBER (4-YEAR TERM)

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- O MOSLEY, JOY
- WRITE-IN

# TOWN OF CAMP VERDE COUNCIL MEMBER (4-YEAR TERM)

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3

- BAKER, JACKIE
- BOLTON, BRIAN
- FOREMAN, ROBERT
- MARTIN, JERRY (GERONIMO)
- MURDOCK, JESSIE
- SEYBOLD, PATRICIA
- WRITE-IN
- WRITE-IN
- ◯ WRITE-IN

# CITY OF PEORIA COUNCIL MEMBER IRONWOOD DISTRICT (4-YEAR TERM)

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

STOKES, RICK

○ WRITE-IN

# CITY OF PEORIA COUNCIL MEMBER WILLOW DISTRICT (4-YEAR TERM)

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- EDWARDS, JON
- WRITE-IN

## TOWN OF WICKENBURG COUNCIL MEMBER (4-YEAR TERM)

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3

- CLARK, SHAWN
- HAYS ROVEY, REBECCA
- SICKLES, EVERETT
- WILLIS, JAMES HENRYPARKES, RICHARD
- NYBERG, MARGARET
- WRITE-IN
- WRITE-IN
- WRITE-IN

# **PROPOSITION 133**

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO PRIMARY ELECTIONS OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING ARTICLE VII, SECTION 10, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; RELATING TO PRIMARY ELECTIONS.

### **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

REQUIRES DIRECT PRIMARY ELECTIONS FOR PARTISAN OFFICES TO ALLOW EACH RECOGNIZED POLITICAL PARTY TO NOMINATE AND PLACE ON THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT AS MANY CANDIDATES FOR EACH OFFICE AS THERE ARE OPEN POSITIONS. PROVIDES THAT DIRECT PRIMARY ELECTION LAWS ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE SUPERSEDE INCONSISTENT CITY LAWS.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of amending the Arizona Constitution to require that when the Legislature enacts laws regulating direct primary elections for partisan offices, those laws shall supersede any city law, regulation, or policy to the contrary. The primaries would be conducted in a manner so that each political party represented on the ballot may nominate for each office a number of candidates equal to the number of positions to be filled for that office in the ensuing general election and requires eligible candidates who are nominated at a primary election to be placed on the next general election ballot.

A "no" vote shall have the effect of keeping the current laws related to partisan primary elections.

ΥE

 $\bigcirc$  NO

# **PROPOSITION 134**

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING ARTICLE IV, PART 1, SECTION 1, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; RELATING TO INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

FOR A STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE TO QUALIFY TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT, SIGNATURES FROM A PERCENTAGE OF THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS IN ALL 30 LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS WOULD BE REQUIRED, AS FOLLOWS: 10% FOR STATEWIDE INITIATIVES; 15% FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS; AND 5% FOR STATEWIDE REFERENDA. A "yes" vote shall have the effect of amending the Arizona Constitution to require an applicant wishing to place a statewide measure on the ballot to collect a certain percentage of signatures in each of the 30 legislative districts, rather than a percentage of the total number of statewide voters. Signatures from 10% of the voters in each district would be required for a statewide initiative to appear on the ballot. Signatures from 15% of the voters in each district would be required for an amendment to the Arizona Constitution to appear on the ballot. Signatures from 5% of the voters in each district would be required for a statewide referendum to appear on the ballot. If a proposed measure does not obtain the minimum percentage of signatures in any one of the 30 legislative districts, it would fail to qualify for the ballot, and would not be presented to voters. A "no" vote shall have the effect of keeping the

current constitutional language requiring only the signatures of 10% of the total number of statewide voters for an initiative to amend a statute, 15% of statewide voters for a constitutional amendment, and 5% of statewide voters for a referendum.

$\supset$	YES

○ NO

### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE **RELATING TO THE GOVERNOR OFFICIAL TITLE:**

AMENDING ARTICLE IV, PART 2, SECTION 1, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; AMENDING ARTICLE V, SECTION 4, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; RELATING TO THE GOVERNOR. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

TERMINATES GOVERNOR'S EMERGENCY POWERS, EXCEPT FOR POWERS RELATING TO WAR, FIRE, OR FLOOD, 30 DAYS AFTER THE GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, UNLESS EXTENDED BY THE LEGISLATURE. REQUIRES THE GOVERNOR TO CALL A SPECIAL SESSION UPON PRESENTMENT OF A PETITION SIGNED BY AT LEAST ONE-THIRD OF THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. A "yes" vote have shall have the effect of amending the Arizona Constitution to automatically terminate any emergency powers granted to the Governor thirty days after the date the state of emergency was proclaimed, unless the Legislature extends the emergency powers granted to the Governor or the emergency relates to war, fire, or flood. If the Legislature does not extend the emergency, the Governor may not declare a new state of emergency arising under the same conditions. Additionally, if requested by at least one-third of the members of each house of the Legislature, the Governor must promptly call a special session for the purposes of terminating or altering the emergency powers granted to the Governor during the state of emergency. A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current emergency powers of the Governor.

O YES

# $\bigcirc$ NO

# **PROPOSITION 136**

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE **RELATING TO BALLOT MEASURES** OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING ARTICLE IV, PART 1, SECTION 1, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; RELATING TO BALLOT MEASURES.

# **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

AUTHORIZES A PERSON TO BRING A LAWSUIT TO TRY TO STOP A VOTER-PROPOSED INITIATIVE FROM BEING PLACED ON THE BALLOT IF THAT PERSON SUES AT LEAST 100 DAYS BEFORE AN ELECTION AND CLAIMS THE VOTER-PROPOSED INITIATIVE WOULD VIOLATE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION OR THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of amending the Arizona Constitution to allow lawsuits regarding the constitutionality of a voter-initiated ballot measure to be filed at least 100 days prior to the election, in order to stop the measure from being placed on the official ballot. If a challenged voterinitiated ballot measure were found unconstitutional, the Secretary of State or another officer in charge of elections would be prohibited from placing it on the official ballot. A "no" vote shall have the effect of preserving the

current state of the law, which typically requires challenges to the constitutionality of a voterinitiated ballot measure to be brought only after the voters have decided to approve a ballot measure

YES

# **PROPOSITION 135**

# PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA

**PROPOSITION 137** 

CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT **OFFICIAL TITLE:** 

AMENDING ARTICLE VI, SECTIONS 4, 9, 12, 37, 38, 39, 41 AND 42, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA: RELATING TO THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

### **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

**ELIMINATES JUDICIAL TERMS AND REGULAR** RETENTION ELECTIONS AND NULLIFIES THE RESULTS OF THE 2024 JUDICIAL RETENTION ELECTIONS, FOR ARIZONA SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES, AND SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES IN COUNTIES WITH OVER 250,000 PERSONS. ALLOWS SUCH JUSTICES AND JUDGES TO HOLD OFFICE DURING GOOD BEHAVIOR UNTIL AGE 70.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of amending the Arizona Constitution to eliminate judicial terms for judges of the Arizona Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, and judges of the Superior Court in counties with more than 250,000 people. Voters will no longer have the ability to decide whether to retain those judges at the end of their judicial terms. Those judges would instead be subject to a retention election only if they were convicted of a felony or a crime involving fraud or dishonesty; were a debtor in a bankruptcy proceeding; held a mortgage under foreclosure; or did not meet performance standards according to the Commission on Judicial Performance Review. The House of Representatives and the Senate will each be able to appoint one member to the Commission. If any legislator asks the Commission to investigate whether a judge has engaged in misconduct, the Commission must investigate that allegation. If approved, these amendments will apply retroactively such that votes cast in the November 2024 election about whether to retain a judge will not be given effect. A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current system of voters deciding whether to retain a judge at the end of their judicial term.

$\overline{}$	NO
	NO

# **PROPOSITION 138**

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE **RELATING TO WAGES** 

# **OFFICIAL TITLE:**

AMENDING ARTICLE XVIII, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA, BY ADDING SECTION 11; RELATING TO WAGES.

# **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

PERMITS EMPLOYERS TO PAY UP TO 25% LESS THAN THE MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE FOR EMPLOYEES WHOSE COMPENSATION INCLUDES TIPS OR GRATUITIES FROM PATRONS, BUT ONLY IF THE EMPLOYER CAN ESTABLISH THAT THE EMPLOYEE ULTIMATELY RECEIVED THE MINIMUM WAGE PLUS \$2 FOR EVERY HOUR WORKED. A "yes" vote shall have the effect of amending the Arizona Constitution to allow employers to pay employees up to 25% less than the minimum hourly wage if the employer can establish that the employee's wage plus tips or gratuities is at least \$2 more than the minimum wage for every hour

A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current laws regarding minimum wage.

)	YES			
)	NO			

# **PROPOSITION 139**

PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION **RELATING TO THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO** AN ABORTION

### OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING ARTICLE II, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA, BY ADDING SECTION 8.1: RELATING TO THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO AN ABORTION.

### DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

CREATES A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO ABORTION. LIMITS THE STATE'S ABILITY TO INTERFERE WITH THAT RIGHT BEFORE FETAL VIABILITY, AFTER FETAL VIABILITY, ABORTIONS ARE ALLOWED WHEN NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE LIFE OR HEALTH OF THE PREGNANT INDIVIDUAL. PROHIBITS LAWS PENALIZING A PERSON FOR ASSISTING AN INDIVIDUAL OBTAINING AN ABORTION.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of creating a fundamental right to abortion under Arizona's constitution. The State will not be able to interfere with this fundamental right before fetal viability unless it has compelling reason and does so in the least restrictive way possible. Fetal viability means the point in the pregnancy when, in the good-faith judgment of a treating health care professional, the fetus has a significant likelihood of survival outside the uterus. Throughout the pregnancy, both before and after fetal viability, the State will not be able to interfere with the goodfaith judgement of a treating health care professional that an abortion is necessary to protect the life or health of the pregnant individual. The State will not be able to penalize any person for aiding or assisting a pregnant individual in exercising the right to an abortion.

A "no" vote shall have the effect of not creating a fundamental right to have an abortion under Arizona's constitution, will leave in place current laws that restrict abortion before fetal viability, and will allow the State to further restrict or ban abortion in the future

$\bigcirc$	YES
	NO

# **PROPOSITION 140**

## PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION **RELATING TO ELECTIONS OFFICIAL TITLE:**

AMENDING ARTICLE VII, SECTIONS 2, 7, 10, AND 11, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; AMENDING ARTICLE VII, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA, BY ADDING SECTION 19; RELATING TO ELECTIONS.

# **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

ALL PRIMARY ELECTION CANDIDATES FOR A GIVEN OFFICE WILL HAVE THE SAME SIGNATURE REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOT QUALIFICATION. ELIGIBLE VOTERS MAY VOTE FOR CANDIDATES REGARDLESS OF PARTY AFFILIATION. THE LEGISLATURE MAY PRESCRIBE THE NUMBER OF CANDIDATES ADVANCING TO THE GENERAL ELECTION. PROHIBITS USING PUBLIC MONIES FOR POLITICAL PARTY ELECTIONS.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of allowing all eligible voters to vote for any primary election candidate, regardless of party affiliation; imposing the same signature requirements on all candidates for a given office who wish to appear on the primary ballot; generally prohibiting the use of public funds for political party elections; allowing future law to determine how many candidates advance from the primary election, as well as the process by which candidates are elected at the general election; and if future law provides that three or more candidates may advance to the general election for an office to which one candidate will be elected, voter rankings shall be used.

A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining current requirements related to primary and general elections processes.

$\bigcirc$	YES
$\overline{}$	NO

**Notice:** Pursuant to Proposition 105 (1998), these measures cannot be changed in the future if approved on the ballot except by a three-fourths vote of the members of each house of the legislature and if the change furthers the purpose of the original ballot measure, by an initiative petition or by referring the change to the ballot.

# **PROPOSITION 311**

# REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO FIRST RESPONDERS

### OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING TITLE 12, CHAPTER 1, ARTICLE 1, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTION 12-116.12; REPEALING SECTION 12-116.12, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING SECTION 13-1204, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING SECTION 13-1204, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 3 OF THIS RESOLUTION; AMENDING TITLE 38, CHAPTER 8, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING ARTICLE 4; REPEALING TITLE 38, CHAPTER 8, ARTICLE 4, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; RELATING TO FIRST RESPONDERS.

## DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

REQUIRES THE STATE TO PAY \$250,000 TO THE SURVIVING SPOUSE OR CHILDREN OF A FIRST RESPONDER KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY. ESTABLISHES STATE SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFIT FUND, WHICH SHALL CONTINUOUSLY BE APPROPRIATED THROUGH A PENALTY FEE ON EVERY CRIMINAL CONVICTION. INCREASES PUNISHMENTS FOR AGGRAVATED ASSAULTS AGAINST FIRST RESPONDERS.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of requiring the State of Arizona to pay \$250,000, which would be referred to as the State Death Benefit, to the surviving spouse or children of a first responder killed in the line of duty; creating a State Supplemental Benefit Fund to pay the State Death Benefit; increasing criminal punishments for aggravated assaults against peace officers and other first responders; and require a \$20 penalty fee be imposed on every criminal conviction to fund the State Supplemental Benefit Fund. The State Death Benefit, \$20 penalty fee, and increased criminal punishments for aggravated assaults would expire on January 1, 2033. A "no" vote shall have the effect of not requiring the State of Arizona to provide a State Death Benefit for first responders killed in the line of

	)	YE
ı		

duty.

# $\bigcirc$ NO

# **PROPOSITION 312**

# REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO PROPERTY TAX OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING TITLE 42, CHAPTER 17, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING ARTICLE 9; REPEALING TITLE 42, CHAPTER 17, ARTICLE 9, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; RELATING TO PROPERTY TAX.

# DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

PROPERTY OWNERS MAY APPLY FOR A TAX REFUND FOR EXPENSES INCURRED DUE TO A GOVERNING AUTHORITY'S FAILURE TO ENFORCE CERTAIN PUBLIC NUISANCE LAWS ON OR NEAR THE OWNER'S REAL PROPERTY. THE REFUND MAY NOT EXCEED THE AMOUNT THE PROPERTY OWNER PAID FOR THE PRIOR TAX YEAR IN PRIMARY

PROPERTY TAXES. A "yes" vote shall have the effect of establishing the right to apply for a refund from a property owner's most recent property tax payment up to an amount that matches costs incurred by the property owner to mitigate the effects of a governing authority's repeated failure to enforce laws and ordinances prohibiting illegal camping, loitering, obstructing public thoroughfares, panhandling, public urination or defecation, public consumption of alcoholic beverages, and possession or use of illegal substances. If the documented costs exceed the amount of the most recent property tax bill, the property owner would be permitted to apply for a refund from their next property tax payment(s) to cover the balance of the initial claim. Property owners would be eligible annually for refunds until the taxing entity begins enforcing the relevant public nuisance laws. A "no" vote shall have the effect of retaining the current primary property tax payment laws and regulations.

$\subset$	) <b>\</b>	ES

# $\bigcirc$ NO

### PROPOSITION 313

# REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING SENTENCING

### OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING TITLE 13, CHAPTER 7, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTION 13-720: RELATING TO SENTENCING.

### **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

REQUIRES THAT A PERSON CONVICTED OF A CLASS 2 FELONY FOR CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING BE SENTENCED TO IMPRISONMENT IN THE CUSTODY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR NATURAL LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF RELEASE

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of eliminating the current sentencing ranges for a Class 2 child sex trafficking conviction. The sentence for a person convicted of a Class 2 felony for child sex trafficking would be imprisonment for natural life without the possibility of release.

A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current statutory sentencing ranges for those convicted of a Class 2 felony for child sex trafficking. The current sentencing ranges are between 7 years and natural life imprisonment without the possibility of release, depending on the age of the victim, the defendant's criminal history, and other factors.

$\overline{}$	$\overline{}$	VE
<u>_</u>		1 □

$\bigcirc$	NO

# **PROPOSITION 314**

# REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO RESPONSES TO HARMS AT THE BORDER OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING TITLE 1, CHAPTER 5, ARTICLE 1, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTIONS 1-503 AND 1-504; AMENDING TITLE 13, CHAPTER 34, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTION 13-3424; AMENDING TITLE 13, CHAPTER 38, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING ARTICLE 35; AMENDING TITLE 23, CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE 2, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTION 23-215; RELATING TO RESPONSES TO HARMS RELATED TO AN UNSECURED BORDER.

# DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

MAKES IT A CRIME FOR PERSONS NOT LAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES TO SUBMIT FALSE INFORMATION IN APPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC BENEFITS AND EMPLOYMENT, AND TO ENTER ARIZONA OUTSIDE PORTS OF ENTRY, OR REFUSE TO COMPLY WITH ORDERS TO RETURN. CRIMINALIZES SELLING FENTANYL THAT CAUSES THE DEATH OF A PERSON. A "yes" vote shall have the effect of creating new crimes regarding the following conduct by any person not lawfully present in the United States: (1) applying for a public benefit by submitting a false document; (2) submitting false information to an employer regarding the person's authorization to work in the United States; (3) entering Arizona from a foreign country at any location other than a lawful port of entry; (4) refusing to comply with a court order to return to the person's country of origin or entry. Also creates a new crime of selling

include an authorization allowing state and local law enforcement to transport the person to a port of entry or into federal custody.

A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the

fentanyl that causes the death of another person.

a foreign country if a person is convicted of the

illegal entry crime. The order to return must

Requires state courts to issue an order to return to

current criminal and procedural laws.

$\bigcirc$	YES
$\smile$	

# $\bigcirc$ NO

# **PROPOSITION 315**

REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO RULEMAKING OFFICIAL TITLE:

AMENDING TITLE 41, CHAPTER 6, ARTICLE 4.1, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTION 41-1049; RELATING TO RULEMAKING.

### DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

ANY PROPOSED RULE BY A STATE AGENCY ESTIMATED BY THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE REGULATORY COSTS BY MORE THAN \$500,000 WITHIN FIVE YEARS AFTER IMPLEMENTATION, EXCEPT FOR CORPORATION COMMISSION AND EMERGENCY RULES, SHALL NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE UNLESS THE LEGISLATURE RATIFIES THE PROPOSED RULE.

A "yes" vote shall have the effect of requiring state

agencies to submit any proposed rule that is estimated to increase regulatory costs by more than \$100,000 within five years after implementation to the Office of Economic Opportunity for review. If the Office of Economic Opportunity determines that the proposed rule is estimated to increase regulatory costs by more than \$500,000 within five years after implementation, the proposed rule shall not become effective unless the legislature enacts legislation ratifying the proposed rule. The Corporation Commission and emergency rules are exempt from this act.

A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current laws related to state agency rulemaking.

	YES
_	

O NO

# **PROPOSITION 479**

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY YAVAPAI COUNTY PERMANENT BASE ADJUSTMENT INCREASE OF \$7,900,000 OFFICIAL TITLE:

A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A PERMANENT ADJUSTMENT INCREASING THE STATE-IMPOSED BASE EXPENDITURE LIMITATION FOR YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA.

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

PURSUANT TO THE ARIZONA STATE CONSTITUTION, AND YAVAPAI COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESOLUTION NO. 2129, THE BOARD SEEKS VOTER APPROVAL TO PERMANENTLY ADJUST THE EXPENDITURE BASE OF THE COUNTY AS DETERMINED BY THE ECONOMIC ESTIMATES COMMISSION. THE COUNTY SEEKS AN ADJUSTMENT OF \$7,900,000.

A "YES" vote shall have the effect of allowing the County to adjust its base expenditure limit.

A "NO" vote shall have the effect of not allowing the County to adjust its base expenditure limit.

> YES		
ON C		

# BAGDAD USD #20 QUESTION

BAGDAD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20 OF YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA 15% MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION BUDGET OVERRIDE NOVEMBER 5, 2024

Shall the Governing Board of Bagdad Unified School District No. 20 of Yavapai County, Arizona (the "District"), adopt a General Maintenance and Operation Budget that includes an amount that exceeds the revenue control limit specified by statute by 15% for fiscal year 2025/2026 and for six subsequent years as described below? The fiscal year 2025/2026 budget override authority represent an extension and increase of the existing budget override authorities.

The amount of the proposed increase of the proposed budget over the alternate budget for fiscal year 2025/2026 is estimated to be \$69,259. In fiscal years 2025/2026 through 2029/2030 the amount of the proposed increase will be 15% of the District's revenue control limit in each of such years, as provided in Section 15-481(P) of the Arizona Revised Statutes. In fiscal years 2030/2031 and 2031/2032, the amount of the proposed increase will be 10% and 5%, respectfully, of the District's revenue control limit in each of such years, as provided in Section 15-481(P) of the Arizona Revised Statutes. Any budget increase authorized by this election shall be entirely funded by a levy of taxes on the taxable property in this school district for the year for which adopted and for six (6) subsequent years, shall not be realized from monies furnished by the state and shall not be subject to the limitation on taxes specified in Article IX, Section 18, Constitution of Arizona. Based on the current net assessed valuation used for secondary property tax purposes, to fund the proposed increase in the school district's budget would require an estimated tax rate of \$0.43 per one hundred dollars of net assessed valuation used for secondary property tax purposes and is in addition to the school district's tax rate that will be levied to fund the school district's revenue control limit allowed by law.

A "yes" vote shall authorize the Bagdad Unified School District Governing Board to extend and increase the existing maintenance and operation budget override authority and resulting tax, which includes an amount that exceeds the District's revenue control limit.

A "no" vote shall not authorize the Bagdad Unified School District Governing Board to extend and increase the existing maintenance and operation budget override authority and resulting tax.

BUDGET INCREASE, YESBUDGET INCREASE, NO

# SOCJUSD #9 QUESTION

### SEDONA-OAK CREEK JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 9 SALE, LEASE OR EXCHANGE OF REAL PROPERTY

Shall the Governing Board of Sedona-Oak Creek Joint Unified School District No. 9 of Yavapai and Coconino Counties, Arizona, be authorized to sell, lease or exchange the following described parcel of real property, or any portion thereof, and use all or a portion of any such proceeds of any such sale, lease or exchange to purchase school sites and/or to construct, improve, equip and furnish school buildings, to purchase student transportation or other vehicles and/or any other permitted capital expenditure? The real property is described as follows: Site located 25 W. Saddle Horn Road in Sedona, Yavapai County, Arizona, known as the District's Big Park Community School (approximately 20.8 acres) APN 405-27-006C

$\bigcirc$	SALE, LEASE OR
	EXCHANGE OF REAL PROPERTY, YES

SALE, LEASE OR EXCHANGE OF REAL PROPERTY, NO

# **PROPOSITION 478**

### OFFICIAL TITLE:

PROPOSAL BY THE CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT A DEDICATED TRANSACTION PRIVILEGE TAX OF NINETY-FIVE HUNDREDTHS OF ONE PERCENT (0.95%), FOR PURPOSES OF PUBLIC SAFETY WITHIN THE CITY, TAKING EFFECT ON APRIL 1, 2025 AND THEN REDUCING TO SEVENTY-FIVE HUNDREDTHS OF ONE PERCENT (0.75%) BY DECEMBER 31,

### **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

TRANSACTION PRIVILEGE TAX, THE
REVENUE FROM WHICH SHALL BE
CONTRIBUTED TO THE CITY'S GENERAL
FUND FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF FUNDING
PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES WITHIN THE CITY.
A "YES" vote shall have the effect of adopting the
dedicated transaction privilege tax of ninety-five
hundredths of one percent (0.95%), reducing to
seventy-five hundredths of one percent (0.75%)
by December 31, 2035, the revenue from which
shall be contributed to the City's general fund for
the sole purpose of funding public safety services
within the City.

A "NO" vote shall have the effect of not adopting a dedicated transaction privilege tax which would have contributed to the City's general fund for the sole purpose of funding public safety services within the City thereby limiting funding opportunities for public safety services within the City.

O YES

○ NO

# **PROPOSITION 480**

A proposition to the voters of the City of Cottonwood by the Cottonwood City Council OFFICIAL TITLE:

RATIFICATION OF THE 2024 COTTONWOOD GENERAL PLAN PROPOSED BY THE COTTONWOOD CITY COUNCIL IN RESOLUTION NUMBER 3302.

### **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:**

Proposal to the voters for ratification of the 2024 Cottonwood General Plan, as adopted by the City Council on June 4, 2024, Resolution Number 3302. The 2024 Cottonwood General Plan is a comprehensive, long-range plan for the development of Cottonwood, setting forth community goals and development policies. A "Yes" vote shall have the effect of approving the 2024 Cottonwood General Plan.

A "**No**" vote shall have the effect of not approving the 2024 Cottonwood General Plan, and the current General Plan adopted in 2014 will remain in effect until a new plan is approved by the voters in a future election.

O YES

 $\bigcirc$  NO

### **PROPOSITION 483**

# REFERENDUM ORDERED BY PETITION OF THE PEOPLE

### **OFFICIAL TITLE:**

Petition refers Sedona Ordinance No. 2024-01 (the "Ordinance"), as approved by the Sedona City Council on March 12, 2024, to the City's voters for their rejection or approval. The Ordinance approves a change to the current "Planned Development zoning of Yavapai County Assessor's Parcel 408-47-009A (located northwest of the intersection of W State Route 89A and Cultural Park Place) by adding the City's "Safe Place to Park" Program as a permitted use of the parcel through June 30, 2026.

### DESCRIPTIVE TITLE:

Voters will approve or reject Ordinance 2024-01 approving the City's zoning change of Parcel 408-47-009A (a six-acre City-owned parcel located northwest of SR89A and Cultural Park Place) for the City's "Safe Place to Park" Program as a permitted use of the parcel through June 30, 2026.

A "YES" vote shall have the effect of approving Sedona City Ordinance No. 2024-01 that was approved by Sedona City Council on March 12, 2024, for the zoning change of Parcel 408-47-009A (located northwest of the intersection of W State Route 89A and Cultural Park Place) by adding the City's "Safe Place to Park" Program as a permitted use of the parcel through June 30, 2026

A "NO" vote shall have the effect of rejecting Sedona City Ordinance No. 2024-01 that was approved by Sedona City Council on March 12, 2024, for the zoning change of Parcel 408-47-009A (located northwest of the intersection of W State Route 89A and Cultural Park Place) by adding the City's "Safe Place to Park" Program as a permitted use of the parcel through June 30, 2026.

YES

 $\supset$  NC

# **PROPOSITION 496 (Full Text)**

### PROPOSED WATER AND WASTEWATER UTILITY FRANCHISE CITY OF PEORIA, AZ

OFFICIAL TITLE (Full Text):
EPCOR PROPOSED WATER AND
WASTEWATER UTILITY FRANCHISE
QUESTION:

Shall the proposed Franchise Agreement, as published and submitted to the qualified electorate, be granted to EPCOR Water Arizona Inc., an Arizona corporation, to construct, maintain and operate a water and wastewater utility in the City of Peoria, Arizona, and future annexations.

# TAGLINE TEXT:

Shall the proposed Franchise Agreement, as published and submitted to the qualified electorate, be granted to EPCOR Water Arizona Inc., an Arizona corporation, to construct, maintain and operate a water and wastewater utility in the City of Peoria, Arizona, and future annexations. A "YES" vote will allow the City of Peoria to enter into the Franchise Agreement with EPCOR Water Arizona. Inc.

A "NO" vote will deny the City of Peoria the authority to enter into the Franchise Agreement.

O YES

 $\bigcirc$  NO