

7-0281-00 WHITE EE-1

OFFICIAL BALLOT

1 of 2 FRONT

0281 FESTIVAL

TO VOTE: COMPLETELY FILL THE OVAL(S) NEXT TO YOUR CHOICE(S), AS SHOWN

OF THE GENERAL ELECTION **ELECTION DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2024** COUNTY OF MARICOPA, STATE OF ARIZONA

John Doe

TO VOTE FOR A WRITE-IN CANDIDATE: WRITE THE NAME ATOP OF THE SHADED TEXT AND COMPLETELY FILL THE OVAL, AS SHOWN. DOE, JANE ole ballot and provided with all mailed early ball **COUNTY ASSESSOR** SECTION ONE PARTISAN BALLOT (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) **FEDERAL** FREEMAN, GREGORY (DEM) PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS COOK, EDDIE (REP) (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) EJARANO, YOLANDA DELARGE, CONSTANCE EVANS, CORAL FLORES, AMELIA BARCIA, MARISOL GRIJALVA, ADELITA MCGOVERN, MOLLY SUNDARESHAN, PRIYA VALDEZ, MARIA VASQUEZ, DORA Write-In Candidate HARRIS \bigcirc **COUNTY ATTORNEY** WALZ (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) ARLID, DOREEN (DEM) WOOTEN, TAMIKA N (DEM) GONZALEZ, ABEGAL GREEN, LISA JACKSON, NATHAN C. LEWIS, THOMAS W. LIZER, DOTTIE LIZER, MYRON MCEWEN, STEVEN R. RODRIGUEZ, BELINDA SMITH, TREVOR SWOBODA, GINA SWOBODA, ROBERT L. TRUMP MITCHELL, RACHEL (REP) Write-In Candidate **VANCE COUNTY RECORDER** (REP) (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) MASSIE, REBEKAH MCFARLAND, MICHAEL REID-SHAVER, SHEILA TALLMAN, CORY THOMAS III, DAVID HURST BLITZ, HOWARD DEATON, THOMAS DOPSON, KATIE FOWLER, ERIC GARCIA, ROMAN STRINGHAM, TIM (DEM) OLIVER TER MAAT **HEAP**, **JUSTIN** (REP) (LBT) Write-In Candidate ADGER, STEVEN BECK-JONES, AMEE CEASE, MICHAEL EASTWOOD, ATHENA HANNAH, CODY LUXENBERG, NINA MENOR, SCOTT MONTANO, MICHAEL OGOLA, KIRA QUINTANA, EDUARDO STEFANOW, JENNIFER COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT STEIN (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) **WARE** METCALFE, LAURA (DEM) (GRN) BOGGS, SHELLIL (REP) Write-In Candidate Write-In Candidate **COUNTY SHERIFF** (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) KAMP, TYLER (DEM) U.S. SENATOR SHERIDAN, JERRY (REP) (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 Write-In Candidate GALLEGO, RUBEN (DEM) **COUNTY TREASURER** LAKE, KARI (REP) (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) QUINTANA, EDUARDO (GRN) ALLEN, JOHN M. (REP) Write-In Candidate Write-In Candidate U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS DIST. 9 SECTION TWO NONPARTISAN BALLOT (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 **CENTRAL AZ WATER CONSERVATION** SMITH, QUACY (DEM) DIST. GOSAR, PAUL (REP) **GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER** Write-In Candidate (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 5) PINGER, APRIL STATE STATE SENATOR DIST. 25 ATKINS, LISA ((VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 BIESEMEYER, BRIAN DUNN, TIMOTHY "TIM" (REP) Write-In Candidate FISCHER, RUDY \bigcirc STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST. 25 GODDARD, TERRY (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2 MACRE, HEATHER \bigcirc OLEAR, WILLIAM "BILL" PETER (DEM) Write-In Candidate CARBONE, MICHAEL (REP) Write-In Candidate \bigcirc KUPPER, NICKOLAS "NICK" (REP) Write-In Candidate Write-In Candidate Write-In Candidate Write-In Candidate \bigcirc CORPORATION COMMISSIONER Write-In Candidate \bigcirc (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3) **CITY OF BUCKEYE** POLACHECK, JOSHUA (DEM) **PROPOSITION 494** AGUILAR, YLENIA (DEM) Shall Buckeye be authorized to issue and sell HILL, JONATHON (DEM) \$137,000,000 of general obligation bonds for public safety improvements? WALDEN, RACHEL (REP) BOND APPROVAL, YES LOPEZ, RENE (REP) BOND APPROVAL, NO MARQUEZ PETERSON, LEA (REP) LUXENBERG, NINA (GRN) **PROPOSITION 495** Shall Buckeye be authorized to issue and sell CEASE, MIKE (GRN) \$145,000,000 of general obligation bonds for street and Write-In Candidate transportation improvements? Write-In Candidate BOND APPROVAL, YES \bigcirc Write-In Candidate BOND APPROVAL, NO \bigcirc **COUNTY COUNTY SUPERVISOR DIST. 4** (VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1) SANDOVAL, DAVID M (DEM) LESKO, DEBBIE (REP) Write-In Candidate

7-0281-00 WHITE EE-1

1 of 2 BACK

JUSTICES OF THE Shall the following Justices of	the Supreme Court of	Retain: Division 47 LANG, TODD F.	YES	0
Arizona be retained in office?	YES (Datain, Dising - 54	YES	$\frac{\bigcirc}{\frown}$
Retain: BOLICK, CLINT	NO (Retain: Division 51 MANDELL, MICHAEL	NO NO	$\frac{\bigcirc}{\frown}$
			-	$\frac{\bigcirc}{\frown}$
Retain: KING, KATHRYN H.	YES O	Retain: Division 55 MARWIL, SUZANNE	YES	$\frac{\bigcirc}{\frown}$
IUDOFO OF THE OO	NO O	SCHEINER	NO ·	$\frac{\bigcirc}{\widehat{}}$
JUDGES OF THE CO	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Retain: Division 15 MCCOY, MICHAEL SCOTT	YES	\bigcirc
Shall the following Judges of	the Court of Appeals,		NO	\bigcirc
Division 1, of Arizona, be reta	ined in office?	Retain: Division 73 MCDOWELL, DAVID E.	YES	\bigcirc
Retain: Division 1 PATON, ANGELA K.	YES 🔾		NO	\bigcirc
,	NO 🔾	Retain: Division 30 MIKITISH, JOSEPH P.	YES	\bigcirc
JUDGES OF THE S		MINATION, GOOLI III.	NO	\bigcirc
Shall the following Judges of retained in office?	tne Superior Court be	Retain: Division 78	YES	\bigcirc
Retain: Division 29	YES 🔾	MILLER, KEITH	NO	\bigcirc
ADLEMAN, JAY R.	NO 🔾	Retain: Division 48	YES	\bigcirc
Retain: Division 56	YES 🔾	MINDER, SCOTT S.	NO	\bigcirc
AGNE, SARA J.	NO 🔾	Retain: Division 16	YES	\bigcirc
Retain: Division 76	YES 🔾	PALMER, DAVID J.	NO	\bigcirc
ALLEN, GLENN A.	NO 🔾	Retain: Division 84	YES	\bigcirc
Retain: Division 74	YES 🔾	PARKER, AMANDA MONCAYO	NO	$\overline{\bigcirc}$
AVELAR, STASY D	NO (Retain: Division 59	YES	$\overline{\bigcirc}$
Retain: Division 52	YES (PONCE, ADELE	NO	$\overline{\bigcirc}$
BERESKY, JUSTIN	NO (Retain: Division 75	YES	$\overline{\bigcirc}$
Retain: Division 58	YES (RUSSELL, ANDREW J.	NO	$\overline{\bigcirc}$
BLANEY, SCOTT A.	NO (Retain: Division 04	YES	$\overline{\bigcirc}$
Retain: Division 33	YES (RYAN, TIMOTHY JOSEPH	NO	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
BUSTAMANTE, LORI HORN	NO (Retain: Division 32	YES	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
Retain: Division 31	YES (STARR, PATRICIA ANN	NO	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
COFFEY, RODRICK J.	NO (Retain: Division 19	YES	$\frac{\bigcirc}{\bigcirc}$
Retain: Division 28	YES (THOMPSON, PETER	NO ·	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
COHEN, SUZANNE E	NO (Retain: Division 83	YES	
Retain: Division 18	YES (VALENZUELA, MICHAEL FERNANDO	NO -	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
COURY, CHRISTOPHER A.	NO (-	YES	
Retain: Division 82	YES (Retain: Division 53 VANDENBERG, LISA A.	NO -	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
CUSHNER, QUINTIN	NO (Datain Division 77	YES	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
D.(-)- D' '-'- 70	YES (Retain: Division 77 WAHLIN, LISA S.	NO -	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
Retain: Division 79 DRAKE, JIM	NO (Dutata Di tata 54	YES	
D	YES (Retain: Division 54 WEIN, KEVIN	NO -	$\frac{\circ}{\circ}$
Retain: Division 50 DRIGGS, ADAM	NO O	D. 4	YES	
D. 1 . D	YES (Retain: Division 07 WHITTEN,		$\frac{\bigcirc}{\frown}$
Retain: Division 49 FISK, RONDA R.		CHRISTOPHER T.	NO	$\overline{}$
Date: Pitt of	NO O	-		
Retain: Division 81 GARBARINO, DAVID W.	YES O	-		
.	NO O	-		
Retain: Division 17 GATES, PAM	YES O	-		
	NO O	-		
Retain: Division 05 GORDON, MICHAEL D.	YES O	_		
Potoin: Division 90	YES (-		
Retain: Division 80 HALVORSON, ASHLEY V.	NO (-		
Potoin: Division 06	YES (-		
Retain: Division 06 HANNAH JR., JOHN R.	NO (-		
Potoin: Divisio- 04		1		
Retain: Division 01 KEMP, MICHAEL WILLIAM	YES O	-		
B B	NO O	-		
Retain: Division 85 KNAPP, JAMES R.	YES O	-		
	NO O	-		
Retain: Division 57 LABIANCA, MARGARET	YES O	-		
В.	NO \bigcirc			



0281 FESTIVAL

7-0281-00 WHITE EE-2

OFFICIAL BALLOT

OF THE GENERAL ELECTION **ELECTION DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2024** COUNTY OF MARICOPA, STATE OF ARIZONA

2 of 2 FRONT

STATE

PROPOSITION 133

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO PRIMARY ELECTIONS

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

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

YES

NO (

PROPOSITION 134

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO INITIATIVES AND 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.

PROPOSITION 135

YES

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO THE GOVERNOR

A "YES" vote 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.

current emergency powers of the Governor.

YES	(
NO	

PROPOSITION 136

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO BALLOT MEASURES

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 voter-initiated 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 curren state of the law, which typically requires challenges to the constitutionality of a voter-initiated ballot measure to be brought only after the voters have decided to approve a ballot measure.

YES	\bigcirc

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 137

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

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.

YES	(

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 138

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

"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 worked.

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

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 a 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 good-faith judgment 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

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.

YES 🔾	
-------	--

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 140

PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION RELATING TO **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.

Notice: Pursuant to proposition 105 (1998), these

neasures cannot be changed in the future if approved or

YES	\bigcirc
NO	\bigcirc

NO	\bigcirc

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**

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 duty.

YES	\bigcirc
NO	\bigcirc

7-0281-00 WHITE EE-2

2 of 2 BACK

PROPOSITION 312

REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO PROPERTY TAX

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.

YES

 \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 313

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

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.

YES \bigcirc

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 314

REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO RESPONSES TO HARMS AT THE BORDER

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 fentanyl that causes the death of another person. Requires state courts to issue an order to return to a foreign country if a person is convicted of the illegal entry crime. The order to return must 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 current criminal and procedural laws.

YES

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 315

REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO RULEMAKING

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 (

NO (

COUNTY

PROPOSITION 479

RELATING TO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION EXCISE (SALES) TAXES

Do you favor the continuation of a county transaction privilege (sales) tax for regional transportation purposes in Maricopa County?

A "YES" vote has the effect of continuing the transaction privilege (sales) tax in Maricopa County for twenty years to provide funding for transportation projects as contained in the regional strategic transportation infrastructure investment plan.

A "NO" vote has the effect of rejecting the transaction privilege (sales) tax for transportation purposes in Maricopa County.

YES

NO \bigcirc

PROPOSITION 486

Shall the base expenditure limit of the Maricopa County Community College District established in fiscal year 1979-80 be permanently adjusted by \$52,841,755.

A "YES" vote shall have the effect of permanently adjusting the Maricopa County Community College District's base expenditure limit established in fiscal year 1979-80 by \$52,841,755.

A "NO" vote shall have the effect of not permanently adjusting Maricopa County Community College District's base expenditure limit established in fiscal year 1979-80 by \$52,841,755.

BASE EXPENDITURE LIMIT ADJUSTMENT, YES

BASE EXPENDITURE LIMIT ADJUSTMENT, NO

VOTE BOTH SIDES OF BOTH PAGES

