

OFFICIAL BALLOT

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 5, 2024
COUNTY OF COCONINO
STATE OF ARIZONA

SAMPLE

072G01-A

BALLOT STYLE FOR PRECINCT: 72 - PAGE CENTRAL

PAGE 1 OF 2, FRONT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
1. Put a mark according to the instructions next to the name of each candidate for each office for whom you wish to vote.
2. If you wish to vote for a person whose name is not printed on the ballot, write such name in the blank space provided on the ballot and put a mark according to the instructions next to the name so written.
3. Put a mark according to the instructions next to the word "yes" or "for" for each proposition or question you wish to be adopted. Put a mark according to the instructions next to the word "no" or "against" for each proposition or question you wish not to be adopted.
VOTE LIKE THIS ●

SECTION ONE - PARTISAN BALLOT

FEDERAL

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- HARRIS WALZ (DEM)
[Bejarano, Yolanda; DeLarge, Constance; Evans, Coral; Flores, Amelia; Garcia, Marisol; Garlid, Doreen; Grijalva, Adelita; McGovern, Molly; Sundareshan, Priya; Valdez, Maria; Vasquez, Dora]
TRUMP VANCE (REP)
[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.]
OLIVER TER MAAT (LBT)
[Blitz, Howard; Deaton, Thomas; Dopson, Katie; Fowler, Eric; Garcia, Roman; Giver, Nicole; Massie, Rebekah; McFarland, Michael; Reid-Shaver, Sheila; Tallman, Cory; Thomas III, David Hurst]
STEIN WARE (GRN)
[Adger, Steven; Beck-Jones, Ameer; Cease, Michael; Eastwood, Athena; Hannah, Cody; Luxenberg, Nina; Menor, Scott; Montano, Michael; Ogola, Kira; Quintana, Eduardo; Stefanow, Jennifer]

U.S. SENATOR
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- GALLEGO, RUBEN (DEM)
LAKE, KARI (REP)
QUINTANA, EDUARDO (GRN)

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
DISTRICT 2
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- NEZ, JONATHAN (DEM)
CRANE, ELI (REP)

STATE

STATE SENATOR
DISTRICT 6
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- HATATHLIE, THERESA (DEM)

STATE REPRESENTATIVE
DISTRICT 6
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2

- TSOSIE, MYRON (DEM)
PESHLAKAI, MAE (DEM)
KING, RICH (REP)
JOHNSON, LLOYD (REP)

STATE

CORPORATION COMMISSIONER
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3

- AGUILAR, YLENIA (DEM)
HILL, JONATHON (DEM)
POLACHECK, JOSHUA (DEM)
LOPEZ, RENE (REP)
MARQUEZ PETERSON, LEA (REP)
WALDEN, RACHEL (REP)
CEASE, MIKE (GRN)
LUXENBERG, NINA (GRN)

Write-in

Write-in

Write-in

COUNTY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
DISTRICT 5
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- FOWLER, LENA (DEM)

Write-in

COUNTY ASSESSOR
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- RUIZ, ARMANDO (DEM)

Write-in

COUNTY ATTORNEY
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- BARKER, AMMON (DEM)

Write-in

COUNTY RECORDER
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- SONDEREGGER, AUBREY (DEM)
THORPE, BOB (REP)

Write-in

COUNTY SHERIFF
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- AXLUND, BRET (DEM)

Write-in

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- MANGO-PAGET, CHERYL (DEM)

Write-in

COUNTY TREASURER
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- BENATAR, SARAH (DEM)

Write-in

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE
PAGE
TERM EXPIRES 01/01/2027
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- BARNES, MICHAEL ROBERT (DEM)

Write-in

SECTION TWO - NON-PARTISAN BALLOT
SUPREME COURT

Shall KING, KATHRYN H., Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court be retained in office?

- YES NO

Shall BOLICK, CLINT, Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court be retained in office?

- YES NO

COURT OF APPEALS

Shall FURUYA, BRIAN Y., Judge of the Court of Appeals Division I be retained in office?

- YES NO

SUPERIOR COURT

Shall KRUEGER, STACY, Judge of the Superior Court Division III be retained in office?

- YES NO

SCHOOLS

GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER
PAGE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT #8
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3

- FOWLER, DESIREE
KIDMAN, SANDRA K.
TSOSIE, RENEE
WEISS, CHARLES
BENALLY, CHRIS

Write-in

Write-in

Write-in

CITY OF PAGE

COUNCILMEMBER
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3

- BECKWITH, TINA
HAMMOND, AMANDA
KOCJAN, JOHN
LEIGHTNER, RICHARD
PRELLER, TOM SUNSHINE
ROUNDTREE, DEBRA

Write-in

Write-in

Write-in

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTERS

Refer to full text of the official and descriptive titles and any questions and propositions as printed on the sample ballot and posted in the polling place.

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 ballot.

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.

- YES NO

STATE	STATE	STATE
PROPOSITION 135	PROPOSITION 139	PROPOSITION 313
<p>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO THE GOVERNOR</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current emergency powers of the Governor.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION RELATING TO THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO AN ABORTION</p> <p>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 abortion.</p> <p>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.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING SENTENCING</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>
PROPOSITION 136	PROPOSITION 140	PROPOSITION 314
<p>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO BALLOT MEASURES</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of preserving the current 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.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION RELATING TO ELECTIONS</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining current requirements related to primary and general elections processes.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO RESPONSES TO HARMS AT THE BORDER</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current criminal and procedural laws.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>
PROPOSITION 137	PROPOSITION 311	PROPOSITION 315
<p>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO FIRST RESPONDERS</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO RULEMAKING</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current laws related to state agency rulemaking.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>
PROPOSITION 138	PROPOSITION 312	COUNTY
<p>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO WAGES</p> <p>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 worked.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of maintaining the current laws regarding minimum wage.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	<p>REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE RELATING TO PROPERTY TAX</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of retaining the current primary property tax payment laws and regulations.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>	PROPOSITION 482
		<p>Proposal referred to the people by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors on the permanent adjustment to the 1979-80 expenditure base for Coconino County.</p> <p>A "YES" vote shall have the effect of allowing Coconino County to permanently adjust its 1979-80 expenditure base for County services and programs.</p> <p>A "NO" vote shall have the effect of not allowing Coconino County to permanently adjust its 1979-80 expenditure base for County services and programs.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>
		PAGE HOSPITAL DISTRICT
		PROPOSITION 484
		<p>Shall Page Hospital District, Coconino County, Arizona, be authorized to continue to levy a secondary property tax on all taxable property in the District for the purpose of providing for the operation and maintenance of Page Hospital?</p> <p>A "YES" vote shall have the effect of authorizing the Page Hospital District to continue to impose a secondary property tax on all taxable property in the District.</p> <p>A "NO" vote shall have the effect of not authorizing the Page Hospital District to continue to impose a secondary property tax on all taxable property in the District.</p> <p align="center"><input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO</p>

OFFICIAL BALLOT

SAMPLE

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 5, 2024
COUNTY OF COCONINO
STATE OF ARIZONA

072G01-B

BALLOT STYLE FOR PRECINCT: 72 - PAGE CENTRAL

PAGE 2 OF 2, FRONT

CITY OF PAGE RECALL ELECTION

CITY OF PAGE RECALL ELECTION

Page Action Committee Demand of Recall of David Auge: For refusal to acknowledge constituent's over 1,550-signature opinion petition presented on September 27, 2023, to a regularly scheduled city council meeting where they were included on a public agenda concerning lane reductions to Lake Powell Boulevard thereby affecting citizens' daily lives and businesses. For refusal of allowing all his constituents the democratic process to vote on a matter potentially costing the citizenry 15-30 million dollars and making drastic changes to the major Main Street-Lake Powell Boulevard and choosing to represent therefore a fraction of his constituents by refusal to allow discussion or consideration allowing citizens to vote on proposed lane reductions to Lake Powell Boulevard during City Council meeting on October 25, 2023. For refusal of allowing his constituents the democratic process by accepting their initiated ballot measure that had enough signatures and allowing his constituents to go to the ballot box in July 2024 to voice their opinion about Lake Powell Boulevard being reduced to 3 lanes.

Page Action Committee Demand of Recall of Michael Farrow: For refusal to acknowledge constituent's over 1,550-signature opinion petition presented on September 27, 2023, to a regularly scheduled city council meeting where they were included on a public agenda concerning lane reductions to Lake Powell Boulevard thereby affecting citizens' daily lives and businesses. For refusal of allowing all his constituents the democratic process to vote on a matter potentially costing the citizenry 15-30 million dollars and making drastic changes to the major Main Street-Lake Powell Boulevard and choosing to represent therefore a fraction of his constituents by refusal to allow discussion or consideration allowing citizens to vote on proposed lane reductions to Lake Powell Boulevard during City Council meeting on October 25, 2023. For refusal of allowing his constituents the democratic process by accepting their initiated ballot measure that had enough signatures and allowing his constituents to go to the ballot box in July 2024 to voice their opinion about Lake Powell Boulevard being reduced to 3 lanes.

Statement of Defense by David Auge: The recall of Councilor David Auge is not warranted as he is representing all citizens and not just the unaudited signatures on an opinion petition. On advice of our city attorney and a ruling of the Superior Court of Coconino County the Page Action Committee did not have the legal authority to force the City of Page to put the issue of lane reduction on the July Ballot. As part of a seven-member council body I have worked diligently to ensure the city has a strong balanced budget and spends within its means. I have always had the best interests of the citizens of Page and surrounding communities in mind when casting a vote on any topic including ensuring we have a strong police and fire presence along with a strong utility system. The vision of the council for the three blocks of uptown Page is to create a strong thriving business environment all the while creating an atmosphere of safety and enjoyment for citizens and tourists alike. As your councilor I will continue to serve the citizens of Page to create a city with its recreational activities we all enjoy and love to work and live in.

Statement of Defense by Michael Farrow: I humbly ask for your vote against my recall. As your City Councilman, I have dedicated myself to improving our community. Communication has been a cornerstone of my approach, ensuring your voices are heard. I listened and worked towards recreational improvements, such as a new splash pad, a swimming pool and outdoor activities to enhance our community's quality of life. In addressing our housing needs I have worked tirelessly to create solutions that address our need for accessible housing options for citizens. My commitment to our veterans and first-responders has been unwavering, recognizing their invaluable contributions and ensuring they have the resources they need. As a veteran, I deeply understand the sacrifices made by those who serve. I have also volunteered as a personal defense instructor, emphasizing my dedication to the safety and wellbeing of our community members. My commitment to service is driven by a genuine desire to support and protect our community. One of my proudest achievements is our first city-wide Emergency Operations Plan, enhancing our preparedness and resilience in the face of potential disasters. My record reflects a commitment to progress and community betterment. I ask for your continued trust and support to keep moving forward together.

CITY OF PAGE

COUNCILMEMBER
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- AUGE, DAVID**
- EKSTRAND, COREY**

Write-in _____

CITY OF PAGE

COUNCILMEMBER
VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1

- FARROW, MICHAEL**

Write-in _____

VOTE BOTH PAGES OF THE BALLOT

SAMPLE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK