



# THE VOTER

**THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CENTRAL YAVAPAI COUNTY**

**LWVCYC@gmail.com      P. O. Box 11538, Prescott, AZ 86304-1538      September 2012**

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**President:**

Vicky O'Hara  
[708-0608]

L **1<sup>st</sup> Vice President**

**Program:**

Juliana Goswick  
[717-2083]

**2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President**

**Membership:**

Mary Mallory  
[533-8896]

**Secretary**

Vivian Perry  
[830-9165]

**Treasurer**

Open

**Action Director:**

**Communications**

**Director:**

Nancy Shugrue  
[227-1374]

**Nominating Committee:**

Alice Harris  
[778-6977]

Sandra Garramone  
[443-7683]

Board Member  
To be appointed



## 2012 General Election Ballot Measures PRO - CON

Presented by the  
League of Women Voters of Central Yavapai County

**What are "ballot measures?"  
What do they mean?  
Does a "yes" vote really mean *yes* or *no*?  
How will they affect my life?  
How do they change the way things currently are?  
PUBLIC WELCOME!**

Come and hear and discuss Ballot Measures that will be on the November ballot. LWV General Meetings are now on the **THIRD** Saturday of the month, and are open to the Public.

**When:** Saturday, September 15, 2012  
9 AM - Social Time; 9:30 AM - Program  
**Where:** Lower level Community Room,  
Las Fuentes Village, 1035 Scott, in Prescott

**LWVCYC Website: <http://goo.gl/5R9xU>**



## President's Message

DON'T miss the Pro/Con presentation on Saturday, September 15! Ballot issues can be very confusing. Sometimes it's like a double negative: yes means no, and no means yes. Sometimes it sounds like it won't change much, but there are hidden ramifications. Our experienced League members will attempt to lead you through the propositions, and LWVAZ VOTER GUIDES WILL BE AVAILABLE! Bring a friend!

### Help Wanted, Job Openings:

We are currently seeking volunteers for the following board positions:

- **Treasurer**
- **Voter Services:** half of this position, voter registration, is chaired by Zene Krough.
- **Action Director**

I am now filling in for these vacancies because we do not want to ignore the activities for which our LWVCYC is known. However this takes me from time needed to serve you as President.. If you are a long time member or a new member with willingness to learn, and have at least been thinking of stepping up, now is the time. We have a wonderful Board, and you would be very welcome.

Thank you. Vicky O'Hara, President.

### Mark your calendar for these dates:

#### LWVCYC General Meeting Program List 2012

September 15:	Ballot Issues Pro/Con Forum
October 20:	Centennial Celebration – AZ Women's Right to Vote
November 17:	Juvenile Justice Update
December 5 (evening):	Meet & Greet – LWV, Non-profits, and governmental officials

**2012-13 DUES are still just \$55 for a single member or \$85 for two members in the same household.**

***The time to pay is NOW!***

## The Oh-Nos! The Ballot Propositions

Sometimes when you get to the polls, you suddenly say “Oh NO! The Ballot Propositions! I forgot to study them!” Now you can prepare ahead of time, even before getting a mail in ballot.

Getting good, understandable information isn’t always easy. Below is the listing from the AZ Secretary of State’s website. There have been court fights over whether certain propositions should be on the ballot, and whether the shortened ballot version truly represents the issues. This version is not particularly easy to understand, even if you Ctrl + Click on PDF at the right, to get the original.

**Fortunately, the LWV is presenting an explanatory session on Sept. 15, 9:30 AM, at Las Fuentes to not only explain what each proposition says, but also what it is intended to do, and the Pros and Cons of voting each Ballot Measure into effect.**

**The League will also have written LWVAZ Voters Guides on hand for you to take home to study. Bring a friend, and help distribute the VOTER GUIDES.**

*2012 General Election  
Ballot Measures*

Last updated on August 31, 2012 at 12:51:28 PM  
**Ken Bennett**

Ballot Number	Identifier	Sponsor	Short Title	Full Text
114	SCR1020	Legislature	Crime victim protection from liability for damages a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending article ii, section 31 and article xviii, section 6, constitution of Arizona; relating to crime victim protection from liability for damages.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
115	SCR1001	Legislature	The judicial department a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending article vi, sections 4, 12, 20, 36, 37, 39, 41 and 42, constitution of Arizona; relating to the judicial department.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
116	SCR1012	Legislature	Property tax exemptions a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending article ix, section 2, constitution of Arizona; relating to property tax exemptions.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
117	SCR1025	Legislature	Property tax assessed valuation a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending article ix, section 18, constitution of Arizona; relating to property tax assessed valuation.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
118	HCR2056	Legislature	Establishment of permanent funds a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending article x, section 7, constitution of Arizona; relating to the establishment of permanent funds.	<a href="#">PDF</a>

119	SCR1001	Legislature	State trust lands a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending article x, constitution of Arizona, by adding section 12; relating to state trust lands.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
120	HCR2004	Legislature	State sovereignty a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of Arizona; amending the constitution of Arizona by adding article ii.i; amending article xx, paragraphs 4 and 12, constitution of Arizona; relating to state sovereignty.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
121	C-03-2012	Open Government Committee 5125 North 16th Street, Suite B226 Phoenix, AZ 85016 602-684-3143 Paul Johnson, Applicant & Chairman	Open Elections/Open Government Act This measure will allow all Arizonans, regardless of party affiliation, to vote in a single open primary for the candidates of their choice. The two candidates who receive the most votes in the primary will compete in the general election. There will be a level playing field for all voters and candidates, and the current system of taxpayer-funded partisan primaries will be abolished. This reform will promote open government and encourage the election of candidates who will work together for the good of the state.	<a href="#">PDF</a>
204	I-16-2012	Quality Education and Jobs Supporting of 204 802 North 3rd Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85003 520-390-5693 Ann-Eve Pedersen, Applicant & Chairman	Quality Education and Jobs Act The Quality Education and Jobs Act will strengthen Arizona's economy by equipping children to succeed in the classroom, ensuring an educated workforce and creating jobs. This act, which renews the one-cent sales tax, will provide dedicated funding linked to performance and accountability for students of all ages and prevent legislators from cutting K-12 funding. Scholarships will ensure that universities and community colleges remain affordable. Investment in vocational educational education will allow students to graduate ready to work. This act protects public safety by ensuring continued funding for DPS officers and creates jobs by funding road, rail, transit and other transportation projects.	<a href="#">PDF</a>

**Please note:**  
**LWV General Meetings will now be on the THIRD Saturday of the month.**  
We will continue to meet in the Community Room, in the lower level of Las Fuentes.  
**9:00 Social time**  
**9:30 Program**

## Interesting Reading!

### Study: Arizona 1st in cuts to schools

[111 comments](#) by **Mary Jo Pitzl** - Sept. 4, 2012 10:19 PM  
The Republic | [azcentral.com](#)

The deepest state-funding cuts to education in the nation over the past five years were in Arizona, a new study has found.

The 21.8 percent drop in funding from fiscal 2008 to fiscal 2013 is all the more reason voters should support a continuation of the 1-cent-per-dollar sales tax that expires in May, say supporters of Proposition 204.

"Where we are is not sustainable, if we want to have a successful economy," said Ann-Eve Pedersen, chairwoman of the Quality Education and Jobs initiative.

The Washington, D.C.-based Center for Budget and Policy Priorities study ranked Arizona slightly worse than Alabama in state-funding decreases in recent years. In raw dollars, Arizona was sixth out of 48 states for the biggest drop in per pupil spending, down \$783 from fiscal 2008 to fiscal 2013.

The left-leaning think tank looked at 48 states that had data that could be compared historically; Hawaii and Indiana did not fit the group's criteria.

The cuts occurred as the states plunged into recession-driven budget crises. The study concluded that even as the nation is recovering, most state education budgets aren't keeping pace.

For example, Arizona was one of 22 states to increase its spending this year from last year. Arizona increased spending by \$5. Other states had bigger increases, such as neighboring Utah, with a \$40 bump, and Minnesota, with the largest increase of \$531 per student. The state is spending \$3,887 per student this year, according to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. When local and federal funds and the education-equalization formula, which comes from county-level property taxes, are added in, the figure is \$5,244.

Proposition 204 would pick up where Gov. Jan Brewer's temporary sales tax for schools left off. Brewer sold voters on a three-year increase to 6.6 cents on the dollar to help bridge budget problems.

Peoria parent Ginger McLamb said she is backing a permanent jump in the tax because recent cuts, coupled with legislative requirements for reforms such as tighter reading standards, have taken too heavy a toll on her children's schools.

Proposition 204 would raise \$800 million to \$1 billion a year, with about 80 percent of it earmarked for education, from kindergarten through universities. It would bar lawmakers from controlling the funds, and would block their ability to cut the current level of education funding.

The remaining 20 percent of the proceeds would go to transportation-infrastructure projects and some health-care programs.

## **Top-two primary would have been Russell Pearce's (temporary) salvation**

Laurie Roberts AzR, 9/05/2012

Ben Quayle, Kirk Adams and Ron Gould would still be in the hunt for a congressional seat but Vernon Parker would be on vacation.

Jennifer Petersen (one of my picks for up and coming legislative candidates) would still be a contender but so would Russell Pearce and Lori Klein.

All this, if Arizona lived in a top-two primary world.

This week, the state Supreme Court will decide – again -- whether the Open Elections/Open Government initiative will make the Nov. 6 ballot. This, because Republicans and Democrats have finally found something they can agree upon. To wit:

**DON'T LET THIS THING GET TO VOTERS.**

The top-two initiative would fundamentally change the way we elect people in this state. Instead of holding partisan primaries, Arizona would hold one primary and the top two candidates, regardless of party affiliation, would move to the general.

No more having elections decided by a handful of voters. Gone would be the day when our leaders can cater to the narrow ideological interests that now get them elected before Labor Day. Instead, voters could have a system that allows actual choices come November, one aimed at electing politicians with broad appeal.

Not everybody believes that's a good goal – or that more choice will be the result.

“You certainly would have never seen a Ronald Reagan or an Abraham Lincoln in a system like this one because they were simply too radical, or, for that matter, probably a Barack Obama ...,” said Clint Bolick of the Goldwater Institute, which opposes the top-two primary.

“Any conservative you can think of or liberal you can think of would have great difficulty getting through this system. If you want moderate politicians and you're willing to squelch people's voting rights, this is definitely the system for you. It's sort of like a Russian system where you know what the outcome is going to be in advance of the general election. The moderate candidate is always going to win.”

And that, apparently, is a bad thing.

Bolick says California's top-two primary setup reduced choices by squeezing out third-party candidates and allowing two candidates of the same party on the November ballot. In Arizona, it's true that 26 independent and third-party candidates would not automatically have landed on Nov. 6 ballot this year, under a top-two system. Instead, they'd have had to compete in the primary.

But voters would have had more choices in 15 legislative districts come November – including eight where candidates now are unopposed.

In Scottsdale, voters could have selected between Jennifer Petersen and Michelle Ugenti instead of Ugenti being elected outright in a primary where not even a quarter of the voters bothered. In Yavapai County/Anthem, voters could have had an option in Lori Klein rather than no option because Andy Tobin and Karen Fann won outright last week.

Meanwhile, Russell Pearce rather than Democrat Greg Gadek would be facing Bob Worsley.

In all, four of this year's state Senate races and five congressional contests would have featured candidates of the same party in November.

Gould, Quayle and Adams would be on the ballot rather than an assortment of Democrats and Libertarians. Ed Pastor would face Democrat Rebecca DeWitt.

Bolick believes that robs voters of clear choices.

Me? I think it's better to have a choice between two candidates who actually have a chance to win. But then there is Congressional District 9, likely the poster child for the anti-Open Elections campaign.

Bolick points out it David Schapira, not Parker, would be opposing Kyrsten Sinema in a top-two setup. Because Republicans fielded seven candidates, Democrats would be the only option in a district that on paper leans slightly Republican.

Paul Johnson, spokesman for Open Elections, says you can't assume that the outcome would have been the same. But even if it was, the result should be moderation. He pointed to a congressional primary in California, in which two Democrats won.

"One of the Democratic candidates is out working extremely hard to try to get endorsements by his Republican counterparts...," Johnson said. "One or both of them start recognizing that they've got to pull votes from the center and they've got to pull votes from the other party."

And the one who wins? Well, if he wants more than a career in Congress, he'll spend the next two years in search of rarified earth.

Common ground, I believe it's called.

## **'Secret money' taking over campaign funds**

**By Stephen Engelberg and Kim Barker, ProPublica, Az Repub. 9/2/2012**

### **Citizens United ruling to blame for increased secrecy**

The emergence of non-profits as the leading conduit for anonymous spending in this year's presidential campaign is often attributed to the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United ruling, which opened the money spigot, allowing corporations and unions to buy ads urging people to vote for or against specific candidates.

But a closer look shows that there are several reasons that tens of millions of dollars of secret money are flooding this year's campaign. Actions -- and inaction -- by both the Federal Election Commission and the Internal Revenue Service have contributed just as much to the flood of tens of millions of dollars of secret money into the 2012 campaign. Congress did not act on a bill that would have required disclosure after Citizens United and other court rulings opened the door to secret political spending.

To understand how all this happened, it's worth returning to Justice Anthony Kennedy's opinion in *Citizens United*, and the political system the court envisioned. In the key finding, Kennedy and four other justices said the First Amendment entitled corporations and unions to the same unlimited rights of political speech and spending as citizens.

But in a less-noticed portion of the ruling, Kennedy and seven of his colleagues upheld disclosure rules and emphasized the role of transparency. Undue corporate or union influence on elections, he wrote, could be addressed by voters and shareholders who would instantly access campaign finance facts from laptops or smartphones.

"With the advent of the Internet," Kennedy wrote, "prompt disclosure of expenditures can provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters."

If a company wasted money on politics, the justices agreed, its shareholders could use the publicly available information to "determine whether their corporation's political speech advances the corporation's interest in making profits."

"The First Amendment protects political speech; and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way," Kennedy concluded. "This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages."

A very different system has taken shape. As reporting last week showed, money for political ads is pouring into non-profits ostensibly dedicated to promoting social welfare. These groups are paying for many of the negative ads clogging the airwaves, but are not disclosing their donors.

As a result, it's unclear whether the ads are being paid for by unions and corporations empowered by *Citizens United* or by wealthy individuals.

The Supreme Court's opening of the door to hefty flows of secret money began years before *Citizens United*. In a 2007 case involving a non-profit called *Wisconsin Right to Life*, the justices ruled that unions and corporations could buy ads that mentioned a candidate in the weeks before an election as long as the commercials stopped short of directly advocating the candidate's election or defeat. Even if these ads, known as "electioneering communications," clearly attacked the positions of one candidate, they were permissible unless they were "susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate."

After *Wisconsin Right to Life*, the FEC told social-welfare non-profits that they had to disclose only if the donors earmarked the money for political ads.

"It proved to be the exception that swallowed the rule," said Paul S. Ryan, general counsel of the Campaign Legal Center, a non-profit, non-partisan group that tracks campaign finance. The day the FEC adopted this rule, Ryan wrote on his blog that it would allow massive amounts of secret money into politics. He proved correct.

In 2006, ads bought by groups that didn't disclose donors amounted to less than 2 percent of outside spending, excluding party committees, research by the Center for Responsive Politics shows. By 2008, that number hit 25 percent; by 2010, it was 40 percent.

All of this raises an intriguing question: Was Kennedy aware when he drafted the January 2010 *Citizens United* opinion that non-profits were being widely used to avoid public disclosure of political spending?



"Justice Kennedy was living in a fantasy land," said Ciara Torres-Spelliscy, a professor at Stetson University College of Law who tracks campaignfinance issues. "I wish the world he envisaged exists. It doesn't."

Instead, this is the world that exists: Someone who gives up to \$2,500 to the campaign of President Barack Obama or challenger Mitt Romney will have his or her name, address and profession listed on the FEC website for all to see. But that same person can give \$1million or more to a social-welfare group that buys ads supporting or attacking those same candidates and stay anonymous.

This year, a federal judge struck down the FEC rule stemming from Wisconsin Right to Life. The FEC announced in July that major donors to electioneering communications -- ads that focus on issues without directly advocating for candidates -- must be named.

Already, groups are looking to work around. They're running different kinds of ads. Some name other social-welfare non-profits as their donors.

Ryan said he is hopeful that Congress and the IRS might limit ads from groups that don't disclose donors. The 2012 campaign, though, appears to be a lost cause. "I think this election will be mired and perhaps overwhelmed by secret money," Ryan said.

## **Federal judge limits Arizona voter-ID requirement**

From article by **Michael Kiefer** - Aug. 17, 2012 The Republic | [azcentral.com](http://azcentral.com)

In back-to-back rulings Tuesday and Wednesday, a U.S. District Court judge in Phoenix ordered Arizona to accept federal voter-registration forms that do not comply with a 2004 state law requiring proof of U.S. citizenship. State law cannot be applied to the federal forms.

U.S. citizens can fill out either a state or federal voter-registration form in order to vote in all local, state and national elections in Arizona. The 9th Circuit ruling in April did not remove the law's proof-of-citizenship requirement for individuals who fill out a state form, but it provided a way to sidestep it by ruling that the state cannot require such proof for individuals who fill out a federal form. Proofs are still required before voting.

# The National Mail Voter Registration Form

The National Mail Voter Registration Form is the one document that allows you to register to vote from anywhere in the United States, but proofs of identification are still necessary before being able to vote. An elector who does not provide the required identification shall receive a provisional ballot. Provisional ballots are counted only if the elector provides identification to the county recorder by 5pm on the fifth business day after a general election that includes an election for federal office, or by 5pm on the third business day after any other election.

Available in English, Spanish, and several Asian languages. Last revised: 03/01/2006

[http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/National\\_Mail\\_Voter\\_Registration\\_Form\\_English\\_2%2015%2020121%20Cor.pdf](http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/National_Mail_Voter_Registration_Form_English_2%2015%2020121%20Cor.pdf)

[http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/National\\_Mail\\_Voter\\_Registration\\_Form\\_Spanish\\_2.15.2012.pdf](http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/National_Mail_Voter_Registration_Form_Spanish_2.15.2012.pdf)

## **From the Instructions for using the form:**

### **Who Can Use this Application**

If you are a **U.S. citizen** who lives or has an address within the United States, you can use the application in this booklet to:

- Register to vote in your State,
- Report a change of name to your voter registration office,
- Report a change of address to your voter registration office, or
- Register with a political party.

### **How to Find Out If You Are Eligible to Register to Vote in Your State**

Each State has its own laws about who may register and vote. Check the information under your State in the State Instructions. All States require that you be a **United States citizen by birth or naturalization** to register to vote in federal and State elections. Federal law makes it **illegal to falsely claim U.S. citizenship** to register to vote in any federal, State, or local election. You **cannot** be registered to vote in more than one place at a time.

### **How to Submit Your Application**

Mail your application to the Secretary of State/Elections, 1700 W. Washington, 7th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85007-2888. Or, deliver the application in person to your local voter registration office. The States that are required to accept the national form will accept copies of the application printed from the computer image on regular paper stock, signed by the applicant, and mailed in an envelope with the correct postage.

### **First Time Voters Who Register by Mail**

If you are registering to vote for the first time in your jurisdiction and are mailing this registration application, **Federal law requires you to show proof of identification the first time you vote.** Proof of identification includes:

- A current and valid photo identification or
- A current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck or government document that shows your name and address.

Voters may be exempt from this requirement if they submit a **COPY** of this identification with their mail in voter registration form. If you wish to submit a **COPY**, please keep the following in mind:

- Your state may have additional identification requirements which may mandate you show identification at the polling place even if you meet the Federal proof of identification.
- Do not submit original documents with this application, only **COPIES**.

### **The form requires the following oath:**

I have reviewed my state's instructions and I swear/affirm that:

- I am a United States citizen
- I meet the eligibility requirements of my state and subscribe to any oath required.
- The information I have provided is true to the best of my knowledge under penalty of perjury. If I have provided false information, I may be fined, imprisoned, or (if not a U.S. citizen) deported from or refused entry to the United States.

## Three Rulings Against Women's Rights

### Editorial New York Times, July 31, 2012

At a time when abortion rights and women's access to affordable contraception are threatened by political attacks, judges in three newly decided federal cases failed to preserve constitutional protections for women.

On Monday, Judge James Teilborg of the United States District Court in Phoenix [upheld an Arizona law](#) signed by Gov. Jan Brewer in April that bans all abortion procedures at 20 weeks from a woman's last menstrual period, which is about 18 weeks after fertilization.

It is the most aggressive of the previability abortion bans passed recently by a handful of states. It defies binding Supreme Court precedent that prevents states from banning abortions before a fetus can survive outside the womb, which generally occurs at about 24 weeks.

To get around that pesky barrier, Judge Teilborg erroneously characterized Arizona's outright ban as a permissible "regulation" that limits only "some" previability abortions. To make that argument, he relied, in part, on the fact that the ban contains a dangerously narrow exception for a "medical emergency."

The judge also found the state had valid reason to enact the statute, embracing medically dubious claims about when a fetus can begin to feel pain. He was dismissive of realistic concerns that the law endangers women who develop life- or health-threatening medical problems late in pregnancy and that severe fetal abnormalities sometimes cannot be diagnosed before 20 weeks.

An emergency appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit seeking to stop the law from taking effect on Thursday should be granted.

In United States District Court in Denver on Friday, Judge John Kane [issued a temporary injunction](#) forbidding the Obama administration from requiring a secular, for-profit heating, ventilation and air-conditioning company from complying with the new requirement that it provide employees with contraceptive coverage.

There is no constitutional precedent for individuals, much less corporations, allowing them to violate generally applicable laws because they may have a religious objection. Conversely, the company's claim that its owners or officers have a First Amendment right to impose their personal religious beliefs on the corporation's employees is groundless. The health insurance mandate does not place a substantial burden on religious exercise, so a federal statute protecting such exercise should not be in play.

The Justice Department argued that the notion of a religious freedom violation should be dismissed, but, disappointingly, Judge Kane declined to do so.

The third ruling was a decision last Tuesday by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in St. Louis. The court, sitting en banc, upheld, by a 7-to-4 vote, a 2005 South Dakota law requiring doctors to misinform women seeking an abortion that they face an increased risk of suicide and suicidal thoughts if they go ahead. This dreadful ruling ignores the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence.

**A version of this editorial appeared in print on August 1, 2012, on page A22 of the New York edition with the headline: Three Rulings Against Women's Rights.**

**IMPORTANT WEBSITE  
REFERENCES**

LWVUS Website  
[www.lwv.org](http://www.lwv.org)

LWVAZ Website  
[www.lwvaz.org](http://www.lwvaz.org)

LWVCYC Website  
<http://centralvavapai.az.lwvnet.org/>  
OR: <http://goo.gl/HxKph>

We recommend that you check these out monthly, or more often. Lots of good information! Bookmark them to save on typing, or go to [lwvaz.org](http://lwvaz.org), where there are links to click on. Or Google LWVCYC!

Our website includes current and past VOTERS, and other great material.

*Reminder – Members are always welcome to attend Board meetings - third Tuesday of the month, at 8:00 am at the home of Mary Mallory in Prescott Valley. To request placement of an item on the Board agenda and/or to receive the Board agenda packet, contact the LWVCYC President a week in advance.*

**LWV MEMBERSHIP REGISTRATION**  
**2012-2013**

Dues cover membership through June 30, 2012. Membership in the LWV is open to any person 18 and over who subscribes to the purposes and policies of the LWVUS. Dues for 2012-2013 cover payment for local (\$11.00), state (\$13), and national (\$31.00) memberships.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City/Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Note type of membership, and make check to "LWVCYC":

\_\_\_\_\_ \$55/Yr Individual Membership

\_\_\_\_\_ \$82.50/Yr Household Membership

Plus suggested donation:

\$\_\_\_\_\_ Contribution to League (not tax deductible)

\$\_\_\_\_\_ \*Contribution to Education Fund (tax deductible)

\*Donations to the LWVAZ Education Fund must be made by separate check, to preserve tax deductibility. This supports our Webpage and Voter Service activities. Thank you!

Both new and renewal members, please include this form with your check.

New: \_\_\_\_\_ Renewal: \_\_\_\_\_

**OR**

Be a "Friend" of LWVCYC:

\_\_\_\_\_ \$50/Yr Individual or \_\_\_\_\_ \$75/Yr Household  
(open to businesses and individuals)

Please mail this form and all checks to:

**LWVCYC**  
**PO Box 11538 Prescott, AZ 86304-1538**



**League of Women Voters  
of Central Yavapai County  
P.O. Box 11538  
Prescott, AZ 86304-1538**

**A nonpartisan membership organization, the League of Women Voters neither supports nor opposes political parties or candidates, but encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.**