

**Notice of Election**  
**On a**  
**Referred Measure**

**2025 State Ballot  
Information Booklet**

**STATEWIDE ELECTION DAY**

*Is TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4TH, 2025*

Voter service and polling centers are open from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. On Election Day.

Ballots are mailed to all registered voters between October 10 and October 17, 2025.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proposition A.....	2
Proposition B.....	3
Proposition C.....	4
Proposition D.....	5
Proposition E.....	6
Proposition F.....	7
Proposition G.....	8
Proposition H.....	9
Amendment A.....	10
Amendment B.....	12
Amendment C.....	14
Amendment D.....	15
Glossary of Terms.....	16
Senators.....	17
Representatives.....	17
Legislative Staff.....	18

# PROPOSITION A

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas place a cap on tax increases?

### **Proposition to Limit Tax Increases: Ensuring Stability and Predictability for Taxpayers**

This proposition introduces a critical measure designed to cap the rate at which state and county governments can increase taxes. Specifically, it seeks to implement a limitation that prevents increases in property taxes, as well as other forms of taxation, from exceeding 5% within any given calendar year.

The core intent behind this measure is to foster greater financial stability and predictability for taxpayers across the state and its various counties. By establishing a clear and consistent ceiling on tax increases, the proposition aims to shield individuals, families, and businesses from potentially volatile and significant year-over-year tax hikes. This structured approach to tax adjustments is expected to allow taxpayers to better plan their finances, anticipate future expenses, and allocate resources with a clearer understanding of their long-term tax obligations. The implementation of such a cap would represent a significant shift towards a more controlled and accountable system of taxation, prioritizing the economic well-being and planning capabilities of the taxpaying public.

A **"YES"** vote means: You are in favor of implementing a binding limit on annual increases in both property taxes and other categories of taxes, restricting them to a maximum of 5%. Casting a "YES" vote signifies your support for a legal prohibition that would prevent state and county governmental entities from raising taxes beyond this predetermined 5% cap within the confines of a single calendar year. This vote would reflect a desire for greater fiscal restraint from government bodies and a more controlled tax environment for citizens.

A **"NO"** vote indicates opposition to the proposed measure that would establish a cap on tax increases. Choosing to vote "NO" would mean that you do not support implementing an annual 5% limit on how much state and county governments can raise taxes. Consequently, this would allow these governmental bodies to continue their current practices in setting tax rates, without the constraint of such a percentage-based annual ceiling. In essence, a "NO" vote maintains the existing system where tax rates are determined based on prevailing economic conditions, budgetary needs, and legislative discretion, rather than being restricted by a predefined maximum percentage increase year over year. This approach provides greater flexibility for governments to respond to fiscal challenges or to fund necessary public services as they deem appropriate, free from the limitation of a fixed cap on annual tax adjustments.

# PROPOSITION B

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas allow same-day voter registration?

This proposition introduces a transformative amendment to the existing voter registration framework, proposing the establishment of Election Day voter registration. This groundbreaking measure aims to supersede the current legal mandate, which dictates that all voter registrations must be completed a minimum of seven days prior to any election. The fundamental objective of this proposition is to substantially elevate voter accessibility and engagement, affording residents the unprecedented convenience and flexibility of registering to vote and casting their ballot simultaneously on Election Day. This initiative is designed to streamline the electoral process, making it more inclusive and responsive to the needs of the modern electorate.

A **"YES"** vote means: By casting an affirmative "YES" vote, you unequivocally signal your endorsement and support for the immediate implementation of same-day voter registration. This vote is a clear indication of your conviction that all eligible residents should possess the right and ability to register at their designated polling place on Election Day itself. Such a vote effectively dismantles a significant existing barrier to participation, fostering a more equitable and accessible democratic process. A "YES" vote is, therefore, a powerful statement in favor of expanding access to the electoral system and actively promoting greater civic engagement across all segments of the community. It represents a progressive endorsement of a redesigned system engineered to be inherently more inclusive, adaptable, and acutely responsive to the diverse needs and dynamic schedules of the electorate. This choice reflects a belief in empowering citizens with greater flexibility and reducing logistical hurdles that may deter participation.

A **"NO"** vote means: Conversely, a "NO" vote unequivocally communicates your opposition to the adoption of same-day voter registration. By opting to vote "NO," you are explicitly choosing to uphold and perpetuate the current electoral regulations. These regulations stipulate that all voter registrations must be definitively finalized at least seven days preceding the occurrence of an election. A "NO" vote, in essence, reflects a preference for maintaining the established system and implicitly indicates a belief that the present registration deadline is not only appropriate but also serves the paramount best interests of the integrity and efficiency of the electoral process. This choice may stem from concerns regarding potential administrative challenges, the need for sufficient time for voter roll verification, or a belief that the existing system adequately balances accessibility with the need for security and proper election administration. It represents a vote for continuity and the preservation of current election procedures.



# PROPOSITION C

2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas create a fund for abortions?

This ballot measure proposes the creation of a dedicated public fund to ensure access to abortion services for individuals facing specific, critical circumstances who are unable to cover the costs themselves. The outlined circumstances include cases where the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest, or when a diagnosis of a fatal fetal abnormality has been made, indicating the fetus will not survive outside the womb. The establishment of this fund aims to allocate public resources to provide necessary medical care in these deeply challenging and often traumatic situations, ensuring that financial barriers do not prevent individuals from accessing essential healthcare.

A **"YES"** vote means: You are in favor of establishing a public fund designed to provide financial assistance for abortion services in cases of rape, incest, or diagnosed fatal fetal abnormalities. A **"YES"** vote signifies your support for the principle that individuals in these specific, distressing situations should have access to necessary medical care, irrespective of their financial capacity. This vote would allocate public resources to ensure that these individuals can obtain abortion services, acknowledging the profound emotional and physical impact of such circumstances and aiming to alleviate financial burdens during a vulnerable time. Proponents argue that this measure is a compassionate response to difficult situations, ensuring that healthcare decisions are not solely dictated by economic status.

A **"NO"** vote means: You are opposed to the creation of this public fund. A **"NO"** vote would maintain the current policy where public resources are not specifically earmarked or allocated for abortion services. This stance reflects concerns often centered on ethical considerations regarding the use of public funds for abortion, as well as broader taxpayer burden arguments. Opponents may argue that public funds should not be used for these services, or that alternative private funding mechanisms or support systems should be explored. A **"NO"** vote would indicate a preference for existing healthcare funding structures to remain unchanged, reflecting a position that public monies should not directly subsidize abortion care, even in the specified circumstances.

# PROPOSITION D

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas prioritize mental health over Law Enforcement Training?

This proposition seeks to fundamentally reallocate existing public funds with the explicit goal of bolstering mental health services for both incarcerated individuals and the broader community. The core principle guiding this initiative is a strategic shift in prioritization: it aims to elevate the importance of mental health treatment and support above traditional law enforcement training and related services. By doing so, the proposition intends to achieve several critical outcomes. Firstly, it endeavors to significantly enhance access to crucial mental health care, ensuring that those in need, particularly within the correctional system and vulnerable communities, receive adequate support. Secondly, it aims to reduce recidivism rates by addressing the root causes of criminal behavior often linked to untreated mental health conditions. Ultimately, the broader objective is to foster improved mental well-being across the entire community, recognizing that investing in mental health is an investment in public safety and societal health.

A **"YES"** vote means: By casting a "YES" vote, you are expressing your direct support for a substantial increase in funding specifically earmarked for mental health services. This commitment extends to both inmates within the correctional system and individuals within the wider community. This vote signifies a clear endorsement of the philosophy that emphasizes treatment, therapeutic interventions, and comprehensive support systems as the primary approach to addressing mental health challenges. Crucially, a "YES" vote explicitly indicates a preference for this prioritization over the allocation of funds towards law enforcement training or services. It represents a belief that a public health approach to mental well-being will yield more effective and sustainable outcomes for individuals and society.

A **"NO"** vote means: Conversely, a "NO" vote indicates your opposition to the proposed reallocation of funds. This means you are choosing to maintain the current funding levels and existing distribution of resources for mental health services. Furthermore, a "NO" vote signals a preference for the continued prioritization of law enforcement training and services as they are currently funded. Essentially, a "NO" vote suggests a belief that the current funding structure adequately addresses mental health needs or that resources are more effectively utilized within the existing framework that emphasizes law enforcement roles and functions.

# PROPOSITION E

2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas permit individuals convicted of a misdemeanor to perform community service?

This proposition presents a progressive approach to criminal justice, offering an alternative to traditional incarceration for individuals convicted of misdemeanor offenses. The core objective is to empower these individuals to complete community service as a substitute for serving time in prison. This initiative is designed to achieve multiple beneficial outcomes, including promoting rehabilitation through active engagement in the community, significantly reducing the financial and social burdens associated with high incarceration rates, and fostering positive contributions to society from those who have committed less severe offenses. By shifting the focus from punishment to restorative justice and community integration, this measure aims to create a more effective and humane justice system.

A **"YES"** vote means: You are in favor of implementing this innovative measure, which would grant individuals convicted of misdemeanors the opportunity to perform community service instead of being subjected to prison time. This vote signifies your support for a justice system that prioritizes rehabilitation, emphasizing the importance of an individual's active engagement and positive contributions within their community as a pathway to re-integration and personal growth. A **"YES"** vote aligns with the belief that such an approach can lead to lower recidivism rates, strengthen community ties, and provide a more constructive resolution for minor offenses.

A **"NO"** vote means: You are opposed to the adoption of this measure. A **"NO"** vote indicates a preference for maintaining the existing criminal justice framework, which mandates that individuals convicted of misdemeanors serve time in prison. This choice reflects a commitment to the current punitive system, irrespective of an individual's potential to contribute positively to the community through alternative service. A **"NO"** vote maintains the status quo, where incarceration remains the primary consequence for misdemeanor offenses, without providing an option for community-based alternatives.

# PROPOSITION F

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas prohibit convicted felons from running for office?

This proposition seeks to establish a legal framework that would disqualify individuals who have been convicted of felony offenses from seeking or holding any public office. The fundamental objective of this measure is to safeguard and uphold the integrity of public service, ensuring that those who are elected to positions of trust and authority possess a demonstrably clean legal record. By implementing this prohibition, the proposition aims to restore and maintain public confidence in government and its representatives.

A **"YES"** vote means: You are in favor of enacting a prohibition that would prevent individuals with felony convictions from running for public office. A vote in support of this measure signifies a prioritization of integrity, accountability, and ethical conduct within elected positions. Proponents of a **"YES"** vote believe that elected officials should be held to the highest standards of legal compliance and moral uprightness, and that a felony conviction inherently compromises an individual's ability to effectively and ethically serve the public. This vote would reflect a commitment to ensuring that those who govern are beyond reproach in their legal history, fostering greater trust between the electorate and their representatives.

A **"NO"** vote means: You are opposed to this proposed measure. A vote against this proposition would effectively allow individuals with felony convictions to remain eligible to run for and hold public office. Those who advocate for a **"NO"** vote often emphasize principles of inclusivity, rehabilitation, and the belief in second chances for all citizens, including those who have previously committed felony offenses and served their time. This perspective argues that denying individuals with past convictions the opportunity to participate in the democratic process, particularly by seeking public office, could be seen as a form of perpetual punishment. A **"NO"** vote would demonstrate a commitment to a more expansive view of civic participation, asserting that individuals who have paid their debt to society should have the full range of opportunities, including the right to seek public service, and that voters should ultimately decide their suitability for office.



# PROPOSITION G

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas allocate tax revenue from marijuana and nicotine products to public schools?

This proposition calls for the establishment of a new excise tax to be levied on the sale of nicotine and marijuana products exclusively within the boundaries of the local jurisdiction. The fundamental purpose of this proposed tax is to create a dedicated and consistent revenue stream. This revenue will be ring-fenced, meaning it will be exclusively allocated to the funding of local public schools. The overarching goal of this financial initiative is to bring about a significant enhancement of educational resources across the district. This includes, but is not limited to, improving existing facilities to provide a more conducive learning environment, and offering increased support for both students and teachers. By addressing identified educational funding gaps, this proposition aims to foster a more robust, equitable, and stimulating learning environment for all children within the community. It represents a strategic investment in the future quality of education.

A **"YES"** vote means: A vote in favor of this proposition signifies your explicit endorsement of the implementation of a new excise tax on the sales of both nicotine and marijuana products within the local area. By casting a "YES" vote, you are directly advocating for the responsible allocation of these newly generated additional funds, ensuring they are channeled directly and exclusively to local public schools. This measure is projected to have a profound and positive impact on the educational landscape. It is expected to substantially improve a wide array of educational opportunities available to students, providing them with enhanced tools and programs for success. Furthermore, it will furnish vital resources and professional development opportunities for educators, empowering them to deliver higher quality instruction. Ultimately, a "YES" vote contributes to the creation of a stronger, more equitable, and modern education system that benefits every student and family within the community. It represents a direct and tangible investment in the future intellectual capital of local children and, by extension, the overall quality of their learning experience from kindergarten through graduation.

A **"NO"** vote means: A vote against this proposition indicates your clear opposition to this specific tax measure. Casting a "NO" vote would effectively result in the continuation of the current existing tax structure, which means that no new excise tax would be imposed on the sales of nicotine and marijuana products for the purpose of school funding. Consequently, a "NO" vote would prevent the proposed and dedicated allocation of funds from nicotine and marijuana sales to local public schools. This would signify that the identified educational funding needs and challenges, which this proposition aims to address, would remain unaddressed by this particular revenue source. As a direct result, the current level of resources and support for students and teachers would be maintained without the proposed enhancements, potentially leaving existing infrastructure, programs, and support systems unchanged and without the opportunity for the significant improvements outlined in this proposition.

# PROPOSITION H

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the State of San Andreas allocate tax revenue from firearms to mental health services?

This ballot initiative addresses two distinct but equally crucial areas for the well-being and future of our state: public education funding and mental health services. Voters are asked to consider the allocation of tax revenue from specific products and the implementation of a new tax to support vital community services. This proposition outlines a proposal to impose a new tax on the sale of weapons within the State of San Andreas. The primary objective of this new revenue stream is to exclusively fund mental health services across the state. This includes, but is not limited to, the provision of essential services by qualified professionals such as psychologists, therapists, and social workers. The overarching goal is to significantly enhance access to comprehensive mental health care and support for all individuals in need, fostering a healthier and more resilient community.

A **"YES"** vote means: By voting “yes”, you are expressing your support for the immediate implementation of a new tax on weapon sales within San Andreas. The revenue generated from this tax will be specifically earmarked for the enhancement and expansion of mental health services throughout the state. This dedicated funding is expected to lead to a substantial improvement in access to care for individuals grappling with mental health challenges. It aims to reduce wait times for appointments, increase the availability of qualified mental health professionals, and support programs that promote overall community well-being. A "YES" vote is a vote for proactive investment in the mental health infrastructure of our state, ensuring that residents have the necessary resources to lead fulfilling lives.

A **"NO"** vote means: By voting “no”, you are indicating your opposition to this proposed tax measure. Should Proposition H fail, the current tax structure in San Andreas would remain unchanged, and no new tax would be imposed on weapon sales. Consequently, funds generated from weapon sales would not be specifically allocated to support mental health services as outlined in this proposition. A "NO" vote would maintain the existing funding mechanisms for mental health care, potentially missing an opportunity to significantly expand and improve access to these critical services through a dedicated revenue stream. It reflects a preference to explore alternative funding solutions or maintain the status quo regarding this particular tax proposal.

# AMENDMENT A

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the Constitution of the State of San Andreas be changed to allow elected officials to receive compensation?

This proposition proposes a crucial amendment to the Constitution of the State of San Andreas, aiming to repeal the current prohibition on compensating elected officials. If approved, this amendment would empower the Legislature to establish fair salaries and benefits for state, county, and municipal officials across San Andreas. The fundamental purpose behind this initiative is to democratize public service, making it accessible and viable for individuals from all economic backgrounds, not just those who can afford to serve without pay.

### **Detailed Explanation:**

Currently, the Constitution of the State of San Andreas mandates that all elected officials serve without compensation. While the intention behind this provision may have been to ensure selfless service, its practical effect has been to create a significant barrier to entry for many qualified and dedicated citizens. The financial burden of serving in public office without a salary, or even adequate compensation for expenses, effectively limits the pool of potential candidates to those who are independently wealthy, retired, or have alternative sources of income that can sustain them and their families during their term of service. This can lead to a less representative government, as the perspectives and experiences of a broad segment of the population may be underrepresented in decision-making bodies. Amendment A seeks to rectify this imbalance by striking the constitutional ban on compensation. By doing so, it would grant the Legislature the authority to design and implement a system of salaries and benefits that is commensurate with the responsibilities and demands of public office. This does not automatically mean lavish salaries; rather, it allows for the establishment of fair and reasonable compensation that would enable individuals of diverse economic means to consider public service as a viable career path. Such compensation could include a base salary, as well as provisions for healthcare, retirement, and reimbursement for legitimate expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. The proponents of this amendment argue that by removing the financial disincentive, San Andreas would benefit from a broader and more diverse pool of candidates. This would allow for a wider range of professional expertise, life experiences, and socio-economic perspectives to be brought to bear on the critical issues facing the state. Furthermore, a well-compensated official might be less susceptible to external influences or conflicts of interest, as their primary financial security would stem from their public service rather than other sources. It is believed that a more accessible public office will ultimately lead to a more effective and responsive government that truly reflects the will and needs of all its citizens.





### **A "YES" Vote Means:**

By voting "YES" on Amendment A, you are signaling your support for a fundamental change in how San Andreas approaches public service. A "YES" vote signifies your belief that elected officials, regardless of their personal wealth, should be fairly compensated for their dedication and hard work. This vote would empower your elected lawmakers to establish appropriate salaries and benefits, thereby dismantling the existing economic barriers that currently limit participation in public office. The aim is to create a more inclusive system where individuals with valuable skills, experience, and a commitment to public good can serve without facing undue financial hardship, ultimately leading to a more representative and effective government.

### **A "NO" Vote Means:**

Conversely, a "NO" vote on Amendment A indicates your opposition to this constitutional amendment. Choosing "NO" means you prefer to maintain the current system, where the Constitution of San Andreas explicitly prohibits compensation for elected officials. A "NO" vote would effectively preserve the status quo, continuing the practice that largely restricts public service to those who possess independent wealth or can afford to dedicate their time and effort to government roles without financial remuneration. This choice implies a belief that the current system, despite its limitations on accessibility, is preferable to allowing the Legislature to determine compensation for public servants.



# AMENDMENT B

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the Constitution of the State of San Andreas be changed to re-apportion the House of Representatives?

This proposition introduces a critical amendment to the Constitution of the State of San Andreas, fundamentally reshaping the methodology for determining legislative representation within the General Assembly. Its primary objectives are threefold: to establish a new and more refined apportionment formula, to introduce a strict and defined cap of 255 total members for the General Assembly, and to implement a specific rule designed to address the unique representational challenges posed by large counties with populations exceeding 2 million residents. This comprehensive reform aims to modernize legislative structure and ensure more equitable and efficient governance across the state.

By casting a "YES" vote, you express your unequivocal support for amending the state constitution to impose a definitive limit on the overall size of the legislature. This proposed constitutional amendment would establish a maximum of 200 members in the General Assembly. The core intent behind this cap is to foster a more manageable and efficient legislative body, capable of deliberating and acting with greater agility and focus. Furthermore, a "YES" vote signifies your agreement with the proposed adjustments to representation in very large counties, specifically those with populations exceeding 2 million. These adjustments are meticulously designed to prevent the unchecked and disproportionate expansion of the House of Representatives in such densely populated areas. The underlying principle is to ensure balanced representation across the entire state, preventing any single region, regardless of its population size, from dominating the legislative process. This approach ensures that all voices are heard without allowing an unwieldy number of representatives from highly populated areas to dilute the influence of smaller or less dense regions. The ultimate goal is to ensure effective governance and strategically prevent "legislative bloat," a condition where an oversized legislative body becomes less productive and more susceptible to gridlock, particularly in response to future population growth and demographic shifts. This forward-thinking measure aims to future-proof the legislative branch against the challenges of an expanding populace.

Conversely, a "NO" vote indicates your opposition to this proposed constitutional amendment. By voting "NO," you would be choosing to maintain the existing system of legislative apportionment. This current system, while seemingly straightforward in its design, allocates one representative for every 5,000 residents. However, a critical characteristic of this current system is its inherent lack of an upper limit on the size of the legislature. Consequently, a "NO" vote could allow the General Assembly to continue growing in size indefinitely in the future, potentially exceeding 200 members, or even the proposed 255-member cap. This unlimited growth could be particularly pronounced and accelerated in counties with large and continuously expanding populations. Such unchecked expansion could inevitably lead to an ever-larger and potentially less efficient legislative body, struggling to effectively manage its operations, facilitate productive debate, and make timely decisions. Therefore, a "NO" vote signifies a preference for the current, uncapped representational model, with all its

inherent implications for the future size, composition, and operational efficiency of the state's legislative branch. This choice would effectively endorse a system where the legislature's size is solely dictated by population growth, without any predefined constitutional safeguards to limit its expansion.



# AMENDMENT C

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the Constitution of the State of San Andreas be changed concerning the elections of judicial officers?

This crucial proposition, officially known as Amendment C, seeks to fundamentally alter the established system for judicial selection within the State of San Andreas. If approved, it would initiate a significant restructuring of Article VI of the State Constitution, which governs the judiciary. The core of this amendment lies in its proposal for a new and distinct appointment and election framework for various judicial roles and oversight commissions. Specifically, the amendment targets the methods by which judges for both the Superior and Trial Courts are chosen. Furthermore, it intends to revise the selection processes for members of two critical bodies: the Judicial Nominating Commission and the Commission on Judicial Discipline. This comprehensive reform aims to redefine the balance of power and public involvement in the state's judicial system.

A **"YES"** vote means: By casting a "YES" vote, you are expressing your support for a substantial overhaul of the state's constitutional provisions regarding judicial selection. Your vote would endorse the amendment of Article VI of the state constitution, thereby changing the established selection process for judges and members of key judicial commissions. Specifically, a "YES" vote would empower the Attorney General of the State of San Andreas with a new and significant authority: the ability to appoint members to both the Judicial Nominating Commission and the Commission on Judicial Discipline. This represents a shift in the executive branch's influence over these bodies. Furthermore, a "YES" vote would fundamentally change how judges for the Superior and Trial Courts are selected. Instead of being appointed by the Judicial Nominating Commission, as is currently the practice, these judges would be directly elected by the qualified voters of the State of San Andreas. This aspect of the amendment aims to increase democratic accountability and public participation in the selection of trial and superior court judges.

A **"NO"** vote means: Conversely, a "NO" vote signifies your opposition to this proposed constitutional amendment. By voting "NO," you are choosing to preserve the existing structure and processes for judicial selection within the State of San Andreas. A "NO" vote would maintain the current system where judges for the Superior and Trial Courts are appointed by the Judicial Nominating Commission. This system emphasizes an appointment process intended to be based on merit and professional qualification, overseen by a specialized body. Moreover, a "NO" vote would ensure that the current method for selecting members of the Judicial Nominating Commission remains unchanged. Under the existing system, these commission members are elected by the qualified voters of the state, ensuring a degree of public input into the composition of the body that appoints judges. Finally, a "NO" vote would also keep in place the existing process for selecting members of the Commission on Judicial Discipline, maintaining the current mechanisms for overseeing judicial conduct and ethics. This preserves the established framework for accountability within the judiciary.



# AMENDMENT D

## 2025 COORDINATED ELECTION

### SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## BALLOT QUESTION

Shall the Constitution of the State of San Andreas be changed concerning office vacancy procedures?

The amendment dictates that, in most cases, vacancies will be filled during the next scheduled November general election. Candidates wishing to fill these vacant positions would file their candidacies through either the Secretary of State's office or the relevant local election authority, depending on the office in question. An important provision addresses legislative vacancies, allowing for a temporary appointment of a sitting legislator to maintain representation until a formal election can be held. Furthermore, to prevent prolonged vacancies, if ballot deadlines for a general election have already passed, a special election must be conducted before January 6 of the following year. This ensures that the process remains timely and responsive. A key aspect of this amendment is the establishment of a uniform start date for all newly elected officials, who would officially begin their terms on the third Tuesday of January.

A **"YES"** vote on this amendment signifies support for the creation of a clear, statewide framework for addressing vacancies in elected offices. The core principle behind this measure is to democratize the filling of vacant offices by ensuring that voters, rather than political appointees, are ultimately responsible for selecting their representatives. The mechanism for achieving this is the mandate for vacancies to be filled through the democratic process at the next available November election. The only exception to this voter-centric approach is the provision for temporary appointments within the legislature, which is designed to prevent a lapse in representation for constituents until an election can take place. The inclusion of special elections when ballot deadlines have passed is a critical component, designed to prevent extended periods during which an office might remain vacant. Overall, this measure seeks to inject consistency, transparency, and fairness into the methods by which offices are filled across the entire state, moving away from fragmented and potentially inconsistent practices.

Conversely, a **"NO"** vote indicates opposition to the addition of this amendment to the State Constitution. If the amendment is rejected, the State Constitution would continue to lack any explicit statewide rules for handling vacancies. Consequently, the existing, often disparate, practices for addressing vacancies would remain in effect. This means that different rules and procedures might continue to apply to state and local offices, or vacancies might continue to be resolved through ad-hoc legislative or executive actions on a case-by-case basis. Rejecting this measure would, therefore, preserve the current flexibility in how vacancies are managed but would forgo the opportunity to establish a uniform, voter-driven process for filling these positions.



# GLOSSARY OF TERMS

## SAN ANDREAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

### **“AMENDMENT” (CONSTITUTIONAL)**

This suggests a change to the San Andreas State Constitution. A state constitution grants citizens of that state certain rights, and sets up the structure for that specific states’ government. A constitutional amendment must have at least a 55% majority vote to pass.

### **“PROPOSITION” (STATUTORY)**

This suggests an amendment or addition to the San Andreas Revised Statutes, which are the codified laws passed by the General Assembly, defining offenses against the state and its citizens. For the proposition to pass, a simple majority of 50% plus one vote is required.

### **“REFERENDUM”**

A referendum is a measure (either a statutory or a constitutional amendment) which has been introduced by the General Assembly, but referred to the voters of the State of San Andreas to be voted on in an election. As per the State Constitution Article VII, Section 4, any matter before the General Assembly concerning education, taxes, and the state treasury shall be referred to the voters and may not be enacted by the General Assembly without voter approval.

# SENATORS

Miriam Steinbeck, 1st Senatorial District  
Brandon Stimpson, 1st Senatorial District  
Mark Cho, 2nd Senatorial District  
Ryan Wells, 2nd Senatorial District  
Virgil Murillo, 3rd Senatorial District  
Albert Petty, 3rd Senatorial District  
Sarah Forbes, 4th Senatorial District  
Christopher Robertson, 4th Senatorial District  
Betty Brinkerhoff, 5th Senatorial District  
Benny Harrison, 5th Senatorial District

# REPRESENTATIVES

Howard Ballard, 1st Congressional District	Gina Richards, 26th Congressional District
Isaac Mitchell, 2nd Congressional District	Ervin Becker, 27th Congressional District
Celia Simmons, 3rd Congressional District	Sherri Martinez, 28th Congressional District
Johnnie King, 4th Congressional District	Lynette Watts, 29th Congressional District
Margarita Osborne, 5th Congressional District	Lorena Morton, 30th Congressional District
Cesar Boone, 6th Congressional District	Clara Owen, 31st Congressional District
Blanche Moreno, 7th Congressional District	Angelica Wood, 32nd Congressional District
Emma Johnston, 8th Congressional District	Kristina Spencer, 33rd Congressional District
Lewis Yates, 9th Congressional District	Kenneth Vasquez, 34th Congressional District
Laurie Roberts, 10th Congressional District	Adam Jenkins, 35th Congressional District
Olga Jefferson, 11th Congressional District	Rafael Singleton, 36th Congressional District
Julia Willis, 12th Congressional District	Charlie Walker, 37th Congressional District
Adrian Gonzales, 13th Congressional District	Tommie Pratt, 38th Congressional District
Jamie Barnes, 14th Congressional District	Darla Marsh, 39th Congressional District
Chelsea Mendoza, 15th Congressional District	Hazel Stokes, 40th Congressional District
Alfred Brewer, 16th Congressional District	Margie Nichols, 41st Congressional District
Mandy Richardson, 17th Congressional District	Ernesto Wilkerson, 42nd Congressional District
Tyrone Shaw, 18th Congressional District	Irving Black, 43rd Congressional District
Jeannette Murphy, 19th Congressional District	Pat Kelly, 44th Congressional District
Daniel Huff, 20th Congressional District	Ricardo Schneider, 45th Congressional District
Danny Larson, 21st Congressional District	Maggie Ross, 46th Congressional District
Sara Howell, 22nd Congressional District	Henrietta Malone, 47th Congressional District
Dolores Jennings, 23rd Congressional District	Adrienne Cole, 48th Congressional District
Caleb Floyd, 24th Congressional District	Dave Price, 49th Congressional District
Ashley Arnold, 25th Congressional District	Colleen Bowman, 50th Congressional District

# LEGISLATIVE STAFF



State Capitol Building,  
722 Occupation Ave  
Los Santos, SA 25022

Betty Brinkerhoff, President of the Senate  
Chelsea J. Martinelli, Secretary of the Senate  
Hana Harvey, Senate Office Staff  
Marlon Velazquez, Senate Office Staff  
Zyaire Duran, Senate Office Staff  
Roy Greer, Senate Office Staff  
Kenji Miles, Senate Office Staff

Ashley Arnold, Speaker of the House of  
Representatives  
Mary T. Aronson, Clerk of the House of  
Representatives  
Sariah Doyle, House Office Staff  
Eliana Dominguez, House Office Staff  
Alessandra Arellano, House Office Staff  
Jeffrey Berry, House Office Staff  
Bailey Sherman, House Office Staff  
Kaia Lopez, House Office Staff

Alison Beasley, Legislative Legal Council  
Robin Bass, Legislative Legal Council  
Payton Gibson, Legislative Legal Council  
Asa Miller, Legislative Legal Council  
Amirah Vasquez, Legislative Legal Council  
Alexis Holmes, Legislative Legal Council