

Request to Inspect and Remove Noncompliant Political Signs

June 13, 2026

Via Email and Online Code-Enforcement Portal

City of Phoenix — Office of the City Clerk

and City of Phoenix Code Enforcement

200 W Washington Street, 15th Floor

Phoenix, AZ 85003

Re: Request to inspect and remove noncompliant candidate-committee slate signs displayed in the City of Phoenix — "Kevin Thompson & Nick Myers — Republicans for Corporation Commission" (AZ SOS Filer IDs 101859 and 100484)

Dear City Clerk and Code Enforcement:

I am a Maricopa County voter. On June 13, 2026, I observed and photographed a joint slate sign produced by the campaign committees of Kevin Thompson and Nick Myers — two candidates for Arizona Corporation Commissioner — displayed in the public rights-of-way of the City of Phoenix at the location identified below. Photographs are enclosed.

I am writing to ask the City to **inspect these signs and address them as the City deems appropriate under its own sign regulations and its general police powers**. The committees' underlying campaign-finance disclosure violation is being separately referred to the Arizona Secretary of State, which is the filing officer for both committees under A.R.S. § 16-938(A) and the sole public officer authorized by statute to investigate the § 16-925 disclosure violation and impose any committee penalty. **The City's role, and my request here, is limited to addressing the signs in the City's public rights-of-way.**

The signs

The slate sign at issue measures **48 inches in vertical height**. Each sign bears, side by side, the names "KEVIN THOMPSON" and "NICK MYERS" in equal-sized lettering, with the descriptor "REPUBLICANS FOR CORPORATION COMMISSION" beneath. Two parallel "paid for by" disclosure lines appear on each sign — one for each committee.

The disclosure attributable to the Thompson committee reads, in substance:

*"Paid for by Kevin Thompson for Corporation Commissioner. Authorized by Kevin Thompson.
(602) 402-1238"*

The disclosure attributable to the Myers committee follows the parallel format. **Both disclosure lines are printed at the same character height.**

The signs are facially noncompliant with A.R.S. § 16-925(D)(4)

A.R.S. § 16-925(D)(4) requires that the disclosure on a candidate-paid political sign "shall be displayed in a height that is at least four percent of the vertical height of the sign or billboard." For a 48-inch sign, the statutory minimum disclosure height is **1.92 inches**. The disclosure as printed on the signs measures approximately **7/16 inch (0.4375 inch)** in cap height — roughly **0.91% of the sign's vertical height**, and **about 23% of the legally required size**. Each disclosure line independently fails the four-percent minimum.

The violation is established on the face of the printed sign by direct measurement with a tape measure. It is not a question that depends on the committees' financial filings, their forthcoming pre-primary reports, or any investigation into the print run or its production. The deficiency is reproducible by any inspector with a tape measure. The disclosure on the printed sign as deployed is what the statute regulates.

The City has its own authority over signs in its rights-of-way

The City of Phoenix has independent authority to inspect, regulate, and address signs displayed in its public rights-of-way under the Phoenix City Code and its general police powers. That authority is the City's, not the Secretary of State's and not the Citizens Clean Elections Commission's. The Secretary of State investigates and penalizes the committee; the City addresses the signs in its right-of-way.

A.R.S. § 16-1019(C) limits the City's removal authority when a political sign in the public right-of-way satisfies five enumerated conditions, including, at subsection (C)(5), that the sign "contains the name and telephone number or website address of the candidate or campaign committee contact person." I respectfully invite the City's attention to two questions under subsection (C)(5) as it inspects these signs:

1. Whose phone number is on the sign. The telephone number printed on the disclosure — **(602) 402-1238** — is the main business telephone for **The Resolute Group LLC**, an Arizona limited liability company (AZ Corporation Commission Entity ID **1937682**) with its principal place of business at 3030 N Central Avenue, Suite 1001, Phoenix, AZ 85012. That number is published as The Resolute Group's main line on the firm's public website (theresolute.group) and in the firm's Google business profile. It is not the campaign-committee contact telephone for either Kevin Thompson for Corporation Commissioner or Nick Myers for Corporation Commissioner. The committees' own contact telephones, as listed in their periodic reports filed with the Secretary of State, are **(480) 586-6472** for the Thompson committee and **(480) 331-7747** for the Myers committee. Whether a third-party consulting firm's main business line satisfies (C)(5)'s requirement of "the name and telephone number ... of the candidate or campaign committee contact person" is a question on which the City may form its own view.

2. Whether a disclosure printed at 23% of the legally required size is functionally "contained" on the sign. A.R.S. § 16-925(D)(4) sets the floor for the size at which a disclosure must be displayed on a sign. A disclosure printed below that floor is, by the Legislature's own measure, not displayed at a height the law treats as sufficient. Whether such a sub-statutory disclosure "contains" the (C)(5) contact information for the purposes of City removal authority is, again, a question on which the City may form its own view.

To the extent the City's analysis under subsection (C) leads it to conclude the signs do not qualify for the limitation on removal in § 16-1019(C), the City's notice-and-removal authority under A.R.S. § 16-1019(D) is available.

Additionally, A.R.S. § 16-1019(B) excludes signs "placed in violation of state law" from the protections of § 16-1019. Subsection (B) provides that the section "does not apply to the removal, alteration, defacing or covering of a political sign or other printed materials ... placed in violation of state law or county, city or town ordinance or regulation." A sign whose "paid for by" disclosure falls below the minimum vertical-height requirement of A.R.S. § 16-925(D)(4) is, on the face of the printed sign, a sign placed in violation of state law. To the extent the City reads subsection (B) as a separate exclusion from the anti-removal protection of § 16-1019, the City has authority to address such signs on that basis under § 16-1019(B) and (D) and its own sign regulations.

To the extent the City concludes its removal authority is limited as to these signs, the City retains its inspection, notification, citation, and referral authority under its own sign regulations and general police powers, and may coordinate with the Secretary of State concerning the underlying § 16-925 violation.

Why the typical cure window is not the right framework here

A.R.S. § 16-938 sets out a notice-and-cure framework that applies to the **committee's** opportunity to respond to a campaign-finance enforcement action at the state level. That framework runs against the committee, not against the signs themselves, and it is the Secretary of State's process to administer.

The signs in the City's rights-of-way are a separate matter. The sign is the size it is, the disclosure is the size it is, and a measurement taken today is the same measurement that will be taken next week. There is nothing for the committee to "cure" on a printed sign already in place; the only meaningful cure is to take the sign down, reprint with a compliant disclosure, and redeploy. The City's interest in regulating signs in its rights-of-way exists today, independently of whatever process is unfolding at the state level.

Requested action

I respectfully ask the City of Phoenix to:

- 1. Inspect** the Thompson/Myers slate signs displayed in the public rights-of-way at Chandler and 50th St. (and any other instances of the same sign the City may identify on inspection).
- 2. Document** the disclosure-size measurements taken on inspection, together with any additional measurements (sign area, location, hazard analysis) the City makes in the course of evaluating the signs.
- 3. Notify** the Thompson and Myers committees of the inspection findings, with copies to the Secretary of State's Campaign Finance Division (campaignfinance@azsos.gov), to which a parallel complaint has been submitted under A.R.S. § 16-938 concerning the same disclosure violation.
- 4. Take whatever action the City deems appropriate** under the Phoenix City Code, A.R.S. § 16-1019, and the City's general police powers to address the noncompliant signs in its public rights-of-way, including removal where the City determines it is authorized to remove the signs.

5. Confirm receipt of this request and advise me of the inspection outcome and the City's action.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am happy to provide additional photographs, measurements, or location specifics on request.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

[ADDRESS REDACTED] , [CITY REDACTED] 85284

[EMAIL REDACTED]

[PHONE REDACTED]

Enclosures: Photographs of the Thompson/Myers slate sign with disclosure measurements (June 13, 2026)

**KEVIN
THOMPSON**

PAID FOR BY KEVIN THOMPSON FOR CORPORATION COMMISSIONER. AUTHORIZED BY KEVIN THOMPSON. (602) 402-1238

**NICK
MYERS**

PAID FOR BY NICK MYERS FOR CORPORATION COMMISSIONER. AUTHORIZED BY NICK MYERS. (602) 402-1238

**REPUBLICANS FOR
CORPORATION COMMISSION**







50th St. 5000 E



KEVIN THOMPSON
NICK MYERS

PROTECT OURS & KIDS
GLASSMAN
BOONEGLASSMAN.COM

RAMIREZ
INDEPENDENT FOR AZ SENATE
Not Red. Not Blue. Arizona.
RAMIREZFORAZ.COM

DAVID W. RICHARDS
STATE REPRESENTATIVE
For Arizona



KEVIN THOMPSON

PAID FOR BY KEVIN THOMPSON FOR CORPORATION COMMISSIONER. AUTHORIZED BY KEVIN THOMPSON. (602) 402-1238

NICK MYERS

REPUBLICAN CORPORATION COMMISSIONER