ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Report of Regular Meeting
Tuesday, March 17, 2026
House Hearing Room 5 -- 2:00 P.M. OR UPON RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF FLOOR

Convened 3:13 P.M.
Adjourned 5:22 P.M.

RECEIVED
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
MAR 20 2026

Members Present
Representative Aguilar
Representative Blackman
Representative Carter N
Representative Crews
Representative Diaz
Representative Hendrix
Representative Volk
Representative Wilmeth
Representative Way, Vice-Chairman
Representative Weninger, Chairman

Members Not Present
Representative Cavero

Agenda
Original Agenda – Attachment 1

Request to Speak
Report – Attachment 2

Committee Attendance
Report – Attachment 3

Committee Action

Bill	Action	Vote	Attachments
SB1566	DP	7-3-0-1	4,5
SB1254	HELD	HELD	6,7
SB1787	DP	7-2-1-1	8,9
SB1478	DP	10-0-0-1	10,11
SB1431	DP	7-1-2-1	12,13

Abby Selvey
Abby Selvey, Committee Secretary
March 20, 2026

(Original attachments on file in the Office of the Chief Clerk; video archives available at http://www.azleg.gov)

CORRECTED & REVISED #3 - 3/16/26

Convened: 3:13pm

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Adjourned: 5:22pm

DATE Tuesday, March 17, 2026 ROOM HHR 5 TIME 2:00 P.M. or upon recess or adjournment of Floor

Members of the public may access a livestream of the meeting here:
https://www.azleg.gov/videoplayer/?clientID=6361162879&eventID=2026031077

Members:

Representative Aguilar	~~Representative Connolly~~	~~Representative Villegas~~
Representative Blackman	Representative Crews	Representative Volk
Representative Carter N	Representative Diaz	Representative Wilmeth
Representative Cavero	Representative Hendrix	Representative Way, Vice-Chairman
		Representative Weninger, Chairman

Bills		Short Title	Strike Everything Title
~~*SB1128~~		~~study committee; scrap metal theft~~	
		~~(Gowan)~~	
		~~COM, RULES~~	
(2) *SB1254	Held	real property conveyances; formal requirements	
		(Mesnard)	
		COM held 0-0-0-0-0, RULES	
(5) SB1431	DP	municipalities; planned communities; design; prohibition	
	7-1-2-1	(Bolick: Bravo, Farnsworth, et al)	
		COM, RULES	
(4) SB1478	DP	liquor; policies; procedures	
	10-0-0-1	(Bolick)	
		COM, RULES	
(1) SB1566	DP	malicious delay; enforcement; penalty	
	7-3-0-1	(Petersen)	
		COM, RULES	
(3) SB1787	DP	exactions; individualized determinations; appeal	
	7-2-1-1	(Petersen)	
		COM, RULES	

* On previous agenda

ORDER OF BILLS TO BE SET BY THE CHAIRMAN

RA
03/16/2026

People with disabilities may request reasonable accommodations such as interpreters, alternative formats, or assistance with physical accessibility. If you require accommodations, please contact the Chief Clerk's Office at (602) 926-3032 or through Arizona Relay Service 7-1-1.

ATTACHMENT 1

Information Registered on the Request to Speak System

House Commerce (3/17/2026)

SB1254, real property conveyances; formal requirements

Support:

James Roth, representing self; Tom Farley, Arizona Association Of Realtors

All Comments:

James Roth, Self: Provides additional protection against mortgage fraud, fraudulent deeds, and stolen house equity. In RTS county recorders and assessors support this bill.

SB1431, municipalities; planned communities; design; prohibition

Testified in support:

Spencer Kamps, HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF CENTRAL AZ; David Morris, AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY AZ; Jake Hinman, ARIZONA NEIGHBORHOOD PROJECT; Kileen Lindgren, PACIFIC LEGAL FOUNDATION; Rocky Hanish, representing self

Testified as opposed:

Nick Ponder, City Of Phoenix, City Of Prescott, City Of Tucson , LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES & TOWNS, Town Of Paradise Valley, YUMA, CITY OF; Susan Edwards, representing self; Carol Ayotte, representing self

Support:

Michele Hamer, representing self; deana corsa, representing self; Jonathan Soto Robles, representing self; Andrea Hernandez Falcon, representing self; Hunter Anderson, representing self

Neutral:

Dennis J Legere, ARIZONA HOMEOWNERS COALITION

Oppose:

Beverly Janowitz-Price, representing self; Steven Perlmutter, representing self; Dianne Post, representing self; Jeanne Kentch Mohave County Assessor, representing self; pam fitzgerald, representing self; Kate Bauer, representing self; Rivko Knox, representing self; Andrea De La Cruz, MARANA, TOWN OF; Robert Wisler, APACHE JUNCTION, CITY OF; Mayor Clarinda Vail, TOWN OF TUSAYAN; Paul Davenport, representing self; Mary Crozier, representing self; Destyn Moreno, representing self; Jackie Rich, representing self; James Roth, representing self; Brent Kleinman, representing self

All Comments:

Susan Edwards, Self: So new developments built on high-traffic roads, w/no fence? Nowhere for kids to play? The nearest park is miles away because the city/town has no funds for a new park. How is that safe -- let alone family friendly?; Carol Ayotte, Self: Please stop pre-empting the cities and towns authority for homebuilding which takes

ATTACHMENT 2

the voice away from the citizens at the local level by giving the authority to the homebuilder whose prime focus is to make $$ not to be there for the long term.; Steven Perlmutter, Self: This bill will harm the communities in question.; Jeanne Kentch Mohave County Assessor, Self: Locals should be able to choose.; Kate Bauer, Self: This bill would be a disaster for the cities, towns, and residents of AZ. Please stop this preemption.; Mayor Clarinda Vail, TOWN OF TUSAYAN: Please oppose SB1431. AZ communities are not one-size-fits-all. Tusayan, near Grand Canyon National Park, needs nice aesthetics. Rights of residents and those they elect really matter. Please vote NO on this and any bills that remove local input.; Paul Davenport, Self: This deregulation bill 's one-size-fits-all approach carries a lot of baggage for our communities and their residents, purportedly to promote affordable housing but more realistically to cheapen housing to benefit developers' bottom lines.; Mary Crozier, Self: We have seen so many abuses to the existing zoning legislation mandated by the State. Please oppose this bill that will exacerbate an already growing problem.; Jackie Rich, Self: Prohibiting cities from doing their jobs with preemptive laws creates unintended consequences.; James Roth, Self: This seems like state government overreach; local government should have more control and it is more directly accountable to its residents. This seems to be lobbyist driven. In RTS,builders are for it and municipal government against.; Brent Kleinman, Self: SB1431 threatens voter-approved plans for smart, safe & responsible development by overriding resident input in favor of profits for developers. Cutting cities out of the process fundamentally alters the character & livability of our neighborhoods.; Dennis J Legere, ARIZONA HOMEOWNERS COALITION: This bill prevents municipalities from requiring builders to mandate restrictions on the property use but does not limit the ability of the developer to actually apply all those restrictions on the property by themselves voluntarily.

SB1478, liquor; policies; procedures

Testified in support:

Dr Garrison Ellam, ARIZONA CRAFT PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

Support:

Don Isaacson, Arizona Licensed Beverage Association; Trish Hart, Arizona Food Marketing Alliance; Marie Isaacson, Arizona Licensed Beverage Association; Steve Barclay, BEER & WINE DISTRIBUTORS OF ARIZONA; Samuel Richard, BEER AND WINE DISTRIBUTORS OF ARIZONA

Oppose:

James Roth, representing self

All Comments:

James Roth, Self: Some provisions seem good like freeing small brewers and wine producers from federal regulations but otherwise it seems to be lobbyist driven. Liquor producers and distributors support this bill but is it good for consumers?

SB1566, malicious delay; enforcement; penalty

Testified in support:

Kileen Lindgren, PACIFIC LEGAL FOUNDATION

Testified as opposed:

Susan Edwards, representing self; Jacob Emnett, COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSN OF AZ

Oppose:

Craig McDermott, representing self; Rob Bohr, GILBERT, TOWN OF; Dianne Post, AZ NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN (NOW), Self; James Roth, representing self

All Comments:

James Roth, Self: This is a pro-developer and builder bill to impose time periods on permit approval It seems that "malicious" in this context is vague. I can foresee municipalities approving permits in may otherwise reject to avoid lawsuits. Hire better people.

SB1787, exactions; individualized determinations; appeal

Testified in support:

Jake Hinman, ARIZONA NEIGHBORHOOD PROJECT; Kileen Lindgren, PACIFIC LEGAL FOUNDATION

Testified as opposed:

Jacob Emnett, COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSN OF AZ; Frank Cassidy, LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES & TOWNS

Oppose:

Rob Bohr, GILBERT, TOWN OF; Nick Debus, AZ ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE; Robert Wisler, APACHE JUNCTION, CITY OF; James Roth, representing self

All Comments:

James Roth, Self: This can be abused by local governments but in some cases, it is a public safety measure such as a turn lane into driveway for strip mall on busy street. This is bill proposed by legislator who is a real estate builder.

COMPLETE FORM FOR PUBLIC RECORD

STATE OF ARIZONA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REQUEST TO SPEAK

Committee on Commerce Date: 3/17/24 Bill Number: 1787

Name: Gina Schuh | ☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Neutral | Need to Speak: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Representing: _____ Registered Lobbyist ☐ Yes ☒ No

Address: 5006 E Harmony Ave City/State: Mesa AZ Zip Code: 85206

Email Address: ginanschuh@gmail.com Phone Number: 209-631-5466

Comments: _____

SPEAKING TIME DETERMINED BY THE CHAIRMAN

ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE

Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD

COMMITTEE ON **COMMERCE**

CHAIRMAN: Jeff Weninger VICE-CHAIRMAN: Michael Way

DATE	03/17/26	
CONVENED	3:13pm	
RECESSED		
RECONVENED		
ADJOURNED	5:22 PM	
MEMBERS	PRESENT	NOT PRESENT
Aguilar	✓	
Blackman	✓	
Carter N	✓	
Cavero		✓
Crews	✓	
Diaz	✓	
Hendrix	✓	
Volk	✓	
Wilmeth	✓	
Way, Vice-Chairman	✓	
Weninger, Chairman	✓	
TOTAL	10	1

ATTACHMENT 3

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57th Legislature, 2nd Regular Session
Majority Research Staff
Senate: GOV DPA 3-2-2-0 | Third Read 17-12-1-0-0

SB1566: malicious delay; enforcement; penalty
Sponsor: Senator Petersen, LD 14
Committee on Commerce

Overview
Establishes municipal and county prohibitions on malicious delays in responding to an application for single-family construction and applications for a license or permit.

History
For any new or existing ordinance or code requiring a license, a local government is required to have in place an overall time frame during which the local government will either grant or deny each type of license that it issues. The overall time must distinguish between the administrative completeness review time frame and the substantive review time frame (A.R.S. §§ 9-835, 11-1605).

Additionally, if a municipality with a population of 30,000 persons or more does not approve, conditionally approve or respond with required additions or revisions to an application for a single-family residential building permit within 15 working days after the date the application is submitted, any required review of the application may be performed by a qualified third-party selected by the municipality (A.R.S. § 9-470.01).

Provisions

Prohibition on Malicious Delay; Municipalities

1. Prohibits a city or town from maliciously delaying adopted licensing time frames or a response to an application for single-family residential construction. (Sec. 1)
2. Authorizes the Attorney General (AG) to enforce the prohibition. (Sec. 1)
3. Allows the AG, for municipalities that are found to have violated the prohibition, to impose a $5,000 civil penalty per violation. (Sec. 1)
4. Asserts the prohibition does not modify the authority of a building code official to withhold a certificate of occupancy in accordance with a municipality's adopted codes and ordinances. (Sec. 1)
5. Allows a municipality to challenge the AG's finding of a malicious delay by bringing an action in a court with appropriate jurisdiction. (Sec. 1)
6. Defines *malicious* as:
   a. acting with specific intent to obstruct approval of an application by imposing requirements not specifically authorized by law;

☐ Prop 105 (45 votes)	☐ Prop 108 (40 votes)	☐ Emergency (40 votes)	☐ Fiscal Note

ATTACHMENT 4

b. repeated unexplained delays of more than twice the municipality's adopted licensing time frame for single-family residential construction; or
c. delays resulting from other pending applications by the same applicant. (Sec. 1)

7. Stipulates *malicious* does not include any delays due to resource constraints or by the applicant or a third party, good faith errors or enforcement of adopted technical codes, ordinances or standards. (Sec. 1)

Prohibition on Malicious Delay; Counties

8. Prohibits a county from maliciously delaying a response to a license, approval or permit or any similar application or request. (Sec. 2)

9. Authorizes the AG or county attorney to enforce the prohibition. (Sec. 2)

10. Subjects a county that violates the prohibition to a civil penalty of $5,000 per violation. (Sec. 2)

11. Allows a county to challenge the findings of malicious delay by the AG or the county attorney by bringing an action in a court with appropriate jurisdiction. (Sec. 2)

12. Defines *malicious* as:
    a. acting in bad faith or with specific intent to obstruct approval of a license, approval or permit or any similar application or request by imposing requirements not specifically authorized by law or engaging in selective enforcement; or
    b. repeated unexplained delays or actions taken without a legitimate health, safety or planning concern. (Sec. 2)

13. Stipulates *malicious* does not include any delays due to resource constraints, good faith errors or enforcement of identified codes, ordinances or standards. (Sec. 2)

Property Right and Land Use Malicious Delay Claims

14. Entitles a plaintiff filing a malicious delay claim in superior court for a single-family residential application to expedited judicial review. (Sec. 3)

15. Requires the court to set an initial case management conference within 10 calendar days of the complaint being served to establish an expedited schedule for discovery, briefing and hearings. (Sec. 3)

16. Requires all fact discovery in the action to be completed as expeditiously as possible after the initial case conference, unless otherwise ordered for good cause. (Sec. 3)

17. Requires the court to:
    a. consider and rule on all motions for summary judgment or other dispositive motions as soon as practicable; and
    b. set a trial or final hearing date as soon as practicable after the case management conference, absent a finding of good cause. (Sec. 3)

18. Provides for an expedited process relating to an appeal of malicious delay claim in the court of appeals. (Sec. 3)

Miscellaneous

19. Defines *application*. (Sec. 1,3)

20. Contains a legislative findings clause. (Sec. 4)

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

ROLL CALL VOTE

COMMITTEE ON Commerce BILL NO. SB 1566

DATE March 17, 2026 MOTION: DP

	PASS	AYE	NAY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Aguilar			✓		
Blackman		✓			
Carter N	–	✓			
Cavero					✓
Crews			✓		
Diaz		✓			
Hendrix		✓			
Volk			✓		
Wilmeth		✓			
Way, Vice-Chairman		✓			
Weninger, Chairman		✓			
		7	3	0	1

Angela Hall
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:

JEFF WENINGER, Chairman
MICHAEL WAY, Vice-Chairman

ATTACHMENT 5

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57th Legislature, 2nd Regular Session
Majority Research Staff
Senate: FIN DP 6-0-1-0 | Third Read 27-0-3-0-0

SB 1254: real property conveyances; formal requirements
Sponsor: Senator Mesnard, LD 13
Committee on Commerce

Overview
Includes signature requirements for deeds and conveyances of real property.

History
The Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions (DIFI) regulates the insurance industry through licensure and examination of insurance professionals and businesses, including insurance producers and adjusters. The director of DIFI is responsible for the licensure of title insurance and escrow agents (A.R.S §§ 6-814, 20-1580).

Statute prohibits estates of inheritance, freehold, or for a term longer than a year, in lands or tenements, from being conveyed unless the conveyance is by an instrument in writing, subscribed and delivered by the party disposing of the estate, or by his authorized agent. Furthermore, deeds and conveyances of real property are required to be signed by the grantor and duly acknowledged before an officer authorized to perform notarial acts. Grantees that are a corporation, partnership, or regulated by DIFI, if doing business in Arizona, must provide their name, address, state and country in which the grantee is incorporated, licensed, chartered or formed, in every deed or conveyance of real property (A.R.S. § 33-401).

Provisions
1. Requires every deed or conveyance of real property to include the signature of the grantee or the grantee's authorized agent. (Sec. 1)
2. Specifies only the grantor's signature is required for deeds and conveyances submitted for recording by a licensed title insurer, title insurance agent or escrow agent. (Sec. 1)
3. Stipulates a deed or conveyance cannot be accepted unless the grantee's acceptance is evidenced by either the signature of the grantee or if authorized in writing, the authorized agent, on the instrument or by a certificate or resolution of acceptance attached to or printed on the deed or conveyance. (Sec. 1)
4. Prescribes the form and content of certificates or resolutions of acceptance that are submitted by a person who is not a licensed title insurer, title insurance agent or an escrow agent. (Sec. 1)

☐ Prop 105 (45 votes) ☐ Prop 108 (40 votes) ☐ Emergency (40 votes) ☐ Fiscal Note

ATTACHMENT 6

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

ROLL CALL VOTE

COMMITTEE ON Commerce BILL NO. SB 1254

DATE March 17, 2026 MOTION: Held

	PASS	AYE	NAY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Aguilar					
Blackman					
Carter N					
Cavero					
Crews					
Diaz					
Hendrix					
Volk					
Wilmeth					
Way, Vice-Chairman					
Weninger, Chairman					

Angela Hall
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:

JEFF WENINGER, Chairman
MICHAEL WAY, Vice-Chairman

ATTACHMENT 7

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57th Legislature, 2nd Regular Session
Majority Research Staff
Senate: RAGE DP 5-1-1-0 | Third Read 23-5-2-0-0

SB 1787: exactions; individualized determinations; appeal
Sponsor: Senator Petersen, LD 14
Committee on Commerce

Overview
Provides for requesting and appealing an individualized determination which demonstrates the basis for an exaction being imposed on the proposed project.

History
A property owner may appeal the requirement by a local government of a dedication or exaction as a condition of granting approval for the use, improvement or development of real property. The local government must notify the property owner of their right to appeal the local government's action and provide a description of the appeal procedure.

In the appeals proceedings, the local government has the burden to establish that there is an essential nexus between the dedication or exaction and a legitimate governmental interest and that the proposed dedication or exaction is roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use, improvement or development. The hearing officer must decide on the appeal and if determined that the local government did not meet its burden, the hearing office must modify or delete the requirement of the dedication or exaction. If the hearing officer modifies or affirms the requirement of the dedication or exaction, the property owner aggrieved by the hearing officer's decision may file a complaint for a trial de novo in the superior court on the facts and the law regarding the issues of the condition or requirement of the dedication or exaction (A.R.S. §§ 9-500.12, 11-832).

Provisions

Local Government

1. Prohibits a local government from:
   a. imposing an exaction on an applicant for any proposed project without a written notice of the required exaction; and
   b. requiring the applicant to satisfy the exaction as a prerequisite to appeal the validity of the individualized determination. (Sec. 1, 2)
2. Requires a local government to pay for the individualized determination and to provide the completed individualized determination within 60 days after receiving the request from the applicant. (Sec. 1, 2)
3. Stipulates that the local government, in an appeal, has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the exaction is roughly proportional to the adverse impact of the proposed project. (Sec. 1, 2)

☐ Prop 105 (45 votes) ☐ Prop 108 (40 votes) ☐ Emergency (40 votes) ☐ Fiscal Note

ATTACHMENT 8

Applicant

4. Allows an applicant to:
   a. on receipt of the written notice of the exaction, request an individualized determination demonstrating the basis for the exaction being imposed on the proposed project;
   b. appeal directly to the Attorney General if they object to the methodology, supporting information or conclusions in the individualized determination;
   c. elect to proceed under protest and satisfy a required exaction as the exaction is being appealed; and
   d. bring an action in an appropriate court to challenge the validity of the individualized determination or the exaction. (Sec. 1, 2)

Attorney General

5. Mandates the Attorney General to investigate any appeal alleging that a local action violates state law or the Arizona Constitution. (Sec. 1, 2)

6. Requires the Attorney General, if an applicant's appeal is successful, to:
   a. deem the exaction excessive and waive the exaction; or
   b. direct the local government to compensate the applicant for any costs that the applicant has expended in furtherance of the excessive exaction if the applicant has proceeded under protest. (Sec. 1, 2)

Individualized Determination

7. Requires the individualized determination to include the methodology, supporting data and information used to determine the adverse impact that is anticipated to result from the proposed project and the method of calculating the exaction amount. (Sec. 1, 2)

8. Stipulates that:
   a. the individualized determination is the final determination, unless an applicant files an appeal; and
   b. the exaction is deemed excessive and is waived if the individualized determination is not completed and delivered to the applicant within 60 days after receiving the request from the applicant. (Sec. 1, 2)

Judicial Review

9. Prohibits any satisfaction of an exaction under protest from being construed as a waiver of any objections, appeals or right to judicial review of the exaction. (Sec. 1, 2)

10. Requires the court to review the exaction de novo. (Sec. 1, 2)

11. Instructs the court to award compensatory damages and attorney fees to a prevailing applicant that brings an action. (Sec. 1, 2)

Miscellaneous

12. Defines pertinent terms. (Sec. 1, 2)

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

ROLL CALL VOTE

COMMITTEE ON Commerce BILL NO. SB 1787

DATE March 17, 2026 MOTION: DP

	PASS	AYE	NAY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Aguilar				✓	
Blackman		✓			
Carter N	–	✓			
Cavero					✓
Crews			✓		
Diaz		✓			
Hendrix		✓			
Volk			✓		
Wilmeth		✓			
Way, Vice-Chairman		✓			
Weninger, Chairman		✓			
		7	2	1	1

Angela Hall
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:

JEFF WENINGER, Chairman
MICHAEL WAY, Vice-Chairman

ATTACHMENT 9

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57th Legislature, 2nd Regular Session
Majority Research Staff
Senate: RAGE DPA 7-0-0-0 | Third Read 22-4-4-0-0

SB 1478: liquor; policies; procedures
Sponsor: Senator Bolick, LD 2
Committee on Commerce

Overview
Revises liquor statutes relating to regulations and definitions.

History
The Department of Liquor Licenses and Control (DLLC), which consists of the State Liquor Board and the Office of the Director of the Department regulates the manufacture, distribution and sale of liquor in this state through the issuance of 21 license types or series.

Federal regulations define *nonbeverage products* as products including, medicines, medicinal preparations, food products, flavors, flavoring extracts or perfume, which are manufactured using taxpaid distilled spirits and that are unfit for use as a beverage (27 CFR § 17.11).

Provisions

Liquor Regulations

1. Allows the Director to issue interim permits to applicants for certain licensees regardless of whether that license has been used in the past three years if specified conditions exist. (Sec. 4)
2. Modifies a condition which must exist for issuing interim permits. (Sec. 4)
3. Clarifies a licensed farm winery may label a wine offered for sale that is produced from grapes or other fruit grown within a federally recognized viticultural area located in this State. (Sec. 11)
4. Repeals statute which subjects licensed producers, craft distillers, brewers and farm wineries production and storage spaces to federal food safety rules. (Sec. 15)
5. Exempts *nonbeverage products* as defined by federal law and that are qualified by the United States Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau as nonbeverage products from the Alcoholic Beverages statutes. (Sec. 16)

Liquor Regulatory Definitions

6. Modifies the definition of *cider* to include any beverage that contains more than .5% of alcohol by volume and not more than 8.5%, rather than 7%, of alcohol by volume. (Sec. 1)
7. Excludes, from the definitions of *distilled spirits* and *spirituous liquor*, bitters containing alcohol and fruits preserved in ardent spirits. (Sec. 1)

☐ Prop 105 (45 votes)	☐ Prop 108 (40 votes)	☐ Emergency (40 votes)	☐ Fiscal Note

ATTACHMENT 10

8. Includes, in the definition of *distilled spirits,* beverages that contain more than .5% of alcohol by volume and that are produced by the distillation or rectification of fermented material. (Sec. 1)

9. Includes, in the definition of *spirituous liquor,* cider.

10. Excludes, from the definition of *spirituous liquor, nonbeverage products* as defined by federal law and that are qualified by the United States Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau as nonbeverage products. (Sec. 1)

11. Includes, in the definition of *veteran,* a person who has served in the U.S. Space Force who has received a discharge other than dishonorable. (Sec. 1)

Luxury Privilege Tax Definitions

12. Includes a definition of *beer* with the same meaning as prescribed in the Alcoholic Beverages statutes. (Sec. 18)

13. Conforms the definitions of *cider, craft distiller* and *spirituous liquor* to the same meanings as prescribed in the Alcoholic Beverages statutes. (Sec. 18)

14. Redefines *malt liquor* as any beverage that is obtained by the alcoholic fermentation, infusion or decoction of barley malt, hops, rice, bran or other grain, glucose, sugar or molasses, or any combination of them, and may include, as adjuncts in fermentation, honey, fruit, fruit juice, fruit concentrate, herbs, spices and other food materials. (Sec. 18)

15. Adds that *malt liquor* includes beer that is aged in an empty wooden barrel previously used to contain wine or distilled spirits and as such is not considered a dilution or mixture of any other spirituous liquor. (Sec. 18)

16. Redefines *vinous liquor* as the product obtained by the fermentation of grapes, other agricultural products that contains natural or added sugar or cider or any such alcoholic beverage fortified with grape brandy and that contains not more than 24% of alcohol by volume. (Sec. 18)

17. Adds that vinous liquor does not include cider. (Sec. 18)

Miscellaneous

18. Replaces the term *manufacturer* with *producer.* (Sec. 1, 2, 3, 19, 20)

19. Makes technical and conforming changes. (Sec. 1-14, 16, 17, 20)

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

ROLL CALL VOTE

COMMITTEE ON Commerce BILL NO. SB 1478

DATE March 17, 2026 MOTION: DP

	PASS	AYE	NAY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Aguilar		✓			
Blackman		✓			
Carter N		✓			
Cavero					✓
Crews		✓			
Diaz		✓			
Hendrix		✓			
Volk		✓			
Wilmeth		✓			
Way, Vice-Chairman		✓			
Weninger, Chairman		✓			
		10	0	0	1

Angela Hall
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:

JEFF WENINGER, Chairman
MICHAEL WAY, Vice-Chairman

ATTACHMENT 11

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57th Legislature, 2nd Regular Session
Majority Research Staff
Senate: RAGE DP 6-0-1-0 | Third Read 17-12-1-0-0

SB 1431: municipalities; planned communities; design; prohibition
Sponsor: Senator Bolick, LD 2
Committee on Commerce

Overview

Prohibits municipalities from requiring certain shared features or amenities as part of a development or subdivision and interfering with a home buyer's right to choose home design standards.

History

A planning agency of a municipality cannot require that a subdivider or developer to establish an association as part of a subdivision regulation or zoning ordinance. Alternatively, the municipality may require a subdivider or developer to establish an association to maintain private, common or community owned improvements that are approved and installed as part of a preliminary plan, final plat or specific plan, and cannot require that an association be formed or operated other than for the maintenance of common areas or community owned property. (A.R.S. § 9-461.15).

Statute defines *association* as a nonprofit corporation or unincorporated association of owners that is created pursuant to a declaration to own and operate portions of a planned community and that has the power under the declaration to assess association members to pay the costs and expenses incurred in the performance of the association's obligations under the declaration (A.R.S. § 33-1802).

Provisions

Development & Subdivision Standards

1. Prohibits a municipality from requiring as part of a development or subdivision:
   a. a shared feature or amenity that would require a homeowners' association, a condominium association or any other association to maintain or operate the feature or amenity, except if required by federal law; or
   b. a gate, wall, fence or other perimeter enclosure or any type of controlled access. (Sec. 1)
2. Asserts the municipal prohibitions relating to shared features do not supersede applicable building codes, fire codes or public health and safety regulations. (Sec. 1)
3. Defines *condominium association* and *homeowners' association*. (Sec. 1)

Planning & Home Design Standards

4. Prevents a municipality from interfering with a home buyer's right to choose the features, amenities, structure, floor plan, interior and exterior design of a home. (Sec. 2)

☐ Prop 105 (45 votes)	☐ Prop 108 (40 votes)	☐ Emergency (40 votes)	☐ Fiscal Note

ATTACHMENT 12

5. Outlines specified home design features that a municipality cannot require through the adoption of any code, ordinance or regulation for a single-family home or an accessory dwelling unit. (Sec. 2)
6. Prohibits a municipality from denying, delaying or conditionally approving a building permit or other entitlement based on prohibited home design requirements. (Sec. 2)
7. Authorizes a municipality to require the preparation and submission of acceptable electric and water utility plans and specifications. (Sec. 2)

Applicability

8. Specifies the prohibited home design requirements do not supersede:
   a. applicable building codes or fire codes;
   b. public health and safety regulations;
   c. utility clearance requirements or utility easements;
   d. minimum parking requirements; and
   e. dark sky ordinances. (Sec. 2)
9. Outlines the types of properties that are exempted from the prohibited home design requirements. (Sec. 2)

Miscellaneous

10. Defines pertinent terms. (Sec. 2)
11. Makes technical changes. (Sec. 1)

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-seventh Legislature - Second Regular Session

ROLL CALL VOTE

COMMITTEE ON Commerce BILL NO. SB 1431

DATE March 17, 2026 MOTION: DP

	PASS	AYE	NAY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Aguilar		✓			
Blackman		✓			
Carter N		✓			
Cavero					✓
Crews			✓		
Diaz		✓			
Hendrix		✓			
Volk	–			✓	
Wilmeth		✓			
Way, Vice-Chairman		✓			
Weninger, Chairman				✓	
		7	1	2	1

Angela Hall
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

APPROVED:
Jeff Weninger
JEFF WENINGER, Chairman
MICHAEL WAY, Vice-Chairman

ATTACHMENT 13