

This summary is intended to be a quick reference guide for voters as they consider questions that will be on the November 2022 ballot. It briefly summarizes each proposition as well as the main themes in the arguments submitted to the [Arizona Secretary of State](#)¹ for and against each proposition.

For information on candidates that will appear on the ballot, refer to the [Citizens Clean Elections Commission's Voter Education Guide](#).²

You might be aware that legislative redistricting occurred this year. To familiarize yourself with your new legislative and congressional districts, refer to the [Independent Redistricting Commission's Legislative Map](#).³

Proposition 128

What it does:

The Arizona Voter Protection Act was passed by Arizona voters in 1998 as a constitutional amendment that prohibits the Arizona State Legislature from amending or repealing any language in voter-approved ballot initiatives and referendums. (Unless the change to voter-approved language furthers the initial intent of the measure and is approved by a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote in each chamber of the Legislature.)

Proposition 128 would allow the legislature to amend language, divert funds from, or supersede an initiative or referendum if it's found to contain illegal or unconstitutional language by the Arizona or United States Supreme Court. Under this proposed language, a change to voter-approved language would not have to further the original intent and could pass with just a simple majority in the Legislature.

What the proponents say:

- Initiatives that are found to have unconstitutional or illegal provisions cannot be easily fixed by the Legislature, usually resulting in the entire measure being thrown out by the courts. Under Prop. 128, the Legislature would have the opportunity to correct illegal or unconstitutional portions of the law.
- Prop. 128 could save taxpayers money in legal fees due to litigation that occurs from being bound to illegal or unconstitutional language.
- Under current law, in the event that an initiative is invalid due to illegal or unconstitutional language, the supporters' only option is to begin the initiative process again at the next election, which is costly and lengthy.

¹ "2022 Ballot Measure Language and Arguments," Arizona Secretary of State, 2022, <https://azsos.gov/2022-ballot-measure-information>.

² "Voter Education Guide," Citizens Clean Elections Commission, 2022, <https://www.azcleelections.gov/arizona-elections/voter-education-guide>.

³ "AZ IRC Official Legislative Map," Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, 2022, <https://irc-az.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/lookup/index.html?appid=424810a4667049388ef6df4f0c73098b>.

What the opponents say:

- The way the proposition is written, the Legislature wouldn't only have authority to change the illegal or unconstitutional language, but rather the entire measure if any portion of it is illegal or unconstitutional.
- There is no reason to remove the safeguard of furthering the original purpose and requiring a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote, as this has successfully been the standard since 1998.
- The authority to divert funds would allow the legislature to use revenue from a voter-approved tax and put it towards an entirely unrelated program.
- The intent of the citizen initiative process was to give more power to the voters. However, Prop 128 would give more power to the Supreme Court and Legislature.

Groups in support:

- Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Center for Arizona Policy Action
- Commercial Real Estate Development Association, Arizona Chapter (NAIOP)

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Education Association
- Chispa Arizona
- Common Defense
- League of Women Voters of Arizona
- Living United for Change in Arizona (LUCHA)
- Maiz Tucson
- Mi Familia Vota
- Mormon Women for Ethical Government (Arizona, Mesa, and Oro Valley chapters)
- One Arizona
- Our Voice Our Vote Arizona
- Rural Arizona Engagement

Proposition 129

What it does:

Proposition 129 requires that every initiative measure on the ballot only addresses one subject, and that one subject must be accurately represented in the title of the initiative.

By way of background, any bills considered in the Legislature must also comply with the "single-subject rule." The legislature passed a budget in 2021 that included unrelated policy changes within the budget bills. A group of plaintiffs challenged these bills in court, and successfully had the unrelated policy portions thrown out of the budget bills. As such, there is a renewed focus on the "single-subject rule."

What the proponents say:

- Prop. 129 would make initiatives align with other legislation in terms of the “single-subject rule”
- It would simplify decisions for voters, so that they wouldn’t have to contemplate a proposal where they agreed with some portions of the language but not all of it.
- Protects voters from making unintended changes to Arizona’s laws or Constitution.

What the opponents say:

- This proposition would make it harder for citizens to enact laws at the ballot and easier for language to be challenged and thrown out by the courts.
- Solutions to complex problems require multi-pronged solutions, and citizens would have to pass multiple piecemeal measures to abide by the single subject rule and still craft effective policy. The time and cost associated with the initiative process makes this a significant burden.
- It’s difficult to predict what future courts will allow under the proposed single subject rule. Initiatives passed in recent years, like the legalization of marijuana, might not have withstood this level of scrutiny.

Groups in support:

- Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Center for Arizona Policy Action
- Commercial Real Estate Development Association, Arizona Chapter (NAIOP)

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Education Association
- Chispa Arizona
- Common Defense
- League of Women Voters of Arizona
- Living United for Change in Arizona (LUCHA)
- Mi Familia Vota
- One Arizona
- Our Voice Our Vote Arizona
- Rural Arizona Engagement

Proposition 130

What it does:

Currently, the Arizona Constitution has language about property tax exemptions scattered throughout several sections. Prop. 130 repeals these sections and consolidates them into one for ease of consideration. Much of the proposed language is just a combination of the existing

sections, except the exemption for disabled veterans. This exemption was blocked by the court because its original language only applied to disabled veterans who lived in Arizona prior to entering the armed services.

It exempts the following property from taxation:

- Federal, state, county, and municipal property
- Public debts, as evidenced by bonds
- User-owned household goods used for noncommercial purposes
- Resale products that are the inventory of a retailer or wholesaler

It grants the Legislature the authority to exempt the following property from taxation and allows the Legislature to determine the qualifications for and amount of each exemption:

- The property of a non-profit educational, charitable, or religious organization
- Personal property used in trade or business for agricultural purposes
- Cemeteries
- The property of a widow or widower who is a resident of Arizona
- The property of an Arizona resident who is at least 18 years old and has a medically certified total and complete disability
- The property of an honorably discharged U.S. veteran who has a service or nonservice-connected disability and is a resident of Arizona

According to analysis by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the estimated fiscal impact of Prop. 130 is a \$2.1 million loss to the state general fund beginning in fiscal year 2024.

What the proponents say:

- Prop 130 helps support disabled veterans who have given so much to this country by offering small relief on property taxes.
- Granting the Legislature authority to determine the details of these exemptions gives the flexibility to react when circumstances change.
- This proposition is mostly a technical fix to make previously approved exemptions able to be implemented.

What the opponents say:

- No arguments were submitted against Proposition 130.

Groups in support:

- Arizona Association of Counties
- Arizona Tax Research Association
- Former Yuma County Assessor, 1992-2020
- Maricopa County Assessor
- Pima County Assessor
- The American Legion
- Vanguard Veteran

Proposition 131

What it does:

This proposition requires candidates running for Governor to choose a Lieutenant Governor as a running mate on a joint ticket. It also changes the line of succession, so that if a Governor leaves office during their term due to death, permanent disability, resignation, or removal of office, the Lieutenant Governor would become the Governor, rather than the Secretary of State as is under current law. If approved, gubernatorial candidates would have to choose a Lieutenant Governor beginning in the 2026 election.

What the proponents say:

- Arizona is one of only five states that doesn't have a Lieutenant Governor position. The Secretary of State is elected to handle administrative election duties and state records, not serve as the state's chief executive.
- Prop. 131 would prevent an official from a different political party stepping in to serve as Governor, which could vastly change the direction of the state during the term.
- It is a nonpartisan issue that will lead to good governance, and passed the legislature with bipartisan support.

What the opponents say:

- No arguments were submitted against Proposition 131.

Groups in support:

- J.D. Mesnard, State Senator
- League of Women Voters of Arizona
- Republican Party of Arizona
- Sean Bowie, State Senator

Proposition 132

What it does:

Proposition 132 would require that any initiative or referendum that creates a new tax passes with sixty percent of the votes to become law.

What the proponents say:

- In the Legislature, a 2/3 vote is required to pass a measure that raises taxes. Prop. 132 would bring parity to the initiative process.
- Under this measure, voters could know that taxes will only increase if an initiative has broad support and funds programs valued by a strong majority of voters.

- Enacting new taxes may have unintended negative economic consequences; this would create a more cautious approach.

What the opponents say:

- Prop. 132 would weaken the citizen initiative process and limit citizens' ability to pass laws.
- Many meaningful past initiatives would not have been enacted if a 60% approval was required, including the Smoke Free Arizona Act, the proposition that created First Things First, and the original Prop. 301 sales tax that supports education.

Groups in support:

- Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Arizona Tax Research Association
- Center for Arizona Policy Action
- Commercial Real Estate Development Association, Arizona Chapter (NAIOP)
- Doug Ducey, Governor, State of Arizona
- Foundation for Government Accountability
- The Goldwater Institute
- Tim Dunn, State Representative

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Center for Economic Progress
- Arizona Department of Health Services, Former Director (2009-2015)
- Arizona Education Association
- Arizona Education Association Retired
- Chandler Education Association
- Children's Action Alliance
- Chispa Arizona
- Common Defense
- Friends of ASBA
- Glendale Union Education Association
- League of Women Voters of Arizona
- Living United for Change (LUCHA)
- Mesa Education Association
- Mi Familia Vota
- Mormon Women for Ethical Government (Arizona, Mesa, and Oro Valley chapters)
- One Arizona
- Our Voice Our Vote
- Paradise Valley Fund for Children in Public Education
- Peoria Education Association
- Rural Arizona Engagement
- Tucson Education Association

- Washington Elementary School District Governing Board
- Washington District Education Association

Proposition 209

(“Predatory Debt Collection Protection Act”)

What it does:

- Reduces the maximum interest rate on medical debt from 10% annually to 3% annually.
- Increases exemptions from debt collection as follows:
 - Reduces, from 25% to 10%, the maximum amount of disposable income that can be garnished for debt collection.
 - In the case of extreme economic hardship, allows the court to garnish between 5-10% of disposable income, decreased from 15-25%.
 - Protects a primary residence valued up to \$400,000, rather than \$150,000, from being garnished for debt collection. Requires this amount to increase annually with inflation.
 - Protects household furniture, furnishings, goods, and electronics up to \$15,000 in total value, rather than \$6,000, from being garnished for debt collection. Requires this amount to increase annually with inflation.
 - Protects one motor vehicle valued up to \$15,000, rather than \$6,000, from being garnished for debt collection. Requires this amount to increase annually with inflation.
 - If the debtor or their dependent has a physical disability, the protected amount is increased to \$25,000.
 - Protects up to \$5,000, rather than \$300, in cash in a single account from garnishment. Requires this amount to increase annually with inflation.
 - Sets the maximum amount of disposable earnings in a workweek eligible for garnishment to 10%, rather than 25%, or the amount that exceeds 60 times the minimum hourly wage, rather than 30 times the minimum wage.

What the proponents say:

- Arizona law already protects some family homes and cars from seizure for debt, but the protected values aren't in line with today's cost of living. Increasing the value and having it adjusted with inflation will ensure consumer protections as intended in the original legislation.
- Medical debt is the largest source of bankruptcy in the country, and lowering the maximum interest rate on this type of debt would help Arizonans pay off costly medical bills.
- Small business owners with no health insurance or very high deductibles would be able to spend less money per year on medical debt and keep their businesses open, protecting the strength of Arizona's economy.

What the opponents say:

- Predatory medical providers could simply charge higher prices for services to make up for the lost revenue from lower interest rates.
- Medical providers may be less inclined to offer financing for patients who can't afford to pay cash for a procedure, because they will make less money due to the lower interest rates.
- Because Prop. 209 would increase protected assets for all types of debt, lenders might be less inclined to offer financing and extend credit to low-income applicants because they would have less recourse to collect money from debtors.
- Businesses might be less willing to relocate to Arizona if they can't collect on debts.

Groups in support:

- Ann Kirkpatrick, Congresswoman
- Arizona Building and Construction Trades Council
- Arizona Democratic Party
- Arizona Education Association
- Arizona Faith Network
- Arizona Jews for Justice
- Arizona Public Health Association
- Arizona Student's Association
- Be a Hero Fund
- Case Action
- Center for Economic Integrity
- Democrats of Casa Grande
- Healthcare Rising Arizona
- Living United for Change in Arizona (LUCHA)
- Neighbors Forward AZ
- Our Voice, Our Vote
- People's Defense Initiative
- Phoenix Workers Alliance
- Rural Arizona Action
- Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation
- Southwest Conference United Church of Christ
- Southwest Fair Housing Council
- Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters
- Unite Here! Local 11
- Wildfire
- Workers United
- YWCA Southern Arizona

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Bankers Association
- Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry

- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Forgiveco PBC Inc.
- Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
- Kino Financial Co. LLC
- The Goldwater Institute
- Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce

Proposition 211

(“Voters’ Right to Know Act”)

What it does:

Current law requires disclosure of cash donations over \$50 from individuals to political campaigns. This disclosure doesn’t apply to independent expenditures, which are third-party groups that are formed to support or oppose a candidate or issue without directly coordinating with the official campaign. They are run by groups categorized as “social welfare organizations” by the IRS. Independent expenditures often send mail or take out advertisements in local media for their given issue. They are required to register with the Secretary of State and disclose how they spend their money, but not the identity of donors.

Proposition 211 would require disclosure of the identity of the individual donors contributing over \$5,000 towards an aggregate total (including in-kind contributions) of \$50,000 or more for a statewide race or \$25,000 or more for any other race.

What the proponents say:

- Currently, unlimited money can be spent on anonymous political ads from secret donors across the country. Any Arizona citizen’s campaign donation is public record, but people spending millions to influence our elections don’t have the same disclosure requirements. Prop 211 would help bring transparency to our elections.
- Without knowing who is paying for political advertisements, it’s difficult for the average voter to decide if their message is credible or not, and there is no accountability for misleading or inaccurate advertisements.
- Voters should have the right to know which special interest groups are trying to influence election outcomes by purchasing advertisements.

What the opponents say:

- The First Amendment protects the right to free speech, and Prop. 211 might hinder the ability to support causes or candidates someone believes in without fear of harassment or intimidation.
- If passed, Prop. 211 might scare people out of donating to campaigns.

Groups in support:

- Former Director, Arizona Department of Health Services (2009-2015)
- League of Women Voters of Arizona
- Patrice Horstman, Coconino County Board of Supervisors
- Sandra Kennedy, Arizona Corporation Commission

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Center for Arizona Policy Action

Proposition 308

What it does:

Proposition 308 would allow any student who graduated from and spent at least two years attending an Arizona public or private high school or homeschool equivalent to be eligible to receive in-state tuition at state universities and community colleges, regardless of immigration status. It also allows these students to be eligible for state financial aid at state universities and community colleges, regardless of immigration status.

What the proponents say:

- Prop 308 will benefit Dreamers who came to Arizona as children, have grown up in our community, and will continue to contribute to the economy of Arizona with a chance at in-state tuition rates.
- Would create fairness for all Arizona high school graduates.
- Arizona Legislative Council analysis found that implementing Prop. 308 would have no impact to the state's general fund.

What the opponents say:

- U.S. citizens from other states do not get the benefit of in-state tuition in Arizona, so citizens of other countries should not either.
- This proposition is an attempt to solve the high cost of college tuition, but could lead to an increase in taxes statewide.

Groups in support:

- Aliento Education Fund
- ALL in Education
- American Business Immigration Coalition
- Arizona Center for Economic Progress
- Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Arizona Education Association

- Chicanos Por La Causa
- Children's Action Alliance
- Creighton University School of Medicine, Phoenix
- Education Forward Arizona
- Former Director, Arizona Department of Health Services (2009-2015)
- Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
- Helios Education Foundation
- Jesuits West CORE AZ
- Kate Gallego, Mayor of Phoenix
- La Machine Consulting
- Local First Arizona
- Mormon Women for Ethical Government (Arizona, Mesa, and Oro Valley Chapters)
- Paul Penzone, Maricopa County Sheriff
- PHX East Valley Partnership
- Raquel Teran, State Senator
- Regina Romero, Mayor of Tucson
- Scholarships A-Z
- Stand for Children Arizona
- Southern Arizona Leadership Council
- Valley Interfaith Project

Groups in opposition:

- Republican Party of Arizona
- RIDERSUSA

Proposition 309

What it does:

Proposition 309 would make various changes to the requirements to vote in Arizona. Voters using an early mail-in ballot would be required to write their birth date, a government-issued identification number, and signature on their ballot. Voters casting a ballot in person would be required to show photo identification to do so. Arizona Department of Transportation would be required to issue government identification cards at no cost to individuals without a driver's license who request one for voting purposes.

What the proponents say:

- The security measures in Prop. 309 will help restore voter confidence in the integrity of our elections.
- A majority of voters in Arizona choose to vote by mail, which requires a signature to validate the ballot. This subjective measure can lead to legal votes being rejected and illegal votes counted.

What the opponents say:

- If passed, a voter who mailed in their ballot but failed to include the affidavit, their vote would not be counted.
- Requiring personal identifying information on a ballot could be problematic if another election is audited by volunteers.
- Prop. 309 would make it harder to vote in person. Currently, voters must show a photo ID or two other proofs of identity, such as a tax bill or recorder's certificate. If this measure is approved, a voter will need a valid, unexpired photo ID to receive a ballot. No other proof of identity will be allowed. These changes could turn potential voters away at the polls, including elderly voters with expired licenses and younger voters without a driver's license or non-operating license.

Groups in support:

- Aimee Yentes, Vice Mayor of Gilbert
- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Arizona Women of Action
- Ben Toma, State Representative
- Center for Arizona Policy Action
- Center for Election Integrity
- Election Transparency Initiative
- Foundation for Government Accountability
- Heritage Action for America
- Jacqueline Parker, State Representative
- J.D. Mesnard, State Senator
- Joseph Chaplik, State Representative
- Liberty Caucus of Arizona
- Nancy Barto, State Senator
- Shawwna Bolick, State Representative
- The Goldwater Institute
- Warren Petersen, State Senator

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Education Association
- Chispa Arizona
- Defend Arizona Rights
- League of Women Voters of Arizona
- Living United for Change in Arizona (LUCHA)
- Mi Familia Vota
- One Arizona
- Our Voice Our Vote Arizona
- Prescott Indivisible

Proposition 310

What it does:

Proposition 310 creates a statewide sales tax of 0.1% beginning in January 2023 through December 2042 to support fire districts in Arizona. A fire district is a special taxing district located outside of a city or town that is funded through secondary property tax levies at the county level.

What the proponents say:

- This sales tax would help lower response times to emergency calls in rural areas.
- Fire districts are mainly along our major highways and interstates and are the first line of defense against wildfires. Prop 310 would ensure these districts have the staffing, equipment, and training necessary to protect our state.
- 85 to 95% of the revenue in fire districts comes from property taxes. The costs to operate are outpacing the 5% limited increase of property taxes allowed by law. This sales tax would be a much-needed new revenue stream.

What the opponents say:

- Prop 310 would force Arizona taxpayers who already pay for city fire and EMS services to subsidize 1.5 million other Arizona taxpayers in the state.
- The governing boards of fire districts do not have enough oversight and accountability to be given more revenue.
- A statewide sales tax isn't the answer to a local problem, and more targeted solutions would be better suited.

Groups in support:

- Arizona Fire Chiefs Association
- Arizona Fire District Association
- Buckeye Valley Fire District
- Central Arizona Fire and Medical Authority
- Clay Springs Pinedale Fire Department
- Cochise County Fire Association
- Cooper Canyon Fire and Medical District
- Daisy Mountain Firefighters
- Former Director, Arizona Department of Health Services (2009-2015)
- Gila County Fire Chief's Association
- Hellsgate Fire District
- Highlands Fire District
- Lela Alston, State Senator
- Mount Lemmon Fire District
- Northeastern Arizona Fire Chief's Association
- Paul Boyer, State Senator

- Pima County Fire Chiefs' Association
- Pinetop Fire District
- Professional Fire Fighters of Arizona
- Superstition Fire and Medical District
- Sun City Fire District
- Tusayan Fire District
- United Flagstaff Firefighters
- Verde Valley Fire District
- Vernon Fire District

Groups in opposition:

- Arizona Free Enterprise Club
- Republican Party of Arizona