



VOTING GUIDE TO ARIZONA BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

General Election November 8, 2022

A PUBLICATION OF

GOODMAN • SCHWARTZ
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

VOTING GUIDE TO ARIZONA BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

This voting guide is intended to educate interested voters about the ballot propositions on the November 2022 General Election ballot in Arizona.

Nothing in this document should be construed as an endorsement or opposition to any particular ballot proposition.

Rather, diligent care was taken to objectively describe each ballot proposition and to provide the typical arguments used by proponents and opponents, respectively.

In the unlikely event there is a discrepancy between the actual ballot proposition and the information contained herein, the actual ballot language shall take precedence.

IMPORTANT DATES

Voter Registration Closes

OCTOBER 11TH

Vote by Mail Begins

OCTOBER 12TH

Return Vote by Mail Ballot

NOVEMBER 1ST

General Election

NOVEMBER 8TH

About This Guide

Under the Arizona Constitution, the Arizona Legislature and residents have the right to place propositions on the General Election ballot to make changes to either the Arizona Constitution or Arizona Revised Statutes.

A referendum is a ballot proposition that has been placed on the ballot by the Arizona Legislature. Unlike other legislation, a referendum does not go to the Governor for approval or veto. Rather, if a majority of the Arizona House of Representatives and Arizona State Senate pass the legislation, the measure is automatically placed on the ballot.

An initiative gives residents the same right as the Arizona Legislature to place an issue on the ballot, provided that the residents collect enough valid signatures from registered voters to qualify. In Arizona, the number of signatures needed to place a measure on the ballot is based on the total number of votes cast for the Governor in the preceding election.

For the 2022 election cycle, initiative measures and constitutional amendments require 237,645 and 356,467 valid signatures, respectively.

For added historical perspective, during the 2018 election cycle, initiative measures and constitutional amendments required 150,642 and 225,963 valid signatures, respectively.

The Arizona Secretary of State, in coordination with the County Recorders in each of Arizona's 15 counties, determines whether an initiative qualifies for the ballot.

How Ballot Propositions Are Numbered

Arizona state law requires that ballot measures be numbered according to four criteria:

- **100 series (Prop. 1XX)** represents constitutional amendments, whether initiated by the people or referred to by the Arizona Legislature.
- **200 series (Prop. 2XX)** represents initiatives pursued by the people to create new state laws or amend existing state statute.
- **300 series (Prop. 3XX)** represents a referral to the ballot by the Arizona Legislature to create new laws or amend existing state statute.
- **400 series (Prop. 4XX)** represents local ballot measures.

DISCLAIMER: The arguments contained in this document, for both the proponents and opponents alike, are the opinions of those that submitted statements to the Secretary of State for publication in the official publicity pamphlet of the 2022 General Election cycle. The views listed in this ballot proposition guide do not necessarily reflect the views of Goodman Schwartz Public Affairs.



PROPOSITION 128

Voter Protection Act; Court Determinations

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 128 would amend the Arizona Constitution to provide that the Legislature may amend or supersede an initiative or referendum measure if any part of the measure is found by the United States Supreme Court or the Arizona Supreme Court to contain illegal or unconstitutional language. The legislative action could occur by a majority vote of each house of the Legislature and would not be required to further the purpose of the measure.

The Arizona Constitution currently provides that if an initiative or referendum measure is approved by the voters, the following requirements (often referred to as “voter protection” or “Proposition 105” from 1998) apply:

1. The Legislature is prohibited from repealing the law.
2. The Legislature may amend or supersede the law (including diverting or repurposing monies in funds created by the law) only if the legislative action furthers the purpose of the law and is approved by at least three-fourths of the members of each house of the Legislature.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 128

The current Voter Protection Act does not provide meaningful tools for the Arizona Legislature to address or otherwise resolve constitutional flaws in voter-approved ballot measures.

Prop. 128 allows the Arizona Legislature to make limited corrections to voter-approved ballot measures necessary to address unconstitutional provisions, as determined by the Courts.

Prop. 128 will improve the citizen initiative process by creating a mechanism in which the Arizona Legislature can narrowly amend voter-approved initiatives for a limited purpose and avoid the current process of bringing an issue back to the ballot to correct the problem that the legislative process could otherwise solve in a timelier and more cost-effective manner.

Opponents of Proposition 128

The Voter Protection Act, approved by voters in 1998, prohibits the Arizona Legislature from amending, appropriating funds from, or superseding initiatives passed by the voters unless such actions “furthers the purpose” of the measure. Any such changes require a three-fourths vote of the Arizona Legislature.

Prop. 128 provides the Arizona Legislature with an unprecedented opportunity to, once again, ignore the will of voter-approved ballot measures by establishing a mechanism in which such enacted ballot measures could be changed by a simple majority of state legislators.

Prop. 128 establishes a mechanism in which the Arizona Legislature will have the authority to appropriate, or otherwise divert, funds created by a voter-approved ballot measure to repurpose such funds for whatever purpose they wish, thereby ignoring the voters’ will as to how such funding is to be spent.

PROPOSITION 129

Initiatives; Single Subject; Title

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 129 would amend the Arizona Constitution to expressly require that:

1. Each initiative measure must embrace only one subject and matters properly connected to that subject.
2. The subject of the initiative measure must be expressed in the title of the measure.
3. Any portion of an initiative measure that is not contained in the title is void.

The Arizona Constitution currently requires that every act of the Legislature must embrace only one subject and matters properly connected to that subject. If a subject is not contained in the title of a legislative act, the portion not contained in the title is void.

The Arizona Supreme Court has previously interpreted the Arizona Constitution to provide that measures submitted for voter approval under the power of the initiative are not required to contain only one subject and that the constitutional requirement for legislative titles does not apply to initiative measures.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council.]

Proponents of Proposition 129

Under the current ballot proposition process, statutory initiatives that are placed on the ballot are allowed to contain numerous provisions, none of which are legally required to be related, nor

be reflected in the initiative's title, thus forcing voters to make a choice to support or oppose an initiative in its entirety even when they may favor some parts but have serious concerns with others.

Moreover, a 2017 Arizona Supreme Court decision determined that while legislation introduced at the Arizona Legislature is required to be limited to the same subject and transparently identified by the title of the bill, the Court ruled that those standards do not apply to ballot initiatives.

Given the important role that the initiative process continues to play in Arizona policymaking, ballot measures should be required to follow the same standards as legislation, as they both are functionally amending state statute.

Opponents of Proposition 129

Prop. 129 will further limit the ability of residents to enact laws that address issues and problems that the Arizona Legislature has declined to address.

Given the readily availability of the Courts to be used as a tool in opposing ballot propositions, Prop. 129 opens the door to legal challenges regarding what qualifies as a single subject, forcing parties pursuing a policy change at the ballot to propose multiple, piecemeal initiatives to provide effective solutions at a significant added expense resulting from multiple measures.

Over the last several years there has been a wide spectrum of enacted legislation intended to make it more difficult for citizen initiatives to be successful in qualifying for the ballot, including, but not limited to, changes to how petitions are circulated, increased limitations on petition circulators, and requiring courts to apply a strict compliance standard on signature verification and other technical aspects of the petition process, among others. Prop. 129 represents additional hurdles to the ballot initiative process.



PROPOSITION 130

Constitutional Property Tax Exemptions

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 130 would amend the Arizona Constitution to consolidate and clarify the constitutional provisions that prescribe exemptions from property tax. Proposition 130 would also allow the Legislature to prescribe the qualifications for and limits on some of these exemptions.

Under the Arizona Constitution, all property in this state is subject to property tax unless it is exempt under the laws of the United States or the Arizona Constitution. Currently, the Arizona Constitution provides for thirteen different exemptions from property tax in four sections of the Constitution. Proposition 130 would consolidate all but one of these exemptions in one constitutional section and reorganize them based on whether they are self-executing or whether they need further legislative action to implement. The one exemption that would be eliminated would be for the property of persons who served in the United States military or navy during World War I or earlier wars.

For the current exemptions for widows, widowers, persons with disabilities and veterans with service or non-service disabilities, the Arizona Constitution prescribes the maximum amount of the exemptions and qualifications for the exemptions based on the taxpayer's household income and the assessed value of the property. The Arizona Constitution allows the Legislature to adjust the maximum amount of the exemptions for agricultural and business

personal property for inflation. It also authorizes the Legislature to establish by law exemptions for the property of cemeteries and of educational, charitable and religious organizations.

Under Proposition 130, the Constitution would no longer prescribe the initial values for the exemption qualifications and limits for the exemptions that require legislative action. The Legislature would determine the qualifications for and the amount of these exemptions. In the 2022 legislative session, the Legislature passed a bill that would set the exemption limits and qualification amounts at the amounts currently prescribed in the Arizona Constitution as adjusted for inflation to 2022. That bill does not go into effect unless Proposition 130 is approved by the voters.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 130

Prop. 130 corrects a defect in the residency requirements in Arizona's Constitution, which caused a federal court to prohibit county assessors from accepting veterans' property tax exemptions.

The Arizona Constitution provides disabled veterans with property tax relief if the veteran was an Arizona resident at the time of entering the armed services. Prop. 130 reestablishes the disabled veterans property tax exemption to all disabled veterans that qualify as an Arizona resident, regardless of when they entered the armed services.

Without the enactment of Prop 130, county assessors will continue to follow the federal court ruling in having to decline the property tax relief being requested by disabled American veterans residing in Arizona.

Opponents of Proposition 130

No arguments were filed in opposition to Prop. 130.

PROPOSITION 131

Lieutenant Governor; Joint Ticket

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 131 would amend the Arizona Constitution to create the office of Lieutenant Governor within the Executive Department. Beginning with the 2026 election, at least sixty days before the general election, each nominee for Governor would name a Lieutenant Governor to run on a ticket as a joint candidate with the Governor at the general election.

Proposition 131 would amend the Arizona Constitution to provide that the Lieutenant Governor succeeds to the office of Governor in the event the Governor dies, resigns, is removed from office or is permanently unable to carry out the duties of the Governor and serves until a successor is elected. It would also require the Governor to appoint a person to serve as Lieutenant Governor in the event the Lieutenant Governor dies, resigns, is removed from office or is permanently unable to carry out the duties of the Lieutenant Governor. The appointment is subject to approval by a majority vote of each house of the Legislature.

Proposition 131 would also amend the Arizona Constitution to provide that the Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Attorney General and Superintendent of Public Instruction may succeed to the office of Governor regardless of whether they were elected to their offices. Currently, the Secretary of State, only if elected, succeeds to the office of Governor, followed in order by the Attorney

General, State Treasurer and Superintendent of Public Instruction, only if elected.

In the 2022 legislative session, the Legislature passed a bill that requires the Governor to appoint the Lieutenant Governor to serve as the Governor's Chief of Staff or the Director of the Arizona Department of Administration or to fill any position for which the Governor is authorized by law to make an appointment. This bill does not go into effect unless Proposition 131 is approved by the voters.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 131

Prior to the current Ducey Administration, no Governor has completed a full eight years in office in more than three decades, as a result of resignation, death or impeachment. Arizona is one of only five states without a Lieutenant Governor, which, on two separate occasions, has caused the line of succession to change the political party of the Governor's office, once in each direction.

Prop. 131 strengthens the executive branch of state government, as it is intended to integrate its administration by centralizing authority and responsibility in the Governor's office by avoiding mid-term changes in political party, continuity problems or policy reversals with the creation of an Office of Lieutenant Governor with duties separate from that of the Secretary of State.

Prop. 131 establishes a clear line of succession and ensures that the elected political party of power from the previous election cycle continues until the next appropriate general election, which is identical to the model of the federal government.

Opponents of Proposition 131

No arguments were filed in opposition to Prop. 131.



PROPOSITION 132

Initiatives; Supermajority Vote; Requirement

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 132 would amend the Arizona Constitution to provide that an initiative measure, a referendum measure or a proposed constitutional amendment to approve a tax becomes law only if approved by 60% of the votes cast.

The Arizona Constitution currently provides that any initiative, referendum or constitutional amendment becomes law if approved by a majority of the votes cast.

The Constitution also currently provides that if an initiative or referendum measure is approved by the voters, the following requirements (often referred to as “voter protection” or “Proposition 105” from 1998) apply:

1. The Legislature is prohibited from repealing the law.
2. The Legislature may amend or supersede the law (including diverting or repurposing monies in funds created by the law) only if the legislative action furthers the purpose of the law and is approved by at least three-fourths of the members of each house of the Legislature.

Additionally, the Constitution currently requires that if the Legislature attempts to enact a law that results in a net increase in state revenue through the imposition of a new tax, an increase in tax rates or the elimination of a tax exemption, the law becomes effective only on the affirmative vote

of two-thirds of each house of the Legislature.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 132

The Arizona Legislature has a constitutionally imposed supermajority (two-thirds) vote requirement on any increase in state revenue, including both taxes and fees. It is appropriate that voter-approved ballot propositions meet the same standard.

Prop. 132 reduces the risk of voter-approved ballot initiatives from raising taxes by requiring that ballot propositions that raise taxes be passed by at least 60% of the vote, as opposed to a simple majority vote, which is particularly important in election cycles with low voter turnout.

Prop. 132 limits the ability of out-of-state special interests to raise taxes on Arizona residents in pursuit of their own policy agendas.

Opponents of Proposition 132

Often a majority of voters, but less than 60 percent, have approved important ballot measures that raised revenue; and, had this proposition been in place, these would have failed.

Examples of previously voter-approved funding programs include measures relating to education funding, Smoke Free Arizona, state trust land funding for schools and First Things First (early childhood education). Despite their popularity among a majority of the voting electorate, these voter-approved initiatives would likely not have achieved the proposed 60% threshold.

Arizona residents know that investing in their priorities is crucial to the state’s future, and Prop. 132 has the potential to prevent them from doing so.

PROPOSITION 209

Predatory Debt Collection Protection Act

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 209 would increase the following debt collection exemptions (and would also provide that the exemption amounts would be increased annually based on the change in the United States Department of Labor consumer price index):

1. The homestead exemption on a debtor's home would increase from \$250,000 to \$400,000.
2. The exemption on a debtor's household furniture, furnishings, goods and appliances would increase from \$6,000 to \$15,000.
3. The exemption on the debtor's equity in one motor vehicle would increase from \$6,000 to \$15,000, or if the debtor has a physical disability, from \$12,000 to \$25,000.
4. The exemption on a debtor's single account in one financial institution would increase from \$300 to \$5,000.

Proposition 209 would decrease the portion of a debtor's weekly disposable earnings that is subject to debt collection actions (other than support payments) to the lesser of 10% of the disposable earnings or sixty times the highest applicable federal, state or local minimum wage. Currently the amount of disposable earnings that is subject to debt collection actions (other than support payments) is the lesser of 25% of the disposable earnings or thirty times the federal minimum wage. Additionally, in a garnishment action, if the court

determines by clear and convincing evidence that the 10% calculation on disposable earnings would cause extreme economic hardship to the debtor or the debtor's family, the court may reduce the amount to 5% of disposable income. Currently, the court may reduce the amount to 15% of disposable income.

Proposition 209 would lower the maximum interest rate on medical debt (an obligation arising directly from the receipt of medical products or devices or the receipt of health care services provided at or by licensed health care institutions, the offices or clinics of most licensed health care providers or ambulance services) from the current rate of 10% per year (unless a different rate is contracted for in writing) to the lesser of 3% or an annual rate equal to the weekly average one-year constant maturity treasury yield, as published by the Federal Reserve Board, for the calendar week preceding the date when the consumer was first provided with a bill. The new maximum rate would also apply to judgments on medical debt.

Proposition 209 would only apply to contracts and agreements entered into on or after the effective date of this measure. The proponents' political committee would have standing to defend the measure in any legal challenge.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 209

Too many Arizona families are suffering because of emergency medical debt and predatory debt collection practices. No Arizona family should lose their home or car, or struggle to put food on the table because of a medical emergency or accident or be trapped into an unending cycle of debt by unfair interest rates on medical care. Prop. 209



prevents creditors from garnishing more than 10% of an individual's wages.

Prop. 209 shields Arizonans' assets and belongings from creditors by protecting up to \$400,000 on the value of a home, \$5,000 held in a bank account, \$15,000 in household goods, and vehicles worth up to \$15,000 (or up to \$25,000 for disabled drivers).

The measure adjusts all protected amounts for inflation, so consumer protections keep up with the cost of living.

Opponents of Proposition 209

This California Union-funded ballot initiative is being framed by its proponents as a way to stop predatory debt collection on medical debts and protect people from predatory debt collection practices. However, the ballot initiative is written to reduce lenders' ability to collect on all debts, not just medical debts.

Effectively, Prop. 209 makes anyone who earns less than \$50,000 per year untouchable by creditors. As a result, perhaps unintentionally, Prop. 209 will restrict the ability of Arizona low-income earners to access credit and loans, as lenders will have little to no ability to recoup money from individuals that default on their respective debts. The unfortunate result will likely make it more difficult for working families to get car loans, home loans or other items secured by debt.

When lenders are unable to collect outstanding debts, the net result is to pass their losses onto their other customers, which likely means higher interest rates and increased collateral requirements for low-income earners.

PROPOSITION 211

Voters' Right To Know

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 211 would amend the campaign finance laws to require a "covered person" (a person or entity that spends \$50,000 or more on campaign media for a statewide candidate during a two-year election cycle or that spends \$25,000 or more on campaign media for any other type of candidate during a two-year election cycle) to disclose the identity of anyone who is the original source of donations of more than \$5,000 to the covered person for campaign media. Proposition 211 also requires any donor that contributes more than \$5,000 to a covered person during an election cycle for campaign media spending to identify to the covered person the identity of any person who contributed more than \$2,500 in original money that is being transferred to that donor, as well as any intermediaries that previously transferred the funds being given to the covered person.

Proposition 211 also provides for the following:

1. Requires that the covered person's disclosure report to the Secretary of State include the following:
 - (a) The identity of the person who owns or controls the money being contributed.
 - (b) The identity of any entity established, financed, maintained or controlled by the person who owns or controls the money being contributed and that maintains its own transfer records.
 - (c) The name, address and position of the

person who is the custodian of the transfer records.

- (d) The name, address and position of the person who controls how the money is spent.
 - (e) The total amount of money donated or promised to be donated to the covered person for use or transfer for campaign media spending on the date the covered person makes the report.
 - (f) The identity of each donor of original monies who contributed, directly or indirectly, more than \$5,000 of money or in-kind contributions for campaign media spending during the election cycle to the covered person, and the date and amount of each donor's contribution.
2. Requires each covered person to file a supplemental report within three days each time the covered person spends money or accepts in-kind contributions totaling an additional \$25,000 for campaign media spending during an election cycle on statewide campaigns or an additional \$15,000 during an election cycle for any other type of campaigns.
 3. During the twenty days before an election, requires a political action committee or political party that is a covered person that spends reportable money or receives reportable in-kind contributions to file disclosure reports within three days.
 4. Exempts the following from the new disclosure requirements in this measure:
 - (a) Persons or entities that spend only their own personal money or business income.
 - (b) Candidate committees.
 - (c) Political action committees or political parties if they receive not more than \$20,000 from any one person or entity during an election cycle.

(d) Donors who contribute \$5,000 or less directly or indirectly to a covered person.

- (e) Original sources of contributions that are otherwise protected by law or if the Clean Elections Commission determines that there is a reasonable probability that disclosure of that original source will subject that original source or the original source's family to serious risk of physical harm.
5. Requires disclosures to be electronically filed with the Secretary of State under penalty of perjury and with other officials as provided by law, with the disclosures to be publicly posted.
 6. Prohibits a person from attempting to, assisting in or structuring any solicitation, contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement or other transaction to evade campaign finance reporting requirements.
 7. Designates the Clean Elections Commission as the primary agency to implement and enforce this act. Authorizes the Commission to adopt and enforce rules, issue civil subpoenas, initiate enforcement actions, conduct fact-finding hearings and investigations, impose civil penalties for noncompliance and seek legal and equitable relief in court.
 8. Requires the Clean Elections Commission to establish requirements for a covered person to name in the campaign media at least the top three donors who made the three largest contributions during the election cycle, except for certain electronic communications when not technologically possible.
 9. Requires the Clean Elections Commission's civil penalties to be at least as much as the amount of the improper contribution, but not more than three times that amount, and requires penalties to be deposited in the Clean Elections Fund to pay for implementing and enforcing campaign finance laws or for other



Commission-approved purposes.

10. Allows any voter to file a complaint with the Clean Elections Commission to enforce this act and provides for an investigation and a hearing. If the Commission dismisses or takes no enforcement action on the complaint, the voter may file a civil action to compel the Commission to take action on the complaint.
11. Provides for an additional 1% surcharge on civil and criminal penalties, to be deposited in the Clean Elections Fund. Allows suspension of the surcharge for one to three years if the Commission determines it can perform its duties under this act without the surcharge.
12. Allows the Legislature and counties, cities and towns to enact more stringent disclosure provisions.
13. Allows the Clean Elections Commission and the proponents of this act to have standing to intervene in or defend any challenge to this act.
14. Gives the Clean Elections Commission authority to select its own attorneys regarding this act.
15. States that the rights established by this act shall be construed broadly.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 211

Arizona law allows unlimited financial contributions to be spent on anonymous political campaign advertising. Currently, the names and motivations of those actually paying for these campaigns remains hidden. Yet, when an Arizona resident contributes \$50 or more to an individual candidate, they must disclose their name, the amount contributed, home address and employer. This information becomes publicly available and searchable on the internet. But people spending millions on political campaigns to

influence our vote do not have to disclose anything.

Current law allows organizations to hide behind a cloak of secrecy and engage in false, negative, and misleading political campaign advertising. Without accountability for what is said, those running misleading or inaccurate political campaign advertisements face no consequences. Voters should have the right to know which special interests are trying to influence election outcomes.

On this topic, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia observed: "For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, campaigns anonymously and even exercises the direct democracy of initiative and referendum hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism."

Opponents of Proposition 211

One of the bedrock principles our country was founded upon was the right to free speech, which includes being able to support causes and issues they believe in without fear of harassment and intimidation. Just last year the U.S. Supreme affirmed this right, declaring that any effort to require non-profit organizations to publish the names of their donors and supporters is unconstitutional.

The hypocritical nature of this initiative is apparent in the fact that it demands disclosure from private groups while exempting persons or entities that spend only their own personal money or business income. Opponents cite big tech, corporate media, and labor unions as examples of exempt entities, asserting the irony that all those exempted favor one party over the other.

The measure is also likely unconstitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court has already ruled that campaign contributions are free speech.

PROPOSITION 308

Tuition; Postsecondary Education

☐ Yes ☐ No

In 2006, the voters approved a measure that prohibits a person who is not a United States citizen or legal resident and who does not otherwise possess lawful immigration status in this country from being classified as an in-state student or county resident for community college or state university tuition purposes. The 2006 measure also provided that a state university or community college student who is not a United States citizen and who does not otherwise possess lawful immigration status in this country is not entitled to waivers, grants or any other financial assistance paid in whole or part with state monies. If approved by the voters, Proposition 308 would repeal these provisions and the related reporting requirements.

Proposition 308 would specifically provide that a student (other than a nonimmigrant alien temporarily admitted to the United States for a specific purpose as described in federal law) who attended high school or the homeschool equivalent while physically present in this state for at least two years, and who graduated from high school or the homeschool equivalent while physically present in this state or obtained a high school equivalency diploma in this state, is eligible for in-state tuition at any state university or community college, even if the student does not possess lawful immigration status.

Finally, current law requires an agency or political subdivision of this state that administers any

“state or local public benefit” to require any person who applies for the state or local public benefit to submit documentation demonstrating lawful presence in the United States. Proposition 308 would amend the law to exclude postsecondary education from the definition of “state or local public benefit”.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 308

Prop. 308 gives Arizona voters the opportunity to allow all students, including Arizona Dreamers, to receive in-state college tuition when a student attended a school in Arizona for a minimum of two years and graduated from a public school, private school, or homeschool in Arizona.

K-12 education has long been a place where students become comfortable and successful as they prepare to participate in our local economy and workforce. But for approximately 2,000 Dreamers each year, high school graduation marks the expiration of those opportunities, as Arizona law requires “dreamer” children to pay over twice as much tuition to attend college as their high school classmates.

To label a segment of our youth as undeserving of that encouragement because of a decision their parents made to come to this country seems counterproductive.

Opponents of Proposition 308

In 2006, Prop. 300 was a voter-approved ballot proposition that was enacted with 71.44% of the vote prohibiting non-citizens and people without legal residential status from receiving in-state college tuition, education financial aid, or state-subsidized childcare assistance.



The 1996 federal Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) prohibits state colleges and universities from providing in-state tuition rates to illegal aliens “on the basis of residence within the state” unless the same in-state rates are offered to all citizens of the United States.

If approved by the voters, Prop. 308 will lead to an increase in taxes statewide and would use our tax dollars to pay for illegal aliens and non-citizens to attend university at an equal or lower cost compared to American students.

PROPOSITION 309

Arizonans For Voter ID Act

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 309 would require that a voter who appears in person at a polling place, voting center, on-site early voting location or other in-person voting location must present a photo ID to receive a ballot. Specifically, a voter may present either:

1. A valid and unexpired photo ID containing the name and address of the elector that reasonably appear to be the same as the name and address in the voting precinct register, including an Arizona driver’s license, an Arizona nonoperating identification license, a tribal enrollment card or other form of tribal identification that is issued by a tribal government or a United States government issued identification. (Proposition 309 would remove the current provision in law that allows a voter to present any state or local government issued

photo ID to receive a ballot.)

2. A valid and unexpired photo ID containing the name and address of the elector that does not reasonably appear to be the same as the address in the precinct register, or identification that is a valid United States military identification card or valid United States passport but does not contain an address, if the identification is accompanied by an additional document that contains the name and address of the voter that reasonably appears to be the same as the name and address in the precinct register. Acceptable additional documents include a utility bill, a bank or credit union statement dated within ninety days of the election, a valid Arizona vehicle registration, an Arizona vehicle insurance card, an Indian census card, tribal enrollment card or other form of tribal identification, a property tax statement, a recorder’s certificate, a voter registration card, a valid United States federal, state or local government issued identification or any mailing that is labeled as “official election material”. (Proposition 309 would remove the current provision in law that allows a voter who does not present a photo ID to instead present two of the additional documents listed above to receive a ballot.)

Proposition 309 would also require that the affidavit that accompanies an early ballot and return envelope must:

1. Be capable of being concealed when delivered or mailed to the officer in charge of the election.
2. Require the voter to provide the voter’s “early voter identification” number, date of birth and signature. The “early voter identification” number is defined as the voter’s Arizona driver license number or nonoperating identification number, the last four digits of the voter’s social security number or the voter’s unique identifying

number from the statewide voter registration database. (Current law does not require the voter to provide an early voter identification number or date of birth on the affidavit.)

On receipt of the envelope containing an early ballot and the completed ballot affidavit, the officer in charge of the election must review the signature and confirm the elector's early voter identification number and date of birth. If the officer cannot confirm the signature, early voter identification number or date of birth, the officer must make reasonable efforts to contact the voter, advise the voter of the inconsistency and allow the voter to correct the information or resolve the inconsistency no later than the fifth business day after a primary, general or special election that includes a federal office or the third business day after any other election. If the officer can confirm the signature, early voter identification number and date of birth, the officer must process the ballot for counting.

The Department of Transportation may not charge a fee for issuing a nonoperating license if the person attests on the application that the person applied for the nonoperating identification license to comply with any legal requirements related to registering to vote or voting.

Any qualified elector would have standing to:

1. File a special action to require a legally authorized official to enforce this act if the official refused or threatened to refuse to enforce this act.
2. File a declaratory judgment action to determine the proper construction of this act. This act would apply no later than the 2024 primary election.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 309

Prop. 309 would require photo ID for in-person voting and provide a photo ID to eligible voters who don't have one so that no obstacle stands in the way of their constitutional right. For those who choose to vote by mail, Prop 309 would apply an objective standard of written identification that people conveniently and routinely use in everyday life and require the identification be appropriately concealed until verified by election officials.

These reasonable policies established in Prop 309 will help restore voter confidence in the integrity of our elections by ensuring all Arizona residents, no matter when, where, or how we vote, present ID when casting a ballot so that all legal votes – but only legal votes – are accepted and counted.

Arizona has no Voter ID requirement for mail-in voting, leaving our elections vulnerable to fraud, errors and abuse. Voter ID is intended to be an effective reform to increase voter confidence in the integrity of our elections.

Voters who vote at the polls already expect to show voter ID, and this standard should be applied to every voter, no matter what mechanism they use to vote.

Opponents of Proposition 309

Prop. 309 will require already vetted and registered voters to submit an additional affidavit of identity with their mail-in ballot for their vote to count. Voters that do not mail the completed affidavit back with their mail-in ballot will have their votes negated without a chance to cure their ballot.

Using mail ballots in Arizona is a well-established, secure and popular voting method. If Prop. 309 requires election officials to verify this information before counting the vote. This process opens the possibility of linking ballots to individuals and how they vote, violating their privacy.



Arizona already has strict voter ID laws and proof of citizenship requirements to register to vote, with felony consequences for falsifying forms. This measure intends to reduce further citizens' access to the fundamental right to vote.

PROPOSITION 310

Fire Districts; Funding TPT Increment

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 310 would increase the state transaction privilege tax (commonly known as the sales tax) and the state use tax from the current state tax rate of 5.6% to 5.7% for twenty years, beginning on January 1, 2023, to provide funding for fire districts. The new revenue generated by the tax increase would be deposited into the fire district safety fund and would be used first to pay the costs to implement and administer the fund; the remaining revenue would be distributed each month to fire districts to carry out the districts' statutory duties.

The initial monthly distribution would be to fire districts in proportion to each fire district's most recent equalized property valuation, except that a single fire district could not receive more than 3% of the total amount of monies to be distributed to all fire districts. If monies remain after the initial distribution, there would be a second distribution to fire districts that received less than 3% of the total amount of monies to be distributed in proportion to those fire districts' most recent

equalized property valuation, except that a single fire district's initial and second distribution may not be more than 3% of the total amount of monies to be distributed to fire districts. Any monies that remain after the initial and second distributions would be distributed equally among all the fire districts.

Proposition 310 would allow any Arizona resident to have standing to enforce or defend the measure or to appeal an adverse judgment against the measure if the attorney general fails to do so.

Fire districts are special taxing districts formed under existing state law to provide fire, rescue and other emergency services to specific areas outside of the boundaries of a city or town. Fire districts are different from fire departments, which provide services within the boundaries of a city or town.

The revenue distributed from the fire district safety fund would be in addition to the revenues a fire district may currently receive from secondary property taxes levied on the taxable property within the fire district.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 310

Arizona's 144 fire districts have a shortage of manpower, equipment, and resources, causing longer response times. Prop 310 will create a temporary one-tenth-of-a-penny increase in the state's sales tax to ensure fire district firefighters and paramedics have the staffing, equipment and training necessary to protect public safety state-wide – just one cent on a \$10 purchase.

Fire districts serve all Arizona residents and visitors either by directly protecting residences or indirectly when driving within the State along all

the major interstates. Emergency services operate in the business of minutes and seconds but when resources are inadequate that means individuals are at risk, as fire district response times can take up to 30 minutes or longer, compared to urban departments that arrive within five or six minutes.

Fire districts are struggling; 85 to 95% of their revenue is based on property taxes. The costs are outpacing the 5% limited increase (of property taxes) allowed by law.

Opponents of Proposition 310

Fire districts are funded by local property taxes and report to five-member governing boards. These governing boards are generally comprised

of retired employees and other members who rubber stamp whatever level of annual spending the Fire District chief presents to them. These governing boards have full, unchallenged taxing authority. The taxpayers have no say as to how much they are taxed or how their taxes are spent.

Taxpayers have no say in the election of fire district board members outside their jurisdiction despite paying taxes to them.

Prop. 310 discourages fiscal responsibility in fire districts and incentivizes each one to increase spending as such districts are being given access to a statewide pool of taxpayer funds with no requirements for reform or accountability.

DISCLAIMER: *The arguments contained in this document, for both the proponents and opponents alike, are the opinions of those that submitted statements to the Secretary of State for publication in the official publicity pamphlet of the 2022 General Election cycle. The views listed in this ballot proposition guide do not necessarily reflect the views of Goodman Schwartz Public Affairs.*

HOW TO REGISTER TO VOTE

Click [here](#) to register to vote online.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

For full text of the propositions, the analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council and a complete listing of all submitted arguments for and against a proposition, please click [here](#) to review the publicity pamphlet.

