

## CENTER FOR ARIZONA POLICY

### GUIDE TO ARIZONA'S 2022 BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

*Prepared by Center for Arizona Policy (CAP) to assist voters, this guide summarizes each ballot proposition, including support and oppose arguments, as submitted to the Arizona Secretary of State. The full text of the propositions and arguments may be found at [www.azsos.gov](http://www.azsos.gov).*

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 128</b>	The constitutional amendment would allow the state Legislature to amend an initiative or referendum measure if the measure is found to contain illegal or unconstitutional language by the Arizona or United States Supreme Court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many ballot measures are drafted by out-of-state special interest groups that are unfamiliar with Arizona's constitution. This results in illegal or unconstitutional language passed by unsuspecting voters. Prop 128 allows the state Legislature to fix it or repeal the language, saving Arizonans money and time</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Center for Arizona Policy Action encourages a YES vote on Prop 128</b></p>	

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 129</b>	The constitutional amendment would limit an initiative measure to a single subject and require that subject to be expressed in the title of the initiative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently, ballot measures do not have to comply to the same rules that laws passed by the Legislature must follow. Prop 129 would require ballot initiatives follow the same rules</li> <li>Limiting initiatives to one subject avoids the problem of "log-rolling," which forces voters to vote in favor of a provision they don't want just to get the provision they do want</li> <li>Limiting ballot initiatives to a single subject provides voters with more accurate and understandable information on which to base their votes</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Center for Arizona Policy Action encourages a YES vote on Prop 129</b></p>	

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 130</b>	Would consolidate four sections of the Arizona Constitution regarding property taxes and allow exemptions for veterans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It restores the disabled veterans' property tax exemption, cleans up problematic language regarding widows and widowers, and it allows state legislators to make adjustments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No arguments filed against Prop 130</li> </ul>

**CENTER FOR ARIZONA POLICY**  
**GUIDE TO ARIZONA'S 2022 BALLOT PROPOSITIONS (CONTINUED)**

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
	with disabilities, widows, and widowers.		

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 131</b>	<p><b>Lieutenant Governor; joint ticket-</b>            Creates the office of Lieutenant Governor beginning with the 2026 election; requiring that a nominee for Governor name a nominee for Lieutenant Governor to be jointly elected; replacing the Secretary of State with the Lieutenant Governor as first in the line of succession to the office of Governor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creates a better continuity and predictability within our government, providing voters greater confidence when selecting an administration</li> <li>• Arizona is one of only a few states nationwide without a Lt. Governor position. In the vacancy or absence of the governor, the Lt. Governor would fill the role and responsibilities. A clear succession line is important and should stay within the elected party of power from the previous election cycle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No arguments filed against Prop 131</li> </ul>

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 132</b>	<p>The constitutional amendment would require initiatives or referendums that increase taxes to secure 60% of the votes cast to become law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arizona voters passed a measure requiring the state Legislature to secure a two-thirds vote to raise taxes. This initiative would also require a higher vote for a tax measure</li> <li>• Many tax measures are proposed by special interest groups designed to impose punitive tax increases on a minority population of taxpayers</li> <li>• Tax increases passed by citizens are locked-in to Arizona law. This could have unintended negative consequences later due to an unforeseen economic downturn or other developments. Because of the Voter Protection Act, lawmakers could not make adjustments to the increase</li> </ul>	

**CENTER FOR ARIZONA POLICY**  
**GUIDE TO ARIZONA'S 2022 BALLOT PROPOSITIONS (CONTINUED)**

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
		<b>Center for Arizona Policy Action encourages a YES vote on Prop 132</b>	

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 209</b>	Puts restrictions on medical debt collection practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prop 209 shields Arizonans' assets and belongings from creditors</li> <li>Outrageous interest rates on medical debt crush Arizonans. Prop 209 would limit the interest rate to 3%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan by outside California interest groups would lead to higher interest rates for all Arizonans as creditors pass their loss onto other customers. This would negatively impact lower income families that generally have a tougher time accessing credit</li> <li>It passes one family's debt onto another</li> </ul>

	Summary	Arguments For	Arguments Against
<b>Prop 211</b>	Requires certain political organizations to disclose the original donor of contributions to the organization, while allowing others to remain private.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prop 211 would silence the political speech of some, while allowing others to give and speak privately</li> <li>Under the guise of "transparency," Prop 211 effectively gives license to dox donors of political organizations that run contrary to the drafters' political views, while giving a pass to their own donors. Corporate media, Big Tech, and labor unions are exempt from the disclosure requirements</li> <li>The prop is very likely unconstitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court recently affirmed the right of citizens to support causes they believe in without the threat of harassment and intimidation</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Center for Arizona Policy Action encourages a NO vote on Prop 211</b></p>

**CENTER FOR ARIZONA POLICY**  
**GUIDE TO ARIZONA’S 2022 BALLOT PROPOSITIONS (CONTINUED)**

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Arguments For</b>	<b>Arguments Against</b>
<b>Prop 308</b>	Allows Arizona students, regardless of immigration status, to be eligible for in-state tuition rates and financial aid at state universities and community colleges. Eligible students will have to graduate from an Arizona private, homeschool, or public high school they attended for at least two years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Dreamers” were brought to Arizona by their parents and at no fault of their own. Arizona is the only home they know</li> <li>• Giving immigrants, regardless of their legal status, every opportunity to go to college and start a career will benefit all Arizonans as they contribute to the workforce and the community as a whole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prop 308 applies not only to “Dreamers” but to anyone now and in the future who has lived in Arizona for two years and graduates from high school.</li> <li>• Prop 308 uses taxpayer dollars to educate those here without legal status and could lead to increased taxes statewide</li> <li>• It would allow those here without legal status to benefit from in-state tuition, while requiring higher tuition from out-of-state students</li> </ul>

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Arguments For</b>	<b>Arguments Against</b>
<b>Prop 309</b>	Requires valid identification to vote in Arizona, both in person and by mail. Voters using mail-in ballots would be required to write their birthdate, government-issued ID number, and signature on a concealed early ballot affidavit. It also requires a valid photo ID to vote in-person and calls for the department of transportation to issue a free ID upon request.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prop 309 requires valid voter ID to vote in Arizona, no matter when, where, or how you vote</li> <li>• For mail-in ballots, a voter would include with their signature, a date of birth and either the last four digits of their social security number or their Arizona driver’s license number. The information would be concealed on the outer envelope</li> <li>• In-person voters would be required to show a valid photo ID</li> <li>• A free ID would be available for those who need one</li> <li>• Tightens regulations against ballot harvesting</li> </ul> <p style="background-color: yellow;"><b>Center for Arizona Policy Action encourages a YES vote on Prop 309</b></p>	

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Arguments For</b>	<b>Arguments Against</b>
<b>Prop 310</b>	Increases sales taxes by 0.1% to raise nearly \$200 million to fund a Fire District Safety Fund.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural areas of Arizona do not have access to the same level of emergency service as more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased tax does not only subsidize rural districts, but also subsidizes districts that do not</li> </ul>

**CENTER FOR ARIZONA POLICY**  
**GUIDE TO ARIZONA'S 2022 BALLOT PROPOSITIONS (CONTINUED)**

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Arguments For</b>	<b>Arguments Against</b>
		<p>populated areas. The Fire District Safety Fund would help supplement local taxes to help better serve rural areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rising costs of fuel, equipment, training needs and insurance have taken their toll on rural areas. The money would secure more funding for those things, creating a safer environment in rural areas</li> </ul>	<p>need it, which is not a good use of taxpayer money</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The initiative offers no transparency or accountability to districts for the use of taxpayer money</li> <li>• Governing boards of rural fire districts have taxing authority to increase taxes as needed</li> <li>• Taxpayers would have no say in fire district board elections outside their jurisdiction despite paying taxes to them</li> </ul>