



VOTING GUIDE TO ARIZONA BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

November 3, 2026
General Election

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 2026 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 that there is a discrepancy between the actual ballot proposition and the information contained herein, the actual ballot language shall take precedence.

Ballot Propositions

Under the Arizona Constitution, the Arizona Legislature and qualified Arizona voters have the right to place propositions on the General Election ballot to make changes to either the Arizona Constitution or Arizona Revised Statutes. There are three ways that a proposition can be brought to the ballot.

A referral is a ballot proposition that has been placed on the ballot by the Arizona Legislature. Unlike other legislation, a referral 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. All of the 2026 ballot measures were referred by the Legislature in the 2025 and 2026 legislative sessions.

An initiative gives Arizona voters the same right as the Arizona Legislature to place an issue on the ballot, provided that the enough valid signatures are collected 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. There are no initiatives on the 2026 ballot.

Lastly, a referendum is the method by which voters may seek to reject enacted legislation that has not yet gone into effect by gathering enough qualified signatures from registered voters to place the issue on the ballot. The referendum must file signatures to the Arizona Secretary of State within 90 days of the adjournment of the legislative session in which the law was passed. If enough qualified signatures are submitted, the enacted law will not go into effect, and the issue will be placed on the next general election ballot. There are no referendums on this ballot.

For the 2026 election cycle, initiative state statute and constitutional amendments required 255,949 and 383,923 valid signatures, respectively. For historical perspective, during the 2022 election cycle, initiative measures and constitutional amendments required 237,645 and 356,467 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.

IMPORTANT DATES

Voter registration closes on
OCTOBER 5TH
(At midnight).

Vote by Mail begins on
OCTOBER 7TH

Last Day to Mail Back Your Ballot is
OCTOBER 27TH
(Recommended days to mail back a ballot is 7-10 days before the election)

General Election is
NOVEMBER 3RD

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 2026 General Election cycle. The views listed in this ballot proposition guide do not necessarily reflect the views of Goodman Schwartz Public Affairs.

VOTER PROTECTION ACT

It is important to note that statewide ballot measures and referendums implementing statutory changes passed by the voters are unlikely to be able to be changed in the future because ballot measures and referendums in Arizona are protected under the Voter Protection Act (VPA). Enacted by voters in 1998, the VPA prohibits the Arizona Legislature from amending or repealing voter-approved ballot measures and referendums with very limited exceptions. Meaning, that if the Legislature seeks to make any changes to the policy enshrined by the voters, it requires three-fourths of the members of the Legislature, which can be a difficult threshold to meet, and only if the legislation “furthers the purpose” of the approved measure. Furthermore, any constitutional amendment that required updates would again have to go to the voters by means of a referral or citizen initiative.

PROPOSITION 141

Freedom to Move Act

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 141 would amend the Arizona Constitution to prohibit this state and any county, city, town, municipal corporation or other political subdivision of this state from:

1. Imposing at tax or fee based on the number of miles a person travels in a motor vehicle.
2. Monitoring or limiting the number of miles a person travels in a motor vehicle, unless the person voluntarily consents.

Proposition 141 would not apply to the following:

1. The miles traveled by a person in a motor vehicle if the motor vehicle is a commercial vehicle that operates in more than one state and an interstate agreement is established for reporting fuel taxes or registration fees.
2. The miles traveled by a person in a motor vehicle if the motor vehicle is owned and operated by this state or a county, city, town, municipal corporation or other political subdivision of this state.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 141

Prop. 141 would make Arizona the first state in the nation to constitutionally prohibit the government from invasive government tracking, taxing, or limiting vehicle miles traveled in order to collect revenue.

NOTE: Four states (Hawaii, Oregon, Utah and Virginia) have established permanent mileage-based programs and at least 17 states have received federal grants or are otherwise running pilot programs to research mileage tracking as gas tax revenues decline.

Prop. 141 protects Arizonans’ privacy, freedom of movement, and economic fairness by prohibiting the government from tracking, taxing, or limiting the number of miles you drive. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) systems require monitoring how far, and where you travel, creating an unnecessary risk of government surveillance. Unlike fuel taxes, which are collected efficiently at the point of sale, mileage-based taxes require ongoing reporting, oversight, and enforcement. Once that tracking infrastructure exists, it can be used to cap annual mileage or charge escalating rates after a mileage allowance

Prop. 141 would protect residents living in rural Arizona that have to drive long distances for basic services due to the rural nature of where they live. A mileage-based tax would unfairly burden those who cannot simply drive less.

PROPOSITION 141 Continued on Page 4

Opponents of Proposition 141

Prop. 141 would prohibit Arizona's ability to consider utilizing a mileage-based tax to generate additional revenue to fund Arizona's transportation infrastructure system. To give context, Arizona's transportation system improvements are funded primarily by a tax assessed per gallon of fuel purchased. Over time, revenues from this fuel tax have eroded due to inflation, fuel-efficient vehicles, and electric vehicles. Arizona's Long Range Transportation Plan identified \$231.4 billion is needed for transportation projects over the next 25 years, but only \$69.1 billion of forecasted revenue using the existing fuel tax, leaving a funding gap of \$162.3 billion. That means only 30% of needed transportation improvements can be funded.

To address this huge funding gap, we need more options—not fewer options—for generating the needed revenue to keep Arizona's transportation system in good shape. A tax/fee based on vehicle miles traveled is one potential funding mechanism that would more equitably assess vehicles for their proportional "wear-and-tear" on the transportation system.

At first glance, Prop. 141 may sound like it protects privacy and prevents new taxes. In reality, it would limit Arizona's ability to plan, modernize, and responsibly fund the transportation system we all rely on. This measure would lock Arizona into outdated constraints and make it harder to modernize how we fund critical infrastructure. Other states are responsibly studying these tools, and Arizona should be able to do the same.

*Intentionally
Left Blank*

PROPOSITION 142

Prohibition of Preferential Treatment and Discrimination

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 142 would amend the Arizona Constitution to provide that this state and cities, towns, counties, public universities, community colleges, school districts and any other political subdivisions:

1. Are prohibited from granting preferential treatment to or discriminating against individuals or groups based on race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in public employment, education or contracting, even if a part of a federal program.
2. Are prohibited from requiring applicants, employees, students or contractors to endorse or support giving preferential treatment to or discriminating against individuals based on race or ethnicity as a condition of admission, graduation, hiring, promotion, certification, contracting or other employment or scholarship opportunities. This proposition would:
 - (a) Prohibit requiring or soliciting a written or oral statement supporting certain race-based diversity, equity and inclusion concepts, theories or practices identified in the proposition.
 - (b) Prohibit requiring or soliciting individuals to confess race-based privilege or discuss the individuals' race or ethnicity or the views on or experience with the race or ethnicity of others.
 - (c) Prohibit giving preferable consideration to individuals based on expressed opinions if based on the race or ethnicity of those individuals.
 - (d) Prohibit requiring enrollment in, or completion of, any training or course that promotes the tenets outlined above.

PROPOSITION 142 Continued on Page 5

3. Are prohibited from spending public monies to operate or contract for any office or position at a public educational institution that is responsible for promoting preferential treatment toward or discrimination against individuals or groups based on race or ethnicity, including prohibiting the use of public monies to influence the composition of the faculty and student body or for trainings, programs, activities and policies designed or implemented with reference to race, ethnicity, intersectionality, gender identity or sexual orientation, except as otherwise provided in the proposition.
4. Are prohibited from implementing any disciplinary policy or practice that treats students or employees differently on the basis of race or ethnicity.

Proposition 142 would provide for specified exceptions to these prohibitions.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 142

Currently, Arizona's constitution permits race-based preferences whenever the federal government mandates them. Prop. 142 will eliminate that loophole that has allowed Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) programs and racial quotas to operate in our public institutions, discriminating against qualified candidates and undermining the principles of equal treatment.

Prop. 142 removes the concern that partisan political maneuvering in Washington can impose unfair racial preferences on Arizona. It guarantees that every Arizonan will be judged as an individual based on merit, not as a member of a racial category.

Opponents of Proposition 142

Prop. 142 is unnecessary as the existing provision in the Arizona Constitution in Article 2, Section 36(A) reads: "This state shall not grant preferential treatment to or discriminate against any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education or public contracting."

Prop. 142 goes far beyond those protections by restricting public schools, colleges, universities, and local governments from educational programs, training, outreach activities, and discussions related to race, ethnicity, diversity, inclusion, and equal opportunity. The measure contains expansive and ambiguous language that could discourage institutions from offering lawful programs focused on student success, community engagement, cultural understanding, mentoring or educational access.

PROPOSITION 144

Fast Elections Results Act

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 144 would amend the Arizona Constitution to:

1. Reaffirm that only United States citizens may register to vote and vote in Arizona elections.
2. Require voters to present valid government-issued proof of identity before casting a ballot in each election, as prescribed by law.
3. Require that voters be provided the option to have their ballots tabulated at their voting location on election day.
4. Provide that Arizona elections will be decided solely by the votes of eligible citizen voters.
5. Prohibit foreign nationals from contributing or expending money or anything of value to influence an Arizona election and any person from accepting such a contribution.
6. Allow the people and the legislature to enact laws governing elections, including early voting and mail voting, if the laws are rationally connected to a legitimate state interest, including timely and accurate election results, efficient election administration, election security and preservation of public confidence in election integrity.

PROPOSITION 144 Continued on Page 6

7. Require the legislature to appropriate any money necessary to implement this proposition.
8. Apply this proposition to all elections that take place on or after January 1, 2028.
9. Designate this proposition as the “Fast Accurate Secure Transparent Election Results Act” or the “Fast Election Results Act.”

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 144

Prop. 144 guarantees that only U.S. citizens may vote in Arizona elections. Every voter provides a government-issued ID, so election officials know each ballot is being cast by the person casting it.

Prop. 144 prohibits foreign individuals and corporations from spending to influence Arizona elections by eliminating existing Arizona law that allows foreign nationals to fund ballot measures in Arizona.

Prop. 144 will strengthen public confidence in elections and, simultaneously, improving the time necessary to have reliable results posted on election night, as opposed to the days or weeks it has taken in previous elections.

Opponents of Proposition 144

Prop. 144 will make voting by mail and early voting in general more difficult, which may serve to reduce voter turnout among selected populations. The measure does not address how voters who use vote by mail will provide their government issued ID. Furthermore, Arizonans must already provide proof of identification to register to vote. Election security matters, but not to the point of creating unreasonable barriers for eligible voters.

Prop. 144 disregards the fair and inclusive voting policies that currently exist to ensure that everyone who is eligible can register and vote. Arizona is fortunate to have popular and secure election processes, including strong participation in early voting, which is healthy for our democracy.

Prop. 144 amends the Arizona Constitution to impose new election requirements and establishes detailed

election procedures beyond the reach of ordinary legislative review and the ability to make the necessary changes to those policies in a timely fashion.

PROPOSITION 316

Municipal Transaction Privilege Tax on Food

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 316 would limit the ability of a city, town or other taxing jurisdiction to impose a transaction privilege, sales, use, franchise or other similar tax or fee on food and certain nonalcoholic beverages (ready-to-drink and in a closed container) that are intended for home consumption as follows:

1. For a city, town or other taxing jurisdiction that approved the imposition of such a tax or fee on or before January 1, 2025, any increase in the rate of the tax or fee must be approved by the voters and may not be more than two percent of the tax base. However, if the rate of the tax or fee imposed on or before January 1, 2025 is two percent or more of the tax base, the city, town or other taxing jurisdiction may not increase the rate. Additionally, increases in the rate of the tax or fee may not occur between June 30, 2025 and June 30, 2027.
2. For a city, town or other taxing jurisdiction that has not approved the imposition of such a tax or fee on or before January 1, 2025, the adoption of a new tax or fee and any subsequent increase to the rate of the tax or fee must be approved by the voters and may not be more than two percent of the tax base. Additionally, the adoption of a new tax or fee and any subsequent increase to the rate of the tax or fee may not occur between June 30, 2025 and June 30, 2027.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

PROPOSITION 316 Continued on Page 7

Proponents of Proposition 316

As many municipal governments rely on a “food tax” as an essential source of revenue to support critical services, Prop. 140 offers a balanced approach to managing the food tax going forward. While local communities would retain their existing resources, so municipal services are not negatively impacted, the passage of Prop. 140 would require voter approval from local voters if they ever want to raise the food tax, subject to a maximum cap.

Prop. 316 strikes the right balance by placing a moratorium on local governments creating new or increased food taxes until June 30, 2027, while allowing them to maintain current resources.

Opponents of Proposition 316

While Prop. 316 is being presented as tax relief, it has been designed to strip local control (“Home Rule”) by increasing the Arizona Legislature’s power over municipal governments.

Prop. 316 is a significant overreach by the Arizona Legislature restricting other government bodies from making their own decisions on behalf of their own respective constituents. Municipal governments are dependent on these types of taxes and by limiting a local government’s tax base, there can be significant repercussions on the ability to provide critical local services and support.

*Intentionally
Left Blank*

PROPOSITION 317

Declaring Drug Cartels Terrorist Organizations

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 317 would declare that drug cartels (associations of persons engaging in human smuggling, drug trafficking for profit or any act of terrorism) are terrorist organizations.

The proposition would:

1. Require the Arizona Department of Homeland Security to use all lawful means available within its authority to address threats posed by drug cartels.
2. Declare that this proposition does not support an alien’s claim for asylum under federal law.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 317

Prop. 317 categorizes drug cartels as a terrorist organization under Arizona law in order to enhance Arizona’s ability to utilize state resources in combatting against organizations that engage in criminal activities such as drug and human trafficking, among other acts that pose a threat to Arizona residents.

Opponents of Proposition 317

Governor Hobbs vetoed similar legislation in 2023, citing that the Arizona Department of Homeland Security is an administrative agency and not a law enforcement agency.

While Prop. 317 declares drug cartels as a “terrorist organization,” that is not a function of state governments, but rather a duty of the U.S. Department of State.

PROPOSITION 317 Continued on Page 8

PROPOSITION 318

Protect Girls' Sports in Arizona Act

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 318 would prohibit males from playing in female interscholastic and intramural sports based on the biological sex of the participating athletes as recorded at birth on the athletes' original birth certificates. This proposition would amend Arizona law to require public and private schools and athletic associations that sponsor an interscholastic or intramural athletic team or sport to expressly designate such teams and sports as "males", "men", "boys", "females", "women", "girls", "coeducational" or "mixed".

Proposition 318 would also:

1. Prohibit public schools, private schools, higher education institutions and athletic associations that provide and maintain private spaces, including restrooms, locker rooms and shower rooms, that are integral to athletic engagement from authorizing any individual to use a private space that is not designated for that individual's biological sex as recorded at birth on the individual's original birth certificate.
2. Expand who may sue and be sued for alleged violations of the law.
3. Provide that this proposition would not restrict any athlete's eligibility to participate on a team or in a sport that is aligned with the athlete's sex or that is designated as "coeducational" or "mixed".
4. Define the term "athlete" to include students and individuals who participate in any athletic team or sport.
5. Designate this proposition as the "Protect Girls' Sports in Arizona Act."

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 318

Prop. 318 upholds the original intent of Title IX by ensuring school and athletic teams are designated male, female, or coed based on biological sex by preserving fair competition, protecting female categories, ensuring privacy and safety in private spaces and closing Title IX loopholes in Arizona that have allowed unfair participation (an Arizona statute enacted in 2022 only applied to public schools, not clubs and associations).

Youth sports already use weight classes and age groups to ensure fair competition; separating athletes by sex does the same, allowing girls to compete against peers with comparable physical traits. Biological males and females have different body types, physical characteristics and abilities.

Prop. 318 is consistent with the goals of federal Title IX to ensure that girls have equal athletic opportunities on a level playing field.

Opponents of Proposition 318

Prop. 318 addresses a situation that affects very few students, yet it imposes statewide mandates on every public school, many private schools, colleges, universities, and athletic associations. It also creates privacy concerns by requiring schools to enforce policies based on a student's sex as recorded on an original birth certificate, potentially placing students, families, coaches, and school personnel in difficult and intrusive situations.

Prop. 318 discriminates against trans girls by limiting their accessibility to athletic participation in school athletics, which is a part of a high-quality, equitable public education.

Prop. 318 would require Arizona schools and athletic associations to adopt a blanket rule that does not consider age, level of competition, and sport, as it treats kindergarteners the same as college athletes and treats bowling the same as football.

PROPOSITION 319

Photo Enforcement Systems Prohibition

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 319 would prohibit a local authority or state agency from using a photo enforcement system for speeding or traffic control device violations unless the local authority or state agency has a contract in place before December 31, 2026, to operate a photo enforcement system. If the local authority has a photo enforcement system contract in place before December 31, 2026, Proposition 319 would require the local authority to seek approval from the voters at the next general election to continue to operate the photo enforcement system. If the voters fail to approve the continued operation of the existing photo enforcement system, Proposition 319 would require that the local authority cease operations of the photo enforcement system within 90 days after the election. If the voters approve the continued operation of the existing photo enforcement system, Proposition 319 would allow the continued operation of the photo enforcement system for a period of 10 years. At the conclusion of each 10-year period, the local authority must seek approval from the voters for the continued operation of the photo enforcement system for a period of an additional 10 years.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 319

Prop. 319 restores public accountability by requiring residents of local communities to approve the continued use of photo enforcement systems, as opposed to governments making unilateral decisions on devices that infringe on privacy.

Prop. 319 puts an end to the overreach of photo enforcement programs by prohibiting new photo enforcement

systems and requiring voter approval for existing ones by residents that live in a city or town that currently operates photo enforcement.

Opponents of Proposition 319

Prop. 319 is a threat to traffic safety, as photo enforcement systems are a proven technology to calm traffic, change driving behaviors and prevent serious injuries and death. Red-light cameras at intersections reduce fatal crashes by 21% (Insurance Institute for Highway Safety).

Prop. 319 permanently bans photo enforcement for any city without a program running by the end of the year. This strips local communities of their basic ability to respond to future traffic safety crises and protect road users.

PROPOSITION 320

Prioritize Teacher Pay Act

☐ Yes ☐ No

Proposition 320 would require each school district that has a student count of at least 7,500 or that operates a school in a county with a population of at least 500,000 persons to spend at least 60 percent of the school district's operational spending on direct instructional expenses. The proposition would require the auditor general to define "direct instructional expenses" and "operational spending" for the purposes of this requirement.

Beginning in fiscal year 2027-2028, Proposition 320 would require any school district that spends less than 60 percent of the school district's operational spending on direct instructional expenses to increase the portion of the school district's operational spending that is spent on direct instructional expenses each year by at least one-half of one percent per year until the school districts is in compliance.

PROPOSITION 320 Continued on Page 10

If a school district does not comply with these requirements, this proposition would require the Arizona Department of Education to reduce the school district's allocation from the classroom site fund for the budget year by 25 percent of the amount that would otherwise be allocated to the school district from the classroom site fund for each year the school district did not comply, up to a maximum of 100 percent of the amount if the school district did not comply for four or more years, unless a waiver is granted. Monies that are not distributed because of reductions would be allocated to compliant school districts for the following school year.

[Analysis provided by the Arizona Legislative Council].

Proponents of Proposition 320

Prop. 320 ensures that funding for our schools goes to the classroom, not to school administrators and other non-teaching positions. Over the last 20 years, the percentage of funds used for classroom instruction in public schools has dropped to just 52%.

Prop. 320 will provide teachers with more competitive

compensation, increased resources and essential supplies to be used in the classroom.

Opponents of Proposition 320

Prop. 320 imposes a rigid statewide spending formula requiring certain school districts to spend at least 60 percent of operational funds on direct instructional expenses. While classroom instruction is essential, quality education depends on much more than a single spending category. Arizona schools must also provide transportation, school safety, special education services, counseling, technology, family support services, building maintenance, and other programs that help students succeed. The needs of a large urban district differ from those of a rural district, and a one-size-fits-all mandate does not recognize those differences.

Prop. 320 will ultimately make a teacher's job more difficult, as districts will be required to reduce non-classroom student assistance and instruction support, such as speech or occupational therapy, career counseling and technology specialists that keep the computers, smart boards and sophisticated teaching equipment updated and available to both teachers and students.

HOW TO REGISTER TO VOTE

Register to vote on-line at:

www.servicearizona.com/webapp/evoter/

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 go to the Arizona Secretary of State's [website](#).