



2026 Arizona General Election Ballot Measures

Prepared September 23, 2026

This November, Arizona voters will decide 8 statewide ballot measures. Below is a summary of what each measure does, in plain language, drawn directly from the Arizona Secretary of State's official publicity pamphlet, along with a distillation of the public "for" and "against" arguments that pamphlet includes. This is offered with no advocacy for or against any measure. Measures are listed in the order they appear on the ballot. Whether you're a business owner, a colleague, or just a fellow Arizonan trying to figure out what's on your ballot, I hope it's useful.

Proposition 141 — Prohibit Mileage-Based Taxes and Tracking

Constitutional amendment barring state and local governments from imposing a tax or fee based on vehicle miles traveled, or enacting rules to monitor or limit vehicle miles traveled without the driver's voluntary consent, with exceptions for interstate commercial vehicle agreements and government-owned vehicles.

For: Supporters argue that banning government tracking or taxing of vehicle miles protects driver privacy and shields Arizonans, particularly rural residents and truckers, from a new per-mile cost of driving.

Against: Opponents argue that permanently ruling out a mileage-based fee removes a potential funding option just as gas-tax revenue declines from more fuel-efficient and electric vehicles, at a time when they say Arizona already faces a large road-funding gap.

Proposition 142 — Prohibit State Use of Race or Ethnicity in Public Education, Employment, and Contracting

Constitutional amendment prohibiting the state from compelling or spending public funds on promoting, giving preferential treatment to, or discriminating against any individual on the basis of race or ethnicity in public education, employment, and contracting; prohibits requiring individuals to endorse race-based preference concepts or complete related training as a condition of employment, admission, or contracting; and extends public-funding restrictions to programs organized around gender identity and sexual orientation as well as race and ethnicity. Includes specified exceptions.

For: Supporters argue it closes what they see as a loophole allowing federally mandated race-based preference programs to override merit-based treatment, and say it would ensure hiring, admissions, and contracting decisions are based on qualifications rather than race.

Against: Opponents argue Arizona's constitution already prohibits discrimination, making this redundant and vaguely worded, and warn it could be used to restrict diversity and inclusion programs, certain classroom discussions of race and history, and outreach aimed at underserved students.

Proposition 144 — Voter ID and Election Administration Amendment

Constitutional amendment requiring proof of identity, limited to government-issued ID, to vote in every election, including by mail; guaranteeing voters the option to have their ballot tabulated at their voting location; prohibiting foreign nationals from contributing to or spending on Arizona elections; establishing a new, more deferential standard for judicial review of election laws that could make such laws harder to challenge in court; and requiring the legislature to appropriate funds to implement these provisions, effective for elections beginning January 1, 2028.

For: Supporters argue it would permanently enshrine citizen-only voting, mandatory photo ID, a ban on foreign election spending, and an option for faster same-day tabulation, which they say would strengthen public trust in results.

Against: Opponents argue it would make mail and early voting, currently used by roughly 80% of Arizona voters, significantly harder by adding new ID requirements with no clear process for mail ballots, and say the burden would fall hardest on seniors, rural voters, students, and people with disabilities, to address fraud they contend is extremely rare.

Proposition 316 — Cap Municipal Grocery Tax at 2%

Statutory measure limiting city/town taxes on food and certain non-alcoholic beverages for home consumption: cities already taxing at or above 2% may not raise the rate further; cities below 2% may raise it only with voter approval and only up to 2%. No increase is permitted at all between June 30, 2025 and June 30, 2027.

For: Supporters argue it protects cities' current food-tax revenue while requiring voter approval for any future increase, which they describe as balancing affordability with city budget stability.

Against: Opponents argue it's a state overreach into local control that could significantly reduce small-town budgets, since in some towns the food tax funds more than 30% of revenue, and say that could force cuts to services or a shift toward higher property taxes.

Proposition 317 — Formally Designate Drug Cartels as Terrorist Organizations

Statutory measure directing the state to formally designate drug cartels as terrorist organizations, respond using available state enforcement tools, and clarifying that the designation does not support any asylum claim under federal law.

For: Supporters argue that formally designating cartels as terrorist organizations would direct the Arizona Department of Homeland Security to use its full legal authority against drug trafficking and cartel-related violence.

Against: Opponents argue the measure is largely symbolic with limited practical legal effect.

Proposition 318 — Require Sex-Based Designation of School Athletic Teams and Facilities

Statutory measure requiring all K-12 public and private schools, public and private universities, and athletic associations to designate athletic teams as male, female, or coed based on biological sex at birth, barring male athletes from female-designated teams, and restricting locker room, restroom, and shower access to the space designated for an individual's sex. Authorizes athletes to sue schools and athletic associations that violate the law.

For: Supporters argue that reserving girls' sports and related facilities for biological females protects fairness and safety, preventing athletes born male, who they say retain physical advantages, from displacing girls from rosters, scholarships, and podium finishes.

Against: Opponents argue the measure is an overly broad, one-size-fits-all mandate that could subject any girl to invasive scrutiny of her sex, expose schools to costly lawsuits, and impose sweeping statewide rules to address what they characterize as a very small number of cases, rather than leaving these decisions to schools and athletic associations.

Proposition 319 — Require Voter Approval for Photo Enforcement Cameras

Statutory measure prohibiting state agencies and local governments from using new photo enforcement (red-light/photo-radar) systems unless contracted by December 31, 2026, and requiring voter approval to continue operating existing systems, with removal required within 90 days if voters reject it, and mandatory revotes every 10 years.

For: Supporters argue photo radar and red-light cameras function as profit-driven surveillance that erodes driver privacy without adequate accountability, and say any community that wants to keep an existing system should have to win voter approval to do so.

Against: Opponents argue it goes too far by banning red-light cameras in addition to speed cameras, eliminating a tool that they cite data showing reduces serious intersection crashes and fatalities.

Proposition 320 — Require 60% Instructional Spending for Large School Districts

Statutory measure requiring school districts with at least 7,500 students, or that operate in a county with a population of at least 500,000, to spend at least 60% of operational spending on direct instructional expenses, terms to be defined by the Arizona Auditor General, with a required phase-in of 0.5 percentage points per year for noncompliant districts starting FY2027-28, and escalating reductions (25% to 100%) to a district's Classroom Site Fund allocation for continued noncompliance, subject to limited waivers from the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

For: Supporters argue too much school funding is diverted to administrative costs rather than classrooms and teacher pay, pointing to specific examples of districts spending heavily on travel, conferences, and executive compensation.

Against: Opponents argue the measure's narrow definition of "instructional spending," not yet finalized, excludes nurses, counselors, therapists, transportation, and other support staff, and say compliance could force districts to cut services they consider essential to learning.

Questions about how these measures may affect your business or organization?

Chad Heinrich, Managing Partner, Heinrich Public Affairs

Mobile: (602) 527-5463 | Email: ch@chadheinrich.com | Web: www.chadheinrich.com