2026 Boulder County Republicans Voter Guide

Note: Click the links for the exact ballot language and to a more in-depth discussion.

Candidates

Proposition NN – State Public K-12 Education Funding (TABOR cap increase)

NO: Raises the TABOR cap to grab more revenue for schools—another permanent carve-out instead of fixing spending priorities.

Amendment 81 – Law Enforcement Reporting to Federal Authorities

YES: Lets law enforcement tell DHS when violent offenders' immigration status is unclear—basic public-safety information sharing.

Amendment 82 – Right to Natural Gas

YES: Protects your right to use natural gas for heating and cooking against future bans dressed up as "climate policy."

Amendment 83 – Constitutional Right to Hunt and Fish

YES: Locks in hunting and fishing as constitutional rights—defense against future activist attempts to shut them down.

Amendment 84 – Mail Ballot Voter Identification

YES: Adds ID requirements to mail ballots—minimal friction for voters, concrete step for election integrity.

Amendment 85 – Plain Language Ballot Questions

NO: Whoever controls the "plain language" rules controls the framing — and framing controls outcomes. Hard pass.

Amendment 86 – Congressional Redistricting

NO: Complicates redistricting with new approval layers—invites more legal games and less stability in congressional maps.

Amendment 87 – Graduated Income Tax for Education/Health/Childcare

NO: Opens the door to a permanent progressive tax hike and effectively ends TABOR.

Proposition 132 – Penalties for Fentanyl Crimes

YES: Toughens fentanyl penalties and limits leniency when someone dies providing basic accountability for lethal drug dealing.

Proposition 133 – Penalties for Human Trafficking of a Minor

YES: Makes child sex trafficking a life without parole crime, exactly where the law should be.

Proposition 134 – Male and Female Participation in School Sports

YES: Keeps girls' sports for biological females providing clarity in rules and fairness in competition.

Proposition 135 – Prohibit Certain Surgeries for Minors

YES: Bars irreversible sex-change surgeries on minors. Wait until adulthood for life-altering medical decisions.

Proposition 136 – Income Tax Rate Cap (4.4%)

YES: Caps individual and corporate income tax rates and provides a hard ceiling on future tax hikes.

Proposition 137 – Sporting Goods Sales Tax Revenue for Conservation

NO: Another TABOR carve-out dressed up as conservation — one more slice taken out of refunds.

Ballot Issue 7A – Front Range Passenger Rail District Sales Tax & TABOR Carve-Out

NO: A quarter-percent sales tax plus a permanent TABOR exemption — a blank check for a rail plan they haven't even shown you yet.

City of **Boulder**

2J – Vacancy Excise Tax

NO: A $4,000–$7,000 punitive tax on how often you use your own home — plus another TABOR carve-out.

2K – Recreation & Safety Bond

NO: A $650 million mega-bond with a permanent TABOR carve-out — ask for fire stations and rec centers directly.

2- Charter Language Cleanup (letter pending)

YES: Simple housekeeping — fine to approve, but we'll watch to ensure "cleanup" doesn't quietly rewrite laws.

2L – Firefighter Collective Bargaining

NO: We support firefighters, but this creates a permanent union that will drive up costs and restrict future budgets.

2M – Debt-Limit Calculation Change

NO: A permanent expansion of Boulder's borrowing power — if they want more debt, they should ask openly.

City of Longmont Ballot Measures

Public Safety Tax Package (Sales + Property Tax + TABOR carve-out)

NO: A permanent tax hike wrapped in "public safety" language — too big, too broad, and tied to another TABOR carve-out.

Ranked-Choice Voting (RCV) Charter Amendment

NO: RCV adds complexity, confusion, and cost — and Longmont doesn't need a new voting system to fix a problem it doesn't have.

Council Term Realignment (contingent on RCV)

NO: A restructuring of council terms that only exists to support RCV — if RCV fails, this should too.

Candidates

A note to fellow Republicans. It is no secret that some of us would prefer a different slate of candidates. Unfortunately, not voting certain contests or voting third party has become a luxury we can no longer afford. Fighting our crooked nomination process is the real fight and for this election cycle, that fight is postponed until the beginning of next year. The fight before us now is scratching for every Republican vote we can get, wherever we can get them.

Governor: Victor Marx

US Senate: Mark Baisley

CD2: Kelley Anne Dennison

Attorney General: Michael Allen

Secretary of State: James Wiley

State Treasurer: Kevin Grantham

CU Regent (2): Marty Neilson

SD 15: Rob Woodward

SD 17: Pat Miller

HD 12: Ryan Rhatigan

HD 19: Dan Woog

HD 49: Michael Sherparek

Interesting observation on ballot initiatives: With the 2026 election season, a pattern has emerged. Most of these measures fall into one (or more) of four categories:

1. The Citizen Override

These are the initiatives that defy common sense — the ones you'd never expect to see on a ballot. They're almost always citizen-driven efforts meant to rein in an out-of-control legislature. Protecting girls from being forced to compete against boys, or preserving our right to cook and heat our homes with natural gas, shouldn't have been on anyone's Bingo card. Yet here we are.

2. The Carve-Out

These are the end-runs around TABOR. One initiative is blatant — it openly tries to dismantle TABOR entirely. But others hide behind softer language like "allowing the state to keep and spend a portion of revenue…" That phrase is the giveaway. It means the state wants to carve that revenue out of TABOR's refund formula. Do enough of these carve-outs and you neuter TABOR: less money gets counted, more money stays with the legislature, and taxpayers get smaller refunds. They'll say, "We're not raising taxes," but what they mean is, "We want to keep the excess revenue instead of returning it to you."

Every measure in this cycle that includes a TABOR carve-out was introduced by Democrats.

3. The Redirect

This one is almost funny. California perfected the tactic years ago: slap "for the children" on anything and watch people fall for it. But budgets are fungible. Money moves easily from point A to point B through myriad mechanisms. So, they manufacture a crisis, pass an initiative "for the children," and then quietly redirect the funds to whatever pet projects they actually wanted to bankroll.

4. Public Improvement Districts (PID) – The Double Tax

Public Improvement Districts are a relatively new tactic in Boulder County. The county knows it has a statutory responsibility to maintain neighborhood roads in unincorporated areas. It's one of the core functions counties have carried for more than a century. But road maintenance is expensive, and the county has other priorities it wants to fund.

So instead of using existing revenue, the county encourages neighborhoods to create a brand-new taxing district with a friendly name. The PID becomes a separate layer of government whose sole purpose is to tax residents for projects the county should already be handling, like basic road resurfacing.

The result is simple: Residents end up paying twice for the same roads. Once through regular county taxes, and again through a PID mill levy.

Generally, we oppose any measure that carves revenue out of TABOR, expands government power, or uses emotional framing to hide fiscal consequences. We support measures that strengthen election integrity, protect individual rights, and limit the ability of politicians to manipulate the system.

Legislative Initiatives

Prop NN

Shall state investment in K-12 public education increase two percent each year for the next ten years, with investments used to increase teacher pay, improve teacher retention, lower class sizes, and increase access to career and technical courses, without raising taxes but instead funded by raising the annual limit on state fiscal year spending only by the amount spent on public K-12 education as a voter-approved revenue change, and requiring an annual publicly released, independent audit to show how the new investments are spent?

No: Proposition NN is a legislative do-over of Proposition HH, which voters rejected overwhelmingly in 2023. The strategy hasn't changed — only the marketing. HH tried to keep TABOR surplus revenue by promising it would fund school lunches. NN tries the same thing, but with a new emotional hook: "students and teachers."

The legislature's message hasn't changed: "Let us keep part of your TABOR refund — trust us, it's for the children." California's political class learned this lesson long ago: If you frame a tax increase as "for the children," voters are far more likely to buy it. And make no mistake, eliminating a lawful refund is tantamount to a tax increase: it increases the state's net take and reduces the taxpayer's net return.

And here's the part they hope you don't think about: Colorado's budget is highly fungible**.** Even if NN earmarks retained revenue for education, freeing up money in one part of the budget allows lawmakers to shift dollars elsewhere. When lawmakers expand the state's fiscal capacity, they gain more room to fund whatever priorities they choose. This is why voters rejected HH. They saw through the emotional framing. NN is the same playbook with a different label, banking on the hope that voters won't notice the pattern.

The legislature knows that "for the children" is the safest political hook available. But once TABOR refunds are reduced and the cap is raised, the state's overall spending capacity increases. And when spending capacity increases, lawmakers can direct money toward any number of priorities — including programs that provide services to people who are not lawfully present in the country. They don't need to say that on the ballot. They just need to free up the dollars.

Proposition NN isn't about schoolchildren. It's about permanently expanding the state's fiscal reach by weakening TABOR. Vote No.

Constitutional Amendments

Amendment 81: Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements to Federal Authorities

Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution requiring law enforcement to notify the department of homeland security when a person is charged with either a violent crime or any crime if the person has a prior felony conviction if law enforcement cannot determine that the person is lawfully present in the United States?

Yes: Colorado has spent years avoiding the immigration status question, even when dealing with violent offenders and repeat felons. This amendment forces the issue. If law enforcement can't determine someone is here legally and that person is charged with a violent crime or already has a felony record, Homeland Security gets notified — period. We're done with the "don't ask, don't tell" approach that lets dangerous people disappear into the system. This is basic accountability.

Amendment 82: Right to Natural Gas

Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution creating new law granting the right for consumers to purchase natural gas for cooking or heating in homes or businesses and for distributors and utilities to sell natural gas to consumers?

Yes: We're living in a moment where any rational person would assume this amendment shouldn't even be necessary, but Colorado politics keeps proving otherwise. Radical lawmakers at both the state and federal level have openly pushed the idea of phasing out natural gas and the appliances it powers. This amendment stops that nonsense. Natural gas is a reliable, affordable resource, and it shouldn't be on any legislator's ideological hit list. Voting Yes protects our right to choose how we cook and heat our homes before someone decides to take that choice away.

Amendment 83: Constitutional Right to Hunt and Fish

Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution creating a constitutional right to hunt, fish, and harvest fish and wildlife by traditional methods, including all species of fish and wildlife managed by the state except non-game species, endangered species, or any species that is illegal to hunt under federal law, and, in connection therewith, establishing hunting and fishing as the preferred means of managing fish and wildlife populations; and preserving the right of the state to regulate hunting, fishing, and wildlife management if necessary for sound scientific wildlife conservation and management, public safety, or to preserve the future of hunting and fishing opportunities for all species?

YES: We shouldn't need a constitutional amendment to protect something as basic as hunting and fishing — but this is Colorado now. When the Legislature keeps undermining voters and pushing activist-driven restrictions, you end up having to lock normal rights into the constitution just to keep them safe. This amendment doesn't change how wildlife is managed; it simply prevents future political games from wiping out traditional hunting and fishing methods. You may shake your head at the fact that we have to do this at all, but until elections are fully trustworthy, this is one more layer of protection we need.

Maybe we should we have a similar initiative for our lousy roads, one its sponsors don't pull and one that legislators can't undermine in advance.

Amendment 84: Mail Ballot Voter Identification

Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution requiring a voter to sign and include the last four digits of their social security number or their Colorado driver's license or identification card number on the outside of their mail ballot for any federal or state election, and, in connection therewith, allowing the voter to correct missing or incorrect information, *including with alternative forms of identification; and prohibiting a county clerk and recorder from counting the mail ballot unless the problem is fixed?*

Yes: We've been asking for stronger identity checks on mail ballots, among a host of other things and this amendment finally gives us at least that. Colorado relies almost entirely on signature matching right now, and we all know that leaves too much room for doubt and manipulation. This measure adds a second layer of verification — the last four of our SSN or our driver's license/ID number — and requires us to fix any missing or incorrect information before the ballot can be counted. It's a straightforward way to tighten mail-ballot security without changing how we vote. If we want more confidence that the ballot being returned actually belongs to the voter it was issued to, this amendment moves Colorado in that direction.

Amendment 85: Plain Language Ballot Questions

Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution concerning ballot question language, and, in connection therewith, requiring all state and local ballot questions to be written in plain language and at no more than an 8th grade reading level and prohibiting a state statute from requiring language that conflicts with these requirements in ballot questions for citizen-initiated measures?

No: We don't need the government babysitting our reading level. This amendment pretends to be about "plain language," but you know exactly how this game works: once politicians control the wording rules, they control the framing. And when they control the framing, they control the outcome. You've already seen how ballot language gets twisted to sell tax hikes, TABOR carve-outs, and "for the children" schemes. This measure gives them one more lever to manipulate how citizen initiatives are presented to voters. We don't need another layer of government deciding what language you need to hear. We need honesty and limiting the vocabulary of the authors of initiatives is not honesty, it's control.

Amendment 86: Congressional Redistricting

Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution concerning congressional redistricting, and, in connection therewith, reenacting the current process for congressional redistricting in the Colorado Constitution and prohibiting modifications to a final map unless at least three public meetings are held, the modifications do not have the effect of dividing communities of interest or purposefully favoring one political party, and are approved by the congressional redistricting commission and the Colorado Supreme Court?

Yes: This amendment is a safeguard against future attempts to rewrite Colorado's congressional map for partisan advantage. Colorado is currently a politically balanced 4–4 state, but partisan operatives have already pushed the redistricting commission toward maps that would tilt the delegation to 7–1. While the Legislature cannot directly redraw districts under Amendments Y & Z, nothing stops future commissions, lawsuits, or coordinated interest-group pressure campaigns from trying to force Colorado into a lopsided map that doesn't reflect the state's actual political makeup. This amendment locks down the process by requiring public meetings, banning partisan favoritism, and forcing any changes to pass both the commission and the Colorado Supreme Court. It's a firewall against mid-decade gerrymandering and a direct response to the fear that Colorado's balanced map could be manipulated into an extreme partisan split. If you want to prevent future shenanigans, this amendment strengthens the guardrails.

Amendment 87: Graduated Income Tax

Shall state taxes be increased $2.7 billion annually, in order to increase or improve levels of public services, including K-12 public school education, health care, and early child care and education services, by an amendment to the Colorado Constitution and a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes repealing existing law and creating new law to replace the uniform state income tax rate with a graduated income tax structure, and, in connection therewith, amending the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights to eliminate the constitutional requirement for all taxable net income to be taxed at one rate with no added tax on income; establishing various income tax rates based on the amount of taxable income earned by individuals, estates, trusts, and corporations, while maintaining the current 4.4% tax on income from the sale of a principal residence, which will result in the estimated change in income taxes owed by individuals as identified in the following table; and authorizing the state to retain and spend any increased revenue from the new tax structure, as a voter-approved revenue change, to supplement current levels of funding for K-12 public school education, health care, and early child care and education programs?

Initiative 195 - Change in Income Taxes Owed by Income Category

Income Categories	Current Average Income Tax Owed	Proposed Average Income Tax Owed	Proposed Change in Average Income Tax Owed if Passed + or -

$25,000 or less	$59	$50	-$9
$25,001 - $50,000	$751	$632	-$119
$50,001 - $100,000	$1,877	$1,666	-$210
$100,001 - $200,000	$4,126	$3,828	-$298
$200,001 - $500,000	$9,344	$9,019	-$325
$500,001 - $1,000,000	$19,288	$18,963	-$325
$1,000,001 - $2,000,000	$29,432	$34,196	+$4,764
$2,000,001 - $5,000,000	$41,196	$55,110	+$13,914

Income categories use adjusted gross income reported to the federal Internal Revenue Service.

No: There's that "for the children" emotional hook again. Initiative 195 isn't just another end-run around TABOR and this one is engineered with a level of precision that only lawmakers who assume voters aren't paying attention would attempt. It's sneaky, but only to people who don't already harbor the appropriate suspicions about legislators who think the average voter is too distracted to notice what's happening. But also, this amendment seeks to destroy TABOR.

The engine that drives TABOR is the flat tax. It's the structural guardrail that prevents bracket-creep, surtaxes, and endless tinkering. Initiative 195 eliminates that guardrail entirely by replacing the flat tax with a graduated income tax. Once voters approve this change, legislators gain a permanent green light to add more brackets, increase rates inside brackets, adjust thresholds and create new surtaxes or extra taxes on top of existing ones.

And they can do all of this without ever needing to amend TABOR again because *the flat-tax protection is gone*. The architecture becomes wide open.

But the most dangerous part is the creation of the so-called "Colorado's Future Fund" — a brand-new constitutional bucket that is *explicitly exempt from TABOR's refund requirement*. Under Initiative 195, all revenue above what the 4.4% flat tax would have produced is siphoned into this fund. Once it's in there, it lies completely outside the TABOR refund formula.

You will hear ads claiming this “doesn’t eliminate TABOR refunds.” Technically, TABOR remains on paper. But practically? That claim is effectively a lie. In recent years, TABOR refunds have ranged from $750 million to $3.5 billion. Initiative 195 removes $2.7 billion from the refund calculation every single year. That leaves little to nothing left to refund.

TABOR’s purpose is simple:

1. Make tax increases difficult
2. Limit the growth of government
3. Return excess revenue to taxpayers

Initiative 195 nukes all three. It eliminates the flat-tax protection, expands government’s fiscal reach, and drains the refund mechanism. TABOR becomes a paper tiger — still printed in the constitution, but stripped of its teeth.

This isn’t tax reform. It’s a structural rewrite designed to permanently incapacitate TABOR.

Statutory Propositions

Proposition 132 Penalties for Fentanyl Crimes

Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes concerning criminal penalties for fentanyl and certain synthetic opioids, and, in connection therewith, increasing the felony classifications of drug-related crimes for distribution, manufacturing, dispensing, sale, or possession of fentanyl and certain synthetic opioids; creating mandated treatment for certain drug felony violations based on possession amount; and changing sentencing provisions to narrow or eliminate exemptions for crimes related to fentanyl and certain synthetic opioids and drug-related deaths?

Yes: Colorado’s fentanyl laws have been a joke, and we all know it. Legislators watered down penalties, created loopholes and acted shocked when the crisis exploded. This amendment finally reverses that damage by raising felony classifications, tightening sentencing, and closing the exemptions that let fentanyl offenders walk. We’re tired of watching communities get torn apart while the Legislature pretends this isn’t a real problem. If we want Colorado to take fentanyl seriously, we have to force the issue ourselves.

Proposition 133: Penalties for Human Trafficking of a Minor

Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes modifying existing law concerning human trafficking of a minor for sexual servitude, and, in connection therewith, creating new *law expanding human trafficking of a minor for sexual servitude to include knowingly trading anything of monetary value to buy or sell sexual activity with a minor and increasing the penalty to be life in prison without parole or release?*

Yes: There is no excuse and there should be no leniency for those who are willing to exploit the most innocent among us, especially when those who take advantage of our children are subjecting them to the most horrific conditions imaginable, conditions no child should experience.

Proposition 134: Male and Female Participation in School Sports

Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes creating new law restricting participation in all K-12 and collegiate school sports based on the participant's sex as determined by certain aspects of their biological reproductive system, and, in connection therewith, requiring a school, institution of higher education, or athletic association to designate each school or intramural athletic team or sport as male, female, or coeducational; only allowing participants to compete on the team or sport of their designated sex or to compete on a coeducational team; creating an exception to allow a female to participate on a male-designated team or sport if there is no female team available; prohibiting a government entity, licensing or accrediting organization, or athletic association from entertaining a complaint, opening an investigation, or taking other adverse action against a school for maintaining separate teams or sports for females; and providing the commissioner of education with the authority to enforce the proposed initiative for K-12 school districts?

Yes: We don't need to wait for Colorado to have the same sports controversies other states have already gone through. This amendment is a precaution — a way to keep girls' and women's sports fair before problems start. Colorado's current policies allow participation based on gender identity, and sooner or later that creates conflicts. This measure draws a clear line: male teams, female teams, and coed teams, with girls' sports protected as girls' sports. We shouldn't have to deal with lawsuits or ruined seasons before we act. This simply keeps competition grounded in biological reality and protects female athletics before it becomes an issue here.

Proposition 135: Prohibit Certain Surgeries on Minors

Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes modifying existing law by prohibiting surgery on a minor for the purpose of altering the minor's biological sex characteristics, and, in connection therewith, prohibiting any health-care professional or other person from knowingly *performing, prescribing, administering, or providing any surgery to a minor for the purpose of altering the minor's biological sex characteristics and prohibiting the use of state or federal funds, Medicaid reimbursement, or insurance coverage to pay for this type of surgery?*

Yes: Colorado won't let a 15-year-old get a tattoo, but somehow, we're debating whether they should be able to get surgery that permanently alters their sex characteristics. This amendment restores basic sanity: let our kids grow up first without the pressure of deciding if permanent and possibly disfiguring medical procedures are right for them.

Proposition 136: Income Tax Rate Cap

Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes capping the state income tax rate at 4.4% of federal taxable income for individuals and corporations?

Yes. If you want to lock the base rate at 4.4%, then vote Yes. But let's not kid ourselves: this won't stop the next Initiative 195, the next Prop NN, or the next "for the children" campaign designed to dismantle TABOR.

This measure is worth supporting — but it's not a silver bullet.

Proposition 137: Designate Sporting Goods Sales Tax Revenue for Conservation

Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes creating new law to increase water and land conservation funding without raising taxes, and, in connection therewith, through a voter-approved revenue change, allowing the state to keep and spend a portion of revenue from the state sales tax on sporting goods and equipment to conserve and protect Colorado's water, land, and forests, prevent wildfires, support outdoor recreation training and activities, and reduce revenue spent on these conservation purposes if necessary to preserve funding for certain tax credits?

No: By now it should be apparent exactly what this is. It's yet another attempt to chip away at TABOR by carving out revenue and moving it outside the refund formula. They dress it up as "conservation funding without raising taxes," but the mechanism is simple: if you don't count enough revenue toward TABOR, politicians get to keep more money. Is conservation really such a massive part of the budget that it needs its own TABOR exemption? Of course not. This is just one more slice taken out of TABOR so they can spend more without admitting it.

Boulder County Issues

County Issue [] – Childcare and preschool programs

SHALL BOULDER COUNTY TAXES BE INCREASED $30,000,000 ANNUALLY (IN TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2027), AND BY SUCH ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER, BY A MILL LEVY IMPOSED AT A RATE OF 2.579 MILLS (EQUATING TO APPROXIMATELY $115 PER YEAR ON A $725,000 HOME BASED ON CURRENT RATES OF ASSESSMENT) FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDRESSING THE SHORTAGE AND HIGH COST OF CHILD CARE AND PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR BOULDER COUNTY FAMILIES WITH YOUNG CHILDREN, INCLUDING:

- LOWERING THE HIGH COST OF CHILD CARE AND PRESCHOOL FOR BOULDER COUNTY FAMILIES;
- INCREASING THE COMPENSATION OF CHILD CARE AND PRESCHOOL TEACHERS AND STAFF TO RETAIN AND ATTRACT HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATORS; AND
- ADDRESSING THE SHORTAGE OF CARE BY EXPANDING CAPACITY FOR MORE CHILDREN AND REDUCING WAITLISTS; AND SHALL THE REVENUES AND EARNINGS ON THE INVESTMENT OF THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAX CONSTITUTE A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN SECTION 29-1-301 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, ALL AS MORE PARTICULARLY SET FORTH IN BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' RESOLUTION NO. 2026-048?

No: We're sympathetic to families struggling with the high cost of child-care — it's a real problem. But a permanent property-tax increase with a TABOR carve-out isn't the solution. Boulder County wants a 2.579-mill levy that starts at $115 a year on a $725,000 home and then rises automatically as property values rise. Worse, the measure explicitly exempts all this revenue from TABOR, meaning the county keeps every dollar and never has to refund any of it. The spending categories are broad enough to cover almost anything, and once the tax is in place, it never sunsets. This is another "keep and spend" measure wrapped in emotional marketing.

Note: County issues do not have a designation at this time.

County Issue [] – Sombrero Ranch and Sommerlin Districts Road Improvement

These will appear as two separate ballot question, if you live in those districts. Sombrero Ranch is unincorporated Boulder County in the area in south-central Longmont, east of Airport Road and south of Pike Rd. The Sommerlin district is the area south of Hwy 66 and east of County

Line Rd, west of Longmont. If you live in either of these districts, you will see one of these issues on your ballot, depending on the area in which you live.

SHALL SOMBRERO RANCH PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OF BOULDER COUNTY TAXES BE INCREASED $185,000 (IN TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2027) AND THEREAFTER BY THE DOLLAR AMOUNT PRODUCED FROM THE LEVY OF AN AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX IMPOSED AT A RATE UP TO 14.47 MILLS, WITH THE ANNUAL TAX REVENUES (REGARDLESS OF DOLLAR AMOUNT) FROM SUCH MILL LEVY TO BE USED FOR RESURFACING COUNTY ROADS WITHIN THE DISTRICT AND OTHER COUNTY ROAD IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES WITHIN THE DISTRICT; AND, SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO ENTER INTO A MULTIPLE-FISCAL YEAR OBLIGATION IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $3,500,000, TO BE PAID FROM THE REVENUES OF THE TAX DESCRIBED ABOVE AND ANY OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING LEGALLY AVAILABLE TO THE DISTRICT; AND SHALL THE TAX REVENUES DESCRIBED ABOVE, OTHER LEGALLY AVAILABLE FUNDING, IF ANY, AND THE INTEREST EARNINGS THEREON CONSTITUTE A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSITUTION (TABOR) AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN SECTION 29-1-301 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES OR ANY OTHER LIMITS WHICH MAY OTHERWISE APPLY; AND SHALL SOMBRERO RANCH PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OF BOULDER COUNTY BE ORGANIZED, ALL AS MORE PARTICULARLY SET FORTH IN BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' RESOLUTION 2026-040.

SHALL SUMMERLIN PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OF BOULDER COUNTY TAXES BE INCREASED $60,000 (IN TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2027) AND THEREAFTER BY THE DOLLAR AMOUNT PRODUCED FROM THE LEVY OF AN AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX IMPOSED AT A RATE UP TO 17.34 MILLS, WITH THE ANNUAL TAX REVENUES (REGARDLESS OF DOLLAR AMOUNT) FROM SUCH MILL LEVY TO BE USED FOR RESURFACING COUNTY ROADS WITHIN THE DISTRICT AND OTHER COUNTY ROAD IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES WITHIN THE DISTRICT; AND, SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO ENTER INTO A MULTIPLE-FISCAL YEAR OBLIGATION IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $1,250,000, TO BE PAID FROM THE REVENUES OF THE TAX DESCRIBED ABOVE AND ANY OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING LEGALLY AVAILABLE TO THE DISTRICT; AND SHALL THE TAX REVENUES DESCRIBED ABOVE, OTHER LEGALLY AVAILABLE FUNDING, IF ANY, AND THE INTEREST EARNINGS THEREON CONSTITUTE A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSITUTION (TABOR) AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN SECTION 29-1-301 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES OR ANY OTHER LIMITS WHICH MAY OTHERWISE APPLY; AND SHALL SUMMERLIN PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OF BOULDER COUNTY BE ORGANIZED, ALL AS MORE PARTICULARLY SET FORTH IN BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' RESOLUTION 2026-034?

No: This is an interesting new pattern for our county commissioners. It's no secret that Colorado roads are a disaster and Boulder County is no exception. So, our county commissioners came up with an idea: create a new PID (Public Improvement District) as a trial in heavily Democrat districts where residents set up a new, sort of mini-government to tax themselves for road maintenance and see how it goes. If successful, they could duck road maintenance. That's what they did with the first two of these in Niwot and Gunbarrel. Now they want to create two more PIDs in areas surrounding Longmont. Instead of funding road maintenance from the county's general budget, Boulder County is carving neighborhoods into micro-districts and making residents tax themselves for basic road work.

These measures create permanent taxing districts with baked-in mill levies, the ability to issue long-term debt, a permanent TABOR exemption, and a new layer of government, all to fund road work the county is already responsible for. Do they not get enough revenue from our property taxes already? What are they even spending current revenue on, if they aren't providing basic services? Where does it stop?

If you enjoy permanent taxes, permanent debt, and permanent exemptions, this one's for you. The rest of us are voting against this lunacy.

Boulder Ballot Issues (using summaries – ballot language not available yet)

City of Boulder Ballot Issue 2-: Charter Language Change (no letter designation yet)

The City of Boulder is asking voters to approve a series of technical amendments to the City Charter to update outdated language, remove obsolete provisions, clarify administrative processes, and modernize terminology. These changes do not alter the structure of government, the powers of elected officials, or voter rights.

Yes: This is a straightforward cleanup of Boulder's Charter — updating outdated language, removing obsolete provisions, and fixing administrative clutter. It doesn't expand government power, raise taxes, change representation, or alter how Boulder is governed. It's housekeeping, and cities should do housekeeping.

We don't oppose maintaining the Charter. But we also don't pretend every "technical update" is automatically harmless. Boulder has a habit of packaging real policy shifts inside administrative language changes, so we'll be watching closely to ensure this measure truly does what it claims: clean up wording without changing the substance of the law. As written, this package appears to be legitimate maintenance, and we support keeping the Charter clean, readable, and accurate.

City of Boulder Ballot Issue 2K – Recreation and Safety Bond

The City of Boulder is asking voters to approve up to $400 million in bonds, with a maximum repayment cost of $650 million, funded by a new property tax of up to $32.5 million per year. The bond package would fund major capital projects including the South Boulder Rec Center (with a lap pool), North Boulder Rec Center, West Age Well Center, Fire Stations #1 and #5, a new Public Safety Center and 911 Dispatch facility, the Municipal Services Center, and renovations to the Penfield Tate II Municipal Building.

No: We don't oppose new fire stations or recreation centers for Boulder's youth. Those are legitimate needs, and the people who work in these facilities deserve safe, functional buildings. But just once, can the city ask for that money without a massive TABOR carve-out or a bundled mega-bond that tries to solve every capital problem at once?

This measure authorizes up to $400 million in new debt with a maximum repayment cost of $650 million, backed by a new property tax of up to $32.5 million per year. Instead of asking voters for a focused, transparent bond for a specific project — a fire station, a rec center, a public safety facility — Boulder has packaged *nearly its entire $400 million backlog of deferred maintenance into one enormous, permanent tax stream*.

We support firefighters, dispatchers, and recreation staff. This isn't about them. It's about the city's habit of using feel-good projects to justify huge, open-ended debt authorizations that permanently expand government revenue. If Boulder wants a new fire station, ask for a fire station. If Boulder wants a new rec center, ask for a rec center. Don't bury those needs inside a $650 million repayment plan that voters can't meaningfully separate or prioritize.

This measure is too big, too broad, and too tied to a permanent tax increase. Boulder should fund essential facilities with targeted, honest requests — not with another TABOR carve-out disguised as a community investment package.

City of Boulder Ballot Issue 2J – Residential Vacancy Excise Tax

Shall the City of Boulder taxes be increased $6,000,000 annually (which amount represents estimated revenues in 2028, the first full fiscal year of collection), and by such amounts raised annually thereafter, by imposing a $4,000 tax on vacant homes that are occupied for 183 days or less per year, with such amount never falling below $4,000 but increasing annually in accordance with the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood consumer price index up to, but never exceeding $7,000, with the revenue from such tax to be used for the purpose of supporting City services, including: police and fire protection; parks and recreation; transportation and maintenance; and other general services important to the quality of life in the City; and shall the revenues from such taxes and any related earnings be collected, retained, and spent as a voter-approved revenue change without limitation and an exception to the revenue and spending limits of Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution?

No: Boulder wants to impose a $4,000 tax on homes occupied 183 days or less per year, increasing annually with inflation up to **$7,000**, and never falling below $4,000. The city estimates this will raise $6 million per year starting in 2028. And, as usual, the measure includes a TABOR carve-out so the city can keep and spend all revenue without limitation.

We don't support creating a new punitive tax category based on how often someone uses their home. Boulder frames this as a way to discourage long-term vacancies, but the measure is written far more broadly: it creates a permanent, inflation-indexed tax on a legally owned property simply because the owner doesn't occupy it enough days to satisfy the city. That's a significant expansion of Boulder's taxing authority and a precedent for future behavioral taxes. Besides, why does the City of Boulder get to determine how a private citizen uses their own property?

The revenue isn't dedicated to housing or vacancy mitigation. Instead, it's directed into a general-services bucket — police, fire, parks, transportation, "other services important to quality of life." In other words, it's a general-fund revenue stream justified by a vacancy narrative. If Boulder wants more money for general services, it should ask for that directly, not create a new tax category aimed at a small subset of homeowners.

We oppose new taxes that are punitive, poorly targeted, and tied to permanent TABOR exceptions. This measure is all three.

City of Boulder Ballot Issue 2L – Firefighter Collective Bargaining Rights

The City of Boulder is asking voters to amend the City Charter to allow Boulder firefighters to unionize and engage in collective bargaining with the city regarding wages, benefits, and working conditions.

No: Boulder firefighters do essential work, and we respect the risks they take. But this measure isn't about safety or staffing — it's about rewriting the City Charter to allow a new public-sector union with collective bargaining authority over wages, benefits, and working conditions. Once that authority is granted, it's permanent, and future councils will have far less flexibility in budgeting, compensation, and long-term financial planning.

Boulder already struggles with rising personnel costs, pension obligations, and the pressure to expand city services faster than revenue grows. Adding a new bargaining unit will increase those pressures, not reduce them. If the city wants to improve firefighter pay or facilities, it can do that directly. It doesn't need to create a new union structure that will negotiate against the city every budget cycle.

We support firefighters. We don't support permanently expanding Boulder's collective-bargaining footprint in a way that will increase costs, reduce flexibility, and lock future councils into binding negotiations.

City of Boulder Ballot Question 2M – Debt limit calculation change

If passed, this ballot measure would change how the city's debt limitation is calculated, allowing the city to issue more debt than is currently permitted. It would update the calculation to be based upon the "actual" value of the property in the city instead of the "assessed" value. A change to "actual" value is consistent with how most municipalities and the state calculate debt limitation.

No: Boulder wants to change how its debt limit is calculated — not as a technical cleanup, it's a substantive expansion of borrowing authority. This measure adjusts the Charter's debt-limit formula so the city can issue more debt without returning to voters as often. It's framed as modernization, but the practical effect is simple: Boulder wants more room to borrow.

If the city wants to borrow more money, it should ask for that directly — not by quietly loosening the Charter's financial limits. Debt limits exist for a reason: they force prioritization, discipline, and voter oversight. Changing the formula to make those limits easier to bypass is not "cleanup." It's a policy shift that permanently expands the city's ability to take on debt.

If Boulder needs additional borrowing capacity for a specific project, it can bring that project to voters. What we don't support is a structural change that makes it easier for future councils to borrow more, spend more, and raise taxes to service that debt — all without the same level of voter scrutiny.

Longmont Ballot Issues

Longmont Ballot Issue 3A – Maintain and Increase Fire and Police Services

SHALL CITY OF LONGMONT TAXES BE INCREASED $19.5 MILLION ANNUALLY IN THE FIRST FULL YEAR AND BY WHATEVER ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS AS ARE GENERATED ANNUALLY IN EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR FROM THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY OF NOT TO EXCEED 2.44 MILLS (AS ADJUSTED) BEGINNING WITH TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2027 AND AN ADDITIONAL CITY SALES AND USE TAX IMPOSED AT A RATE OF 0.33% BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2027, WITH THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES BEING USED EXCLUSIVELY TO MAINTAIN AND INCREASE THE LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY IN THE CITY OF LONGMONT, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO PROVIDING FUNDS FOR: POLICE OFFICERS AND PERSONNEL FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS AND PREVENTION; POLICE OFFICERS TO

ENSURE SAFETY OF OFFICERS AND TO IMPROVE EMERGENCY RESPONSE; EMERGENCY DISPATCHERS FOR 911 RESPONSE; FIREFIGHTERS TO ENSURE SAFE AND SUFFICIENT RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES; PERSONNEL TO SUPPORT EMERGENCY PUBLIC SAFETY RESPONDERS; AND PUBLIC SAFETY EQUIPMENT, VEHICLES AND FACILITIES TO ENSURE SAFETY; AND SHALL ORDINANCE O-2026-53 AUTHORIZING SUCH TAX INCREASES BE APPROVED, AND SHALL THE CITY BE AUTHORIZED TO INCREASE THE MILL LEVY AUTHORIZED BY THIS QUESTION BEGINNING IN TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2028 AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER TO OFFSET ANY REVENUE REDUCTIONS CAUSED BY ANY CONSTITUTIONALLY OR STATUTORILY REQUIRED TAX CREDITS, PROPERTY TAX REFUNDS, ABATEMENTS, REDUCTIONS IN THE PERCENTAGE OF ACTUAL VALUATION USED TO DETERMINE ASSESSED VALUATION, OR REDUCTIONS IN THE ACTUAL VALUE AGAINST WHICH THE ASSESSMENT RATE IS APPLIED THAT ARE ENACTED AFTER THE DATE OF APPROVAL OF THIS BALLOT QUESTION OR ARE OTHERWISE SET FORTH IN C.R.S. §§ 29-1-1701, ET SEQ., OR C.R.S. §§ 39-1-101, ET SEQ., AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON BE COLLECTED AND SPENT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

No: Longmont is asking for a permanent tax increase — both sales tax and property tax — wrapped in public-safety language. The measure adds a 0.33% sales tax and up to 2.44 mills in property tax, generating $19.5 million in the first full year and automatically increasing as property values rise. Worse, the city gives itself authority to raise the mill rate every year to “offset” any statewide tax relief, meaning any future property-tax credits or assessment-rate reductions can be canceled out locally. And of course, they added a full TABOR carve-out so the city can keep every dollar without refunding any of it.

We fully support Longmont’s police officers, firefighters, dispatchers, and emergency responders — they do difficult, essential work. But this measure isn’t about supporting them; it’s about creating a permanent revenue engine. The ballot language says the money must be used “exclusively for public safety,” but that category is broad and the phrase “including, but not limited to” gives City Council wide discretion to redefine what counts as public safety later. That means the funds can be shifted, expanded, or repurposed within an ever-growing definition — classic fungibility.

This is a permanent tax, permanent escalator, and permanent exemption — all packaged as a public-safety measure.

City of Longmont Ballot Question 3B: Charter Amendment to Protect Open Space Lands

Shall the City of Longmont Home Rule Charter be amended by revising section 13.2 to add open space to lands that cannot be sold or conveyed without voter approval, with exceptions for public roads, utilities, life-essential infrastructure, open space operations, and the sale or conveyance of structures on such lands?

No: This amendment expands the list of city-owned lands that cannot be sold or conveyed without voter approval by adding open space. We don't support the city's practice of buying land simply to prevent anyone else from buying it. Locking more land into permanent government ownership makes government bigger, more powerful, and less accountable. Once land is designated as "open space" and placed under Charter protection, it becomes extremely difficult to repurpose for housing, infrastructure, or anything that serves the broader community. That's not responsible land management.

The measure includes exceptions for roads, utilities, life-essential infrastructure, and open-space operations, but the core effect is still the same: it further restricts the city's ability to manage land responsibly and increases the amount of property permanently removed from productive use. We respect the people who maintain parks and natural areas and this isn't about them. It's about limiting the city's ability to expand its land holdings and then lock them away forever.

This amendment moves Longmont in the wrong direction.

City of Longmont Ballot Question 3C – Charter Amendment to Allow Ranked Choice Voting

Shall the City of Longmont Home Rule Charter be amended by adopting a new section 2.10 of the Charter to provide for the use of Ranked Choice Voting (ranked voting methods) where possible to elect future mayors and councilmembers of the City of Longmont starting in November 2029?

No: This amendment would replace Longmont's current voting system with Ranked-Choice Voting starting in 2029. Boulder County can run RCV elections, it already does for Boulder City, but Longmont's version isn't guaranteed to work without new ballot configurations, software updates, or certification changes. That's why the ballot language hedges with "where possible."

RCV also makes elections harder for voters to understand and harder for ordinary people to audit. Instead of a straightforward count, you get multiple rounds of elimination and redistribution that depend on software and tabulation rules most voters never see. Yes, RCV is technically auditable, but the process is far more complex, and fewer voters can independently verify the outcome.

And while RCV doesn't violate one-person, one-vote in the legal sense, it does change how ballots influence the outcome. Some ballots affect multiple rounds, others drop out entirely, and the final result depends on a process that's anything but intuitive.

Longmont doesn't need a more complicated voting system. It needs one that is transparent, easy to understand, and easy to audit. RCV moves the city toward complexity, not accountability.

City of Longmont Ballot Question 3D: Charter Amendment to Adjust City Council Electoral Cycles

Shall the City of Longmont Home Rule Charter be amended by amending section 3.6 of the Charter to realign the cycle on which members of the Longmont city council are elected so that the three councilmembers elected at-large are elected in one electoral cycle and the three councilmembers elected from wards are elected in another electoral cycle, with such electoral cycles alternating from then on, with such realignment contingent upon voter approval of the measure on the November 3, 2026 City of Longmont ballot requiring the use of ranked choice voting to elect city council members when possible?

No: This amendment only takes effect if Ranked Choice Voting passes, and we're already opposed to RCV. That makes this measure largely irrelevant on its own. It simply reorganizes council election cycles to make RCV easier for Boulder County to administer — grouping all at-large seats in one cycle and all ward seats in another. If RCV fails, nothing changes. If RCV passes, this measure is just the administrative part of a voting system we don't support.

We're not against the current staggered system, and we're not for reorganizing it just to accommodate RCV. Since this measure only matters if RCV passes, and we oppose RCV, it has no bearing on us beyond being part of the same package.

Superior Ballot Issues

None found

Louisville Ballot Issues

None found

Lafayette Ballot Issues

None found

Erie Ballot Issues

None found

Lyons Ballot Issues

None found

RTD

2026 Ballot Issue 7A: Front Range Passenger Rail Colorado Connector Funding

SHALL FRONT RANGE PASSENGER RAIL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED BY $750,000,000 ANNUALLY (FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR DOLLAR INCREASE) THROUGH IMPOSITION OF A 0.25% SALES AND USE TAX BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2027, AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER, AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND SPEND ALL REVENUE FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY INVESTMENT EARNINGS THEREON AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE NOTWITHSTANDING ANY LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW, AND SHALL SUCH TAX REVENUE BE USED TO FUND, FINANCE, CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE AND RELATED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE FRONT RANGE PASSENGER RAIL DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS PAYABLE FROM SUCH TAXES?

No: This is the "Connect Colorado" rail line from Ft. Collins to Pueblo. It's a quarter-percent sales tax increase paired with a permanent TABOR carve-out for the Front Range Passenger Rail District. They estimate $750 million per year in new revenue, but the real point is the TABOR exemption — once voters approve it, the district can keep and spend every dollar without refund limits, forever.

The measure is framed as "passenger rail funding," but it's really a regional tax authority asking for a blank check before a single mile of track is built, a single right-of-way is secured, or a single operating plan is finalized. They want permanent revenue, permanent bonding authority, and permanent TABOR relief — all before they show taxpayers what the system will actually cost or deliver.

And let's be honest, front range rail has already been promised once. Boulder County has been paying RTD's rail tax since 2004 for the Northwest Rail line that was supposed to reach Longmont by 2017. We've paid the tax for over twenty years and haven't seen a single mile of the rail we were promised. Now another district wants another tax, another TABOR carve-out, and another round of “trust us, the trains are coming.” We’ve heard this story before.

If the district wants rail, it should bring a specific project with a specific budget and ask voters directly. Instead, they’re asking for a massive, permanent tax stream first and promising details later. That’s backwards. We don’t support creating a new taxing district with unlimited revenue retention and bonding authority before the public sees a real plan, real costs, or real accountability.

This is a TABOR carve-out wrapped in a transportation narrative. We oppose it.

At the end of the day, ballot initiatives shouldn’t require this much detective work. But Colorado’s political climate keeps forcing us to read between the lines, spot the tricks, and guard against the Legislature’s worst impulses. Some measures are ridiculous, some are sneaky, and some hide behind “for the children,” but the pattern is always the same: if we’re not paying attention, they’ll take a mile. This guide is simply our way of calling out the nonsense, cutting through the smoke and mirrors, and making sure Colorado voters see these initiatives for what they really are.