

2026 BALLOT INITIATIVE CHEAT SHEET
Mesa County Democrats

STATEWIDE INITIATIVES:

AMENDMENT 81: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Colorado Law Enforcement Cooperation with ICE)

The Mesa Dems oppose this amendment. It would require Colorado law enforcement agencies to report to ICE (within 72 hours) about any person in Colorado who is charged with a crime and who doesn't have proof of citizenship on them.

- 1. We should limit ICE's power in the state, not expand it.*
- 2. It would force everyone (even citizens) to carry documents with them proving they are citizens.*
- 3. Every person—whether a citizen or not—has a right to be considered innocent until proven guilty. Amendment 81 would require involving ICE even before guilt is proven.*

AMENDMENT 82: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Right to Natural Gas)

The Mesa Dems oppose this amendment. It would put a required "right to buy and sell natural gas" into the state constitution, which is unprecedented and misleading. Putting a specific fossil fuel into the constitution could undercut rules aimed at reducing pollution and protecting public health. Natural gas is legal in the state, and should be subject to the same free market that other energy supplies are.

AMENDMENT 83: Mesa County Dems are NEUTRAL
(Right to Hunt and Fish Amendment)

The Mesa County Dems neither endorse nor oppose this amendment. If passed, this would amend the state constitution to guarantee the right to hunt, fish, and harvest fish and wildlife by traditional methods. A "YES" vote enshrines this right in the constitution. It would make hunting and fishing the state's preferred means of managing wildlife, which is fundamentally already the state's current position. The measure would not establish the right to trespass on private property. // A "NO" vote leaves the constitution unchanged. Hunting and fishing would remain legal and regulated under existing state law as well as Colorado Parks and Wildlife rules.

**AMENDMENT 84: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Voter ID Requirement)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this amendment. It would require all Colorado voters include social security, driver's license, or other ID information on the outside of ballot envelopes. This will expose voters to identity theft and attempt to solve a problem that doesn't exist.

**AMENDMENT 85: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Plain Language Amendment)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this amendment. If passed, it would require that all ballot issues be written at an 8th grade reading level, which is overly simplistic when dealing with fiscal and legal matters. We have plenty of opportunity via voter guides and the Blue Book to explain measures, but overly simplified language could easily hide dangerous intent, as well as open measures up to lawsuits.

**AMENDMENT 86: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Stricter Redistricting Amendment)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this amendment. Colorado's current redistricting plan (which happens after each decade's census) is already heavily regulated. Making mid-decade redistricting even more difficult would slam shut our chance to respond to partisan Republican gerrymandering as California and other Democratic-led states have done.

**AMENDMENT 87: Mesa County Dems SUPPORT
(Graduated Income Tax Structure)**

The Mesa Dems support this amendment. If passed, Colorado would establish a graduated income tax structure (replacing our current uniform rate. (Currently, a public school teacher making \$50K per year pays the same income tax rate as a billionaire in Colorado.) It would NOT dissolve or remove TABOR—it would only swap out the tax structure. The expected \$2B increases in income tax revenue due to the new structure would go exclusively to K-12 public education, health care, and early childhood care and education programs. But because the graduated structure would replace the uniform one, this would simply be more revenue, not a new tax, or tax collected that is over the TABOR limits. All other TABOR rules would also still be in place.

**PROPOSITION NN: Mesa County Dems SUPPORT
(Raising TABOR Revenue Cap for Public Education)**

The Mesa Dems support this proposition. It will increase funding for Colorado public schools by 50% over the next 10 years, by raising the TABOR revenue cap, allowing the state to retain money it already collects, and putting billions into our public schools without raising taxes. It would also require annual audits to make sure the funding is spent in classrooms. Colorado currently ranks 43rd among states in how much we fund public education.

**PROPOSITION 132: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Raising Penalty for Fentanyl Crimes)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this proposition. This measure SOUNDS like it's "tough on drugs" but its goal is to fill prisons with people caught up in substance abuse, thus filling the pockets of private prison companies. The increase in prison beds will be paid for by Colorado tax payers, at the expense of Medicaid, treatment services, and K-12 education. It would raise the mandatory prison sentences of fentanyl-related crimes to the point that a single teenager sharing a single pill laced with fentanyl would face 8 to 12 years in prison if convicted.

**PROPOSITION 133: Mesa County Dems are NEUTRAL*
(Raising Penalty for Child Sex Trafficking to Life in Prison)**

The Mesa Dems neither support or oppose this proposition. A "YES" vote would mandate that anyone convicted of child sex trafficking be sentenced to life in prison without parole, a Class 1 Felony, instead of the current Class 2 Felony. Some victims advocates groups argue that it could unfairly punish child sex trafficking victim, and that it advances a broader political agenda about child "safety" rather than reflecting the best practices for supporting survivors. Supporters argue the life without parole mandatory sentence fits the crime.

(It's really a recommended **NO** vote, but we believe the ballot measure was designed to be used as a weapon against organizations that promote a No vote.)*

**PROPOSITION 134: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Anti-Transgender Students in Sports)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this proposition. This measure takes decisions away from parents, schools, and athletic experts and hands them to the government. It s so poorly written that any girl could face an invasive gender check if she s accused by anyone of being transgender. And with no appeals process, parents and families are left powerless to stop these invasive checks.

**PROPOSITION 135: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Anti-Transgender Minor Health Care)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this proposition. This measure takes healthcare decisions out of parents and doctors hands, with no way to appeal if the government gets it wrong. This measure could also interfere with medically necessary care for serious conditions that affect kids well beyond transgender youth.

**PROPOSITION 136: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Locks in State Income Tax at 4%)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this proposition. This measure would counter Amendment 87 (Graduated Income Tax Structure). If passed, Proposition 136 would lock 4.4% as the state's maximum income tax rate into statute. Since Prop 136 and Amendment 87 are in direct opposition, whichever one receives the most votes will go into effect, should both pass. Amendment 87 needs 55% of votes to pass, while Prop 136 only needs a simple majority (since it is statutory, not a constitutional, amendment).

**PROPOSITION 137: Mesa County Dems OPPOSE
(Outdoor Recreation Equipment Sales Tax TABOR Override)**

The Mesa Dems oppose this proposition. If passed, the law would keep sales tax already collected on outdoor recreation goods like tents, instead of refunding the overage per TABOR requirements. The funds would be diverted to outdoor recreation and wildfire mitigation. The League of Women Voters of Colorado, as well as several key Democratic state senators, are deeply concerned by the economic impact. The LWV says: "While the projects the initiatives support are very worthy, and well-liked by League members, the initiatives put restrictions on the judgement of the legislators and reduce the monies in the General Fund available to support the legislators priorities. If we support these initiatives, where will we stop? We elect legislators to recognize the needs of Colorado and allocate the (tax) funds accordingly. The budget for the General Fund is perpetually short. This permanent transfer does not allow for legislative judgment."

LOCAL INITIATIVES:

SCHOOL DISTRICT 51 BALLOT ISSUE 4A: Mesa County Dems SUPPORT (D51 Mill Levy Override)

The Mesa County Dems support this issue, which is a mill levy override and is expected to raise about \$23M to support school safety and security, tech, career, and STEM education, and teacher recruitment and retention. It is a property tax increase, with the estimated monthly cost of \$9 on a \$200,000 home, or \$45 on a \$1M home. District 51 is consistently in the lowest districts in the state for per-student funding.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION MEASURE 2B: Mesa County Dems SUPPORT (Orchard Mesa Pool)

The Mesa County Dems support this issue, which would increase city sales and use tax by .07% (or %.07 per \$100 spent) to repair and modernize the Orchard Mesa Pool. The rate would drop by .04% once repairs are complete, leaving .03% for ongoing maintenance. The Orchard Mesa Pool will be closed if it fails; keeping it open will provide a much needed option for people in OM and others who would have difficulty accessing the new Community Recreation Center.

TOWN OF PALISADE MEASURE 2A: Mesa County Dems SUPPORT (Palisade Sales Tax)

The Mesa County Dems support this issue, which would increase Palisade sales tax from 2% to 3% for the next 8 years; it would provide much needed municipal repairs, offer emergency personnel higher salaries, and would be borne primarily by tourism and nonresidents.

PALISADE FIRE DISTRICT BALLOT ISSUE 6A: Mesa County Dems SUPPORT

(Mill Levy Override for Palisade Fire District) *The Mesa County Dems support this issue, which would raise the Palisade Rural Fire Protection's District's mill levy, costing an estimated additional \$42.55 per \$100K of residential home value. The existing rural contribution was set when the EMS service was largely volunteer, and is no longer sufficient to cover full-time fire and ambulance service. Without the increase, Palisade has warned that service levels could change or rural services could end entirely.*