



ARVADA
United Methodist Church

AUMC’S JUSTICE IN ACTION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS A “NO” VOTE ON PROP 136

Approved by committee vote on September 15, 2026

PROPOSITION 136 – Limiting the State Individual and Corporate Income Tax Rate to 4.4%

WHAT THIS INITIATIVE WOULD DO

If passed, this initiative would amend the Colorado Revised Statutes to provide that neither the individual income tax rate nor the corporate income tax rate in Colorado may exceed 4.4% of a taxpayer’s federal income. (This is the current tax rate applicable to all taxpayers in state law.)

[Text of the initiative](#) (previously referred to as Initiative #232)

ARGUMENTS FOR THE INITIATIVE

Proponents intentionally filed this initiative to counter Initiative 195, which would impose a graduated income tax. Initiative 232 would simply maintain the current state income tax rate, a flat rate of 4.4%. Proponents argue that Colorado already takes in sufficient revenue and that its spending is appropriately limited by TABOR. If opponents want more money to fund different priorities, they should find it in the current state budget.

Supporters: [Advance Colorado](#)

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE INITIATIVE

Opponents’ arguments against this initiative are essentially the same as arguments for Initiative 195, which would revise the current tax structure so that taxpayers who make more money pay higher rates. The provisions of TABOR, which restrict state revenue, mean that there is a persistent structural deficit in the state budget, and the state struggles to fund essential services such as education, health care, and transportation.

In addition, our current flat tax system is regressive when all types of state and local taxes are considered, meaning that poorer taxpayers will pay relatively more of their income in taxes than do wealthier taxpayers. Switching to a graduated tax restores fairness. In addition, Initiative 195 would result in actually lowering taxes for taxpayers making under \$1 million, thereby improving affordability for 95% of Colorado households. For these reasons, voters should vote no on Initiative 232 and vote yes on Initiative 195.

Opponents: [Bell Policy Center](#), [Colorado League of Women Voters](#)

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

2026 Colorado Election Blue Book – Proposition 136 (mailed to voters)

[Ballotpedia](#)

JUSTICE IN ACTION COMMITTEE POSITION ON THIS INITIATIVE

As a committee and pursuant to a consensus vote, **we oppose this initiative and urge United Methodists to vote against it.**

OUR REASONS FOR THIS POSITION

In this election, Colorado voters are being faced with a choice between implementing a graduated income tax rate that would increase tax rates for higher-earning individual and corporate taxpayers (Amendment 87) or remaining with the state’s current 4.4% flat tax rate (Proposition 136), which actually serves to create a regressive tax system when all state and local taxes are considered. For the reasons set forth in our analysis of Amendment 87, we support Colorado’s move to a more progressive tax system that is fairer and that also generates more revenue for key public services.

We also point out that there was no need for Advance Colorado to place this measure on the ballot. If Amendment 87 is not passed, the state income tax rate would remain 4.4% with or without the passage of Proposition 136, because that is the current rate. We must consider that Advance Colorado has expended significant resources on this measure for another purpose – namely, to confuse voters and increase the likelihood that voters could actually pass Amendment 87 but fail to see its benefits.

Here, Amendment 87 and Proposition 136 are in conflict. Under state law, if two measures that conflict are both passed by voters, the one receiving the highest percentage of the vote will govern. Thus, voters could see a scenario in which Amendment 87 passes (say, by 56% of the vote) AND Proposition 136 passes (say, by 57% of the vote). In that case, the provisions of Proposition 136 “win.” Ideally, of course, voters would realize that these two ballot measures conflict and would not vote for both of them at the same time, but not all voters are equally savvy about ballot measures. Thus, by bringing this measure, Advance Colorado is sowing confusion and potentially causing a situation in which Amendment 87 loses even if voters support it.

To make matters worse, Advance Colorado is also arguing that if both measures pass and Proposition 136 receives more votes, the tax rate cuts to lower-income taxpayers in Amendment 87 should go into effect (because technically they don’t “conflict” with Proposition 136, which only sets a tax rate cap. This would reduce overall revenue to an already-struggling state budget. Again, if Advance Colorado would like to directly set a tax rate cut before voters, it should have done so. It is hard to escape the conclusion that this group is seeking to get the outcome it wants by confusing voters, and we cannot endorse such an approach.

WHAT WE CONSIDERED IN TAKING THIS POSITION

UMC sources considered:

- Relevant provisions of the Social Principles of the United Methodist Church (attached)
- UMC Book of Resolutions #4063. [“A Call for Just Tax Structures.”](#)
- Committee discussions

External sources considered:

- [History](#) and [text](#) of the ballot initiative available from the Colorado Secretary of State
- [Ballotpedia resources and analysis](#)
- Reports and analyses:
 - GovFacts. “[How Tax Systems Work: Progressive, Regressive, and Flat Taxes Explained.](#)” May 2025.
 - Anderson, C., and Hernandez, J. [Colorado Initiative 232: Income Tax Rate Cap. Common Sense Institute](#), August 3, 2006.
 - Colorado Fiscal Institute blog, August 10, 2026. “[Alternative Tax Facts Have Entered the Chat.](#)”
 - Davis, L. “[Who Is Advance Colorado?](#)” Colorado Times Recorder, 2026.
- Media reports:
 - Grimes, T. “[Proposal to cap Colorado income tax rate qualifies for November ballot.](#)” Colorado Politics, August 21, 2026.

UMC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES 2025-28 – EXCERPTS RELEVANT TO PROPOSITION 136Para. 161 **II. THE ECONOMIC COMMUNITY**

PREFACE

...

As United Methodists, we profess that all we are and all that we possess, belong to God. We are temporary stewards of the resources and material goods that we have accumulated. In our financial dealings and relationships no less than other aspects of discipleship, we are compelled to serve God and neighbor in all we do.

Few biblical themes are as prominent or as numerous as the scriptural injunctions to stand in solidarity with “the least of these,” including the poor, the orphan, the widow, the stranger, and all other vulnerable members of society (Amos 5:7-13; Matthew 25:3-46; James 2:15-16). Accordingly, we pledge ourselves to the establishment of just, equitable, and sustainable economies that work for all.

ECONOMIC CHALLENGES

...

B. Poverty and Income Inequality – As United Methodists, we follow in the footsteps of our founder, John Wesley, who sought to improve the lives of those who suffered from debilitating conditions such as poverty, starvation, illiteracy, imprisonment, slavery, addictions, and disease.

We decry the widening gap between the rich and the poor and the concentration of wealth in the hands of ever smaller percentages of the global population ...

We reject religious teachings that view the accumulation of wealth as a sign of God’s favor and poverty as a sign of God’s disfavor ...

...

ECONOMIC JUSTICE

...

Our commitment to achieving economic justice is rooted in the covenantal understanding that God’s creation is meant to be shared by all humans and sentient beings. Just as the *oikos* or household served as the heart of the economy in ancient times, our belief in the inclusive nature of God’s global household motivates our pursuit of just, equitable, and sustainable economies.

As members of God’s *oikos* and followers of Jesus, who taught that we must “give to those who ask and not turn away from those who want to borrow,” we embrace our charge to share the abundance of God’s creation in just and equitable ways (Matthew 5:42). We, therefore, urge governments, businesses, and civic associations to ensure that individuals, families, and communities not only survive, but thrive.

...

Para. 163 **IV. THE POLITICAL COMMUNITY**

...

Our involvement in political systems is rooted in the gospel imperative to love our neighbors, to do justice, and to care for the vulnerable. As United Methodists, we acknowledge that love requires responsible political action and engagement aimed at the betterment of society and the promotion of the common good.

...

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Church and Governments –

...

We affirm that every form of government stands under God’s judgment and must therefore be held accountable for protecting the innocent, guaranteeing basic freedoms and liberties, protecting the natural world, and establishing just, equitable, and sustainable economies.