

2026 CANDIDATE SURVEY

Dan McIntosh

State Representative | District 11 | Republican

INCUMBENT

No

CAMPAIGN EMAIL

admin@mcintoshforwyoming.com

CAMPAIGN PHONE

(307) 314-9764

CAMPAIGN WEBSITE

<http://mcintoshforwyoming.com>

Candidate-submitted response. The answers below were received through the 2026 candidate survey form and are reproduced as submitted, with only formatting changes. Publicly researched positions were not used. Publication does not constitute an endorsement by Wyoming Family Alliance Action.

1

1. Abortion is the intentional act of ending the life of another human being, while in the womb. Lawmakers should work to promote and protect the value of human life from conception to natural death, rather than further expansions of abortion access. (HB126-2026; HB42-2025; HB 148-2024)

RESPONSE Agree

My focus will be on making laws crafted well enough to protect the mother, the child, and the medical professionals caring for them. The Supreme Court's January ruling and the litigation around the Human Heartbeat Act show how quickly well-intentioned bills can get tied up in the courts, and a law that can't be enforced doesn't protect anyone. I want Wyoming's protections for life written carefully enough to stand. That means precise statutory language, medical provisions drafted with physicians at the table, and real support for mothers and families so that choosing life is a genuine option in every part of our state, including rural communities where care is already far away.

2

2. The danger of chemical abortion has been heavily researched (see EPPC study). Lawmakers should work to ensure that women are fully informed and receive a medical examination prior to receiving such drugs. (HB64-2025; HB117-2026)

RESPONSE Agree

Informed consent is basic medical ethics, and a woman deserves complete, accurate information and an appropriate medical evaluation before receiving these drugs, both to rule out conditions like ectopic pregnancy that make them dangerous and to make sure her decision is fully her own. Where I'll bring the same focus I've described before is on drafting that lasts. HB 64 was vetoed as too invasive, overridden, and blocked by a court within weeks, which means it protected no one. Requirements written with physicians at the table, grounded in evaluations doctors already recognize as sound clinical practice, will stand up in court and actually reach the women they're meant to protect.

3 *3. Individuals and faith-based entities should have the right of conscience to freely live out their sincerely held convictions without fear of government infringement or retaliation. (HB 207-2025; SF 77-2025)*

RESPONSE Strongly Agree

The freedom to live according to your convictions without government punishment is as foundational as rights get, and as it relates to my previous answers, this is great example of where Wyoming got the framework right in 2025. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act doesn't hand anyone an automatic win but it does guarantee a fair hearing and puts the burden where it belongs, on the government. That's careful, durable drafting, it passed with overwhelming support, and it's the standard I'll defend.

4 *4. Medical personnel should not be required to participate in any medical procedure or service that conflicts with the individual's sincerely held moral, ethical, or religious beliefs. (SF111-2023; HB143-2026)*

RESPONSE Agree

No doctor or nurse should be forced to choose between their conscience and their career, and I believe conscience protections done right actually help Wyoming recruit and keep medical professionals. The reason this protection has failed to pass three years running isn't the principle, it's the drafting: agencies were assigned rulemaking authority they don't legally hold, enforcement wasn't workable, and legislators raised fair questions about what happens in a rural facility when a patient needs care and coverage is thin. Those are solvable problems, and solving them is the difference between a statement and a statute. I'll work for a version written carefully enough to pass, hold up, and protect both the provider's conscience and the patient in Lander or Lusk who has nowhere else to go.

5 *5. Lawmakers should protect minors by ensuring that government-funded spaces, including libraries and public schools, restrict access to sexually explicit content, while recognizing the right of parents to make decisions regarding their minor children's access to such materials. (HB10-2026)*

RESPONSE Agree

Taxpayer-funded children's sections shouldn't contain sexually explicit material, and parents should be the ones deciding what their own kids can access. I want to be precise about what I support, because the distinction matters: this isn't about banning books or restricting what adults may read, and it isn't about removing material because someone finds it offensive. It's about age-appropriate placement and parental consent, which is a different thing entirely. I'd point to what already works: my own district, LCSD1, adopted an opt-in policy in 2024 requiring parental permission for this content. Every parent decides for their own child, nothing is banned for adults, and it didn't take a lawsuit to get there. Where the state acts, it should learn from the last attempt: definitions need to track the constitutional standard and enforcement has to answer the prosecutors' concerns, or we pass a headline instead of a protection. A statewide framework built on the LCSD1 model would pass, hold up in court, and actually protect kids.

6 *6. Wyoming should recognize biological differences between men and women and protect girls' sports, locker rooms, and sex-designated spaces. (SF 44-2025; SF 62-2025; HB 72-2025; HB 32-2025; SF133-2023)*

RESPONSE Strongly Agree

Biological differences between men and women are a matter of fact, and girls deserve fair competition and privacy in their own spaces. Wyoming has now put clear definitions and protections in statute, and I support them. My job in the Legislature is to make sure those laws are enforced as written and defended when challenged, and to do it in a way that's firm on the principle and decent to every person involved. Wyoming can protect girls' sports and spaces without cruelty to anyone, and I'll hold both of those standards at once.

7

7. Lawmakers should support legislation that helps parents stand up to government entities that attempt to circumvent their rights in raising their children. (Sf 09-2024; HB 200-2025)

RESPONSE **Agree**

Parents raise children, the government doesn't. When a school withholds information from parents or substitutes its judgment for theirs, the burden should be on the government to justify it, not on the parents to fight through it. That's the same standard Wyoming just applied to religious liberty, and it's the right default across the board. And I believe we can empower parents without burying teachers in paperwork, because those aren't competing goals. A teacher's job is teaching, and every hour spent on documentation mandates is an hour taken from our kids. Wyoming's own record shows the way, the focused 2024 law took teacher feedback, got narrower and stronger for it, and is on the books working. The broad 2025 expansion piled on mandates and died in committee. Parental rights done right make the parent-teacher relationship stronger, not more adversarial, and that's the version I'll support.

8

8. Lawmakers should allow education funding to follow the child and protect parents' freedom to choose public, public charter, private, or homeschool options. (HB 166-2024; SF 61-2024; HB 199-2025; HB 94-2025; HB 46-2025; HB 23-2026)

RESPONSE **Agree**

I benefited from various kinds of schooling. My mother opened one of Wyoming's first Montessori schools out of our home. My family has taught in public schools for two generations, and I teach at a public college now, so I don't see choice and public education as enemies. Competition among good options makes all of them better. Where I'll be honest is on the lessons of the last two years. Once again, we're confronting ideology versus durability, the means-tested ESA passed and stood, and when the cap was removed over an explicit constitutional warning on the Senate floor, the courts froze the program before a dollar reached a family, and thousands of kids spent a year in limbo. While I agree that money should follow the child, and that has to mean actually following the child, in both directions. If a student returns to public school midyear, the remaining funds need to return with them, prorated to the day, and districts need enough notice to plan classrooms and staffing around real enrollment. A system where the dollars leave but the student can come back without them isn't choice, it's a hole in the school budget that every other kid in the building pays for. Those are drafting problems with known solutions, and solving them is the difference between a program families can rely on and a program that lives in court.

9

9. Lawmakers should support open enrollment policies that allow students to attend schools regardless of their geographic address. (SF 109-2025)

RESPONSE **Strongly Agree**

A kid's education shouldn't be determined by which side of a line their parents can afford to live on. Open enrollment is school choice inside the public system itself, and it makes every public school better by letting families vote with their feet. The practical work is making sure the funding follows cleanly and that small rural districts aren't destabilized by the transitions, which is a solvable drafting question, not a reason to keep kids zoned into schools that aren't working for them.

10

10. Lawmakers should ensure that public schools and post-secondary educational institutions do not seek to enforce DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) mandates, which promote discrimination by dividing individuals into classes of “oppressed” and “oppressor.” (SF 103-2025; HB 147-2025)

RESPONSE Agree

Discrimination in an educational environment is wrong no matter which direction it points. In my classrooms and at my college, I haven't heard of teachers dividing students into classes of oppressor and oppressed. What I have seen is that curriculum-aligned instruction is taken seriously, and it should continue to be, because the classroom exists for learning, and any activity that distracts from it doesn't belong there, whatever banner it flies under. At the same time, precision matters, because DEI has become a label covering everything from compelled statements to wheelchair ramps. When Washington's 2025 anti-DEI directive was drafted too broadly, a federal court permanently struck it down, and in the meantime institutions over-complied by sweeping up services for students with disabilities and learning impairments. Helping a student with dyslexia access the same classroom as everyone else is reasonable accommodation, not ideology. Compelled diversity statements and ideological litmus tests, on the other hand, are the kind of mandates I'd vote to end. Wyoming's own 2025 session proved that precision is what separates a win from a headline. We had two DEI bills passed with the same goal, and the one written with clear, enforceable definitions was signed and is law today, while the one with circular definitions and a reach into private donations was vetoed as impossible to enforce. I teach for a living and know the difference between instruction and indoctrination, and between accommodation and activism. So while I'm opposed to discrimination in every form, I will only support legislation built to be stable and to deliver its intended effect, written with the people it governs at the table, instead of laws that produce unintended consequences and endless court battles that help no one.

Candidate responses are shown verbatim except for typographic normalization needed for document rendering.