

MOTION FOR REHEARING BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF STATE (TITLE BOARD)

We move to rehear the ballot title set on January 2, 2020. Though better than the original staff draft, it is not brief and contains confusing or misleading language which we desire to correct.

An amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning petitions, and, ~~in connection therewith,~~ **THAT ALLOWS** ~~provides~~ ~~the~~ right to petition **ING** ~~at all levels of~~ **LOCAL** governments; **CHANGES PETITION** ~~requirements,~~ procedures; and ~~deadlines for qualifying petitions for the ballot,~~ **REQUIRES** brief, plain English **PETITION** titles; ~~challenging compliance with petition requirements,~~ and inform **S** voters of ~~the contents of a petition~~ **S**; limit **S** ~~the amount of~~ state legislation that ~~is~~ **MAY BE** petition-exempt; **PERMITS** laws enacted **BY** petition to be changed only **BY** ~~through voter approval of another voter-approved petition;~~ establish ~~a fine~~ **FINES** ~~THOSE WHO~~ ~~for interfere~~ ~~with~~ petition **ING** peaceably in public access areas; allow **S** ~~the governor to veto legislation to be referred to the people (FALSE);~~ exempt **S** petitions from municipal home-rule **LAWS** ~~provisions;~~ and repeal **S** all conflicting laws.

An amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning petitions, that allows petitioning local governments; changes petition procedures; requires brief, plain English petition titles; informs voters of petitions; limits state legislation that may be petition-exempt; permits laws enacted by petition to be changed only by another petition; exempts petitions from home-rule laws; and repeals all conflicting laws.

RECEIVED

JAN 07 2020

S.WARD
12:39 PM.

Colorado Secretary of State

- a. “and, in connection therewith,” gives voters no information. This phrase was not used in 2019-2020 #3 (the supreme court just approved), nor in #76 (citizenship).
- b. “at all levels of” is misleading. The word “local” says PRA excludes the federal government from “all.”
- c. Procedures have deadlines. (A better choice is “time lines.”) PRA uses the word “Procedures” in bold print.
- d. It is rare to put gerunds within gerunds. Thus, “allows...changes....requires....informs....limits...permits...exempts...repeals...” is a clearer guide for each clause.
- e. “qualifying petitions for the ballot.” Voters know petition “procedures” make ballot issues.
- f. “challenging compliance with petition requirements” takes procedures. Procedures are enforced and obeyed; voters know that.
- g. “informs voters of petitions” skips “the contents of.” Petition information is in petition contents.
- h. How is legislation measured? Volume? Weight? Words? Pages? The phrase is vague.
- i. “permits” avoids repeating “allows” from the first clause.
- j. A fine is a minor detail that does not merit 12 words. Citizens expect rights to be protected. Fines affect only those violating our rights. If you insist, a briefer clause is offered here.
- k. PRA does not mention “governor,” “Article IV,” “veto,” or “referred to the people.” Petitions are not referred measures. PRA helps citizens petition, not let politicians kill bills. Vetoes void voting, contrary to our intent. To repeal a ban on vetoes does not enact a veto power. A repealed law leaves a blank invisible space. A bill veto is unrelated to a petition. “Allowing the governor to veto” bills does not promote petitions. Vetoing referred measures stops voting; PRA promotes “*the Right to Vote*.” The proposed 1/2/20 clause invents two types of veto—one for regular bills, one for referred; neither is in PRA. **To clear up this issue, we are willing to amend Section 5, first sentence to read - Section 5. Article V section 1 (2)-(10) are repealed except (7.3), now (2); (8), now (3); and the first sentence of (4)(a), now (4).**
- l. PRA will also apply in home rule counties. “Provisions” is more opaque than “laws.”

Natalie Menten
Donald Creager
co-proponents