

1. We are WELL aware of the single subject rule. It is the only semi-automatic grounds for NOT setting a ballot title. Petition Rights has a single subject of ITSELF--a petition titled "Petition Rights." Its entire single subject is defined in its title. No "unrelated OR incongruous" subject is slipped in its half-page wording--nothing about gunowner rights, schools, gender issues, agriculture, taxes, crime, or any other UNRELATED topic. It deals only with the subject of citizens' rights to draft, promote, vote on, and enforce legislation for citizen control of government policy. Its ancestor is the one-sentence First Amendment's multi-part list of subjects, particularly the last clause about the right "to petition the Government...." PRA (1) specifically acknowledges the right to protest an alleged violation of the single subject rule.

2. Our state supreme court has clearly stated substantive or procedural wording are joined as a RELATED SINGLE SUBJECT. DETAILS of both are welcomed as acts of clarity, not different subjects. 1994's passage of Amendment "A" reassured voters of that by concurrent addition of statutory interpretation procedures in section C.R.S. 1-40-106.5. Amendment "A" intended to promote the citizen's right to petition, not prevent it. Ref. "A" only intended to avoid political devices already banned by our legislature of 1) "logrolling," which is packaging different issues that would fail on their own merit, and 2) non-disclosure of DIFFERENT issues hidden "in the coils" of a "complex" measure. PRA is one of the shortest texts this Board will ever see. Its goals are brevity and simplicity. It has no devious or hidden agenda. PRA procedures shorten the time for final resolution of single subject disputes. All are resolved before petitions are circulated.

3. Almost every sentence of PRA's half-page text uses the word "petition," a synonym for it, or reference to it. Cutting words in the text of #245 reduces clarity in its single subject. This Title Board may remove text ONLY to remove (by necessity) an UNRELATED second subject. Only one broad subject may remain in a clear and brief title for voter review. PRA inserts more voter information, and requires use of "plain English" and a 60-word ballot title limit. Its features mimic goals of the general assembly and voters passing ballot issue "A" in 1994. PRA simply strengthens the PRA's single subject rule. We request you allow #245 as revised here to go to signature collection. Every sentence has a "necessary or proper connection" to the text as a whole. It has NO "incongruous" matter. Even if it did, it could be excised here or in post-passage litigation. To save as much as possible of a petition is the clear message of Article V section 1 (5.5) and C.R.S. 1-40-106.5, both of which are to be "liberally construed" to protect everyone's right to petition.

4. We incorporate and refile here our written Answers to legislative staff questions. We urge you to set the summary and ballot title as we drafted it, in the spirit of neutrality and brevity. Following lawyers' precedent is not informative; the people on the street do not know what a "referendum" is, but they know they have a right to "petition." A phrase like "and, in connection therewith," is pedantic and foreign to conversational speech. This Board has a legal and moral duty "to preserve, protect, and defend" the right to petition, and NOT act casually to "protect" voters from other people's right to petition.

5. We carefully answered in writing all 59 single and compound questions for legislative staff on #224, and the added questions in #245 now before you. We look forward to getting a brief, user friendly ballot title, and a sample petition in a day or two, to reprint for secretary of state review.

6. Proponents were faced with vague Board "concerns" and total rejection without the clear alternative of deleting offending words as specifically allowed in section (5.5) and C. R.S. 1-40-106.5. The Board did not "liberally construe" its duty "to preserve and protect the right of initiative...." . There is no logrolling, nor any surprise or fraud, prevention of which was the explicit basis for the single subject rule.

7. STAFF had no trouble in filing a clear DRAFT ballot title, but the Title Board did not accept it. It was acceptable to proponents. Finally, we thank you for allowing our title setting to be heard today. See the latest supreme court opinion on single subject rule dated March 9, 2026, (TEN DAYS AGO, case 25SA334, initiative 158). It shows our awareness of the single subject rule. DOZENS of case annotations state the same simple rule and procedure.