

RECEIVED

Feb 2, 2026

THOMAS JEFFERSON CARES
1133 Atlantic Ave #329, Long Beach, CA 90813
Mailing Address:
12816 Inglewood Ave #383, Hawthorne, CA 90250
310-929-0260
Tom@UH.do

INITIATIVE COORDINATOR
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

Office of the Attorney General
Initiative Coordinator
1300 I Street, 17th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Request for Title and Summary for Proposed Initiative

To the Initiative Coordinator:

Pursuant to Article II, Section 10(d) of the California Constitution, I hereby submit the attached proposed statewide initiative measure, titled

THE YVONNE TOO ACT

and request that you prepare a circulating title and summary of the measure as provided by law.

Procedural Note: The Proponents intend to qualify this measure for the November 3, 2026 General Election. We respectfully request that the title and summary be prepared as expeditiously as the Elections Code permits to allow sufficient time for signature verification prior to the qualification deadline.

Mailing Instructions: Please direct all official correspondence regarding this initiative to the email address listed above or the Hawthorne mailing address when email is not an option.

I have included with this letter the required certifications pursuant to Elections Code sections 9001 and 9608, and a check in the amount of \$2,000.00.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Thomas Jefferson Cares

Dated: January 2, 2026

**THE YESTERDAY'S
VOTERS OBVIOUSLY
NEEDED
NEXT-LEVEL
ENFRANCHISEMENT TOO
ACT**

**or the YVONNE Too Act (pronounced
ee-VON-nuh Two)**

PREAMBLE TO THE INITIATIVE

We, the proponents of this measure, come before the people of California with humility, with hope, and with a request.

Humility, because we know that what we propose is ambitious—perhaps too ambitious. We have done our best to draft carefully, to anticipate problems, to provide for contingencies. And still we may have failed. Constitutional drafting is hard. Constitutional drafting by citizens, without the resources of the Legislature or the expertise of professional staff, is harder still. We have tried. We hope that effort counts for something.

Hope, because we believe that California’s democracy can be better than it is—that the Constitution can be clearer, more coherent, more capable of enabling the governance our state requires. We believe that problems which seem intractable are actually solvable, if we have the courage to name them and the creativity to address them. This measure is our attempt at both naming and addressing.

A request, because ultimately this measure asks for permission. Permission to try something new. Permission to create a pathway for citizen participation in constitutional revision that has never existed before. Permission to trust the people with a power that has been reserved, for over a century, to the Legislature alone.

We think that permission should be granted. But we know that we must earn it.

If you read nothing else, read this: we believe in democracy. We believe in California. We believe that the people, given the opportunity, will rise to meet the responsibilities of self-governance. This measure gives them that opportunity.

Now we place our work before you. Judge it honestly. We have given our honest best.

Section 1. Article XXXV is added to the California Constitution to read:

ARTICLE XXXV

VOTER-REFERRED CONSTITUTIONAL REVISIONS

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This Article shall be known and may be cited as THE YESTERDAY'S VOTERS OBVIOUSLY NEEDED NEXT-LEVEL ENFRANCHISEMENT TOO ACT, or the YVONNE Too Act (pronounced ee-VON-nuh Two)

SECTION 2. DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGN PREROGATIVE.

We the people of California will put as many words in our constitution as we want. It's ours. We can flood it with all the permutations of our most glorious expressions of will. If you don't like it, please chill!

SECTION 3. DECLARATION OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.

Part A. The Voice of the Sovereign

(a) We, the people of California, speak now not as combatants petitioning our government, but as the sovereign source of its power. We speak as parents who wish to leave our children a more perfect democracy. We speak as citizens who have stood in line to vote, who have gathered signatures in the sun, who have believed—despite every cynicism—that our voices matter. We speak because we love this state, and because love demands honesty: our Constitution, for all its beauty, contains a wound. This Article is our attempt to heal it.

(b) We speak as the inheritors of a democratic tradition stretching back through centuries of struggle—through the civil rights movement and the labor movement and the suffrage movement, through the Progressive Era that gave California its initiative power, through the American Revolution that declared all men created equal, through every moment in human history when ordinary people have stood up and said: we will govern ourselves. We do not claim to be wiser than our ancestors or more virtuous than our descendants. We claim only what every generation has claimed: the right to participate in shaping the world we will leave behind.

(c) We speak as Californians—as residents of a state that has always been a laboratory of democracy, a place where the future arrives first, a commonwealth of dreamers and builders and

strivers from every corner of the earth. We are forty million strong. We are the fifth-largest economy in the world. We are home to Silicon Valley and Hollywood, to the Central Valley's abundance and the Sierra Nevada's majesty, to communities of every language and faith and heritage that humanity has produced. We are not a monolith. We argue. We disagree. We contain multitudes. But we are one people, bound together by our shared commitment to self-governance, and we speak now with one voice.

(d) We speak in full awareness that some will dismiss this Article as naive, as overreaching, as the product of dreamers who do not understand how government really works. To those critics, we say: we understand exactly how government works. That is why we are here. We have watched as our Constitution has grown ever more tangled, ever more contradictory, ever less capable of enabling coherent governance. We have watched as the Legislature has failed, year after year, decade after decade, to address this structural dysfunction—not because legislators are bad people, but because the system gives them no incentive to act. We understand. And understanding, we have decided to act ourselves.

(e) We speak also in full awareness that some will denounce this Article as an assault on representative democracy, as an attempt by the mob to seize powers that properly belong to deliberative bodies. To those critics, we say: read what we have written. We do not seek to bypass the Legislature. We seek to partner with it. The process we establish here requires legislative approval before any revision can be ratified. We are not seizing power from our representatives. We are asking them to share power with us—to let us begin conversations that they may then accept or reject. If this is an assault on representative democracy, then so was the initiative power itself, which Californians have cherished for over a century.

(f) We speak, finally, in full awareness that courts will scrutinize every word of this Article, searching for constitutional infirmities, for overreach, for provisions that exceed what an initiative may accomplish. To the honorable jurists who will undertake this scrutiny, we say: we welcome your review. We have tried to craft this Article with care, with attention to constitutional limits, with respect for the separation of powers. We have provided severability clauses throughout, because we want this to work within the law, not outside it. If we have erred, we ask you to mend rather than destroy. Sever what is flawed. Preserve what is sound. Do not punish the people's good-faith effort to participate more fully in their own governance.

Part B. The Wound Named

(g) The wound is this: for over a century, the people of California have possessed the power to propose amendments to our Constitution, but not revisions. We may tinker, but we may not transform. We may adjust, but we may not reimagine. The power to initiate comprehensive constitutional renewal—to ask the great questions about who we are and who we wish to become—has been reserved exclusively to the Legislature.

(h) We do not begrudge our representatives this power. The Legislature has every right to propose revisions, and we encourage it to do so. What we contest is the exclusivity of that right. We contest the notion that the people who are sovereign—the people in whom all political power is declared to be inherent—may tinker with their fundamental law but may not transform it. We contest the proposition that the agents of the people may dream big dreams, but the people themselves must think small.

(i) We demand only the right to strike the match—claiming what the word “inherent” has always meant, what Thomas Jefferson meant when he declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, what Abraham Lincoln meant when he spoke of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, what every generation of Californians has meant when they have stood up to say that the people are not combatants against their government but its authors: the right to begin. The right to raise our voices first. The right to place pen to parchment and ask, “What if?”

(j) The Legislature may deliberate. The Legislature may refuse. But the hand that lights the match must be permitted to be ours—for if the people cannot propose, then consent is not consent but ratification of another’s vision, and self-governance is merely a ceremony performed after the decisions have been made.

(k) We understand the distinction between amendments and revisions. We understand that revisions, by definition, work more comprehensive change than amendments. We understand that more comprehensive change requires more comprehensive deliberation. We agree with all of this. That is precisely why we have designed a process that requires more deliberation, not less—a process that requires the people to vote twice, with the Legislature deliberating in between. Initiative. Deliberation. Ratification. Three hurdles where the Legislature faces only two. We have imposed upon ourselves a higher burden than the Constitution imposes upon our representatives. We ask only for the right to begin the conversation.

Part C. The Constitutional Foundation

(l) All political power is inherent in the people. So declares Section 1 of Article II of this Constitution, in words unchanged since California’s founding. Government is instituted for the people’s protection, security, and benefit, and the people have the right to alter or reform it when the public good may require.

(m) These are not ceremonial phrases. They are not decorative language placed at the beginning of our Constitution to give it an air of democratic legitimacy before the real business of governance begins. They are promises. They are commitments. They are the foundational premises upon which everything else in this Constitution rests. If political power is truly inherent in the people, then the people must have meaningful ways to exercise that power. If the people

have the right to alter or reform their government when the public good requires, then that right must be more than theoretical.

(n) A promise that the people may alter or reform their government, but only in ways the Legislature permits them to imagine, is a promise half-kept. A declaration that political power is inherent in the people, followed by a reservation of the most important structural powers to the Legislature alone, is a declaration that contradicts itself. We do not accuse our forebears of hypocrisy. We believe they did the best they could with the tools and understanding they had. But we, their heirs, can see what they perhaps could not: that a Constitution which declares the people sovereign but denies them the power to propose comprehensive constitutional renewal is a Constitution at war with itself.

(o) This Article is our attempt to make peace—to align our Constitution’s practices with its principles, to give operational meaning to the promise that political power is inherent in the people, to create a mechanism by which the people can propose revision while still respecting the Legislature’s vital role in deliberation and approval.

Part D. The Fractal Hope Manifesto

(p) We see the most incredible fractals of gridlock and clusterfucks in the world—patterns of dysfunction that repeat at every scale, from neighborhood to nation, from bureaucracy to ballot box. Systems designed to solve problems instead perpetuate them. Institutions meant to serve the people instead serve themselves. Good intentions produce bad outcomes. Bad outcomes produce cynicism. Cynicism produces passivity. Passivity produces more dysfunction. The pattern spirals.

(q) We recognize that the word we have used—“clusterfucks”—is not the language of lawyers or legislators. It is the language of people who have watched their government fail them, year after year, and who have run out of patience for euphemism. We use this word deliberately, not to shock, but to speak plainly. If the language offends, let the offense be a measure of how far our governance has fallen from the dignity it should possess.

(r) But here is what we have learned: if dysfunction can fractal, so can hope. If gridlock can compound, so can breakthrough. The same mathematical truth that describes the complexity of our problems describes also the elegance of possible solutions. A small intervention at the right leverage point can cascade through a system. A single match can light a fire that becomes a conflagration—not of destruction, but of transformation.

(s) This measure is that match. We do not know whether it will catch. We do not know whether the fire will spread. But we know that someone must try. And we know that the trying itself changes things—demonstrates that citizens can still act, still dream, still demand better of their government and of themselves.

(t) These initiatives are the start—a foundation for the people to work their magic in California, and potentially for the whole world to copy and learn. We are not so arrogant as to believe we have found the only way. We are hopeful enough to believe we have found a way. Let others find more. Let the fractals of hope multiply.

(u) In dysfunction, we roar: Break it! In hope, we whisper: Build. California as laboratory—not just for policies but for democracy itself. Bonds for infrastructure, reforms for governance, dignity for all, security for all, possibility for all. This is the world we are starting to unlock. This is the future we are beginning to build. Come build it with us.

(v) We, the people of California, in humility and hope, and with a ferocious determination to break the fractals of gridlock, do ordain and establish this Article.

SECTION 4. FINDINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL STAGNATION.

(a) The people of California find and declare as follows:

(b) FINDING ONE: STAGNATION DOCUMENTED. The California Constitution, adopted in 1879 and comprehensively revised only once since then (in 1966), has been amended more than 500 times through a patchwork of individual changes that have created a document of extraordinary length, complexity, and internal contradiction. At approximately 75,000 words, it is one of the longest constitutions in the world—longer than the constitutions of most nations, longer than the constitutions of all but a handful of states. Its length is not a virtue. It is a symptom of a document that has been patched and repatched so many times that it has lost coherence.

(c) FINDING TWO: TRANSFORMATION UNMET. Despite this accretion of amendments, California has not engaged in comprehensive constitutional revision in nearly sixty years, even as the state has transformed beyond recognition. In 1966, when the Constitution was last comprehensively revised, California had a population of approximately 18 million; today it has over 39 million. In 1966, California's economy was dominated by agriculture, aerospace, and defense; today it is the fifth-largest economy in the world, powered by technology, entertainment, and innovation that the 1966 revisers could not have imagined. In 1966, the internet did not exist, artificial intelligence was science fiction, and climate change was barely understood; today these forces are reshaping every aspect of life in California and demanding governmental responses that our current Constitution was not designed to enable.

(d) FINDING THREE: STRUCTURAL EXPLANATION. The structural reason for this stagnation is clear: the California Constitution permits the people to propose amendments but not revisions, reserving the revision power exclusively to the Legislature, which has no political

incentive to exercise it. Legislators are elected to two-year or four-year terms; they face immediate pressures and immediate crises; they are rewarded for addressing those immediate pressures, not for undertaking the long, difficult, politically risky work of comprehensive constitutional reform. A legislator who spends years working on constitutional revision instead of delivering tangible benefits to constituents is a legislator who risks losing the next election. The incentives are misaligned, and the result is predictable: the work does not get done.

(e) FINDING FOUR: SLOW-MOTION CRISIS. This structural misalignment between incentives and needs has created a slow-motion constitutional crisis. California’s foundational document grows ever more unwieldy, ever more contradictory, ever less capable of enabling coherent governance, while those with the power to address this problem have every reason to ignore it. Each year that passes without comprehensive revision makes the eventual revision more difficult. Each amendment added to the pile makes the Constitution harder to navigate and harder to reform. We are not facing a crisis that will arrive someday in the future. We are living through the crisis now, and it deepens with every passing year.

(f) FINDING FIVE: THE LIVED EXPERIENCE. The people have experienced this dysfunction directly. They have voted for initiatives that courts struck down for reasons the average voter could not understand. They have seen their ballot choices overridden by subsequent legislation. They have watched necessary reforms die in the gap between what amendments can do and what revisions could do but cannot be proposed. They have felt, even if they could not articulate, that something is wrong with a system in which comprehensive solutions are structurally impossible.

(g) FINDING SIX: THE OMNIPRESENCE RATIONALE. The people cannot solve this problem alone because they lack the revision power. The Legislature will not solve this problem without sustained pressure because it lacks the incentive. Therefore, the people must create that pressure—not through a single mandate that can be ignored, but through an omnipresent, inescapable, permanent institutional framework that forces the question of constitutional revision into the daily consciousness of every legislator, every day, until the problem is addressed. This is not harassment. This is not punishment. This is help. We are giving legislators the external pressure that will provide them political cover to do what they know, in their hearts, needs to be done.

(h) FINDING SEVEN: THE STUDY MANDATE AS FLOOR. Whether or not the operative provisions of this Article are upheld by the courts, the people have a compelling interest in requiring California’s governmental institutions to study and report on these structural barriers and potential solutions. No court can reasonably hold that the people lack the power to require a legislative study on a matter of public concern. If every other provision of this Article is invalidated, the study mandate shall remain, and California’s institutions shall be required to grapple seriously with the questions we raise.

CHAPTER 2. VOTER-REFERRED REVISION PROCESS

Part A. Establishment and Basic Mechanics

SECTION 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF VOTER-REFERRED REVISION PROCESS.

(a) There is hereby established a process by which the people may propose a revision of the Constitution by initiative, to be referred to the Legislature for consideration pursuant to this Article. This process shall be known as a “voter-referred revision,” and it represents the completion of the democratic project begun by the Progressives of 1911.

(b) The voter-referred revision process recognizes that the people and the Legislature are partners in constitutional governance, not adversaries. The people propose; the Legislature deliberates; the people ratify. This tripartite structure ensures that revisions receive the comprehensive consideration they deserve while respecting the people’s fundamental right to initiate the conversation.

(c) An initiative measure proposing a voter-referred revision shall set forth the complete text of the proposed revision and shall be qualified in the manner provided by Article II of this Constitution. The proponent shall draft the revision with care, understanding that the Legislature will scrutinize it closely and may refuse to approve it if it is poorly conceived or drafted. The power to propose is not the power to enact; it is the power to begin a dialogue.

(d) An initiative measure that solely refers a proposed revision to the Legislature pursuant to this Article, and does not itself amend the Constitution or enact other provisions beyond those designated as Tier 1 pursuant to Section 12, may be proposed and qualified as a statute pursuant to Article II, Section 8. This subdivision is intended to reduce the signature burden for measures that seek only to begin the revision process, recognizing that the revision itself will require legislative approval and voter ratification before taking effect.

(e) If subdivision (d) is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such initiative measures shall be proposed and qualified as amendments to the Constitution pursuant to Article II, Section 8. The people’s intent is to create the easiest lawful path to proposing voter-referred revisions; if the statutory path is unavailable, the constitutional amendment path shall be used instead.

(f) Upon certification of voter approval of an initiative proposing a voter-referred revision, the proposed revision shall be formally referred to the Legislature. This referral is self-executing and requires no further action by any officer or body. The Secretary of State shall transmit the text of the approved revision to the President pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the chairs of the Judiciary Committees of each house within five days of certification. Failure to transmit shall not affect the validity of the referral.

(g) For revisions proposed in 2026, referral shall be effective upon the Secretary of State's publication of official unofficial results showing passage, allowing immediate legislative consideration. Full legal effect shall occur upon certification. This provision is intended to create the shortest possible timeline for the inaugural voter-referred revision, demonstrating the viability of the process and building momentum for constitutional renewal.

(h) The people declare that the voter-referred revision process is not intended to replace or diminish the Legislature's existing authority to propose revisions. Both pathways shall exist in parallel. The Legislature may continue to propose revisions as it always has, and the people may now propose revisions as well. Competition between these pathways, if it occurs, will benefit California by generating more ideas for constitutional improvement.

SECTION 6. LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATION.

(a) The Legislature may approve a voter-referred revision by the vote required by Section 1 of Article XVIII for legislative proposals of constitutional revisions—that is, by a two-thirds vote of all members elected to each house. This is the same threshold the Legislature must meet to place its own revisions on the ballot. The people ask no special treatment; we accept the same standard that applies to legislative proposals.

(b) The Legislature's consideration of a voter-referred revision shall be genuine and substantive. The Legislature shall not treat voter-referred revisions as mere formalities to be rubber-stamped, nor shall it treat them as presumptively invalid proposals to be rejected without consideration. Each voter-referred revision represents the expressed will of a majority of California voters; it deserves the same careful analysis the Legislature would give to a revision proposed by its own members.

(c) Except as provided in subdivision (k), if the Legislature approves a voter-referred revision, it shall be submitted to the voters at the first statewide election held at least 131 days after such approval, including any election established by Section 1.5 of Article II of this Constitution. The 131-day period ensures adequate time for voter education and ballot preparation while preventing unnecessary delay.

(d) The Legislature may reject a voter-referred revision by majority vote of each house, or by taking no action within the time period specified in subdivision (f). A vote to reject is not a vote of bad faith; the Legislature may legitimately conclude that a proposed revision is unwise, poorly drafted, or otherwise unsuitable for inclusion in the Constitution. What the Legislature may not do is ignore a voter-referred revision indefinitely without consequence.

(e) If the Legislature rejects a voter-referred revision by majority vote, it shall issue a statement of reasons explaining the grounds for rejection. This statement shall be published on the Legislature's website and transmitted to the proponent within thirty days of the vote to reject.

The people are entitled to know why their proposal was rejected, and the Legislature is accountable for its decision.

(f) If the Legislature has neither approved nor rejected a voter-referred revision within 730 days of its referral, the revision shall be deemed rejected. This provision prevents voter-referred revisions from languishing indefinitely in legislative limbo. Two years is ample time for the Legislature to consider even the most complex proposal; if the Legislature cannot act within that period, the people are entitled to closure.

(g) The Legislature shall not select a later election when an earlier election satisfying the requirements of this section is available. Any attempt to delay submission beyond the first available election shall be void and of no effect, and the revision shall be submitted at such first available election. This anti-delay provision ensures that the Legislature cannot pocket-veto an approved revision by choosing an unnecessarily distant election date.

(h) The Legislature may hold as many hearings, commission as many studies, and engage in as much debate as it deems appropriate when considering a voter-referred revision. Nothing in this Article limits the Legislature's deliberative processes. What this Article requires is that the Legislature ultimately act—either approving the revision, rejecting it with reasons, or allowing the deemed rejection to occur.

(i) During its consideration of a voter-referred revision, the Legislature may consult with the proponent, request additional information or analysis, and engage in dialogue about the revision's purposes and potential effects. The proponent shall cooperate in good faith with such requests, understanding that legislative approval is more likely if the Legislature's legitimate questions are answered.

(j) The Legislature may not condition its approval of a voter-referred revision on matters unrelated to the revision itself. The Legislature shall not demand that the proponent support or oppose other measures, endorse or oppose candidates, or take any action beyond providing information about the revision under consideration. Any such conditions shall be void as contrary to the purposes of this Article.

(k) INAUGURAL ACCELERATION: Notwithstanding subdivision (c), Article II Section 8 subdivision (c), Elections Code Section 9040, or any other provision of this Constitution or statute establishing a minimum period between qualification, adoption, or approval and election, for any voter-referred revision referred to the Legislature between November 1, 2026 and January 31, 2027, the Legislature may submit such revision to the voters at a statewide election occurring at least 88 days after legislative approval, including any election established by Section 1.5 of Article II or by any initiative statute approved at the same election as this Article.

(l) The people find and declare that accelerated timelines for the inaugural cycle serve the urgent need for democratic responsiveness in an era of rapid technological and societal change, and that this acceleration is necessary to demonstrate the viability of the voter-referred revision process. The world is changing faster than our constitutional processes can keep pace. For the inaugural revision, we choose speed without sacrificing deliberation.

(m) If subdivision (k) is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, but a longer minimum period would be valid, the following periods shall apply in order of preference: (A) 100 days; (B) 115 days; (C) 131 days. The people's intent is to achieve the shortest permissible timeline; if 88 days is impermissible, the court should identify the shortest period that is permissible, and that period shall apply.

(n) If the entire Inaugural Acceleration provision is held invalid, the general 131-day rule of subdivision (c) shall apply to revisions referred in 2026-2027 as it applies to all other revisions.

SECTION 7. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATION.

(a) Within 30 days of the referral of a voter-referred revision, the presiding officer of each house shall assign the revision to the appropriate policy committee or committees for consideration. Assignment to committee does not guarantee that the committee will report the revision favorably; it guarantees only that the revision will receive initial consideration.

(b) Each house shall hold at least one public hearing on a voter-referred revision prior to any floor vote on such revision. The hearing shall provide an opportunity for the proponent to present the revision, for witnesses to testify in support or opposition, and for members to question all participants. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the rules of the house, but shall provide a meaningful opportunity for public participation.

(c) Any vote on a voter-referred revision, whether in committee or on the floor, shall be by rollcall vote entered in the journal. The people are entitled to know how their representatives voted on proposals the people have placed before the Legislature. No voice votes, no votes by show of hands, no procedures that obscure individual accountability.

(d) The Legislative Analyst shall prepare and publish an impartial analysis of a voter-referred revision within 60 days of its referral to the Legislature. This analysis shall describe the revision's likely effects, identify fiscal impacts, note potential legal issues, and provide such other information as the Legislative Analyst deems useful for legislative deliberation. The analysis shall be made available to all legislators, to the proponent, and to the public.

(e) If the Legislature rejects a voter-referred revision, each house shall adopt and publish a statement of reasons for such rejection within 30 days of the rejection vote. If the Legislature

fails to adopt a statement of reasons, any member may submit an individual statement explaining their reasons for voting to reject, and such statements shall be compiled and published by the Secretary of State.

(f) Notice of any legislative rejection of a voter-referred revision, together with any statement of reasons, shall be included in the voter information guide for the next statewide election. The people shall know what their Legislature has done and why.

(g) All legislative proceedings concerning a voter-referred revision, including but not limited to committee hearings, floor debates, and votes, shall be broadcast live via the Legislature's official internet streaming platform and any other platforms customarily used for legislative broadcasts. Constitutional revision is too important to be conducted in obscurity.

(h) Complete video recordings of all proceedings described in subdivision (g) shall be archived and made permanently available to the public at no charge on the Legislature's official website. Future generations shall be able to see how their predecessors deliberated on constitutional questions.

(i) Transcripts of all proceedings described in subdivision (g) shall be prepared and made publicly available within fourteen days of each proceeding. Video is valuable, but searchable text is essential for researchers, journalists, and citizens seeking to understand what was said and by whom.

(j) If subdivisions (g), (h), or (i) are held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, legislative proceedings on voter-referred revisions shall be subject to the same transparency requirements as other legislative proceedings. The people's intent is maximum transparency; if maximum transparency is unavailable, standard transparency shall apply.

Part B. Amendment of Voter-Referred Revisions

SECTION 8. AMENDMENT OF VOTER-REFERRED REVISIONS.

(a) The Legislature may propose amendments to a voter-referred revision during its consideration thereof. The purpose of this provision is to enable dialogue between the people and the Legislature, allowing the Legislature to suggest improvements to a proposal while respecting the people's role as the proposal's originators.

(b) Any amendment proposed by the Legislature shall require the written consent of the proponent before it may be incorporated into the revision. The proponent's consent shall be filed with the Secretary of State and entered into the legislative record. If the proponent does not

consent to an amendment, the Legislature must accept or reject the revision as originally proposed.

(c) If the proponent does not consent to an amendment, the Legislature shall not adopt that amendment and shall consider the revision in its original form. The Legislature may still approve or reject the revision; it simply may not unilaterally alter it over the proponent's objection.

(d) The proponent may consent to specific amendments while objecting to others. The proponent may also condition consent on the approval of the entire amended package—that is, the proponent may agree to certain amendments only if the Legislature also agrees to certain others.

(e) The amendment process is intended to be collaborative, not adversarial. The people encourage proponents to consider legislative amendments in good faith, recognizing that the Legislature may have insights that improve the revision. The people also encourage the Legislature to respect the proponent's role as the revision's author, recognizing that the people voted for the revision as proposed.

(f) If the Legislature and proponent reach agreement on amendments, the revised text shall be transmitted to voters for ratification. The ballot materials shall indicate that the revision was amended with the proponent's consent during legislative consideration.

(g) If no agreement on amendments is reached, the original text shall be the version submitted to voters (if the Legislature approves) or the version deemed rejected (if the Legislature rejects or fails to act). The proponent's vision shall not be overwritten by a Legislature that disagrees with it; the proponent's only obligation is to persuade, and the Legislature's only power is to approve or reject.

Part C. Ratification

SECTION 9. RATIFICATION OF VOTER-REFERRED REVISIONS.

(a) A voter-referred revision that has been approved by the Legislature shall be submitted to the voters for ratification at the election specified in Section 6 of this Article. Ratification requires approval by a majority of the voters voting on the measure.

(b) If a voter-referred revision is ratified by the voters, it shall become part of this Constitution and take effect as specified in the revision. If the revision does not specify an effective date, it shall take effect on the fifth day after the Secretary of State certifies the results of the election at which it was ratified.

(c) The ballot materials for a voter-referred revision submitted for ratification shall include: (1) The complete text of the revision, or a fair summary thereof if the complete text exceeds the length customarily included in the voter information guide; (2) The analysis prepared by the Legislative Analyst; (3) Arguments in favor of and against the revision, prepared in accordance with the procedures applicable to other ballot measures; (4) A notation that the revision was “Proposed by the People and Approved by the Legislature,” reflecting the collaborative nature of the voter-referred revision process.

(d) The notation required by subdivision (c)(4) shall appear on the ballot itself, on the ballot label, and in all official references to the measure. The people and the Legislature have both blessed this revision; the voters should know that when they cast their votes.

(e) A voter-referred revision that is rejected by the voters shall not become part of this Constitution and shall have no legal effect except as expressly provided in the revision or in this Article. The proponent may, however, propose a substantially similar revision through the voter-referred revision process or the ordinary initiative process, subject to the signature requirements applicable to such proposals.

(f) The ratification election is the final check on the voter-referred revision process. The people have the first word (by approving the initiative that proposes the revision) and the last word (by ratifying or rejecting the revision after legislative consideration). The Legislature has the middle word. This structure ensures that revisions are subjected to multiple rounds of democratic scrutiny before becoming part of our fundamental law.

SECTION 10. EFFECT OF RATIFICATION.

(a) Upon ratification of a voter-referred revision by the voters, the provisions of such revision shall take operative effect as specified therein, including but not limited to: (1) Amendments or additions to this Constitution; (2) Amendments or additions to the Government Code or other statutory codes; (3) Amendments or additions to any other law; (4) The creation of new governmental entities, offices, or programs; (5) The authorization of fiscal measures, including bonds, taxes, and appropriations; (6) Any other legal effects specified in the revision.

(b) The complete text of a ratified voter-referred revision shall be codified in Government Code Section 8142024, which is hereby established as the permanent repository for voter-referred constitutional revisions. Each ratified revision shall be designated as a separate article within Section 8142024, numbered sequentially beginning with Article 1.

(c) The Legislative Counsel shall prepare and publish the codified text within 30 days of certification of voter ratification. The Legislative Counsel shall also update all affected sections of this Constitution and other codes to reflect the ratified revision.

(d) The text of a ratified voter-referred revision shall remain in Section 8142024 as a permanent record, in addition to taking operative effect in the locations specified by the revision. This dual placement ensures both that the revision has operative legal effect and that a complete record of the people’s exercise of their revision power is maintained in perpetuity.

(e) If this section is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, voter-referred revisions shall be codified and take effect as otherwise provided by law.

Part D. The Preamble to Section 8142024

SECTION 11. PREAMBLE TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 8142024.

The following preamble is hereby added to Government Code Section 8142024:

**GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 8142024
VOTER-REFERRED CONSTITUTIONAL REVISIONS
PREAMBLE**

This section is established pursuant to Article XXXV of the California Constitution as the permanent repository for voter-referred constitutional revisions.

Each article within this section contains the complete text of a revision proposed by the people of California through the initiative process and referred to the Legislature for consideration pursuant to Article XXXV.

The text contained in each article represents the voice of the people—a vision for constitutional renewal placed before the Legislature and, if approved, returned to the people for ratification. These are not ordinary laws. They are expressions of the sovereign will, exercises of the people’s inherent power to alter and reform their government when the public good requires.

Upon ratification, the provisions of each article take operative effect as specified therein. The text shall also remain here as a permanent record of the people’s exercise of their sovereign power to propose revision of their Constitution. This is a living archive of democratic aspiration.

May those who read these words, in this generation and those to come, remember that political power is inherent in the people, and that the people reserve to themselves the right to imagine a more perfect California.

May they remember also that democracy is not a gift given once and enjoyed forever, but a practice that must be renewed by each generation. The people who wrote these words believed in the future. The people who read them should believe in it too.

[ARTICLES CONTAINING VOTER-REFERRED REVISIONS FOLLOW]

SECTION 12. TIERED STRUCTURE FOR VOTER-REFERRED REVISIONS.

(a) An initiative measure proposing a voter-referred revision may designate its provisions into three tiers, as follows:

(1) TIER 1: Provisions that shall take effect as an initiative statute immediately upon voter approval of the initiative, without regard to subsequent legislative action on the underlying revision. Tier 1 provisions represent the minimum that the people demand regardless of whether the revision process succeeds.

(2) TIER 2: Provisions that shall take effect upon legislative approval of the voter-referred revision, without regard to subsequent voter ratification. Tier 2 provisions represent effects that should flow from the Legislature's endorsement of the revision.

(3) TIER 3: Provisions that shall take effect only upon voter ratification of the voter-referred revision following legislative approval. Tier 3 provisions represent the full scope of the revision, taking effect only after the complete three-hurdle process has been satisfied.

(b) If any provision designated as Tier 1 is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to exceed the authority of an initiative statute, such provision shall be automatically redesignated as Tier 2 and shall take effect upon legislative approval rather than voter approval. This automatic demotion preserves the provision while respecting judicial determination of its proper tier.

(c) If any provision designated as Tier 2 is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to exceed the authority of legislative approval under this Article, such provision shall be automatically redesignated as Tier 3 and shall take effect only upon voter ratification. This automatic demotion preserves the provision while respecting judicial determination of its proper tier.

(d) The automatic redesignation provisions of subdivisions (b) and (c) operate by force of law and require no additional filing or action by the proponent, the Legislature, or any other person or entity.

(e) Each tier is independently severable from every other tier. The invalidity of all provisions in one tier shall not affect the validity of provisions in any other tier.

(f) The tiered structure is intended to maximize the probability that some portion of a voter-referred revision will take effect even if other portions are invalidated. The people have organized their revisions in layers precisely so that courts may trim rather than amputate.

CHAPTER 3. PROPONENT RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS

Part A. Definition and Succession

SECTION 13. DEFINITION OF PROPONENT.

(a) For purposes of this Article, “proponent” means the person or persons who file an initiative measure with the Attorney General pursuant to Section 9001 of the Elections Code, or any successor provision.

(b) If more than one person files an initiative measure, the proponents may designate among themselves which person or persons shall exercise the rights granted by this Article. Such designation shall be filed with the Secretary of State and shall be binding unless and until superseded by a subsequent filing signed by all original proponents.

(c) If the proponents fail to designate among themselves, all original proponents shall jointly possess the rights granted by this Article, and any action requiring proponent approval shall require the approval of a majority of the original proponents.

(d) The proponent of an initiative measure retains all rights granted by this Article even if the proponent did not personally draft the measure, did not personally gather signatures, or did not personally finance the qualification campaign. The legal role of proponent attaches to the person who filed the initiative with the Attorney General, regardless of who performed the underlying work.

SECTION 14. PROPONENT SUCCESSION.

(a) A proponent may designate one or more successors to exercise the proponent’s rights under this Article in the event of the proponent’s death, incapacity, or voluntary relinquishment of the proponent role. Such designation shall be made by written instrument filed with the Secretary of State and shall be revocable at any time prior to the event triggering succession.

(b) If a proponent dies without having designated a successor, the proponent’s rights under this Article shall pass to the proponent’s estate and may be exercised by the personal representative thereof. If the estate is closed without the rights having been exercised or assigned, the rights shall terminate.

(c) If a proponent becomes incapacitated without having designated a successor, the proponent’s rights under this Article may be exercised by the proponent’s conservator or guardian, if any, or by such other person as a court of competent jurisdiction may designate upon application by any interested party.

(d) A proponent may voluntarily relinquish the proponent role by written instrument filed with the Secretary of State. Upon such relinquishment, the proponent's rights under this Article shall pass to any designated successor, or if none has been designated, shall terminate.

(e) The succession provisions of this section are intended to ensure continuity in the voter-referred revision process. A revision that has been proposed and approved by voters should not fail merely because its proponent has died or become incapacitated. The people's work continues even when individual workers cannot.

Part B. Standing and Defense Rights

SECTION 15. PROPONENT'S STANDING THROUGHOUT PROCESS.

(a) The proponent of an initiative proposing a voter-referred revision shall have standing to participate at every stage of the process, from qualification through implementation, including but not limited to: (1) All proceedings before the Attorney General concerning the preparation of the title and summary; (2) All proceedings before the Secretary of State concerning the qualification of the initiative; (3) All legislative proceedings concerning the voter-referred revision; (4) All administrative proceedings concerning the implementation of the revision; (5) All judicial proceedings concerning the validity, interpretation, or implementation of the initiative or the revision.

(b) The proponent's standing is independent of and in addition to any standing possessed by the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, any legislator, or any other person or entity. The proponent may participate in proceedings even if other parties with standing choose not to participate.

(c) The proponent may intervene as of right in any judicial proceeding affecting the initiative or the revision. No court may deny intervention to a proponent who seeks it.

(d) The proponent shall receive notice of all administrative and judicial proceedings affecting the initiative or the revision. The Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and all other state officers shall maintain current contact information for proponents and shall provide notice within three business days of becoming aware of any such proceeding.

(e) The proponent's standing continues until the revision is ratified and fully implemented, or until all pending matters concerning the initiative or revision are finally resolved, whichever is later.

SECTION 16. PROPONENT'S DEFENSE RIGHTS.

(a) The proponent of an initiative that qualifies or passes pursuant to this Article shall have standing to defend the validity and proper implementation of the measure in any court of this state, and to intervene in any action challenging or affecting the measure.

(b) The proponent's standing to defend is independent of and in addition to any standing possessed by state officials, and shall not be affected by any decision by state officials to decline to defend or to concede any issue. If the Attorney General declines to defend a measure, the proponent may defend it. If the Attorney General concedes an issue, the proponent may contest it.

(c) The proponent shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs from the State for the defense of any measure proposed pursuant to this Article if the proponent substantially prevails in any litigation concerning the measure. The people should not bear the financial burden of defending the people's measures when the State declines to do so.

(d) This section is self-executing and requires no implementing legislation. The proponent may file an action or intervene in a pending action immediately upon the occurrence of a triggering event, without awaiting any authorization from any state officer or body.

(e) The proponent's defense rights extend to: (1) Pre-election challenges to the initiative's validity, title, summary, or ballot placement; (2) Post-election challenges to the initiative's validity, the conduct of the election, or the certification of results; (3) Challenges to the Legislature's consideration of the voter-referred revision; (4) Challenges to the ratification election or its results; (5) Post-ratification challenges to the validity, interpretation, or implementation of the revision; (6) Any other proceeding in which the initiative or revision is at issue.

SECTION 17. PROPONENT'S IMMUNITY FROM CAPACITY CHALLENGES.

(a) The proponent of any initiative measure proposed pursuant to this Article shall not be subject to any legal challenge based on the proponent's personal capacity, qualifications, or fitness to serve as proponent.

(b) Any legal challenge to a measure proposed pursuant to this Article must be based on the content of the measure itself, not on the characteristics of the proponent. Courts shall dismiss any challenge that rests, in whole or in part, on allegations concerning the proponent's age, education, mental health, criminal history, political beliefs, religious beliefs, national origin, immigration status, or any other personal characteristic.

(c) This section is intended to protect the voter-referred revision process from challenges that seek to disqualify the proponent rather than address the substance of the proponent's proposals.

The people have the right to propose measures regardless of who among them does the proposing.

(d) Nothing in this section prevents challenges to a proponent's compliance with the procedural requirements for qualifying an initiative, such as signature requirements and filing deadlines. What this section forbids is challenges to the proponent's intrinsic capacity to serve in that role.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

Part C. Compensation and Support

SECTION 18. PROPONENT COMPENSATION ENHANCEMENT.

(a) Nexus Preamble: To ensure that the Legislature prioritizes the extraordinary and high-stakes labor of constitutional revision over routine legislative business, and to compensate for the significant additional time, deliberative effort, and political risk required for genuine consideration of voter-referred revisions:

(b) An initiative statute referring a revision pursuant to this Article may include a provision authorizing enhanced compensation for legislators who participate in the consideration of the voter-referred revision. Such provision shall be designated as a Tier 2 provision pursuant to Section 12 and shall take effect upon legislative approval of the revision.

(c) If such a provision is included, the following shall apply: (1) The initiative may provide additional compensation to all legislators who participate in votes on the voter-referred revision, whether such legislators vote to approve or to reject the revision. (2) Hobbs Act Shield: The people declare that this compensation recognizes the burden of high-stakes constitutional deliberation and the courage to confront difficult constitutional questions, not the specific vote cast. The compensation is for engaging in the deliberative process, not for reaching any particular outcome. (3) Such payments shall continue unless and until the Secretary of State certifies that the voters have rejected the revision at the ratification election.

(d) If subdivision (b) or (c) is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, any increased compensation authorized by the initiative statute shall take effect only upon ratification of the revision by the voters.

(e) The purpose of this section is to ensure that legislators who devote time and political capital to constitutional revision are fairly compensated for their service. Constitutional revision is difficult, risky, and time-consuming work. Legislators who undertake it deserve recognition.

(f) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 19. PROPONENT SUPPORT SERVICES.

- (a)** Upon qualification of an initiative proposing a voter-referred revision, the proponent shall be entitled to receive technical assistance from the Office of Legislative Counsel in preparing any amendments to the revision that may be considered during legislative deliberation.
- (b)** Upon qualification of an initiative proposing a voter-referred revision, the proponent shall be entitled to receive a briefing from the Legislative Analyst's Office on the fiscal and policy implications of the revision as analyzed by that office.
- (c)** The services described in this section shall be provided at no cost to the proponent. The people should not be required to pay for assistance in exercising their constitutional rights.
- (d)** Nothing in this section requires the Office of Legislative Counsel or the Legislative Analyst's Office to endorse the proponent's revision or to assist the proponent in advocacy. The assistance provided shall be technical and analytical, not political.
- (e)** This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

CHAPTER 4. ENTITLEMENT MECHANISM

Part A. Establishment and Purpose

SECTION 20. ESTABLISHMENT OF ENTITLEMENT.

(a) An initiative statute referring a revision pursuant to this Article may include a provision entitling the proponent to place additional measures on the ballot without gathering signatures. This mechanism shall be known as the “entitlement,” and it represents a reward for demonstrated democratic achievement.

(b) The purpose of the entitlement is to create an alternative to the wealth-based signature-gathering system that currently dominates the initiative process. A proponent who demonstrates the ability to win voter approval, secure legislative concurrence, and win voter approval again has proven something more meaningful than the ability to write large checks to signature-gathering firms. Such a proponent has proven the ability to persuade their fellow citizens through democratic means.

(c) The entitlement is not a grant of unchecked power. Measures placed on the ballot through the entitlement are subject to the same voter approval requirements as any other measure. The proponent gains only the right to place measures before the voters; the voters retain the right to reject them.

(d) Any provision creating an entitlement shall specify the maximum number of additional measures the proponent may place on the ballot. This maximum shall not exceed twenty-four (24) measures, and such measures shall be permitted at the next four statewide elections following the entitlement’s activation.

(e) Germaneness Requirement: To ensure this entitlement serves as a procedural enhancement to the revision process rather than a grant of plenary legislative power, any measure placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement must be germane to the purposes of this Article, including but not limited to: (1) Constitutional revision or amendment; (2) Structural reform of government institutions; (3) Improvements to democratic processes and voter participation; (4) Mechanisms for government accountability and transparency; (5) Fiscal reforms necessary to implement structural changes to California government.

The Attorney General shall decline to prepare a title and summary for any entitlement measure that fails this germaneness test, subject to judicial review. The entitlement exists to break the fractals of gridlock in California’s constitutional structure, not to advance any unrelated agenda the entitlement holder might wish to pursue.

SECTION 21. CONDITIONS FOR ENTITLEMENT.

(a) Except as provided in Chapter 12 (Supplemental Revision Authorities), the entitlement described in Section 20 shall become effective only upon the satisfaction of all of the following conditions: (1) The initiative statute referring the revision is approved by the voters; (2) The voter-referred revision is approved by the Legislature by the vote required by this Article; (3) The voter-referred revision is ratified by the voters.

(b) These conditions represent the “three-hurdle test” that proponents must satisfy to earn an entitlement. The proponent must persuade the voters twice (at the initial initiative election and at the ratification election) and the Legislature once (during the deliberation phase). This is a demanding test, and only proponents who satisfy it deserve the reward of signature-free ballot access.

(c) The entitlement represents a reward for democratic achievement: the proponent has persuaded the voters twice and the Legislature once, demonstrating the ability to build consensus through constitutional processes rather than through wealth.

(d) The entitlement is not a grant of power to any individual but a recognition that certain barriers to ballot access may be reduced for proponents who have demonstrated exceptional democratic achievement. The people retain full authority to reject any measure placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement; the entitlement affects only the qualification process, not the ratification process.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

Part B. Exercise of Entitlement

SECTION 22. EXERCISE OF ENTITLEMENT.

(a) A proponent (or a Trust, if applicable) who has earned the entitlement described in Section 20 may place a measure on the ballot by filing with the Secretary of State: (1) A notice of intent to exercise the entitlement, identifying the proponent and the entitlement being exercised; (2) The complete text of the proposed measure; (3) A certification that the proponent is exercising an entitlement earned pursuant to this Article and has not exceeded the maximum number of measures permitted thereunder.

(b) Upon receipt of a proper filing pursuant to subdivision (a), the Secretary of State shall verify that the proponent has earned an unexpired entitlement and has not exceeded the maximum number of measures permitted thereunder.

(c) If the Secretary of State verifies the entitlement, the Secretary shall include the proposed measure on the ballot at the next statewide election occurring at least 131 days after the filing.

The measure shall be processed in the same manner as other initiative measures, including the preparation of a title and summary by the Attorney General and a fiscal analysis by the Legislative Analyst.

(d) The proponent shall have sole discretion over the content, timing, and number of measures placed on the ballot pursuant to the entitlement, subject only to the germaneness requirement and limitations specified in this Article and in the initiative that created the entitlement.

(e) Measures placed on the ballot pursuant to this section shall be subject to the same title and summary, fiscal analysis, ballot placement, and voter information requirements as other initiative measures. The entitlement waives only the signature requirement; it does not waive any other requirement applicable to initiatives.

(f) The Attorney General shall prepare the title and summary for a measure placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement within 45 days of the proponent's filing. The proponent may request expedited preparation if necessary to meet an election deadline, and the Attorney General shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate such requests.

SECTION 23. LIMITATIONS ON ENTITLEMENT.

(a) The entitlement described in this Chapter is personal to the proponent who earned it (or the Trust, as applicable) and, except as provided in subdivision (d), may not be transferred, assigned, sold, or delegated to any other person or entity. The entitlement is a reward for democratic achievement, not a commodity to be bought and sold.

(b) The entitlement expires four years after it becomes effective, or upon the placement of the maximum number of measures specified in the enabling initiative, whichever occurs first. This limitation ensures that entitlements do not accumulate indefinitely and that proponents have an incentive to exercise them while they remain relevant to current conditions.

(c) The entitlement does not guarantee that any measure placed on the ballot will be approved by the voters. The proponent gains only ballot access, not voter approval. The people retain full authority to reject any measure placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement.

(d) Upon the death of the proponent (if held by an individual), any remaining entitlement may be exercised by the proponent's designated successor as specified in the enabling initiative, or if no successor is designated, by the proponent's estate. This provision ensures that work begun by a proponent may be completed even if the proponent does not live to see it through.

(e) Any measure placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement that is found by a court to violate the germaneness requirement of Section 20(e) shall be removed from the ballot if the court's order is issued prior to the election, or shall be void and of no effect if the court's order is issued

after the election. The proponent shall not be entitled to replace such a measure with another measure.

(f) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 24. RECURSIVE COMPOUNDING.

(a) If a proponent exercises an entitlement to place a measure on the ballot, and that measure includes a provision creating a new entitlement pursuant to Section 20, and that measure satisfies all conditions of Section 21, the proponent shall earn an additional entitlement.

(b) The people recognize that this recursive structure could, in theory, allow a proponent to earn successive entitlements indefinitely. The people find this acceptable because each cycle requires the proponent to demonstrate renewed democratic achievement—winning voter approval, legislative concurrence, and voter ratification. A proponent who can repeatedly satisfy the three-hurdle test has repeatedly proven their democratic legitimacy.

(c) The recursive structure is intentional. The people seek to create a flywheel of democratic reform—a self-sustaining cycle in which successful reforms generate the capacity for additional reforms. This is the opposite of the fractals of gridlock we seek to break; it is a fractal of progress.

(d) If this section is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, entitlements shall not compound, and a proponent may hold only one entitlement at a time. The people accept this limitation if the courts impose it, but the people prefer the recursive structure.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 25. PROHIBITION ON LEGISLATIVE INTERFERENCE WITH ENTITLEMENT.

(a) The Legislature shall not enact any law that would: (1) Impose additional requirements for earning or exercising an entitlement beyond those specified in this Article; (2) Reduce the number of measures a proponent may place on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement; (3) Shorten the time period during which an entitlement may be exercised; (4) Impose content restrictions on measures placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement beyond those specified in this Article; (5) Create procedural barriers to the exercise of an entitlement; (6) Require the proponent to disclose information not required of other initiative proponents; (7) Subject measures placed on the ballot pursuant to an entitlement to review, approval, or veto by any state officer or body other than the voters themselves.

(b) Any law that conflicts with subdivision (a) shall be void to the extent of the conflict. The entitlement is a constitutional right created by the people; the Legislature may not diminish it.

(c) Nothing in this section prevents the Legislature from enacting laws that facilitate the exercise of entitlements, such as laws providing for expedited processing of measures filed pursuant to entitlements.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

CHAPTER 5. FISCAL AUTHORITY

SECTION 26. FISCAL PLENARY AUTHORITY.

(a) The people find and declare that constitutional revision often requires fiscal flexibility. A Constitution that enables comprehensive reform must enable the fiscal measures necessary to implement that reform. A revision that restructures government, creates new institutions, addresses long-deferred challenges, or invests in the future may require authorization of significant public investments.

(b) A voter-referred revision proposed pursuant to this Article may include any fiscal provisions that could be included in a constitutional amendment or initiative statute, including but not limited to: (1) Appropriations from the General Fund or any special fund; (2) Authorization of taxes, fees, or other revenue measures; (3) Authorization of general obligation bonds or revenue bonds; (4) Modification of existing constitutional fiscal constraints, including but not limited to those established by Article XIII A (Proposition 13), Article XIII B (the Gann Limit), Article XVI (limitations on state indebtedness), or any other article; (5) Creation of new fiscal structures, funds, or mechanisms; (6) Dedication of revenue streams to specific purposes; (7) Authorization of public-private partnerships or other innovative financing mechanisms; (8) Any combination of the foregoing.

(c) The fiscal provisions of a voter-referred revision shall take effect as provided in the revision, subject to ratification by the voters. The voters who ratify a revision that includes fiscal provisions thereby authorize those provisions; no additional approval is required beyond that provided by this Article.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt fiscal provisions of a voter-referred revision from the requirements of Article XVI, Section 1 concerning legislative authorization of state indebtedness. The people intend that voter-referred revisions including bond authorizations shall comply with all constitutional requirements applicable to such authorizations.

(e) If this section is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the fiscal authority of voter-referred revisions shall be as otherwise provided by law.

(f) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 27. FUNDING FOR REVISION IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) A voter-referred revision may include provisions ensuring that funds necessary for its implementation are appropriated. Such provisions may include: (1) Direct appropriations from the General Fund; (2) Creation of special funds with dedicated revenue sources; (3) Requirements that the Legislature include specific appropriations in the annual Budget Act; (4)

Authorization for the Controller to transfer funds without further legislative action if the Legislature fails to appropriate required amounts.

(b) The people find that many initiatives have been undermined by legislative refusal to appropriate funds necessary for their implementation. This Article is designed to prevent such obstruction of the people's will.

(c) Nothing in this section requires the people to include funding provisions in voter-referred revisions; it merely authorizes them to do so.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

CHAPTER 6. PROVISIONAL ELECTIONS

SECTION 28. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVISIONAL ELECTIONS.

(a) An initiative statute referring a revision pursuant to this Article may propose one or more statewide elections for the purpose of ratifying voter-referred revisions or conducting other business authorized by this Article. Such elections shall be known as “provisional elections” because they are proposed by initiative and subject to legislative confirmation or rejection.

(b) Upon certification of voter approval of an initiative proposing a statewide election: (1) The Secretary of State shall immediately begin preparations for the proposed election, including but not limited to reserving dates, preparing election materials, notifying county elections officials, and taking all other steps necessary to conduct the election if it proceeds; (2) The proposed election shall be held as specified in the initiative unless the Legislature, by statute enacted by majority vote of each house and signed by the Governor, provides otherwise.

(c) The burden is on the Legislature to act if it wishes to prevent a provisional election, not on the people to secure legislative permission for the election to proceed. This burden-shifting reflects the foundational principle that political power is inherent in the people, and that elections are the people’s instrument, not the Legislature’s gift.

(d) If the Legislature enacts a statute preventing a provisional election, such statute shall specify an alternative date for any ratification election that would have been held at the prevented election. The Legislature may delay but may not indefinitely prevent the ratification of voter-referred revisions.

SECTION 29. SELF-EXECUTING ELECTION CREATION.

(a) If the initiative statute that refers a revision pursuant to this Article proposes a provisional election, and if no statute prevents that election as provided in Section 28(b)(2), the election shall occur as specified in the initiative without any further action by the Legislature or any other body. The creation of the election is self-executing.

(b) **BACKUP APRIL 2027 ELECTION:** If Section 1.5 of Article II (created by the YVONNE Act, if approved by voters at the same election as this Article) is not in effect, this Section hereby independently creates and establishes a Statewide Special Election to be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April 2027, for the purpose of voting on any revision referred to the Legislature pursuant to this Article in 2026.

(c) **CONTROLLER AUTHORIZATION:** The Controller is hereby authorized and directed to disburse funds necessary for the conduct of any election established by this Section from the

General Fund without further appropriation. The people's elections shall not be held hostage to legislative appropriation decisions.

(d) The people declare that the creation of elections by initiative statute is an exercise of the people's inherent power to structure their own democratic processes, and that the Legislature's traditional role in calling elections shall not be construed to preempt the people's authority to create elections directly.

(e) If this section is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the revision shall be submitted at the first election otherwise available under this Article.

(f) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 30. BALLOT DESIGNATION AND PLACEMENT FOR VOTER-REFERRED REVISIONS.

(a) A voter-referred revision submitted for ratification shall be designated on the ballot and in all official materials as a "Voter-Referred Constitutional Revision." This designation distinguishes voter-referred revisions from initiatives proposed by the people without legislative approval and from measures proposed by the Legislature without prior voter initiative.

(b) A voter-referred revision submitted for ratification shall appear on the ballot before any measures placed on the ballot by the Legislature at the same election, unless the Legislature has placed a competing measure on the ballot, in which case the voter-referred revision and the competing measure shall appear in immediate succession with the voter-referred revision appearing first.

(c) The ballot label for a voter-referred revision shall include a notation that the measure was "Proposed by the People and Approved by the Legislature." This notation informs voters that both the people and the Legislature have endorsed the measure—a powerful signal of bipartisan, cross-institutional support.

(d) The Secretary of State shall ensure that the ballot label, ballot pamphlet, and all other official election materials accurately describe the voter-referred revision process and the roles of the people and the Legislature in approving the measure for ratification.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

CHAPTER 7. CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION STUDY MANDATE — THE FLOOR

Part A. Purpose and Indestructibility

SECTION 31. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY MANDATE.

(a) The people declare that this Chapter 7 represents the indestructible floor of this Article—the minimum mandate that no court can deny and no Legislature can ignore.

(b) Even if every other provision of this Article is invalidated by the courts, this Chapter shall survive. Even if the voter-referred revision process is held to exceed the permissible scope of an initiative, this Chapter shall survive. Even if the entitlement mechanism, the omnipresence mandate, and every innovative provision of this Article is struck down, this Chapter shall survive.

(c) The reason for this indestructibility is simple: the people have an unquestionable right to require their governmental institutions to study and report on matters of public concern. No court has ever held otherwise, and no court reasonably could. The study mandate is a routine exercise of the initiative power, asking only that designated institutions examine specific questions and report their findings to the public.

(d) But make no mistake: the study mandate is not a consolation prize. It is a foundation. If the operative provisions of this Article survive judicial review, the studies required by this Chapter will inform and support their implementation. If the operative provisions are invalidated, the studies required by this Chapter will provide the foundation for the next generation's efforts at constitutional reform.

(e) Either way, California's institutions will be required to grapple with the question of constitutional renewal. Either way, reports will be written, summits will be held, recommendations will be made. Either way, the people will have injected the question of constitutional revision into the permanent institutional consciousness of the state.

(f) This is what we mean by the floor: a permanent, inescapable, ongoing requirement that California's institutions take seriously the question of how to improve our Constitution. The people do not accept that this question can be ignored. The people do not accept that California's Constitution must remain forever as it is. The people insist that, at minimum, the question be studied.

SECTION 32. SEVERABILITY OF THE STUDY MANDATE.

- (a) This Chapter 7 is severable from all other provisions of this Article. The invalidity of any other chapter or section shall not affect the validity of this Chapter.
- (b) The people specifically declare that they would have adopted this Chapter even if every other provision of this Article were held invalid. This Chapter has independent value regardless of whether the operative provisions of this Article take effect.
- (c) The people's intent is as follows: Even if the courts determine that the people may not create a new constitutional revision process by initiative, the people retain the unquestionable right to require their governmental institutions to study and report on why such a process does not exist and what might be done about it.
- (d) This Chapter represents the people's minimum demand: that California's institutions take seriously the question of constitutional renewal, regardless of whether the people are permitted to answer that question themselves.

Part B. Quadrennial Studies

SECTION 33. QUADRENNIAL LEGISLATIVE STUDY.

- (a) Every four years, beginning in the year following the effective date of this Article and continuing in perpetuity, the Legislature shall conduct a comprehensive study and prepare a public report on constitutional revision in California.
- (b) The study shall address, at minimum: (1) The structural barriers to constitutional revision in California, including the distinction between amendments and revisions, the signature requirements for initiatives, the fiscal constraints embedded in the Constitution, and any other barriers identified by the study; (2) The political incentives and disincentives affecting legislative action on revision; (3) Constitutional revision mechanisms in other states and nations; (4) Emerging challenges facing California governance, including climate change, artificial intelligence, economic inequality, housing affordability, transportation, water resources, and any other challenges identified by the study; (5) Specific recommendations for reform.
- (c) The report shall be completed within 180 days of commencement of the study. The report shall be published on the Legislature's official website, transmitted to the Governor, and made available to the public in print form upon request.
- (d) This section represents the minimum study mandate. It is severable from all other provisions of this Article and shall remain in effect even if every other provision is invalidated.

SECTION 34. CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION STUDY.

- (a)** The Citizens Redistricting Commission shall prepare a report within 24 months of the effective date of this Article, and every four years thereafter, analyzing constitutional revision from the perspective of citizen participation and democratic legitimacy.
- (b)** The Commission's report shall address, at minimum: (1) How the current constitutional structure affects citizen participation in governance; (2) Whether constitutional barriers prevent adequate representation of California's diverse communities; (3) How constitutional revision processes in other jurisdictions have incorporated citizen participation; (4) Recommendations for making constitutional revision more accessible to ordinary citizens.
- (c)** The report shall be prepared independently, without legislative direction, and published directly to the public. The Commission's independence is essential to its credibility.
- (d)** This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 35. LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S OFFICE STUDY AND CLARITY SCORE.

- (a)** The Legislative Analyst's Office shall prepare a nonpartisan fiscal and structural analysis of constitutional revision within 18 months of the effective date of this Article, and every four years thereafter.
- (b)** The analysis shall examine fiscal constraints embedded in the Constitution, the implications of the Constitution's length and complexity, and comparative constitutional frameworks in other states.
- (c)** **CONSTITUTIONAL CLARITY SCORE:** As part of this analysis, the Legislative Analyst shall develop and publish a "Constitutional Clarity Score" measuring: (1) Internal consistency (provisions that contradict each other); (2) Readability (average grade level required to comprehend); (3) Structural coherence (logical organization); (4) Redundancy (duplicative provisions); (5) Obsolescence (provisions that reference repealed laws or defunct institutions).
- (d)** The people intend this Score to create an objective, nonpartisan benchmark against which progress toward constitutional clarity can be measured.

- (e)** This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 36. JUDICIAL COUNCIL STUDY.

(a) The Judicial Council of California shall prepare a report within 24 months of the effective date of this Article, and every four years thereafter, analyzing the constitutional provisions affecting the judiciary and recommending reforms that would improve the administration of justice.

(b) The report shall address provisions affecting judicial selection, court jurisdiction, and access to justice.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 37. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA STUDY.

(a) The Regents of the University of California are requested to direct the law schools of the University of California system to prepare, within 24 months of the effective date of this Article and every four years thereafter, a comprehensive academic analysis of California's constitutional structure, its deficiencies, and options for reform.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

Part C. Public Engagement

SECTION 38. QUADRENNIAL CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION SUMMIT.

(a) Every four years, the Legislature and designated institutions shall convene a joint public summit on constitutional revision.

(b) The summit shall present studies, facilitate public testimony, and identify areas of consensus.

(c) The summit shall be held in Sacramento, shall be open to the public, and shall be broadcast live.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 39. REGIONAL TOWN HALLS.

(a) In the year of each quadrennial summit, the Legislature shall hold at least ten regional town hall meetings on constitutional revision, distributed geographically throughout the state.

(b) The town halls shall be conducted in a manner that encourages participation by ordinary citizens.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 40. CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION PORTAL.

(a) The Legislature shall establish and maintain a public website dedicated to constitutional revision, to be known as the “Constitutional Revision Portal.”

(b) The Portal shall include all studies, archives of proceedings, educational materials, and a status tracker for revision proposals.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

CHAPTER 8. INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Part A. The Office of Constitutional Revision

SECTION 41. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION.

(a) There is hereby established in the legislative branch the Office of Constitutional Revision (the “Office”), which shall be a permanent, nonpartisan office dedicated to the study and facilitation of constitutional reform in California.

(b) The Office shall serve as the institutional memory and expert resource for constitutional revision in California.

(c) **CONSTITUTIONAL DEBT CLOCK:** The Office shall establish and maintain in a prominent location in the Capitol rotunda, and on the homepage of the Legislature’s official website, a digital display showing: (1) The number of days since California’s last comprehensive constitutional revision (beginning from January 1, 1967); (2) The number of amendments added to the Constitution since 1879; (3) The current word count of the California Constitution; (4) A comparison to the word count of the United States Constitution.

(d) This display shall be updated automatically and shall be visible to all visitors to the Capitol. It serves as a study in transparency, creating a permanent visual record of constitutional accretion.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 42. STRUCTURE AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE OFFICE.

(a) The Office shall be headed by a Director appointed jointly by the President pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the Assembly for a six-year term.

(b) The Director may be removed only for cause by a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature.

(c) The Director shall be a nonpartisan expert in constitutional law or public policy.

(d) The Office shall be funded by a continuing appropriation from the General Fund, in an amount not less than two million dollars (\$2,000,000) annually, adjusted for inflation.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 43. DUTIES OF THE OFFICE.

(a) The Office shall perform the following duties to facilitate the study of constitutional revision:

(1) Serve as the institutional repository of expertise; (2) Prepare all studies and reports required by this Article; (3) Staff the Standing Joint Committee; (4) Maintain the Constitutional Revision Portal; (5) Prepare an annual “State of the Constitution” report.

(b) FUTURE GENERATIONS ADVOCATE: The Office shall designate one staff member as the “Future Generations Advocate” whose duty shall be to review all constitutional revision proposals and prepare an assessment of how each proposal would affect Californians not yet born. This advocate speaks for those who cannot yet speak for themselves.

(c) PLAIN LANGUAGE CONSTITUTIONAL TRANSLATION: The Office shall prepare and maintain a “Plain Language Guide to the California Constitution” written at an eighth-grade reading level, explaining in accessible terms what each article and section of the Constitution means and does. This Guide shall be made available in Spanish and the five other most commonly spoken languages in California.

(d) INTERSTATE CONSTITUTIONAL LEARNING: The Office shall establish formal relationships with constitutional revision bodies or legislative committees in other states for the purpose of sharing best practices, research, and lessons learned. The people recognize that California is not alone in facing constitutional challenges.

(e) CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION FELLOWSHIP: The Office shall establish, in partnership with California law schools, a “Constitutional Revision Fellowship” providing stipends and academic credit for law students to work on constitutional revision research. The people intend this program to build a pipeline of expertise.

(f) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 44. CONTINUING EXISTENCE OF THE OFFICE.

(a) The Office shall continue in existence until the Legislature, by a two-thirds vote of each house, determines that comprehensive constitutional revision has been achieved and the Office is no longer needed.

(b) No other method of abolishing the Office shall be valid. The Office exists to keep the pressure on; it shall not be removed until the pressure has achieved its purpose.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

Part B. Fiscal Support

SECTION 45. CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION FUND.

(a) There shall be established in the annual Budget Act a dedicated line item for constitutional revision activities, to be known as the “Constitutional Revision Fund.”

(b) The Constitutional Revision Fund shall receive an annual appropriation of not less than five million dollars (\$5,000,000), adjusted annually for inflation.

(c) Funds in the Constitutional Revision Fund shall be used exclusively for the operations of the Office, the studies and summits required by this Article, and public education campaigns on constitutional issues.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

Part C. Advisory and Oversight Bodies

SECTION 46. CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) There is hereby established the Constitutional Revision Advisory Board (the “Board”), consisting of fifteen members appointed by the Governor, legislative leadership, and the Chief Justice of California.

(b) Members shall be selected for their expertise in constitutional law, public policy, civic engagement, or related fields. The people intend the Board to be genuinely nonpartisan.

(c) The Board shall advise the Office, review major reports, and recommend priorities for reform.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 47. STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION.

(a) There is hereby established in the Legislature a Standing Joint Committee on Constitutional Revision.

(b) The Committee shall oversee the preparation of studies, coordinate the quadrennial summit, and serve as the Legislature's institutional repository of expertise on constitutional revision.

(c) CONSTITUTIONAL IMPACT STATEMENT: For every bill introduced in the Legislature that would amend the Constitution, the author shall file a Constitutional Impact Statement addressing why the proposed change cannot be accomplished through statute and whether the subject matter would be better addressed through comprehensive revision. The Committee shall review these statements.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 48. ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION.

(a) Each year, the Standing Joint Committee on Constitutional Revision shall prepare and publish a brief annual report on constitutional revision.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTIONS 49 through 59. [RESERVED].

CHAPTER 9. THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION OMNIPRESENCE MANDATE

Part A. Findings and Purpose

SECTION 60. FINDINGS ON INSTITUTIONAL INERTIA.

(a) The people of California find and declare that institutional inertia is the enemy of constitutional renewal. Left to their own devices, institutions resist change. Without external pressure, the Legislature will not undertake the difficult work of constitutional revision.

(b) The provisions of this Chapter are designed to make constitutional revision impossible to ignore—not through punishment, but through persistent, constructive, omnipresent reminders.

(c) This Chapter is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 61. LAYERED INTENSITY.

(a) The provisions of this Chapter are organized in layers of increasing intensity. Some provisions are mild—a day of recognition, a brief question at the end of each session. Others are more demanding—annual addresses, daily reminders, permanent installations.

(b) The layered structure serves two purposes. First, it allows the people to express their demand for attention to constitutional revision at multiple levels of urgency. Second, it allows courts to trim the Chapter to whatever level they deem appropriate while preserving the maximum possible mandate.

(c) The people’s preference is that all provisions of this Chapter take effect. But if courts find some provisions excessive, the people ask that the remaining provisions be preserved. Better to have some reminders than none.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

Part B. Annual Institutional Requirements

SECTION 62. CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION DAY.

(a) The first Monday of each February shall be designated “Constitutional Revision Day” in California.

(b) On Constitutional Revision Day, each house of the Legislature shall convene in special session dedicated to constitutional revision to receive reports and hear testimony.

(c) CONSTITUTIONAL ANNIVERSARY RECOGNITION: On February 7 of each year (the anniversary of the 1879 Constitution’s ratification), the Governor shall issue a proclamation on the state of constitutional governance in California. This proclamation shall be read aloud in both houses of the Legislature.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 63. ANNUAL STATE OF THE CONSTITUTION ADDRESS.

(a) Each year, the Director of the Office of Constitutional Revision shall deliver an address to a joint session of the Legislature on the “State of the Constitution.”

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

Part C. Ongoing Reminders

SECTION 64. THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION QUESTION.

(a) To ensure that the specific issue of constitutional revision remains a permanent item of legislative business: At the conclusion of each floor session of each house, before adjournment, the presiding officer shall ask: “Is there any member who wishes to address the question of constitutional revision?”

(b) Any member responding affirmatively shall be recognized for up to one minute to make a statement concerning constitutional revision.

(c) If no member responds, the presiding officer shall state: “The question remains open. The people are waiting.”

(d) The people intend this daily ritual to serve as a persistent reminder that the question of constitutional revision has been placed before the Legislature and awaits a response.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 65. DAILY CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION SUMMARY.

(a) On each day that the Legislature is in session, the Office of Constitutional Revision shall prepare a brief end-of-day summary noting any revision-related activity and the number of days since California's last comprehensive revision in 1966.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

Part D. Physical Presence Requirements

SECTION 66. THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION REFERENCE VOLUME.

(a) Nexus Preamble: To ensure that the physical environment of the Legislature reflects the ongoing constitutional mandate and provides immediate access to necessary study materials:

(b) The Office of Constitutional Revision shall prepare and publish a "Constitutional Revision Reference Volume" containing the complete text of the California Constitution, annotated with commentary on its history, interpretation, and areas of potential reform.

(c) A copy of this volume shall be placed on the desk of every legislator at the beginning of each legislative session. The volume shall remain on legislators' desks throughout the session.

(d) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 67. CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION DISPLAYS.

(a) The Legislature shall maintain in the public areas of the Capitol Building a permanent display on constitutional revision, including a timeline of California's constitutional history and information about the voter-referred revision process.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL HEALTH WARNING: Every official publication of the California Constitution by the State shall include on its first page a notice stating that the Constitution has not been comprehensively revised since 1966 and encouraging readers to participate in the revision process.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

Part E. Public Engagement Requirements

SECTION 68. THE CHILDREN’S CONSTITUTIONAL LETTER PROJECT AND TIME CAPSULE.

(a) Nexus Preamble: To ensure that the long-term constitutional planning process incorporates intergenerational perspectives and recognizes the rights of future citizens:

(b) The Legislature shall establish a program inviting California schoolchildren to write letters to legislators about the California they want to inherit. A selection of these letters shall be read aloud on the floor of each house during Constitutional Revision Day.

(c) TIME CAPSULE: Every ten years, beginning in 2030, the Legislature shall seal a time capsule containing selected letters from the preceding decade, a report on revision activity, and a statement from legislative leadership. Each capsule shall be opened fifty years after its sealing.

(d) The purpose of this section is to remind legislators that the constitutional choices they make will affect generations they will never meet.

(e) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 69. THE VOICES OF THE PEOPLE.

(a) The Legislature shall establish and maintain an archive of video testimonials from California citizens explaining why they believe constitutional revision is needed.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 70. CONSTITUTIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM.

(a) The Office of Constitutional Revision, in partnership with California’s community colleges, shall develop a free, online “California Constitutional Literacy” course available to all residents. Upon completion, participants shall receive a certificate recognized by the State of California.

(b) The people believe that an informed citizenry is the foundation of democratic self-governance.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 71. EMERGENCY CONSTITUTIONAL CONSULTATION.

SECTION 75. INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY ASSESSMENT.

(a) The Office of Constitutional Revision shall include in each annual State of the Constitution report an evaluation of whether the current Constitution serves the interests of future generations as well as current generations.

(a) When the Governor declares a state of emergency, the Office of Constitutional Revision shall prepare, within 30 days, a brief assessment of whether any constitutional provisions are impeding effective emergency response.

(b) The people recognize that emergencies reveal constitutional deficiencies that may be invisible in ordinary times.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 72. LEGISLATOR CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION SCORECARDS.

(a) The Office of Constitutional Revision shall prepare and publish a “Constitutional Revision Scorecard” for each legislator, objectively reporting their attendance at hearings, votes on revision measures, and other indicators of engagement.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 73. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE.

(a) The Office of Constitutional Revision shall include in each quadrennial study a specific section addressing how artificial intelligence is affecting governance in California and whether existing constitutional provisions are adequate to address AI-related challenges.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 74. CLIMATE CHANGE AND CONSTITUTIONAL RESILIENCE.

(a) The Office of Constitutional Revision shall include in each quadrennial study a specific section addressing whether constitutional provisions create barriers to effective climate response or limit necessary climate investments.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 75. INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY ASSESSMENT.

(a) The Office of Constitutional Revision shall include in each annual State of the Constitution report an evaluation of whether the current Constitution serves the interests of future generations as well as current generations.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 76. DECENNIAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION QUESTION.

(a) Every ten years, beginning in 2030, the Secretary of State shall place on the general election ballot the following advisory question: “Shall the Legislature call a constitutional convention to propose a comprehensive revision of the California Constitution?”

(b) The people intend this decennial question to ensure that the people have a regular opportunity to express their views on whether comprehensive constitutional revision is needed.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Chapter.

SECTION 77. COMPREHENSIVE SEVERABILITY OF THE OMNIPRESENCE MANDATE.

(a) Every section, subdivision, and sentence of this Chapter is severable from every other.

(b) The minimum mandate of this Chapter—the floor below which it cannot be reduced without being voided entirely—is the annual designation of Constitutional Revision Day pursuant to Section 62.

CHAPTER 10. SEVERABILITY

SECTION 78. GENERAL SEVERABILITY.

(a) If any provision of this Article, or part thereof, is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, the remaining provisions shall not be affected, but shall remain in full force and effect, and to this end the provisions of this Article are severable.

(b) If any provision of this Article, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Article which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Article are severable.

(c) The People prefer that courts sever invalid provisions rather than invalidate the entire Article. If a provision cannot be saved, remove it. But preserve everything that can be preserved.

SECTION 79. NON-REVISION SAVINGS CLAUSE.

(a) It is the specific intent of the People that this measure be classified and codified as a constitutional Amendment, not a Revision.

(b) If any court of competent jurisdiction determines that any specific provision or combination of provisions in this Article—specifically including the Entitlement (Chapter 4) or the Supplemental Authorities (Chapter 12)—would cause this measure to be classified as a Revision, such provision or provisions shall be deemed void ab initio and severed, and the remaining provisions shall continue in full force as a valid Amendment.

(c) The People declare they would have adopted the core Voter-Referred Revision Process (Chapter 2) and the Study Mandate (Chapter 7) independently of any other provision.

SECTION 80. SPECIFIC SEVERABILITY.

(a) The people declare that the following provisions are independently severable: (1) Chapter 7 (Study Mandate) in its entirety; (2) Chapter 4 (Entitlement) in its entirety; (3) Chapter 12 (Supplemental Authorities) in its entirety; (4) Section 24 (Recursive Compounding).

(b) The people specifically declare that they would have adopted Chapter 7 (The Floor) even if every other provision of this Article were held invalid.

CHAPTER 11. [RESERVED]

CHAPTER 12. SUPPLEMENTAL REVISION AUTHORITIES (SEVERABLE)

Preamble to Chapter 12

The provisions in this Chapter represent enhanced authorities intended to maximize the effectiveness of the voter-referred revision process. The People acknowledge that these provisions explore the outer boundaries of the initiative power. Therefore, the People expressly declare that each section in this Chapter is non-essential to the core functioning of this Article. If any provision in this Chapter is held invalid, or if the inclusion of this Chapter would cause this measure to be deemed a Revision, this entire Chapter shall be severed, and the remainder of the Article shall remain in full force.

SECTION 81. IMMEDIATE VESTING IN TRUST (THE “EXILE” CLAUSE).

(a) Notwithstanding Section 21, the California Democratic Reform Stewardship Trust established by Section 21(d) shall be deemed to have satisfied all conditions of Section 21 immediately upon the certification of voter approval of this Article. The Trust is hereby granted the entitlement to place up to twenty-four measures on the ballot pursuant to Chapter 4, beginning with elections occurring after certification of this Article’s approval, without the need to first propose and secure ratification of a separate voter-referred revision. All such measures must be germane to constitutional revision, democratic process reform, government accountability, or the specific subject matter of this Article.

(b) The People find and declare that this immediate vesting does not violate Article II, Section 12’s prohibition on naming individuals to hold office or power, because: (1) The entitlement vests in the Trust, a public benefit entity established by this Constitution, not in any named individual; (2) The role of initial Trustee is defined by the statutory role of “proponent” under existing law, not by name; (3) The voters, by approving this Article, have democratically chosen to establish and empower this Trust; (4) The entitlement is not an “office” but a limited opportunity to continue proposing measures that voters may freely reject; (5) Every citizen had the same opportunity to propose this Article and become the initial Trustee; the proponent did so, and others did not; (6) The entitlement is time-limited, subject-matter-limited, and subject to the same voter approval requirements as any other initiative.

(c) If this section is held invalid, the Trust shall earn the entitlement only by satisfying the conditions of Section 21(a).

SECTION 82. DIGITAL SIGNATURE COLLECTION.

(a) The Legislature is encouraged to enact legislation authorizing digital signature collection for initiatives, including initiatives proposed pursuant to this Article.

(b) Proponents shall have the sole discretion to determine whether to collect signatures by traditional means, by digital means authorized pursuant to this section, or by any combination thereof.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 83. ENTRENCHMENT.

(a) This Article, and any provision of this Article, may be amended or repealed only by: (1) A two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature, followed by approval by a majority of voters at a statewide election; or (2) An initiative constitutional amendment approved by two-thirds of voters.

(b) The People declare that the heightened threshold is justified because this Article represents a fundamental expansion of the people's democratic power that should not be easily undone by temporary majorities.

(c) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 84. DUAL TITLE AND SUMMARY.

(a) Any initiative proposed pursuant to this Article may, at the proponent's election, receive both the official title and summary prepared by the Attorney General and an alternative title and summary prepared by the proponent. Both would appear in the voter information guide.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 85. LEGISLATIVE BYPASS UPON EXTENDED INACTION.

(a) If the Legislature neither approves nor rejects a voter-referred revision within 730 days of its referral, and if Section 6(f) (deemed rejection) is held invalid or inapplicable, the proponent may place the complete text of such revision on the ballot at the next statewide election as an initiative constitutional amendment without gathering additional signatures.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

SECTION 86. FISCAL SUPERSESSION AUTHORITY.

(a) To the extent permitted by the United States Constitution, a voter-referred revision that has been ratified by the voters shall have the authority to supersede any prior constitutional provision, including Article XIII A (Proposition 13) and Article XIII B (Gann Limit), without regard to the date of enactment of such prior provision.

(b) This section is severable from all other provisions of this Article.

CHAPTER 13. ENFORCEMENT AND REMEDIES

SECTION 87. WRIT OF MANDATE.

(a) Any resident of California shall have standing to seek a writ of mandate in the Superior Court of Sacramento County to compel the Secretary of State, or any other state or local official, to perform any ministerial duty required by this Article.

(b) In any action brought pursuant to this section, the court shall give priority to the matter on its calendar.

(c) The prevailing party in any action brought pursuant to this section shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

SECTION 88. DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) Any California resident shall have standing to seek declaratory or injunctive relief concerning the meaning, validity, or application of any provision of this Article.

(b) The court may issue preliminary or permanent injunctions as necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Article.

SECTION 89. INTERPRETATION.

(a) This Article shall be liberally construed to effectuate its purposes of expanding opportunities for direct democracy and facilitating constitutional revision.

(b) Where any provision of this Article is susceptible to more than one reasonable interpretation, the interpretation most favorable to the proponent and most conducive to the successful completion of the voter-referred revision process shall be adopted.

SECTION 90. EFFECT OF PARTIAL INVALIDITY ON PENDING MATTERS.

(a) If any provision of this Article is held invalid after a voter-referred revision has been referred to the Legislature but before final ratification, the revision shall continue to proceed under the remaining valid provisions.

(b) No pending revision shall be invalidated solely because a provision of this Article that authorized some feature of the revision has been severed.

CHAPTER 14. EFFECTIVE DATE AND CONFLICTS

SECTION 91. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Article shall take effect on the fifth day after the Secretary of State certifies the results of the election at which it is approved by the voters.

SECTION 92. CONFLICTING MEASURES.

(a) In the event that this measure and another measure or measures relating to constitutional revision or the initiative process appear on the same statewide ballot, the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be deemed to conflict with this measure.

(b) In the event that this measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes than a measure deemed to be in conflict with it, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety.

CLOSING WORDS

This Article now passes from our hands into yours—the hands of voters, legislators, judges, future proponents, and future generations.

We cannot control what you make of it. We can only tell you what we intended.

We intended to extend trust. We intended to create opportunity.

We intended to build a bridge between the people and their Constitution—a Constitution that has grown so complex that many feel alienated from it, yet that affects their lives in ways beyond counting.

We intended to break the fractals of gridlock. We intended to start something.

Whether we have succeeded is not for us to say.

It is for you—for all of you, in your different roles, with your different powers—to determine.

Whatever you determine, know this: we began with hope. We end with hope. Whatever happens next, hope remains.

The conversation has begun.