

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

WEDNESDAY JUNE 20, 2012

Present: Ald. Sangiolo, Blazar, Linsky, Hess-Mahan, Merrill, Rice

Absent: Ald. Baker, Fischman

Also present: Ald. Johnson, Crossley, Fuller

Staff: Craig Manseau (Executive Secretary of Election Commission), Dolores Hamilton (Director of Human Resources), Dave Turocey (Commissioner, Public Works), Rebecca Smith (Committee Clerk)

REFERRED TO PROGRAMS & SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

#184-12 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting the establishment of four revolving accounts for both FY12 and FY13 as follows:

<u>Account Title</u>	<u>Effective Date</u>	<u>Spending Limit</u>
High School Student Activity	07/01/11	\$350,000
Middle School Student Activity	07/01/11	\$100,000
High School Drama	07/01/11	\$100,000
All City Band, Chorus & Orchestra	07/11/11	\$100,000

These accounts will be used for the deposit of revenue to offset costs associated with student activities, high school drama and All City Music.
[06/11/12 @5:51 PM]

ACTION: **HELD 6-0**

NOTE: Sue Dzikowski, Director of Finance, School Department, joined the Committee to present the item. The money collected thus far for these 4 fees is \$107,000. This money has been deposited into the revenue revolving account but has to be authorized for spending. The revolving accounts must be created in order for the school department to spend these funds. Ms. Dzikowski explained the breakdown of fee collection for the accounts: \$40,000 was collected from the middle school activities fee; \$40,000 was collected from the high school activities fee; \$11,000 was collected from the high school drama fee; the balance was from the All-City music fee.

There was some general concern expressed about the impact of fees on the participation of students and whether this is going to negatively affect children's ability to thrive in certain areas that could propel them to college or to a career. There is also the concern that the city is creating a financial strain on families by nickel and diming them.

The committee was generally hesitant about passing these revolving funds without having a more detailed explanation about where the money is actually going. The Committee voted to hold the item until more information is provided.

Due to the timely nature of this item, the Chair agreed to hold a special joint meeting with the Finance Committee during their meeting night (June 25th) where the requested documentation would be provided. For the detailed account of that joint meeting please see the Finance Committee Report.

#205-11 ALD. SANGIOLO, GENTILE, HARNEY, LINSKY requesting a discussion with the School Committee regarding a proposal to enter into contractual relationships with the Newton Schools Foundation to sell naming rights on behalf of the Newton Public Schools. [06/22/2011 @ 8:32AM]

ACTION: **HELD 6-0**

NOTE: The Chair reported that she had not heard from the School Committee about how they wish to proceed given the IG's opinion. The Committee moved to hold the item. The item will be taken up at a later date.

REFERRED TO PROGRAMS & SERVICES AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

#39-12 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting authorization to establish a revolving account with an annual expenditure limit of \$2,000,000 for the purpose of receiving funds collected by the Newton Schools Foundation in connection with the sale of naming rights for Newton Public School buildings and facilities and to be distributed for the sole purpose of public school education technology and curriculum purposes. [01/30/12 @ 4:18 PM]

ACTION: **HELD 6-0**

NOTE: See note for item #205-11

#165-12 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR submitting (1) the report prepared by Kopelman & Paige PC, the consultant engaged to review the city's election procedures, and (2) proposing that Charter Sections 2-1(b) and 4-1(b) be amended to establish a particular date by which nomination papers are made available. [05/25/2012 @ 1:35PM]

ACTION: **HELD 6-0**

NOTE: Craig Manseau, Executive Secretary for the Election Commission presented the item. He walked the Committee through the report. He explained that the major element is the clarification of the residency date along with providing a date certain for the availability of the nomination papers. The Mayor has spoken with Pres. Lennon about changing the language of the charter. Having a date certain when nomination papers would be available would be preferable.

Ald. Sangiolo asked what criteria would be used to prove residency. Mr. Manseau explained that is an issue to be discussed and determined by the Board.

When questioned on next steps to implement the findings, Mr. Manseau explained that language needs to be drafted, with a date certain, to replace the language currently in the charter.

The Committee suggested that before they discuss this in greater detail, the Election Commission should take a look at the report and provide their recommendations on the matter. The motion to hold was made and carried unanimously.

#145-12 ALD JOHNSON requesting a review by the Solicitor's office as to what constitutes "reorganization" per our City Charter. [05/16/12 @ 10:24PM]

ACTION: **HELD 6-0**

NOTE: Ald. Johnson explained that this item was prompted by the incorrect assessment that the police department was undergoing reorganization because of their addition of Deputies. Following this, Ald. Johnson reached out to the City Solicitor's office. There have been several opinions over the years that address potential reorganizations (attached). Whether the city needs to have a definition of reorganization and where the appropriate place to address reorganization (the Rules or the Charter) requires further discussion.

The Committee will ask the Law Department to advise on what options are available. Until then, the Committee decided to hold the item.

#122-12 ALD. HESS-MAHAN proposing a RESOLUTION calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people by clarifying (1) that corporations are not entitled to the Constitutional rights of human beings, and, (2) that the U.S. Congress and the states may place reasonable limits on both political contributions and political spending.

ACTION: **APPROVED 6-0**

NOTE: Ald. Hess-Mahan presented the item to committee. He explained that the intent is to create a resolution to encourage a constitutional amendment to provide mitigation of the Citizens United ruling. This ruling extended the rights of corporations so that they are treated as people. There has been a lot of effort to set realistic limits on the amount individuals can contribute to political campaigns and this ruling negates that and allows for corporations to give an incredible amount of money to political super pacs. The resolution drafted is not identical to the one at the U.S. House of Representatives; Ald. Hess-Mahan stated that he wanted to stay away from controversial and unnecessary language. He also shared with the committee that a significant amount of states, red and blue, have passed and/or are currently working on resolutions to the House of Representatives as well.

Ald. Linsky and Blazar thanked Ald. Hess-Mahan for his efforts. Ald. Blazar expressed his opinion that a shorter resolution would allow for less time and banter with syntax on the floor of the Board.

Ald. Linsky stated that he'd like to put this to a vote should people agree with the general thrust of the argument. If Ald. Hess-Mahan can take a look at the language over the next couple weeks, and can come up with something cleaner, then that will be presented at a special meeting of the Programs and Services Committee prior to the full Board on July 9th. If not, then what has been presented to the Committee will go to the full Board.

Jane Brown was a member of the public who spoke in favor of the resolution. She reported that she has been collecting signatures in support of the amendment.

Ald. Linsky moved approval of the item which carried unanimously.

#84-12(2) PROGRAMS AND SERVICES COMMITTEE proposing a resolution to allow the Board of Aldermen to provide guidance to the Licensing Commission on petitions submitted in response to the possible acceptance of G.L. c. 138 §33B, which would allow the selling of alcohol to commence at 10:00am on Sunday mornings. [04-11-12 @ 9:30PM]

ACTION: **NO ACTION NECESSARY 6-0**

NOTE: This item is no longer necessary given the acceptance of the main item in a previous meeting. A motion of NAN carried unanimously.

REFERRED TO PROG. & SERV AND PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEES

#36-12 ALD. CROSSLEY & FULLER requesting Home Rule legislation or an ordinance to require inspections of private sewer lines and storm water drainage connections prior to settling a change in property ownership, to assure that private sewer lines are functioning properly and that there are no illegal storm water connections to the city sewer mains.

A) Sewer lines found to be compromised or of inferior construction would have to be repaired or replaced as a condition of sale;

B) Illegal connections would have to be removed, corrected, and re-inspected in accordance with current city ordinances and codes, as a condition of sale. [01/24/12 @ 8:07 AM]

ACTION: **HELD 5-0 (Linsky not voting)**

NOTE: Alderman Fuller and Alderman Crossley introduced the item to the Committee. Alderman Fuller began by saying that they were not quite ready to bring the full proposal forward. She reminded the Committee that a discussion took place regarding a plan to address City sewer lines. In that discussion, we learned that cracks in the lateral lines – the ones that go from a private home or business to the street, allow clean water to enter and that goes to Deer Island to be treated. We don't know which homeowner's pipe may

be broken but we all pay for the treatment. Using Title 5 as a role model, when a house is sold, this proposal would require an inspection. The best way to conduct an inspection is not with a scope and camera to take pictures but a pressure test (companies apparently do this already). The results would be given to potential purchasers as well as the seller and upon sale, following the septic model, the owner would have 6 months to get the lateral line repaired and a certificate has to go to Inspectional Services Department to show the repair was done. This would accomplish two things: get the sewer line fixed but also provide consumer protection.

Aldermen Crossley and Fuller are working with the Law Department (Ouida Young) and the Water and Sewer Department (Lou Taverna) regarding the specifics of the program – the costs of repair and the cost of testing and what can people expect if this moves forward.

Alderman Crossley added that they originally looked at doing this on a state wide level and contacted State Representative Ruth Balser and the MWRA. They thought it best to do this on a local level as communities differ from each other and it would be a slow moving effort. Newton would be the first community to do this although Ouida Young did find that the Town of Ipswich adopted something similar but for illegal inflow conditions prior to sale.

Alderman Blazar thought this was an interesting idea but was concerned about timing. If someone puts his home on the market, they may run into timing problems. Homeowners have to be aware before they put their house up for sale. Alderman Crossley responded suggesting that the Realty community would need to be the ones to get the message out. She suggested that the realty community would most likely oppose it and see it as an impediment to sale. She argues it is a consumer protection device.

Alderman Blazar asked who does the testing. Alderman Fuller said the City will have a list of companies that do this. Alderman Blazar asked if they are considering making it mandatory to fix it. Alderman Crossley responded that it would be if it was discovered in some way. Alderman Blazar then asked how much it would cost to fix it. Ald. Fuller suggested it would be in the thousands rather than the hundreds.

Ald. Linsky asked if the Law Department was considering whether this would require home rule petition. Alderman Hess-Mahan confirmed that Home Rule would likely be required. He added the State has the authority over Title 5 and he was not sure whether we have the authority to do this.

Alderman Hess-Mahan was recognized for a series of questions. He pointed out that this proposal was an appropriate comparison to Title 5. People should be aware that inspections are done by private contractors and he made an analogy to home inspectors – some are good – some not so good. He suggested that people ought to know who is doing the inspections.

Alderman Crossley stated that they have a list of things that still need to be discussed and addressed. With regard to inspections, they have a list of prequalified vendors that do repairs. The City will create a list but what they still need to know is what is the City's basis for prequalification. Alderman Fuller added that they think that a pressure test is best but defining what constitutes a failure is really important.

Alderman Hess-Mahan added his concern when someone goes to sell a house, that there are additional costs involved in investigating and repairing a sewer leak – such as digging up and replacing a lawn and landscaping. He suggested that it will not just be the realty community that will be concerned but also homeowners directly. He asked that even though there is a 6 month window of time, what happens in the winter months. Alderman Crossley responded saying we would be surprised how much can be done in the winter months.

Alderman Hess-Mahan then asked about the specifics of the sale. Would the transfer in real estate between a homeowner to a trust or for a condo conversion also be included in this proposal? Alderman Crossley said it is included in Title 5.

Finally, Alderman Hess-Mahan suggested that the Committee hold a public comment on this proposal. Alderman Crossley asked if it was a requirement for home rule petitions and the Chair responded that it wasn't.

Alderman Crossley suggested that they would need help reaching out to the realty community. The Chair recommended that she contact Alderman Swiston as well as Janet Edsall who has appeared before the Board for other petitions as well as the Chamber of Commerce, the Economic Development Commission and the Planning Department – particularly since they had done significant outreach during the FAR proposal. Alderman Fuller asked the Committee to hold the item and believes it can be back to the Committee in the Fall.

Alderman Blazar asked if we had any idea on how many may be leaking. Alderman Crossley response was that the men in the Water and Sewer Department think it's a big part of the problem but have no idea whether it is 35% or greater or less than that. Commissioner Turocy, who was also present for a portion of this item, said they really don't have any statistical analysis on this. Alderman Fuller added that the DPW staff are talking with the Assessor's Department regarding the number of annual home sales in the City. It appears it is roughly 5%.

The Chair asked Commissioner Turocy how the City's 5 year moratorium on opening up streets that have been paved would impact this proposal. Commissioner Turocy responded that he doesn't think it will be widespread and that even if a street has been done, a situation like this may rise to an emergency level.

A motion to hold was moved and voted unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sangiolo, Chairman

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Alderman Joseph DePasquale

DATE: May 19, 1978

FROM: Daniel M. Funk, City Solicitor

SUBJECT: Reorganization Question -
Licensing and Printing

FACTS

I.

The Executive Department has proposed to place the licensing supervisory function in the Building Department. Currently, Carleton Merrill, the Veterans' Agent, oversees the administrative functions of the Licensing Board. These administrative functions have been and are carried out by a secretary assigned to Licensing Board matters. The Mayor's proposal would result in the transfer of this secretarial position to the Building Department, representing a budgetary shift of one employee. This secretary will continue to do licensing work, and the Licensing Commission will continue to function in all respects as it has in the past.

II.

The Executive Department has proposed to place the printing function in the Building Department. Currently, the Purchasing Agent signs the payroll for the three persons who work in the printing office. Onsite supervision is provided by a Mr. Charlie Lennon who is not, however, a Department Head. Previously, the printing function was assigned to the Engineering Department. There are no proposed changes in the operation of the printing function after it is transferred to the Building Department.

QUESTION

Under these facts, has a reorganization or consolidation of city agencies taken place within the meaning of Charter Provision 6-2 with reference to either the licensing work or the printing function?

SHORT ANSWER

Although there are no definitive guidelines for what constitutes a reorganization or consolidation as set forth in the city charter, the degree of change within a department is the key element in making such a determination. It does not appear that

a reorganization or consolidation has occurred in the instances described above since the degree of change involved is a minimal departure from prior practices within the Building or Purchasing Departments.

DISCUSSION

The applicable charter provision, Section 6-2, reads as follows:

"(a) The Mayor may from time to time prepare and submit to the Board of Aldermen reorganization plans which may, subject to applicable law and the charter, reorganize, consolidate or abolish any city agency, in whole or in part, or establish new city agencies that he deems necessary or expedient. Such reorganization plans shall be accompanied by an explanatory message when submitted."

Unfortunately, there are no definitions in the charter or even in the law for the term "reorganization". Clearly, there is no abolition of a city agency, nor is there a consolidation of one. The term "consolidation" is defined in McQuillin Section 8.21 as follows:

"Consolidation merges two or more political units, involving the surrender of all power of one unit to the other or to a new consolidated government."

The only question remaining is whether or not there is a reorganization of any city agency.

In determining whether or not a reorganization has occurred, one must scrutinize the degree of change involved as to whether or not such change is merely formal or de minimis or a substantial departure from prior practices. Changes within city agencies may be seen as falling somewhere along a continuum with small scale administrative adjustments falling at one end and major mergers or alterations of structures and functions at the other end. Examples of the former might be the hiring of new employees, the assignment of new duties to a member of a department, or even the expansion of the duties of a department such as having to administer a new federal grant program. Examples of the latter would be the merger of two departments to form a third department with all the powers of the first two separate departments; or the abolition of a department and the creation in its place of a new department with significantly enhanced or altered powers and duties. I think it rather clear that the issues raised in this instance fall much closer to the portion of the continuum containing small scale administrative adjustments.

With reference to the Licensing Board, it is a creature of statute, and it is thus not subject to the reorganization provisions of the Newton City charter. The duties of the Licensing Board are prescribed by statute, not by the city charter or by a city ordinance. Thus, the functions and duties of the Licensing Board will not be altered in any way, shape or form by the Mayor's proposal to transfer one secretary to the Building Department.

The Building Department has no authority to interfere in any way with the Licensing Board's decisions to issue common victuallers' and alcoholic beverage licenses, Sunday entertainment licenses, alcoholic consumption I.D. cards, or any other license request that comes before them.

The Building Department has a longstanding, close working relationship with the Licensing Board since, in the course of determining whether or not to grant a license, the Licensing Board must seek the assistance of the Building Department as to compliance with the zoning ordinances and the State Building Code as they pertain to the request for said license. The secretary that will be transferred to the Building Department will continue to work on licensing matters as she had formerly done while working directly under the Licensing Board. However, she will now be in a better physical position to perform her tasks. The overall relationship between the Licensing Board and the Building Department will not be altered, and the functions of each will remain the same. The Building Commissioner will have one more employee to supervise, which supervision will involve the same sort of coordination with the Licensing Board for which the Building Commissioner is presently responsible. Thus, it is difficult to conclude that the Building Department has been reorganized, or that its functions have been altered to any substantial degree, based upon the addition of one secretarial position.

With reference to the printing function, the change contemplated in the Mayor's proposal is one of supervision from the Purchasing Agent to the Building Commissioner. Under either supervisor, the functions of the printing office are not merged into the functions of the respective departments. The printing office will continue to perform the same functions, in the same location, and under the same onsite supervisor. The change in department head is largely a formal or de minimis alteration of the agencies' relationship. Apparently, the time or effort devoted to supervision of the printing office by the department head is not a significant portion of his overall duties. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude here, too, that there not being a substantial alteration in the function of the Building Department, no reorganization has transpired.

By contrast, it would be worthwhile to examine briefly the reorganizations or consolidations of past years within the City. In December, 1975, the Newton Planning Department was abolished, and in its place was created the Planning and Development Department, the Conservation Commission, the Historical Commission, and the Urban Beautification Commission. There was clearly substantial alteration of the duties and powers of the Planning Department and considerable restructuring of the new agencies created. New powers and functions were spelled out in the amended ordinance, and new positions were created.

A second example can be seen in the changes that were made in the Public Works Department in December of 1976. The ordinance dealing with Public Works was extensively amended to adjust the powers and duties of the Commissioner of Public Works, the Water Commissioner and the City Engineer. A Recreation Department was created, and changes were made in the duties of the Building Department and the Designer Selection Committee.

A third example involved the reorganization of the Personnel Department which the Mayor proposed in October of 1976. This reorganization involved the abolition of the City Physician Department, the creation in the Personnel Department of a Health Advisory Board and the granting of substantial new responsibilities to the Personnel Department which would be performed by the City Physician within the Personnel Department.

Each of these examples involved substantial changes in the structure and/or functions of the various city agencies. Agencies were abolished or were merged. New positions were created; power and control relationships were altered, and responsibilities were changed both within and between the agencies involved. The difference between these changes and those involved in the above proposal is more one of degree than of kind, but the difference in degree is clear. Based upon all of the above, it is extremely difficult to conclude that a reorganization has taken place by carrying out the proposals in question.

DMF/lmt

Alderman Joseph DePasquale

June 6, 1978

Daniel M. Funk
City Solicitor

Reorganization - Licensing
and Printing (ADDENDUM)

At your request, I have pursued this matter further by attempting to ascertain a more extensive factual background with reference to the administration of the licensing function. I have discussed the administrative functions of licensing at length with Carleton Merrill and Barbara Hutchinson. I have also discussed with Allan Fraser his understanding of his current and anticipated role vis-a-vis licensing.

You have suggested that Mr. Merrill's activities have become so broad that to transfer his duties to the Building Department would result in a reorganization. I have concluded that although Mr. Merrill has apparently performed many worthwhile services for the License Commission for the past several years, no reorganization will have occurred by having the Building Commission administratively oversee Barbara Hutchinson's licensing work. Essentially, Mr. Merrill's duties can and likely will be shared in large part by Barbara Hutchinson, the Police Department, the Law Department and the Building Department. As such, my initial opinion that the Building Department will not be reorganized is consistent with the additional facts that I have been able to ascertain.

In July of 1975, Carleton Merrill was told by the Executive Department to "administratively oversee" the activities of all functions of the Licensing Board. Without getting too deeply involved in the background details, suffice it to say that it was apparently intended that Mr. Merrill oversee Mary Farmer's administrative and secretarial work performed for the Licensing Commission. As time went on, Mr. Merrill became more and more involved in various other aspects of the licensing function including:

- Organization of "flow system" regarding license applications
- upgrading and updating of records and files
- initiation of bookkeeping system
- final and intermittent inspections of licensed premises
- attendance at License Commission meetings and hearings
- attendance at ABCC hearings
- responding to legal questions pertaining to licensing
- checking on manager changes
- checking on license renewals
- general involvement in processing of licenses and applications

In the meantime, Barbara Hutchinson, who had been working as a part-time secretary doing licensing work, began to perform this function on a full-time basis in July of 1976. Mrs. Hutchinson

has been performing all of the administrative office work for the License Commission since that time. She generally processes license applications from start to finish, interviews and instructs applicants, checks on manager changes and license renewals, and performs all other necessary clerical and administrative work. She will continue to perform these functions while working in the Building Department.

With reference to the License Commission meetings, prior to Carleton Merrill's attendance at same, I am informed that Mary Farmer used to attend. Barbara Hutchinson has indicated a willingness, and Allan Fraser the desire that Ms. Hutchinson attend these meetings.

With reference to inspections, it has always been and will continue to be the function of the Police Department to inspect premises for licensing purposes.

With reference to legal questions and required attendance by or representation for the License Commission at ABCC hearings, the Law Department is capable and willing to perform that function.

Thus, as stated above, the vast majority of activities performed by Carleton Merrill can and will be taken over by Barbara Hutchinson and other city departments where necessary. However, by no means is this analysis meant to denigrate the job done by Mr. Merrill, which appears to have been quite commendable. The main legal point to be aware of here is that neither the Building Commissioner nor the Building Department will have taken on any substantial increase or change in duties so as to constitute a reorganization of the Building Department.

In my original opinion I pointed out by way of example the magnitude of change involved in past reorganizations within the city. Similarly, I would like to point out other more dramatic changes than that involved herein that were also not construed as reorganizations.

When the Human Services Department created the Committee on the Environment of the Handicapped, the department got itself involved in a new and broad field of administration that formerly was not within said department. The addition of this new function, which clearly had a greater impact on the Human Services Department than the licensing issue will have on the Building Department, was not construed as a reorganization of the Human Services Department.

Likewise, no reorganization occurred when the Health Commission instituted its program of Health Services to the Elderly. This function was transferred from Human Services to Health

without the need for reorganization proceedings.

Also, Cultural Affairs was transferred from Human Services to the Recreation Department along with a transfer of several staff members. Here, too, no reorganization was considered to have occurred.

With this background, it is even more difficult to conceive of the proposed change vis-a-vis the administration of licensing matters as constituting a reorganization.

DMF/lmt

cc: Mayor Theodore Mann
Jane Pitt
Carleton Merrill
Allan Fraser

CONFIDENTIAL - - NOT A PUBLIC DOCUMENT
 OPINION
 CITY OF NEWTON
 LAW DEPARTMENT

DATE: March 28, 1997
 TO: Lowell K. Haynes, Director of Human Services
 FROM: Daniel M. Funk, City Solicitor
 RE: Transportation program--reorganization

BACKGROUND

Earlier this year your department hired an employee for the new position of "Transportation Coordinator." In the process of preparing the fiscal year 1998 budget documents relating to your department, you submitted an organizational chart which includes the new position.

QUESTION

Does the addition of the new Transportation Coordinator position constitute a Reorganization within the meaning of the Newton Charter?

SHORT ANSWER

No.

DISCUSSION

Sections 6-1 and 6-2 of the City Charter provide for a concept known as "reorganization" (see attached copy). Whenever a change in the organization of municipal government constitutes a reorganization within the meaning of the Charter, certain procedural requirements may come into play. However, as a starting point, it must be understood that the term "reorganization" as used in the Charter is a term of art. Unfortunately, the Charter does not provide a definition for the term but the term has been interpreted in a series of City Solicitor's Opinions which draws lines and provides a working understanding of the concept of "reorganization."¹

¹ See *Opinion* of Daniel M. Funk to Ald. George Mansfield regarding Reorganization of Office of Treasurer/Collector dated February 4, 1991 for a discussion of prior interpretations.

One of the basic tenets is that whether a particular change in a city agency constitutes a reorganization depends on whether the function of a department is changed in a material way. Not every alteration of a function constitutes a reorganization. Changes within city departments should be seen as falling somewhere along a continuum with small scale administrative adjustments at one end and major mergers or alterations of departmental structure and/or functions at the other end.

In this case your department has provided senior citizen transportation for some time. At this time your department is expanding the City's involvement in the area of public transportation by establishing a jitney service for the general public which will be carried out by a private contractor. The new Transportation Coordinator will manage the contract, market the services, write grant applications, raise funds and serve as the City's spokesperson regarding the jitney service. Your department has served in all these roles in the past for the senior transportation, although on a smaller scale.

It appears very clear that this additional activity in the transportation area does not change the function of your department in a material way. The new work related to the jitney is merely an extension of the existing functions carried out by your department. Thus, I do not see that it constitutes a reorganization.

attachment

cc. Richard Robinson, Chief Administrative Officer
Richard J. McGrath, President of the Board of Aldermen
David C. Wilkinson, Comptroller of Accounts

Robert Perruzzi, Deputy Comptroller

CITY OF NEWTON
MASSACHUSETTS

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Alderman George Mansfield

DATE: February 4, 1991

FROM: Daniel M. Funk, City Solicitor

SUBJECT: Reorganization of
~~Office of Treasurer/~~
Collector

BACKGROUND AND QUESTIONS

Questions have arisen as to the applicability of the reorganization process of Section 6-1 of the City Charter to the Treasurer/Collector's Office. More specifically, you have raised these questions in connection with the following scenarios:

1. Does the reorganization provision of Section 6-1 of the City Charter apply in general to the Treasurer's Office?
2. If the Treasurer/Collector were to report to a Finance Director pursuant to City Ordinances would that change constitute reorganization?
3. If the appointing authority for the Treasurer/Collector were to be changed from the Aldermen to the Mayor would that constitute reorganization?
4. Would it constitute a reorganization if positions within the office are either (a) created and abolished; (b) changed in their descriptions and/or authority or (c) changed in terms of their reporting relationships?

SHORT ANSWERS

1. A reorganization of the Treasurer's Office is subject to reorganization procedures of the City Charter.
2. It would not constitute a reorganization of the Treasurer's Office if the Treasurer/Collector were to report to a Finance Director.
3. It would not constitute a reorganization if the Mayor were to appoint the Treasurer/Collector instead of the Board of Aldermen.
4. The alteration of the internal management of existing duties in the Treasurer's Office would not constitute a reorganization.

DISCUSSION

The applicable charter provision Section 6-1 reads as follows:

Except as otherwise provided by law or the charter, the Board of Aldermen may by ordinance reorganize, consolidate, or abolish any existing City agency in whole or in part; establish new City agencies; and prescribe the functions of any City agencies. All City agencies under the direction and supervision of the Mayor shall be headed and administered by officers appointed by him.

1. There is nothing in Section 6-1 or any other section of the Charter or other law that would generally disqualify the Treasurer's Office from the reorganization procedures of the City Charter. Thus, it would seem, that the Treasurer's Office as well as the other departments headed up by aldermanic appointees would be equally subject to the reorganization procedures of the City Charter.

2. If the Treasurer/Collector were to report to a Finance Director pursuant to Section 2-105 of the City Ordinances, it would not constitute a reorganization for the simple reason that the ordinance providing for such a relationship is already in place. As set forth above, Section 6-1 provides for an opportunity for the Board of Aldermen to reorganize by ordinance. If in fact having a Finance Director supervising a Treasurer/Collector is a reorganization (and I'm not necessarily suggesting that it is), that reorganization would have already taken place when Ordinance Section 2-105 was adopted. The mere implementation of an already existing ordinance cannot be construed as a reorganization pursuant to Section 6-1.

In a sense there is no need to discuss this question any further given the above analysis. However, suffice it to say that having a Director of Finance supervise the Treasurer/Collector is merely a management tool and would not in and of itself constitute a reorganization in any event. Most of the duties of the City Treasurer/Collector are set forth by statute in any event and to alter the reporting mechanism for the City Treasurer/Collector simply doesn't reach the level of reorganization.

3. Similarly, if the Charter were amended to allow for the Mayor to appoint the City Treasurer/Collector as opposed to the Board of Aldermen this too is more of a management tool than a reorganization of the duties of the officer in question.

4. This question compels a more thorough analysis of just what constitutes a reorganization in the City of Newton both analytically and historically. The two primary components that must be analyzed in determining whether or not a reorganization exists are: 1) whether the function of a department is changed and, 2) if so, what is the magnitude of such change? For reorganization to have occurred, the actual function of a department must change in some material way. In other words, one must ask the very basic question: "Will the proposed changes alter the work being done by the department in question?" It is likely that the more a position or a function is determined by statute, the less the opportunity for the function of the department to be altered through a reorganization. Therefore, what one looks for initially is a basic restructuring of the functional responsibilities of a department before one can assume that a reorganization has occurred or will occur.

Secondly, not every alteration of a function will constitute a reorganization. The degree of change within a department is the key element in making a determination as to whether or not such alteration of a function constitutes a reorganization. Changes within City agencies may well be seen as falling somewhere along a continuum with small scale administrative adjustments at one end and major mergers or alterations of structures or functions at the other end.

The definition or "reorganization" as set forth in the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language reads as follows:

Reorganization, n.1. The act or process of organizing again or differently 2. Finance, A thorough alteration of the structure of a business corporation especially after a bankruptcy

Although the second definition is focused on the notion of bankruptcy, it is interesting and somewhat instructive to note that a reorganization in that context must be a thorough alteration of the structure of a corporation.

On the other end of the spectrum, the reassignment of tasks among employees within a department simply does not constitute a reorganization. One must construe such internal changes as a function of ordinary management that must and will occur in various degrees on a regular basis. Historically, reorganization plans that have been submitted and adopted have not included enumerations of job duties for departmental employees, except at the department head and deputy level.

It might be useful for purposes of this analysis to briefly review some of the historical reorganizations and "non-reorganizations" that have occurred in order to help us determine the lines that have been drawn in this City along the continuum mentioned above.

A. Examples of Reorganizations:

i. The Mayor proposed the transferring of the printing, mail function and telephone responsibilities to the Purchasing Department from the Building Department.

ii. In 1976 major changes were made to the functions of the Public Works Department. The ordinance dealing with Public Works was extensively amended to adjust the powers and duties of the Commissioner of Public Works, the Water Commissioner and the City Engineer. A Recreation Department was created and changes were made in the duties of the Building Department and the Designer Selection Committee.

iii. The Forestry Division, with twenty or more employees, was transferred from DPW to Parks and Recreation.

iv. The consolidation of the Clerk of the Board and City Clerk functions constituted a reorganization in 1980 in accordance with Section 6-1.

v. In December 1975 the Newton Planning Department was abolished, and in its place was created the Planning and Development Department, the Conservation Commission, the Historical Commission and the Urban Beautification Commission. There was clearly substantial alteration of the duties and powers of the Planning Department and considerable restructuring of the new agencies created. New powers and functions were spelled out in the amended ordinance and new positions were created.

vi. The Personnel Department was reorganized in 1976. This reorganization involved the abolition of the City Physician's Department, the creation in the Personnel Department of a Health Advisory Board and the granting of substantial new responsibilities to the Personnel Department which would be performed by the City Physician within the Personnel Department.

B. "Non-Reorganizations":

i. It was contemplated that the printing function would be transferred from the Purchasing Agent to the Building Commissioner. This was going to involve merely a minor change in supervisory functions, not a change in the actual printing function itself.

ii. It was contemplated that the Secretary to the Licensing Board would be transferred to the Building Department involving the supervision of this one employee by the Building Commissioner. With the functioning of the Licensing Board being primarily statutory, this was not considered to be a reorganization.

iii. When the Health Department: 1) abolished numerous positions, including five permanent civil service school physicians, the Administrative Assistant and Inspectors, 2) contracted out some services and 3) created new positions rehiring some employees it was not considered a reorganization.

iv. When the Human Services Department created the Committee on the Environment of the Handicapped, the department got itself involved in a new and broad field of administration that formerly was not within said department. The addition of this new function was not construed as a reorganization.

v. No reorganization occurred when the Health Department instituted its program of health services to the elderly. This function was transferred from Human Services to Health without the need for reorganization proceedings.

vi. When Cultural Affairs was transferred from Human Services to the Parks and Recreation Department along with a transfer of several staff members no reorganization was considered to have occurred.

The answer to the fourth question as it relates to the analysis and historical review as set forth above is more difficult to answer given the general nature of the suggested changes you propose in your question. Obviously, if one knew the exact changes in position and function that were being contemplated, a more definitive answer could be and would be given. However, in light of the generic nature of your question, I have concluded that none of the suggested changes that you propose in question 4. would constitute a reorganization.

(a) The creation and abolition of positions in and of itself seems to be primarily internal management and would lie on that part of the continuum further removed from what has been construed as a reorganization in this City.

(b) Similarly, a change in the description or level of authority within a department would be treated as such.

(c) Changing the terms of the reporting relationships in a department also appears to fall within the realm of internal management changes as opposed to rising to the level of a reorganization.

Unfortunately, there are no cases on this subject as it is a creature of local city charter. As such, common sense analysis and a look at historical treatment are the best ways of answering the questions posed. I realize there may be some follow up questions arising from the aforesaid. If so please do not hesitate to contact me.

DMF/JMc

cc: Verne W. Vance, Jr.
Paul E. Coletti

(b) Similarly, a change in the description or level of authority within a department would be treated as such.

(c) Changing the terms of the reporting relationships in a department also appears to fall within the realm of internal management changes as opposed to rising to the level of a reorganization.

Unfortunately, there are no cases on this subject as it is a creature of local city charter. As such, common sense analysis and a look at historical treatment are the best ways of answering the questions posed. I realize there may be some follow up questions arising from the aforesaid. If so please do not hesitate to contact me.

DMF/JMc

cc: Verne W. Vance, Jr.
Paul E. Coletti

bcc: Mayor Theodore D. Mann
Rich Kelliher

DRAFT

#___-12

CITY OF NEWTON
IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

_____, 2012

BE IT RESOLVED:

WHEREAS, the U.S. Bill of Rights provides certain inalienable rights to natural persons, and

WHEREAS, corporations are not mentioned in the U.S. Constitution, and

WHEREAS, corporations are legal entities created solely by state action, their entitlement, if any, to certain rights should be more narrowly defined than the rights afforded natural persons under the U.S. Constitution, and

WHEREAS, the decision to regulate corporate financial campaign contributions is one that historically Congress and the states have been constitutionally allowed to address, and

WHEREAS, in 1907, Congress enacted the Tillman Act prohibiting corporate financial contributions to federal election campaigns for public office, and

WHEREAS, in 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 130 S.Ct. 876 (U.S. 2010), ruled that Congress and the states lacked the constitutional right to ban independent corporate expenditures to political campaigns for public office, and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Citizens* decision relied on its previously issued opinion in the 1976 case *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (U.S. 1976), in which it equated the spending of money for electing candidates to public office as speech, and

WHEREAS, the *Citizens* decision has allowed for the creation of super political action committees in election campaigns for public office that allow for unregulated campaign expenditures in unprecedented amounts, and

WHEREAS, as a result of the *Citizens* decision, Congress and the state legislatures were denied any legal authority to regulate independent corporate political expenditures, and

WHEREAS, a restoration of the guidelines established in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 is imperative so that Congress and the state legislatures may exercise their historic authority to make their own decisions about whether to regulate corporate political expenditures, and

WHEREAS, this policy change will require that the U.S. Constitution be amended to authorize congressional or state regulation of individual and corporate financial participation in political campaigns, and

WHEREAS, since April 2011, at least the following Massachusetts cities and towns have already passed resolutions urging the Massachusetts congressional delegation and the U.S. Congress to propose legislative or congressional action to address the issues raised by *Citizens* including that money is not speech and corporations are not persons under the U.S. Constitution, including Yarmouth, Provincetown, Leverett, Truro, Wellfleet, Lanesborough, Great Barrington, Brewster, Dennis, Orleans, Chatham, Williamstown, Lynn, Lincoln, Newburyport, Northampton, and Brookline, and

WHEREAS, Massachusetts Senator Jamie Eldridge with 25 co-sponsors has filed a Petition accompanied by Resolution, Senate No. 772, calling upon the U.S. Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people, and

WHEREAS, U.S. Senator Tom Udall of New Mexico with 22 cosponsors has introduced Senate Joint Resolution 29, "proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections," that would give the Congress and the states the authority to regulate the raising and spending of moneys with respect to elections,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Newton Board of Aldermen that the Board of Aldermen expresses its disagreement with the holdings of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Buckley* and in *Citizens* that money is speech, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Aldermen urges the General Court of Massachusetts to adopt Senate No. 772, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Aldermen urges Congress to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 29, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board of Aldermen be directed to send a copy of this RESOLUTION to the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation and to the General Court of Massachusetts.

112TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 29

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

NOVEMBER 1, 2011

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-*
3 *thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the fol-
4 lowing article is proposed as an amendment to the Con-
5 stitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all
6 intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when
7 ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several
8 States within seven years after the date of its submission
9 by the Congress:

1 "ARTICLE —

2 "SECTION 1. Congress shall have power to regulate
3 the raising and spending of money and in kind equivalents
4 with respect to Federal elections, including through set-
5 ting limits on—

6 "(1) the amount of contributions to candidates
7 for nomination for election to, or for election to,
8 Federal office; and

9 "(2) the amount of expenditures that may be
10 made by, in support of, or in opposition to such can-
11 didates.

12 "SECTION 2. A State shall have power to regulate the
13 raising and spending of money and in kind equivalents
14 with respect to State elections, including through setting
15 limits on—

16 "(1) the amount of contributions to candidates
17 for nomination for election to, or for election to,
18 State office; and

19 "(2) the amount of expenditures that may be
20 made by, in support of, or in opposition to such can-
21 didates.

22 "SECTION 3. Congress shall have power to implement
23 and enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

○

Senate No.00772

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

PRESENTED BY:

James B. Eldridge

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in General Court assembled:

The undersigned legislators and/or citizens respectfully petition for the passage of the accompanying bill:

By Mr. Eldridge, a petition (accompanied by resolution, Senate, No. 772) of James B. Eldridge, Daniel A. Wolf, Stanley C. Rosenberg, Katherine M. Clark and other members of the General Court memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore free speech. The Judiciary.

PETITION OF:

NAME:	DISTRICT/ADDRESS:
James B. Eldridge	Middlesex and Worcester
Daniel A. Wolf	Cape and Islands
Stanley C. Rosenberg	Hampshire and Franklin
Katherine M. Clark	Middlesex and Essex
James J. O'Day	14th Worcester
Timothy R. Madden	Barnstable, Dukes and Nantucket
Jonathan Hecht	29th Middlesex
Kay Khan	11th Middlesex
William Smitty Pignatelli	4th Berkshire
Cleon H. Turner	1st Barnstable
Paul W. Mark	2nd Berkshire
Peter V. Kocot	1st Hampshire
Sarah K. Peake	4th Barnstable
Cory Atkins	14th Middlesex
Benjamin B. Downing	Berkshire, Hampshire, and Franklin

Charles A. Murphy	21st Middlesex
James Arciero	2nd Middlesex
Sonia Chang-Diaz	Second Suffolk
Sal N. DiDomenico	Middlesex, Suffolk, and Essex
Eileen M. Donoghue	First Middlesex
Tricia Farley-Bouvier	3rd Berkshire
Denise Andrews	2nd Franklin
Linda Dean Campbell	15th Essex
Thomas M. McGee	Third Essex and Middlesex
Brian A. Joyce	Norfolk, Bristol, and Plymouth
John F. Keenan	Norfolk and Plymouth

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

In the Year Two Thousand Eleven

RESOLUTIONS

1 **WHEREAS,** THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
2 WAS DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE FREE SPEECH RIGHTS OF PEOPLE, NOT
3 CORPORATIONS;

4 WHEREAS, FOR THE PAST THREE DECADES, A DIVIDED UNITED STATES
5 SUPREME COURT HAS TRANSFORMED THE FIRST AMENDMENT INTO A
6 POWERFUL TOOL FOR CORPORATIONS SEEKING TO EVADE AND INVALIDATE
7 DEMOCRATICALLY-ENACTED REFORMS;

8 WHEREAS, THIS CORPORATE TAKEOVER OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT HAS
9 REACHED ITS EXTREME CONCLUSION IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S
10 RECENT RULING IN CITIZENS UNITED V. FEC;

11 WHEREAS, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S RULING IN CITIZENS
12 UNITED V. FEC OVERTURNED LONGSTANDING PRECEDENT PROHIBITING
13 CORPORATIONS FROM SPENDING THEIR GENERAL TREASURY FUNDS IN OUR
14 ELECTIONS;

15 WHEREAS, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S RULING IN CITIZENS
16 UNITED V. FEC WILL NOW UNLEASH A TORRENT OF CORPORATE MONEY IN OUR
17 POLITICAL PROCESS UNMATCHED BY ANY CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE TOTALS IN
18 UNITED STATES HISTORY;

19 WHEREAS, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S RULING IN CITIZENS
20 UNITED V. FEC PRESENTS A SERIOUS AND DIRECT THREAT TO OUR DEMOCRACY;

21 WHEREAS, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES HAVE PREVIOUSLY USED
22 THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROCESS TO CORRECT THOSE
23 EGREGIOUSLY WRONG DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
24 THAT GO TO THE HEART OF OUR DEMOCRACY AND SELF-GOVERNMENT;

25 NOW BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
26 HEREBY CALLS UPON THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO PASS AND SEND TO
27 THE STATES FOR RATIFICATION A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RESTORE
28 THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND FAIR ELECTIONS TO THE PEOPLE.

People For the American Way
Published on *People For the American Way* (<http://www.pfaw.org>)

[Home](#) > Printer-friendly

Citizens United v. FEC Constitutional Remedies: List of local, state and federal resolution efforts



Here's a list of federal, state and local bills and resolutions which have been introduced or passed in support of amending the Constitution to undo the harm of Citizens United.

Citizens United v. FEC Constitutional Remedies: List of local, state and federal resolution efforts Updated 6/17/2012

Federal Resolutions

112th Congress

Senate Resolutions

- [S.J.Res. 29](#) ^[1], introduced on November 1, 2011 by **Senators Tom Udall (D-NM), Michael Bennet (D-CO), Tom Harkin (D-IA), Dick Durbin (D-IL), Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI), Jeff Merkley (D-OR), and Mark Begich (D-AK)**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on the *Citizens United v. FEC*.
- [S.J. Res. 33](#) ^[2], introduced on December 8th, 2011 by **Senator Bernie Sanders**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to expressly exclude for-profit corporations from the rights given to natural persons by the Constitution of the United States, prohibit corporate spending in all elections, and affirm the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations and to regulate and set limits on all election contributions and expenditures.
- [S.J. Res. 35](#) ^[3], introduced on January 24th, 2012, by **Senator Max Baucus** and **Senator Jon Tester**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress and states to regulate to raising and spending of corporate and labor funds in support of or in opposition to candidates running for federal and states offices.

House Resolutions

- [H.J. Res. 8](#) ^[4], introduced on January 5, 2011 **Rep. Marcy Kaptur**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to limitations on the amounts of contributions and expenditures that may be made in connection with campaigns for election to public office.
- [H.J. Res. 72](#) ^[5], introduced on July 13, 2011 by **Rep. Kurt Schrader**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States affirming the power of Congress and the States to regulate contribution of funds to candidates and the expenditure of funds intended to influence the outcome of elections.
- [H.J. Res. 78](#) ^[6], introduced on September 12, 2011 by **Rep. Donna Edwards**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate the expenditure of funds for political activity by corporations.

- [H.J. Res. 82](#) ^[7], introduced on October 14, 2011 by Rep. Ted Deutch, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing regulation of any expenditure in connection with an election.
- [H.J. Res. 86](#) ^[8], introduced on November 4, 2011 by **Rep. Betty Sutton**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on the *Citizens United v. FEC*.
- [H.J. Res. 88](#) ^[9], introduced on November 15, 2011 by **Rep. Jim McGovern**, proposes an amendment that would overturn the Supreme Court ruling on *Citizens United v. FEC* and to make clear that corporations are not people.
- [H.J. Res. 90](#) ^[10], introduced on November 18, 2011 by **Rep. Ted Deutch**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to expressly exclude for-profit corporations from the rights given to natural persons by the Constitution of the United States, prohibit corporate spending in all elections, and affirm the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations and to regulate and set limits on all election contributions and expenditures.
- [H.J. Res. 92](#) ^[11], introduced on December 6, 2011 by **Rep. Keith Ellison**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate the disbursement of funds for political activity by for-profit corporations and other for-profit business organizations.
- [H.J. Res. 97](#) ^[12], introduced on December 20th, 2011 by **Rep. John Yarmuth and Rep. Walter Jones**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States declaring that spending on elections does not qualify as protected speech under the First Amendment, giving Congress the authority to create a public financing system as the sole source of funding for federal elections, and designating a national holiday for the purpose of voting.
- [H.J. Res. 100](#) ^[13], introduced on January 18th, 2012 by **Rep. Dennis Kucinich**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States declaring that elections should be publicly funded, and that Congress and the states have the right regulate independent expenditures.

111th Congress

Senate Resolutions

- [S.J. Res. 28](#) ^[14], introduced on February 24, 2010 by **Senators Chris Dodd (D-CT), Tom Udall (D-NM), Michael Bennet (D-C), Arlen Specter (D-PA)**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States affirming the power of Congress to regulate financing of federal elections and the power of states to regulate financing of state elections.
- [S.J. Res. 36](#) ^[15], introduced on July 27, 2010 by **Senator Max Baucus**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to authorizing regulation of contributions to candidates for State public office and Federal office by corporations and labor organizations, and expenditures by corporate entities and labor organizations in support of, or opposition to such candidates.

House Resolutions

- [H.J. Res. 68](#) ^[16], introduced on January 21, 2010 by **Rep. Leonard Boswell**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting corporations and labor organizations from using their operating funds to pay for political ads.
- [H.J. Res. 74](#) ^[17], introduced on February 2, 2010 by **Rep. Donna Edwards**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting Congress and the States to regulate the expenditure of funds by corporations engaging in political speech.
- [H.J. Res. 82](#) ^[18], introduced on April 14, 2010 by **Rep. Paul W. Hodes**, proposes the "Doris 'Granny D' Haddock Amendment of 2010" to the Constitution of the United States regarding the authority of Congress and the States to regulate the spending and activities of corporations with regard to political campaigns and campaigns for election for public office.
- [H.J. Res. 84](#) ^[19], introduced on May 13, 2010 by **Rep. Kurt Schrader**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate campaign contributions for Federal elections.

State and Local Resolutions

Alaska

State Resolutions

- [HJR 33](#) ^[20], **introduced** by Representatives Gara, Tuck, Holmes, Miller, Gardner, Kawaski, Kerttula, and Petersen on February 2, 2012, proposes that Congress and the President work to pass a constitutional amendment that would limit the ability of corporations, unions and wealthy individuals from making limitless independent expenditures to influence the outcome of elections. Currently awaiting passage in Alaska's House of Representatives.
- [SJR 13](#) ^[21], introduced by Senator Dyson, **passed in the Senate** on March 21, 2012 in a 12-7-1 vote and is **currently awaiting passage in the House**. It proposes that Congress and the President work to pass a constitutional amendment that would limit the ability of corporations, unions and wealthy individuals from making limitless independent expenditures to influence the outcome of elections.

Arizona

State Resolutions

- [HCR 2049](#) ^[22], **introduced** by State Representative McCune Davis on February 1, 2012, provides support for the introduction of a 2012 ballot initiative that would call upon Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision and related cases.
- [SCR 1040](#) ^[23], **introduced** by State Senator Steve Gallardo on January 31, 2012, provides support for the introduction of a 2012 ballot initiative that would call upon Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision and related cases.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On May 4, 2012 the Flagstaff City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment, organized by a new citizens' group called Flagstaff for Democracy. The resolution calls on Congress to approve a 28th amendment to the United States Constitution that would overturn *Citizens United* by stating that corporations are not natural persons entitled to constitutional protections of free speech, that money is not speech for the purpose of influencing elections, and that local, state and federal government shall have the right to regulate, limit or prohibit contributions and expenditures, including a candidate's own contributions and expenditures for the purpose of influencing in any way the election of any candidate for public office or any ballot measure, and that any permissible contributions and expenditures be publicly disclosed.

Arkansas

Local Resolutions Passed

- On June 5, 2012, the Fayetteville City Council passed a resolution to defend democracy by ensuring only human beings, not corporations, have constitutionally protected free speech.

California

State Resolutions

- [AJR 3](#), **introduced** on January 23, 2010 by Assemblyman Pedro Nava (D-35), expresses disagreement with the Citizens United ruling, and calls upon Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to address the issue.
- [AJR 22](#) ^[24], introduced on March 20, 2012 by Assemblyman Weikowski, **passed in the California State Assembly** and is currently being **proposed in the California State Senate**. It proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On April 25th, 2000, the municipality of Point Arena passed a resolution rejecting corporate personhood, which

declared, "Interference in the democratic process by corporations frequently usurps the rights of citizens to govern."

- On May 19, 2004, the city of Arcata passed Resolution No. 034-51, the Corporate Personhood Resolution, declaring corporate personhood illegitimate and undemocratic. It attempts to prevent corporations from challenging Arcata town laws that restrict corporations.
- On February 10, 2010, the Humboldt County Democratic Central Committee passed the Resolution to Legalize Democracy and Abolish Corporate Personhood in response to the Citizens United v. FEC ruling. The resolution calls for an amendment to the US Constitution to abolish corporate personhood.
- On March 1, 2010, Richmond City Council votes unanimously to support a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to abolish corporate personhood.
- On April 1, 2010, the Berkeley City Council passed a resolution calling for "amending the United States and California Constitutions to declare that corporations are not entitled to the protections or "rights" of human beings and to declare that the expenditure of corporate money is not a form of constitutionally protected speech."
- On December 1, 2010, students at UC Santa Barbara passed a resolution against corporate personhood through their student government.
- On March 28, 2011, the Fort Bragg (CA) City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to ban corporate personhood. All of the council members present voted for it; one member was absent.
- On April 1, 2011, AFSCME Local 1684 in Eureka passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and proposing a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On April 12, 2011, the Central Labor Council of Humboldt and Del Norte adopted the Move to Amend Model Resolution.
- On April 22, 2011, the Associated Students of HSU passed a resolution supporting the Move to Amend campaign and calling for a constitutional amendment to abolish corporate personhood. The resolution was proposed by a group of students working with Democracy Unlimited.
- On July 21, 2011, the South Robertson Neighborhood Council (SORONC) passed a non-binding resolution to amend the Constitution to state clearly and unequivocally that human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights and that money should not be equated with speech.
- On August 15, 2011, the Ojai Valley Democratic Club endorsed a resolution supporting a Constitutional amendment ending corporate personhood.
- On August 24, 2011, the Marin County Board Supervisors voted unanimously in favor of a resolution supporting a Constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and limit corporate constitutional rights.
- On Tuesday October 18, 2011, the Marina City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment in response to the Citizens United vs Federal Election Commission case.
- On December 1, 2011, the Wellstone Progressive Democrats of Sacramento passed a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment that abolishes corporate personhood. They also agreed to send a letter with the endorsed resolution to the California State Democratic Central Committee asking the California Democratic Party to endorse the resolution.
- On December 6, 2011, Los Angeles City unanimously endorsed a resolution to end personhood rights of corporations and allows Federal, State, and Local governments to regulate campaign finance.
- On December 20th, 2011, the city council of Oakland, California unanimously passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment to reverse the *Citizens United* decision.
- On January 11th, 2012, the town council of Fairfax California approved a resolution in favor of abolishing corporate personhood with the intent of restoring the democratic process to the people.
- On January 17, 2012, West Hollywood passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on

Citizens United and supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.

- On January 24, 2012, the city of Santa Cruz approved a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On January 25, 2012, the city of Petaluma passed a resolution in a 6-1 decision that called for a reversal of the *Citizens United* decision.
- On January 31, 2012, the city of San Francisco passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and supporting a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On February 6, 2012, the Albany City Council has passed a municipal government resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people.
- On February 21, 2012, the city council of Davis voted unanimously on a resolution in support of Assembly Joint Resolution 22, a bill in the California legislature that calls on Congress to pass an amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On March of 2012, the city of Point Arena unanimously passed a resolution supporting their previous resolution in 2000, which called for the abolition of corporate personhood.
- On March 1, 2012, the Democratic Central Committee of Marin passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, the Berkeley City Council unanimously passed their second resolution calling upon Congress to amend the Constitution to overturn *Citizens United* in support of Assembly Bill AJR 22 and to 'stand with communities across the country' who are engaged in the movement.
- On March 13, 2012, the Ojai City Council passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.
- On March 14, 2012, Nevada City's City Council passed a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment stating that corporations should not receive the same constitutional rights as natural persons and that money is not speech.
- On March 19, 2012, the Los Altos Hills City Council approved a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 20, 2012, the city council of Mountain View passed a resolution in favor of abolishing corporate personhood, and encouraging Congress to pass a constitutional amendment that would overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On March 23, 2012, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors voted urging Congress to pass an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would overturn the Citizens United decision.
- On March 27, 2012, the city council of Santa Monica passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment that would overturn the *Citizens United* decision and declare that money is not speech.
- On April 17th, 2012, the city council of Chico passed a resolution calling on Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision. The resolution provides that corporations should not have the constitutional right to spend money in elections, and that money should not be equated to speech.
- On April 24, 2012, City Council of the City of Thousand Oaks passed a resolution declaring its support for an amendment to the United States Constitution to end Corporate Personhood.
- On May 5th, 2012, the Redlands City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment based upon the principles that corporate rights should be limited and money is not speech.
- On May 15, 2012, the Plumas County Board of Supervisors in Quincy, California passed a resolution to call for a constitutional amendment to abolish corporate personhood.

- On June 12, 2012, the Ventura County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that supports a Constitutional amendment ending corporate personhood and the doctrine that money is not free speech.

Colorado

Local Resolutions Passed

- On April 5, 2011, the Arapahoe County Democratic Central committee approved a resolution in support of the Move to Amend constitutional amendment campaign.
- On April 13, 2011, the Boulder Democratic Party passed the Urging Support of a Constitutional Amendment Abolishing Corporate Personhood resolution supporting an anti-corporate personhood amendment.
- On September 12, 2011, the Jamestown Board of Trustees unanimously passed a resolution calling for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to establish that only human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights and that the First Amendment does not protect unlimited political spending as free speech.
- On November 1, 2011, voters in Boulder City passed a ballot measure calling for an amendment to the US Constitution that would state that corporations are not people and reject the legal status of money as free speech.
- On January 3, 2012, the Commissioners of Pueblo County, Colorado unanimously passed a resolution in favor of overturning the *Citizens United* decision, and calling for the end of corporate personhood.
- On May 17, 2012 the Town Council of the town of Telluride passed a resolution declaring its support to ending corporate personhood.

Connecticut

Local Resolutions Passed

- On May 15th, 2012, the city council of Hartford unanimously passed a resolution in support of an amendment to the Constitution that would overturn *Buckley v. Valeo* and the *Citizens United v. FEC*. The public support for the amendment was strong, with standing-room-only at the public hearing and over 60 Hartford residents in support.
- On June 4, 2012, the City Council of New London approved a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment abolishing corporate personhood.
- On June 4, 2012, the Common Council of Middletown passed a resolution condemning the Citizens United decision and calling for electoral form.
- On June 4, 2012, the New Haven Board of Aldermen passed a resolution that calls for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing corporate personhood.
- On June 11, 2012, the West Haven City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United.

Florida

State Resolutions

- [SM 1576](#) ^[25] – the People’s Rights Amendment – **introduced** by Sen. Braynon on January 5th 2012, proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment that would overturn the Citizens United decision.
- [HM 1275](#) ^[26] – the People’s Rights Amendment – **introduced** by Rep. Williams on January 5th 2012, proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment that would overturn the Citizens United decision.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On September 15, 2011, the Sarasota Alliance for Fair Elections (SAFE) has passed a resolution stating that SAFE stands with the Move to Amend campaign and communities across the country to defend democracy from the corrupting effects of undue corporate power by amending the United States Constitution.

- On October 1, 2011, the Coalition of Concerned Patriots of Bradenton passed a resolution standing with the Move to Amend campaign, and calling for constitutional remedies to counter corporate influence.
- On October 4, 2011, the South Miami City Commission passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to end corporate personhood.
- On October 14, 2011, the Fruitland Park chapter of Pax Christi passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment and the Move to Amend campaign.
- On October 20, 2011, the Social Justice Committee of the Universalist Unitarian Church in Venice approved a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On October 27, 2011, the Palm Beach County of Progressive Democrats passed a resolution calling for an amendment to end corporate personhood and reject the notion that money is speech.
- On November 14, 2011, citizens in Orlando passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision in the Citizens United case. Furthermore, the resolution rejected the notion that 'money is speech.'
- In November of 2011, the Cutler Bay City Council passed a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On December 1, 2011, the Southwest Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice passed a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United.
- On March 15, 2012, the Tampa Bay City council unanimously passed a resolution calling for Congress to amend the Constitution to rectify the Supreme Court's interpretation of corporate rights and corporate engagement in the electoral process.
- On March 19, 2012, the Key West City Commission passed a resolution condemning the Citizens United decision, stating that corporations should not have the same rights as people.

Georgia

State Resolutions

- [HR 1377](#) ^[27], **introduced** on February 15, 2012 by State Representative Stephanie Benfield, opposing the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and requesting a constitutional amendment "to restore republican democracy to the people of the United States."

Hawaii

State Resolutions

- [SCR225](#) ^[28], **introduced** on March 10, 2010 by Senator Gary L. Hooser (D-7), expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to pass a constitutional amendment barring the use of "person" when defining "corporate entity."
- [SR116](#) ^[29], **introduced** on March 10, 2010 by Senator Gary L. Hooser (D-7), expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to pass a constitutional amendment barring the use of "person" when defining "corporate entity."
- [HCR282 HD1](#) ^[30], introduced on March 10, 2010 by Rep. Bob Herkes (D-5) – **passed both the House and Senate** and was adopted on April 28th, 2010, expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit Congress and States to regulate expenditure of funds by corporations engaging in political speech.
- [HR204](#) ^[31], **introduced** on March 10, 2010, also by Rep. Bob Herkes (D-5), expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to pass a constitutional amendment barring the use of "person" when defining "corporate entity."

- [HB36](#) ^[32], **introduced** on January 20, 2011 by Rep. Karl Rhoads (D-28), proposes a state constitutional amendment to provide that freedom of speech applies only to natural persons.
- [HCR 51](#) ^[33] – a joint measure – was **introduced** on February 11, 2011 by Rep. Roy Takumi (D-36), proposing that the United States Congress pass a constitutional amendment that provides that corporations are not persons under the laws of the U.S. or any of its jurisdictional subdivisions.
- [HR 44](#) ^[34] – a house measure – **passed in the House** on April 14, 2011. The bill was introduced by Rep. Roy Takumi (D-36). Proposes that the United States Congress pass a constitutional amendment that provides that corporations are not persons under the laws of the U.S. or any of its jurisdictional subdivisions.

Idaho

State Resolutions

- [HJM012](#) ^[27], **introduced** on February 24, 2010 in the House State Affairs Committee, expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to take action through legislation or a constitutional amendment.

Illinois

Local Resolutions Passed

- On May 14, 2012, the Evanston City Council unanimously passed a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* ruling. The city's resolution explicitly states its support for all such constitutional amendments introduced in Congress, including the one co-sponsored by U.S. Senator Dick Durbin (D-Ill.).
- On June 4, 2012, Galesburg became the second city in Illinois to pass a City Council resolution calling for Congress to overturn the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizen's United v. FEC* by way of Constitutional Amendment.

Iowa

State Resolutions

- [SR 113](#) ^[35], introduced by State Senator Jeff Danielson, **passed in the Senate** by a 7-4 vote on March 12, 2012. The resolution expresses disagreement with the current interpretation of corporate rights and the *Citizens United* decision, and calls for Congress to enact appropriate legislation to regulate and restrict corporate spending in elections.

Kansas

State Resolutions

- [SCR 1617](#) ^[36], **introduced** on March 18, 2012 by State Senators Holland, Faust-Goudeau, Francisco, Haley, Hensley and Steineger, opposing the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, and requesting a constitutional amendment to repeal corporate personhood.

Kentucky

State Resolutions

- [HR 14](#) ^[36], **introduced** by Representative Rollins on the January 4, 2011 General Assembly regular session, calls upon Congress to amend the Constitution to prevent corporate control of elections.

Maine

Local Resolutions Passed

- On January 18, 2012, the city council of Portland, Maine, passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment that would provide that corporations are not people.
- On February 21, 2012, the city council of Waterville passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment that would overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On February 26, 2012, the town of Great Pond passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment that would overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On March 11, 2012, the Selectmen of Maine unanimously agreed to allow citizens to vote on a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 26, 2012, the Bangor City Council passed in a 5-3 vote a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and stating that corporations are not entitled to the same rights of natural persons.
- On April 11, 2012, the Fairfield City Council unanimously passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and stating that corporations are not entitled to the same rights of natural persons.
- On May 14, 2012, the city council of Winslow passed a resolution supporting an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would clarify that money is not speech and corporations are not persons.
- On May 15, 2012, the Bar Harbor City Council unanimously passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and stating that corporations are not entitled to the same rights of natural persons.
- On June 2, 2012, the attendees of the Town Meeting of Leeds passed a Town Warrant to call for a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United*.

Maryland

State Resolutions

- On January 19, 2012, State Senator Jamie Raskin introduced a letter to the Maryland General Assembly. It sharply disagrees with the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calls for a constitutional amendment to be sent to each state for ratification to overturn the ruling. **The majority of members in the House of Delegates and State Senate have signed this letter in agreement.**

Local Resolutions Passed

- On January 23, 2012, the Greenbelt City Council passed a resolution that supported a Maryland General Assembly Letter to Congress calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United*.
- On January 24, 2012, the College Park City Council passed a resolution that supported a National General Assembly Letter to Congress calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United* and clarify that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On February 21, 2012, the Prince George's County Council passed a resolution expressing support for a Maryland General Assembly Letter to Congress calling for a reversal of the *Citizens United* decision and to restore fair elections and democratic sovereignty to the people.
- On March 6, 2012, the Mt. Rainier City Council unanimously passed a resolution supporting a Maryland General Assembly Letter to Congress that calls for campaign financing and spending by corporations should be limited and not protected under the First Amendment. It seeks to create a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 21, 2012, the city council of Baltimore passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment abolishing corporate personhood.

Massachusetts

State Resolutions

- SD 772 ^[37], **introduced** by State Senator Jamie Eldridge on January 21, 2011, the Free Speech for People resolution calling for the United States Congress to pass and send the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections for the people. Currently being heard by the Joint Committee on the Judiciary.

City/Local Resolutions

- In April of 2011, the town of Yarmouth passed a resolution in a town hall meeting demanding a constitutional amendment to dismantle corporate personhood.
- On April 4, 2011, Provincetown passed resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people, and calling on the Massachusetts General Court to pass resolutions requesting those actions.
- On April 24, 2011, the town of Leverett passed Move to Amend's model resolution at a townhall meeting.
- On April 26, 2011, the town of Truro passed a resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On April 26, 2011, the town of Wellfleet passed a resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- In May of 2011, Lanesborough citizens passed a resolution that supports the overturning of the Citizens United decision, stating that the Supreme Court's findings were wrong and clarifying that corporations are not people.
- On May 2, 2011, the town of Great Barrington passed a resolution calling upon the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment that Congress and the states will regulate the use of funds for political speech by any corporate entity.
- On May 3, 2011, the town of Brewster passed a resolution calling for the Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On May 3, 2011, the town of Dennis passed a resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On May 8, 2011, the town of Orleans passed a resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On May 9, 2011, the town of Chatham passed a resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On May 12, 2011, Williamstown passed a resolution calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On October 13, 2011, the town of Somerville passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On October 24, 2011, the Cambridge City Council passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On December 1, 2011, Psychologists for Social Responsibility in Brookline approved a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On January 5, 2012, the town of Westport passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.

- On January 30, 2012, the Cambridge City Council passed a second resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United.
- On February 14, 2012, the city council of Lynn passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On February 29, 2012, the city of Boston passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision.
- On March 20, 2012, the members of the Falmouth Town Meeting declared their support for abolishing corporate personhood, affirming their belief that the First Amendment only protects people.
- On March 24, 2012, a town hall meeting in Lincoln passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On March 27, 2012, the Newburyport Town Council passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United.
- On April 4, 2012, the town of Provincetown passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision.
- On April 5, 2012, the town of Falmouth passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision.
- On April 10, 2012, the town of Oak Bluffs passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United.
- On April 10, 2012, the town of Edgartown passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On April 10, 2012, the town of West Tisbury passed a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On April 10, 2012, the town of Tisbury passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On April 12, 2012, the town of Natick voted in favor of a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On April 19, 2012, the Northampton City Council unanimously passed a resolution calling for a Constitutional amendment that would reverse a Supreme Court decision giving corporations the same rights as people.
- On April 23, 2012, the town of Chilmark passed a local resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and supporting a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On April 24, 2012, the town of Framingham passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On April 27, 2012, the town of Concord voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On April 28, 2012, the town of Leverett passed a second resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and calling for a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On April 28, 2012, the town of Nahant voted to pass a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On April 30, 2012, the town of West Newbury voted to pass a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On May 1, 2012, the town of Reading passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.

- On May 1, 2012, the town of Shutesbury passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On May 1, 2012, the town of Shelburne passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On May 1, 2012, the town of Deerfield passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On May 3, 2011, the town of Dennis, MA introduced, voted and passed article 51 calling on the United States Congress to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people.
- On May 5, 2012, the town of Pelham passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 5, 2012, the town of Warren passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 5, 2012, the town of Ashfield voted in favor (with only two dissenting votes out of 65) to support a resolution in favor of amending the Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 7, 2012, the Amherst City Council unanimously passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 7, 2012, the town of Sheffield passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 7, 2012, the town of Warwick passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 1, 2012, the town of Swampscott passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On May 8, 2012, the town of Colrain passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 9, 2012, the town of Orleans passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 9, 2012, the town of West Tisbury passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 10, 2012, the Salem City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 14, 2012, the town of Boxborough passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 14, 2012, the town of Needham passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 14, 2012, the town of Rowe passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 14, 2012, the town of Medway passed a resolution approving Article 49 and urged support for the Senate Bill 772: A Resolution Restoring Free Speech, sponsored by state Sen. Jamie Eldridge.
- On May 15, 2012, the town of Conway passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.

- On May 15, 2012, the town of Otis passed a resolution calling for an amendment to Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 15, 2012, the city council of Worcester passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and supports the People's Rights Amendment.
- On May 16, 2012, the town of Arlington passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On May 21, 2012, the town of Somerset passed a resolution abolishing corporate personhood.
- On May 23, 2012, the town of Richmond passed a resolution to abolish corporate personhood.
- On May 25, 2012, the town of Stockbridge passed a resolution in opposition to the *Citizens United* decision.
- On May 25, 2012, the town of Charlemont passed a resolution in support of abolishing corporate personhood.
- On May 29, 2012, the town of Newbury passed a resolution in support of abolishing corporate personhood.
- On June 4, 2012, the City Council of Quincy passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United vs. FEC*.
- On June 4, 2012, the Town of Wendell passed a resolution to show their support for an amendment to the US Constitution that would proclaim that the rights listed in the bill of rights are for people, rather than corporations.
- On June 7, 2012, the town of Bernardston passed a resolution advocating for the reversal of the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* by way of a constitutional amendment.

Michigan

Local Resolutions Passed

- On December 1, 2011, the Dickinson County Democratic Party passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision.
- On February 2, 2012, the Emmet County Democratic Committee Executive Board declared support for the Move to Amend resolution, which calls upon Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution that would abolish corporate personhood and the judicial interpretation that money is speech.
- On February 9, 2012, the 15th Congressional District Democratic Organization of Michigan passed a resolution that calls upon Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution that would abolish corporate personhood and the judicial interpretation that money is speech.
- On March 28, 2012, Gogebic County Democratic Party passed a resolution, affirming its belief that corporate personhood must be abolished by amending the Constitution.

Minnesota

State Resolutions

- [HF0914](#) ^[38], **introduced** on March 7, 2011 to the Minnesota State Legislature, provides that corporations are not natural persons and proposes a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.
- [SF683](#) ^[39], **introduced** on March 9, 2011 to the Minnesota State Senate, condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On March 1, 2011, the Minnesota Democrats passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to define an individual as a "natural person" in hopes to abolish corporate personhood.

- On August 9, 2011, the Minnesota Coalition of Peacemakers passed a resolution seeking to abolish corporate personhood by an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
- In October of 2011, the Minnesota Retiree Council of the AFL-CIO passed a resolution to support Move to Amend.
- On December 13th, 2011, the city council of Duluth, Minnesota passed a resolution in opposition to the Citizens United decision and the legal definition of corporate personhood.
- On June 11, 2012, the St. Paul City Council passed a resolution supporting an Amendment to the United States Constitution that only human beings, not corporations, are protected by democratic rights.

Mississippi

State Resolutions

- [HC 108](#) ^[40], **introduced** on April 5, 2012 by Representative James Evans, provides for a constitutional convention with the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would abolish the concept of corporate personhood.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On December 13, 2011, the Jackson City Council passed a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarifying that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On June 2, 2012, the Mississippi Democratic Party declared its support for an Amendment to the Constitution to abolish corporate personhood and the doctrine that money is speech.

Missouri

State Resolutions

- [HCR 38](#) ^[40], **introduced** by Rep Tracy McCreery, calls for a constitutional amendment that clearly states that corporations are not human beings and do not have the same rights as the citizens of the United States.

Montana

State Resolutions

- [HJ 10](#) ^[41], **introduced** by Representative Hill on February 2, 2011, proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On August 23, 2011, the Missoula City Council voted to place a referendum on the 2011 ballot that urges federal and state lawmakers to amend the U.S. Constitution to clearly state "that corporations are not human beings and do not have the same rights as citizens." On November 8, 2011, Missoula voters approved a local ballot referendum urging Congress to propose a constitutional amendment that clearly states that corporations are not people and do not have the same rights as citizens by a three to one margin.
- On May 2, 2012, the city council of Hot Springs unanimously passed a resolution in support of an amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision, and providing that corporations are not people.

New Hampshire

State Resolutions

- In May 2004, the Democratic Party of New Hampshire, **passed a resolution** ^[42] declaring that "Corporations shall not be considered "persons" protected by the Constitution of the United States or by the Constitutions of the states that so declare; and the rights of individual, natural persons shall be privileged over any and all rights that have been extended to artificial entities."

- [HCR 1](#) ^[43], **introduced** by Rep. Weed and Rep. Car on January 5th, 2011, proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment that provides that constitutional rights such as free speech apply to living persons, and not to corporations, for the purpose of electioneering, among others.
- [HR 8](#) ^[44], **introduced** by Rep. Pierce and Rep. Richardson on January 6th, 2011, proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment that would limit corporate spending in elections, and thus overturn the *Citizens United* ruling.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On March 14, 2012, citizens in a Bradford Town Hall Meeting voted to pass a resolution condemning the *Citizens United* decision and calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling.

New Jersey

State Resolutions

- [AR 64](#), ^[45] **introduced on** on March 4, 2010, by State Representative Herb Conway, calls on Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide that with regard to corporation campaign spending, a person means only a natural person for First Amendment protection of free speech.
- [SR 47](#) ^[46] **introduced on** Feb 16, 2012 by Senator Jeff Van Drew. Calls on Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide that with regard to corporation campaign spending, a person means only a natural person for First Amendment protection of free speech.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On April 10, 2012, the Franklin Township Council (Somerset County, NJ) passed a Resolution (#12-167) in support of a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision.

New Mexico

State Resolutions

- [Joint Memorial 36](#) ^[47], **introduced** on February 11, 2011 by Rep. Mimi Stewart (D-21), failed by one vote on the House floor. It expresses strong opposition to the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and call upon the United States congress to propose and send to the states for ratification an amendment to the United States constitution to restore free speech and fair elections to the people of the United States.
- [HM 4](#) ^[48], introduced by Representative Stewart, **passed** in a 38-29 vote in the House on January 30, 2012. [SM 3](#) ^[49], introduced by Senator Fischmann, **passed** in a 20-9 vote in the Senate on February 7, 2012. On February 11, 2012, **the New Mexico joint legislature passed** a resolution calling for Congress to propose a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision, becoming the second state in the union to do so.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On January 11, 2012, citizens in Santa Fe passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On February 25, 2012, the Taos City Council passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On April 17, 2012, the Taos County Commission unanimously approved a resolution requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution to counter the effects of the *Citizens United* ruling.

New York

State Resolutions

- [K01016](#) ^[50], introduced by Assemblyman James Brennan on March 7, 2012, **passed the New York State Assembly's Law Election Committee, awaiting a floor vote**, provides that the US Congress to send the states

a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United case, which would enable corporate spending in elections.

Local Resolutions Passed

- In February of 2011, the Essex County Democratic Committee voted to approve a constitutional amendment that would establish money is not speech and that people, not corporations, are people with constitutional rights.
- In March of 2011, the Progressive Coalition of Northern New York approved the Move to Amend resolution.
- On December 6, 2011, the Albany Common Council passed a resolution stating that "Corporations are not People".
- On December 28, 2011, the Brighton Town Council voted to pass a resolution in support of abolishing corporate personhood.
- On January 4th, 2012, the city council of New York City passed a resolution "supporting an amendment to the Constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or 'rights' of natural persons."
- On January 11, 2012, citizens in Buffalo passed a local resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision and clarify that corporations are not natural persons.
- On February 1, 2012, the Common Council of Ithaca, NY voted 8-1 in favor of a resolution calling on Congress to pass an amendment to end corporate personhood.
- On February 13, 2012, the town board of Danby voted unanimously for a resolution calling on Congress to pass an amendment to end corporate personhood.
- On March 1, 2012, the city of Troy passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision and clarifying that corporations are not people.
- On March 26, 2012, the Yonkers City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment providing that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or "rights" of natural persons, specifically so that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form of constitutionally protected speech.
- On May 2, 2012, the Allegheny County Council approved a resolution in support of an amendment that would overturn the Citizens United decision.
- On May 8, 2012, the Mt Kisco Village Board of Trustees unanimously passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment that declares corporations are not given the same legal status as people and that corporate spending for influencing elections is not deemed to be a form of speech.

North Carolina

Local Resolutions Passed

- On April 1, 2011, The Alamance County Democrats passed a resolution at their democratic convention, calling for a Constitutional amendment to abolish corporate personhood.
- On December 10, 2011, the Progressive Democrats of North Carolina passed the Move to Amend model resolution.
- On January 9, 2012, the Chapel Hill Town Council passed the Move to Amend Resolution stating that corporations are not people and that money is not speech.
- On January 17, 2012, the Carrboro Board of Alderman unanimously passed a resolution in to clarify that "corporations are not people and money is not speech."
- On February 14, 2012, citizens in Asheville passed a local resolution calling for the reversal of the Citizens United decision, stating that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.

- On February 21, 2012, the board of commission of Orange County passed a resolution supporting an amendment to Constitution that would provide that corporations are not people.
- On April 2, 2012, the Franklin Board of Alderman passed a resolution calling upon the North Carolina General Assembly to petition Congress for a constitutional amendment that would overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United.
- On April 4, 2012, the Board of Aldermen of Bryson City, NC passed a resolution to support a constitutional amendment to abolish the doctrine that money is speech and that human beings, rather than corporations, are protected by democratic rights.
- On April 17, 2012, the Highlands Town Council passed a resolution supporting an amendment to the Constitution that would provide that corporations are not people, and that money is not speech.
- On May 2, 2012, the Alleghany County Council approved a resolution in support of an amendment that would overturn the Citizens United decision.
- On May 7, 2012, the Commissioners of Jackson County passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment to abolish corporate personhood.
- On May 24, 2012, the City Council of Durham supported a constitutional amendment that would "defend democracy from the corrupting effects of corporate power."

Ohio

Local Resolutions Passed

- On February 6, 2012, the city council of Athens unanimously passed a resolution rejecting the Citizens United decision and calling for an amendment to redefine corporate constitutional rights.
- On February 23, 2012, the Oberlin City Council unanimously approved a resolution calling upon the US Congress and Ohio legislature to create a constitutional amendment that would reverse the Citizens United decision and reinstates that free speech is a right of persons, not corporations.

Oklahoma

State Resolutions

- On May 17, 2003, the Oklahoma Democratic Party, at their state convention, **approved** a resolution opposing corporate personhood.

Oregon

State Resolutions

- [HJM 9](#) ^[51], **introduced** by Representative Phil Barnhart on January 10, 2011, provides that Congress to pass a constitutional amendment that would "restore the First Amendment and fair elections to the people."

Local Resolutions Passed

- On June 23, 2011, the Democratic Party of Douglas County, Oregon voted to pass a resolution opposing Corporate Personhood and in support of the Move to Amend organization.
- On January, 12, 2012, the Portland City Council voted unanimously in favor of a resolution put for by Mayor Sam Adams, which declared that money is not speech and corporations are not people.
- On February 6, 2012, the Corvallis City Council passed a resolution that condemned the Supreme Court's ruling on Citizens United and proposed a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision.
- On February 7, 2012, the Klamath County Democratic Central Committee passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.

- On February 15th, 2012, the city council of Eugene, Oregon passed a resolution encouraging Congress to pass an amendment to the Constitution that would overturn the Citizens United decision.
- On April 12, 2012, the City Council of Yachats rejected the Citizens United ruling, passing a resolution in affirmation of the belief that money is not speech and that the Constitution protects the rights of human beings.
- On April 23, 2012, the City Council of the City of West Lin voted to pass a resolution in opposition to corporate personhood.
- On May 15, 2012, the City Council of Newport passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment abolishing corporate personhood and the doctrine that money is not speech.

Pennsylvania

State Resolutions

- [HR 653](#) ^[52] **introduced** on March 9, 2010 by Rep. Steve Santarsiero (D-31), expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to call a constitutional convention.
- [Senate Resolution 264](#) ^[53], **will be introduced** shortly by Senator Jim Ferlo, who announced his intention to do so on March 9, 2012. The bill calls to support the nationwide effort to amend the US Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* ruling.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On January 1, 2010, the Lehman City Council passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supporting a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On December 30, 2011, the Pittsburgh City Council passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to abolish corporate personhood and return our elections back to the American people.
- On February 14, 2012, the town of Lancaster passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.

Rhode Island

State Resolutions

- [H 6156](#) ^[54], **introduced** on May 18, 2010 by Rep. Thomas Winfield, proposes that Congress pass a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- [H 8186](#) ^[55], **introduced** on May 27, 2010 by Rep. David Segel (D-2), applies to the Congress of the United States to call a constitutional convention.
- [H7899](#) ^[56] was introduced by Speaker of the House Gordon Fox and **passed** on May 8th. [S2656](#) ^[57] was introduced by State Senate President Teresa Paiva-Weed and **passed** on April 25th, 2012. These companion resolutions call for Congress to pass an amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision and its subsequent, related cases.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On June 7, 2012, the Providence City Council unanimously passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the U.S. Supreme Court decision lifting the federal ban on corporate campaign spending.

South Dakota

State Resolutions

- [HCR 1018](#) ^[58] **introduced** on March 2010, by Rep. Ed Iron Cloud (D-27) and Sen. Jim Bradford (R-27), failed on a 24-43 vote on the day after it was introduced. The resolution urged the Congress and the States to propose a constitutional amendment that would reverse *Citizen's United V. FEC* decision.

Vermont

State Resolutions

- **JRS11** ^[59], introduced January 21, 2011 by Senator Virginia Lyons (D-Chittendon), and **passed in the Senate** on April 12, 2012 urges the United States Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution, which provides that corporations are not persons under the laws of the United States or any of its jurisdictional subdivisions. The bill **passed the House** on April 19th, 2012, with a 92-40 vote, which made **Vermont the third state in the country** – following Hawaii then New Mexico – to ratify a Citizens United-related resolution.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On February 28, 2011, the town of Lincoln approved a resolution to end corporate personhood in their community.
- On March 6, 2012, in Albany, citizens voted in favor of a ballot that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, at a town hall meeting in Barnet, citizens passed a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and called for a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in Bolton, citizens nearly unanimously voted to pass a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Brattleboro passed a resolution that condemns the *Citizens United* decision and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, in Brandon, citizens voted to pass a resolution calling for campaign finance reform and urging both the Vermont and US Congresses to support the same resolution. It supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Bristol voted to support a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and clarify that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Burlington passed a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, in Calais, citizens at a town hall meeting voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Charlotte voted in favor of a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Chester passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, in Chittenden, citizens at a town hall meeting voted in favor of a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Craftsbury voted to pass a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment that would overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in a town hall meeting in East Montpelier passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's rulings on *Citizens United* and calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, in Fayston, citizens passed a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Fletcher voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.

- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Granville voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's rulings on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in Greensboro, citizens passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Hardwick unanimously voted in favor of a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Hartford voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, in Hartland, citizens passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Hinesburg voted in favor of a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Jericho voted to pass a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Marlboro voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the *Citizens United* decision and clarifies that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, in Marshfield, citizens passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment that reverses the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Middletown Springs voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Monkton voted to pass a resolution calling for a reversal of the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, in Montgomery, a town hall meeting passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Montpelier voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarifies that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Moretown voted to pass a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, in Mt. Holly, citizens at a town hall meeting passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Newbury voted in favor of a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Newfane voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in Norwich, citizens passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Peru voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment that would overturn the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Plainfield voted in favor of a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by

the First Amendment.

- On March 6, 2012, at a town hall meeting in Putney, on two ballots, citizens unanimously passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, in Randolph, citizens at a town hall meeting voted to pass a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Richmond voted in favor of a resolution that condemns the *Citizens United* decision and calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, at a town hall meeting in Ripton, citizens unanimously passed a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, in Rochester, citizens voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Roxbury voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Rutland City passed a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, in Rutland Town, citizens voted to pass a resolution condemning the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and support a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Sharon voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Shelburne passed a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Shrewsbury voted to pass a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, in South Burlington, citizens voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Starksboro passed a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Sudbury unanimously voted in favor of a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in Thetford Center, citizens at a town hall meeting voted to pass a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and clarify that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Tunbridge passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens at a town hall meeting in Underhill voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in Waitsfield, citizens passed a resolution that favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, at a town hall meeting in Walden, citizens voted to pass a resolution that condemns the

Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.

- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Waltham voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Warren passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in West Haven, citizens voted to pass a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to reverse the *Citizens United* decision and clarifying that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, at a town hall meeting in Williamstown, citizens voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Williston passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, in Windsor, citizens at a town hall meeting voted to pass a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the *Citizens United* decision and clarifies that corporations are not people protected by the First Amendment.
- On March 6, 2012, a town hall meeting in Winooski voted in favor of a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United*.
- On March 6, 2012, citizens in Woodbury passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United* and favors a constitutional amendment to reverse the decision.
- On March 6, 2012, at a town hall meeting in Woodstock, citizens supported a resolution that calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United* and clarifies that corporations are not people.
- On March 6, 2012, in Worcester, citizens voted to pass a resolution that supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizens United*.

Virginia

State Resolutions

- On December 11, 2011, the Democratic Party of Virginia **ratified** a resolution against the *Citizens United* ruling, which provides "that corporations are not entitled to the same rights in our elections as people" and that "the Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United* was incorrectly decided."
- On June 2, 2012, the Democratic Party of Virginia State Convention declared support for a constitutional amendment to overturn the Citizens United decision. View the document of support [here](#).^[60]

Local Resolutions Passed

- On June 4, 2012, the City Council of Charlottesville passed a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment overturning the Citizens United ruling.

Washington

State Resolutions

- [SJM 8027](#)^[61], **introduced** on February 4, 2010 by Senator Ken Jacobsen (D-46), expresses disagreement with the *Citizens United* ruling and calls on the US Congress to pass a constitutional amendment.
- [SJM 8007](#)^[62], **introduced** on February 16, 2011 by State Senator Adam Kline, requests a constitutional amendment declaring that corporations are not persons under U.S. law.
- On April 30, 2011, the Washington State Democratic Party **passed** a [resolution](#)^[63] entitled "Amending the U.S. Constitution to Reserve Constitutional Rights for People, not Corporations." The resolution calls on the state

legislature to pass a joint resolution urging Congress “to pass and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to establish that a corporation shall not be considered a person eligible for rights accorded to human beings under the U.S. Constitution.” The resolution goes on to say that the amendment should stipulate that “the use of money to influence elections or the acts of public officials shall not be considered a protected form of speech.”

Local Resolutions Passed

- On December 1, 2011, the Jefferson County Democratic Party passed a resolution supporting a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court’s ruling on *Citizens United*.
- On March 5, 2012, the Port Townsend City Council unanimously passed a Municipal Government resolution that condemns the Supreme Court’s ruling on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.
- On April 23, 2012, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners passed a resolution in support of an amendment to the United State Constitution to abolish corporate personhood.
- On May 14, 2012, the Seattle City Council unanimously passed a resolution condemning the Citizens United decision and calling upon Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to overturn it.
- On June 4, 2012, the City Council of the City of Bellingham passed a resolution in support of amending the US Constitution to declare “that corporations are not entitled to the constitutional rights of natural persons, and further to ensure that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form on constitutionally protected speech.”

West Virginia

Local Resolutions

- On January 12, 2012, the Martinsburg City Council adopted a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court’s ruling on *Citizens United* and clarifying that corporations are not people.
- On January 26, 2012, the Jefferson County Commission passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court’s decision on *Citizens United* and supports a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On March 5, 2012, Charles Town passed a resolution calling on the US Congress to amend the constitution to state that only living persons are endowed with constitutional rights and that money is not the same as free speech.
- On April 3, 2012, the Saint Albans City Council unanimously passed a resolution that condemns the Supreme Court’s decision on *Citizens United* and presses for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling.

Wisconsin

State Resolutions

- On March 6, 2011, the Democratic Party of Wisconsin **adopted** a resolution in support of a constitutional amendment overturning the *Citizens United V.FEC* case.
- On February 9th, 2012, Representatives Mark Pocan and Chris Taylor **introduced** legislation (yet to be numbered) that provides that Congress amend the Constitution to overturn the *Citizens United* decision and related cases.

Local Resolutions Passed

- On March 28, 2011, the Milwaukee County Democrats passed a resolution that calls for amending the U.S. Constitution to make clear that corporations are not persons and that money is not speech.
- In April of 2011, 84% of voters in Madison, WI approved a resolution containing the following:

“Shall the City of Madison adopt the following reolution: RESOLVED, the City of Madison, Wisconsin, calls for

reclaiming democracy from the corrupting effects of undue corporate influence by amending the United States Constitution to establish that:

1. Only human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights, and
2. Money is not speech, and therefore regulating political contributions and spending is not equivalent to limiting political speech.”

- On April 1, 2011, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) 40 passed a resolution advocating for a constitutional amendment to oppose corporate personhood, and to declare that money is not speech.
- On April 3, 2012, voters in West Allis passed a ballot resolution that rejects the Supreme Court’s decision on *Citizens United* and calls for a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling.
- On April 5, 2011, Dane County voters approved the following resolution by 78%:

“Should the US Constitution be amended to establish that regulating political contributions and spending is not equivalent to limiting freedom of speech, by stating that only human beings, not corporations, are entitled to constitutional rights?”

- On June 4, 2012, the common council of Wisconsin passed the Move to Amend model resolution, providing that corporations are not people and money is not speech.

Wyoming

Local Resolutions Passed

- On May 15, 2012, the Sheridan County Democrats passed a resolution providing that corporations are not people and money is not speech.

SOURCES:

- <http://movetoamend.org/> [64]
- <http://freespeechforpeople.org/> [65]
- <http://democracyisforpeople.org/> [66]
- <http://www.thealliancefordemocracy.org/> [67]
- <http://www.duhc.org/> [68]

Hide Right

Source URL: <http://www.pfaw.org/issues/government-the-people/citizens-united-v-fec-constitutional-remedies-list-of-local-state-and-f>

Links:

- [1] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112sjres29>
- [2] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c112:S.J.RES.33>:
- [3] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c112:S.J.RES.35>:
- [4] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hjres8>
- [5] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hjres72>
- [6] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hjres78>
- [7] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c112:H.J.RES.82>:
- [8] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hjres86>
- [9] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hjres88>
- [10] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hjres90>
- [11] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/D?d112:7:./temp/~bddHjZ:|/bss/>
- [12] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c112:H.J.RES.97>:
- [13] <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c112:H.J.RES.100>:
- [14] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.111sjres28>
- [15] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.111sjres36>
- [16] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.111hjres68>
- [17] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.111hjres74>
- [18] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.111hjres82>
- [19] <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.111hjres84>
- [20] http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_bill.asp?bill=HJR%2033&session=27
- [21] http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_bill.asp?bill=SJR%2013&session=27
- [22] http://www.azleg.gov/DocumentsForBill.asp?Bill_Number=HCR2049&Session_ID=107
- [23] http://azleg.gov/DocumentsForBill.asp?Bill_Number=sqr1040&image.x=0&image.y=0

- [24] http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120AJR22&search_keywords=
- [25] <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/billsdetail.aspx?BillId=48587&>
- [26] <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/billsdetail.aspx?BillId=48539&>
- [27] <http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/legislation/2010/HJM012.htm>
- [28] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2010/lists/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=SCR&billnumber=225
- [29] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2010/lists/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=SR&billnumber=116
- [30] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2010/lists/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=HCR&billnumber=282
- [31] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2010/lists/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=HR&billnumber=204
- [32] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=HB&billnumber=36
- [33] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/Archives/measure_indiv_Archives.aspx?billtype=HCR&billnumber=51&year=2011
- [34] http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/Archives/measure_indiv_Archives.aspx?billtype=HR&billnumber=44&year=2011
- [35] <http://coolice.legis.state.ia.us/Cool-ICE/default.asp?Category=billinfo&Service=Billbook&frame=1&GA=84&hbill=SR113>
- [36] <http://www.mygov365.com/legislation/view/id/4dfa929549e51b645e620a00/tab/versions/>
- [37] <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/Senate/S00772>
- [38] <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bin/bldbill.php?bill=H0914.0.html&session=ls87>
- [39] <http://e-lobbyist.com/gaits/text/212502>
- [40] <http://billstatus.ls.state.ms.us/documents/2012/html/HC/HC0108IN.htm>
- [41] [http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W\\$BSRV.ActionQuery?P_BLTP_BILL_TYP_CD=&P_BILL_NO=&P_BILL_DFT_NO=LC2067&Z_ACTION=Find&P_SBJ_DESCR=&P_SBJT_SBJ_CD=&P_LST_NM1=&P_ENTY_ID_SEQ=](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W$BSRV.ActionQuery?P_BLTP_BILL_TYP_CD=&P_BILL_NO=&P_BILL_DFT_NO=LC2067&Z_ACTION=Find&P_SBJ_DESCR=&P_SBJT_SBJ_CD=&P_LST_NM1=&P_ENTY_ID_SEQ=)
- [42] http://reclaimdemocracy.org/personhood/new_hampshire_democratic_oppose_corporate_rights.html
- [43] <http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2011/HCR0001.html>
- [44] http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/bill_status.aspx?lsr=917&sy=2011&txtsessionyear=2011&txtbillnumber=HR8
- [45] http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/AR/64_11.PDF
- [46] <http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/bills/BillView.asp?BillNumber=SR47>
- [47] http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/_session.aspx?Chamber=H&LegType=JM&LegNo=36&year=11
- [48] <http://www.nmlegis.gov/sessions/12%20Regular/final/hm004.pdf>
- [49] <http://www.nmlegis.gov/Sessions/12%20Regular/final/SM003.pdf>
- [50] http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default_fld=&bn=K01016&term=&Summary=Y&Actions=Y&Votes=Y&Memo=Y&Text=Y
- [51] <http://www.leg.state.or.us/11reg/measpdf/hjm1.dir/hjm0009.intro.pdf>
- [52] <http://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/billinfo/billinfo.cfm?year=2009&synd=0&body=H&type=R&BN=0653>
- [53] <http://www.pasenate.com/?p=8001>
- [54] <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/BillText/BillText11/HouseText11/H6156.pdf>
- [55] <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/BillText10/HouseText10/H8186.pdf>
- [56] http://e-lobbyist.com/gaits/text/599421/Rhode_Island-2012-H7899-Draft.pdf
- [57] <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/billtext12/senatetext12/s2656.pdf>
- [58] <http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2010/index.aspx>
- [59] <http://www.leg.state.vt.us/database/status/summary.cfm?Bill=JRS011&Session=2012>
- [60] <http://concarlitos.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/2012statecuadopted6-2.pdf>
- [61] <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=8027&year=2009>
- [62] <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2011-12/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Joint%20Memorials/8007-Corporations.pdf>
- [63] http://www.wa-democrats.org/vfmfiles/Resolutions/CorporatePower/WSDCCRES%20-%20515%20-%2020110430%20-%20PASS%20-%20CORP%20-%20Resolution%20on%20Corporate%20Personhood%20_1_.pdf
- [64] <http://movetoamend.org/>
- [65] <http://freespeechforpeople.org/>
- [66] <http://democracyisforpeople.org/>
- [67] <http://www.thealliancefordemocracy.org/>
- [68] <http://www.duhc.org/>