

From: [Zach Lipton](#)
To: [REG - BSC Clerk](#)
Subject: Request for reconsideration - Reserving the Upper Great Highway as Public Open Recreation Space
Date: Thursday, July 25, 2024 2:50:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Ballot Simplification Committee Members:

Thank you for the dedicated effort you put into preparing this digest on Wednesday. It was my first time seeing the Ballot Simplification Committee process in action, and I have a new appreciation for all that goes into making the voter guide such an accessible and helpful resource.

I am respectfully submitting a request for reconsideration on two portions of the proposed digest that I believe risk confusing voters:

1. "A NO vote means" is confusing

I suggest restoring the version the Committee drafted earlier in the process:

A NO Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to use the Upper Great Highway as public open recreation space, permanently closing it to private motor vehicles, with limited exceptions.

Or simply:

A NO Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to make this change.

The current "a NO vote means" digest introduces a lot of confusion by using the highly loaded term "closed" (language used by those on only one side of this issue) to describe a vote to keep the Great Highway open to vehicle traffic. Even more confusion results from the temporary nature of the pilot program: the text is trying to describe all the outcomes that will occur at different times.

The version of the text that inverted the "a YES vote means" section prevented this problem and made it clear that a "no" vote was the opposite of a "yes" vote. Or the Committee's classic "you do not want the City to make this change" language avoids all confusion and cleanly frames the issue as "if you vote yes, you want these things to happen. If you vote no, you do not."

2. "Personal and commercial motor vehicles" is wordy and inaccurate. Using the original phrasing of "private motor vehicles" is clearer and true to the legal text

The vehicle restriction is not based on the personal or commercial ownership status of the vehicle; it is based on whether or not the vehicle is privately operated or whether it falls into one of the exceptions provided for vehicles performing public services under the auspices of a government agency, such as emergency response or public transportation. Some types of commercial vehicles are excepted when authorized, while other commercial vehicles, such as trucks, have always been prohibited on the Upper Great Highway. As a result, "personal and commercial motor vehicles" is not an accurate description of the legislation, which prohibits private vehicle traffic. Using the phrase "private motor vehicles" is consistent with the restriction in the legal text and avoids unnecessary words.

With appreciation for your public service and your consideration,

Zach Lipton