
FOR OUR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

2028 BALLOT ROADMAP
AND STATEWIDE OUTREACH PACKET

A volunteer-only Maine initiative.
Legislative action pursued in parallel.
Clear duties. Real notice. Effective compliance.

Childhood does not pause
while institutions deliberate.

JTforME.com/initiative

October 13, 2026 | rev9

2028 target / 2030 contingency / legislative action in parallel

VOLUNTEER-ONLY REVISION • NOT AN OFFICIAL PETITION



START HERE

A statewide path to reform

2028 target. 2030 contingency. Legislative sponsorship in parallel.

Whole-child history. Continuous institutional responsibility.

The first substantive requirement is material whole-child history and individual conduct over time. The coordinated rev9 bill also requires workable orders, protected access, proportionate interim restrictions and continuous process improvement with owners, clocks, evidence, independent verification and correction. [49–56]

What this updated packet is

The full planning and correspondence volume, aligned to the accompanying rev9 CPI review bill. The earlier website rev08a remains the historical baseline, not the new operative review text. The two bill editions have identical operative language; the Haughty Legalise Edition adds separately labeled advocacy. This packet does not reproduce the Act. No website replacement or official petition issuance is claimed.

Three matters that cannot be left until the end

Timing: issuance expiration and signature age are separate clocks. The supplied roadmap's calendar analysis is retained as provisional planning, not an official 2028 or 2030 deadline. A fall-2026 collection drive is not a reliable foundation for a January-2028 submission. [2–5]

Threshold: 67,682 is the source packet's posted number based on the 2022 gubernatorial vote. It is not the number to advertise as the 2028 requirement. Obtain the certified post-November-2026 threshold. [5]

Draft quality: rev9 removes the fixed January 1, 2027 effective date and prior filing gates. The fee model, professional civil claim, constitutional and rule coordination, new review clocks, staffing and funding still require explicit decisions before consent to final text.

Volunteer-only remains the operating model

No paid circulators, staff, petition manager or fundraising program is assumed. Letter B remains optional for an actual unresolved resource or disclosure question. The proposal's public implementation costs are not a campaign budget. No correspondence has been sent, no endorsement is implied and no private child, medical or litigation exhibits are included.

NAVIGATION

Inside the packet

A working publication for proponents, legislative offices and statewide volunteers.

THE ROUTE	PAGE
Executive decision brief	2
Two parallel routes	4
Legal calendar and project roadmap	5–6
Official application and petition integrity	7–8
Volunteer-only model and responsibility map	9–10
Rev9 risk review; safety and due process	11–12
Notice and repeated noncompliance	13
Mandatory continuous improvement; measures and public money	14–15
Legislative action	16
ORGANIZATION AND CORRESPONDENCE	PAGE
Statewide team and 16-county coverage	17–18
Collection channels; custody and privacy	19–20
Office and prospective-partner directories	21–22
Letters A–D: Elections, optional Ethics, sponsor, Revisor	23–26
Letters E–H: Courts, agencies, municipalities, associations	27–30
Letters I–K: organizations, volunteers, independent notaries	31–33
CONTROLS AND SOURCES	PAGE
Public copy and first 90 days	34–35
Legal, source and revision notes	36
Original 48 references	37–40
Coordinated-revision references [49]–[56]	41

Draft letters remain drafts. All original source references are retained. New clock and performance requirements describe proposed legislation, not existing legal deadlines.

Legislate sooner. Prepare the ballot.

A statutory proposal—not a constitutional amendment or an appeal of an individual case.

LEGISLATIVE TRACK	CITIZEN-INITIATIVE TRACK
Seek a sponsor-controlled drafting request, an LR number and the proper legal, committee and fiscal review. Ordinary legislation can be amended; track every substantive change.	Complete official review and obtain the issued petition. Signatures support that exact text, not a later website revision. Maintain the issuance and signature-age records.

A direct initiative may propose statutory law, not amend the Maine Constitution. The constitutional process governs legislative consideration and referral of a qualified measure; qualification does not guarantee enactment or survival of constitutional review. A competing measure is possible. [2] [26]

Recommended first legislative ask

Present the complete rev9 CPI review bill with its unresolved-decision list. Lead with whole-child history and individual conduct, then workable orders, timely review, protected access and mandatory continuous institutional improvement. Sections 1-B, 14 and 14-A turn administration into an owned, measured, tested and independently reviewed responsibility.

As an expressly partial first step, discuss an implementation-and-access bill drawn from sections 17-A through 17-C, with compatible improvement controls, while the broader package receives review. A narrower bill is not enactment of the full initiative. Do not suggest that unresolved fee, liability or fiscal questions have been approved.

One version register for both tracks

Maintain the historical website draft, current review PDFs, sponsor draft, Elections review draft, issued petition and amendments as distinct versions. Keep one authorized policy-change contact. Organizing may continue while legislation is considered; reassess the initiative against the actual enacted text, not a promise.

Public position

“We are pursuing enactment through the Legislature and preparing a lawful citizen-initiative route. The objective is timely, effective protection for children and families—not a particular route for its own sake.”

The dates that govern the project

Calendar calculations below are provisional planning aids, not published Secretary of State deadlines.

CLOCK	CONTROLLING REQUIREMENT
Issuance	Petition filing must occur within 18 months after the approved form is furnished.
Signature age	A signature more than one year old on the actual Secretary of State filing date is invalid.
Annual filing	5 p.m. on the 50th day after first-session convening, or the 25th day after second-session convening; weekend/holiday adjustment applies.
Municipal certification	Deliver to the appropriate officials by the applicable tenth-day deadline. Timely direct-initiative petitions have a five-business-day certification-return period.
State review / challenge	Ordinarily 30 business days for a validity decision; a special election-period rule exists. Initial court review ordinarily must begin within 10 days of the decision.

Authorities for the independent clocks: constitutional filing and age rules; municipal certification provisions; statutory review provisions. [2] [3] [13]

PLANNING CYCLE	STATE FILING	MUNICIPAL OUTER DATE
2028 target	January 31, 2028, 5 p.m.	January 21, 2028, 5 p.m.
2030 fallback	January 28, 2030, 5 p.m.	January 18, 2030, 5 p.m.

Calculated from ordinary second-session convening on January 5, 2028 and January 2, 2030, adding 25 days and moving the Sunday result to Monday. The local dates are ten days before those state dates. Actual convening, holidays, petition expiration and official instructions must be confirmed in writing. An earlier issuance-expiration date can control instead. [2] [3] [4]

Campaign deadline: earlier than the legal deadline

Plan main collection for spring–December 2027, begin municipal certification in rolling batches, and aim to have substantially all originals returned and reconciled in early January 2028. Set exact internal dates only after Elections confirms the controlling dates.

From public draft to submission

Make the 2030 contingency an organized restart—not an assumption that old signatures can be saved.

PERIOD	DELIVERABLE / DECISION
Oct.–Dec. 2026	Recruit five additional proponents and a volunteer operations team; send the Elections inquiry; seek a sponsor commitment or documented response; request volunteer legal review. Use the optional Ethics inquiry only for an actual unresolved question.
Jan.–Mar. 2027	Confirm the new signature threshold; finish statutory integration and public-implementation fiscal inputs; complete official application and review. Obtain the issued form before qualifying collection.
Spring–summer 2027	Train a pilot group, inspect its first packets, then expand. Recruit coverage in all 16 counties and a named route for every participating municipality.
July–Sept. 2027	Use repeat public events and local volunteer hosts. Forecast from observed valid returns, not promises. Working milestone: 65% of the gross target by September 30.
Oct.–Dec. 2027	Close coverage gaps; arrange lawful election-day collection locally; reach the gross target by mid-December and continue replacement collection if needed.
Jan. 2028	Complete local certification, independently reconcile originals and affidavits, and hand-deliver the submission with an itemized receipt before every controlling deadline.
After qualification	Track hearing, exact-text legislative action or competing measure, ballot wording, fiscal explanation and any expedited court challenge. Review reporting only if actual activity triggers it.
2030 fallback	If 2028 cannot qualify, reassess text and volunteer capacity, seek 2029 sponsorship, and seek fresh issuance for a 2029 collection drive and early-2030 filing.

Milestones are campaign design choices. Official review, form issuance and qualification remain governed by the cited authorities. The 2030 pre-election filing threshold would ordinarily still look to the November 2026 gubernatorial vote, not the future November 2030 vote. [2] [4] [5] [13] [14]

Apply correctly before collecting

A notice letter opens a conversation. It does not replace the official application.

Application package

Use the Secretary of State’s current application form. Assemble the applicant plus five additional Maine voters, with the required contact information and signatures. Submit the complete proposed law and its purpose-and-intent summary in electronic and printed form. The applicant signs before an authorized official or notary. [6]

Review and issuance

The initial statutory form review is due within 15 business days; subsequent draft review is within 10 business days. Resolve the Revisor-style issues, provide written consent to the final text, and obtain the Secretary’s issued petition. Print that approved form exactly; this publication and the website’s bill PDF are not substitutes. [6]

Fiscal impact of the law—not a campaign budget

The Office of Fiscal and Program Review estimates the proposal’s fiscal impact within 15 business days after consent to final language. This concerns public implementation costs, not a requirement to fundraise or pay volunteers. Supply supportable assumptions for personnel, hearing time, technology, GAL capacity, treatment, interpretation, administration and privacy. Do not claim cost neutrality without a basis. [15]

Pre-issuance document control

KEEP TOGETHER	CONTROL
Application and notices	One authoritative file; all six proponents receive and monitor official notices.
Draft and redline	Version, date, section numbering and change explanation.
Issued form	Native file, issuance correspondence, print specifications and expiration date.
Training packet	Current instructions, approved summary/fiscal statement, affidavits and escalation contact.

Do not manufacture a signing shortcut

A QR code may lead to the bill, events or volunteer sign-up. An online pledge, petition-platform click or unattended paper sheet is not a substitute for the issued, properly witnessed petition. [3] [8] [9]

Train for validity—not just volume

The initiative should be able to explain the origin and custody of every submitted sheet.

REQUIRED CONTROL	FIELD INSTRUCTION
Official text and disclosures	Carry the issued form and offer the voter the official summary and fiscal-impact statement before signing. Complete required circulator and identifying fields.
Personal witnessing	The identified circulator must actually witness each signature. Do not leave clipboards unattended or distribute sign-and-mail-back packets.
Municipal routing	Ask which municipality maintains the signer's voter registration. Organize sheets by that municipality; the signing location is not necessarily the certification municipality.
Affidavit and oath	Use the current circulator affidavit. Have the oath administered and notarial certificate completed correctly before municipal certification.
Independent notary	Use a qualified notary who provides no other services to initiate or promote this initiative. A county captain or other campaign volunteer must not notarize its packets.
Exceptions and uncertainty	Use the official procedure for legally authorized alternative signatures. Do not improvise remote witnessing, electronic signing or an accommodation rule; escalate first.

Authorities: summary and fiscal disclosure; witnessing and verification; training and affidavits; independent-notary restriction. [7] [8] [9] [10]

Nonresident volunteers: confirm the current instructions

The source packet cites *Gilbert*, 2026 ME 59, upholding invalidation of signatures from four nonresident circulators who had not consented by affidavit to Maine jurisdiction. Do not read resident-only language in isolation. Obtain Elections' current nonresident affidavit and instructions before assigning a nonresident volunteer. Maine resident registered voters remain the initial organizing model—not a statement that other lawful participation is impossible. [11] [45]

People, not a paid campaign

No paid circulators. No paid staff. No paid petition manager. No fundraising program in this plan.

The request is for time and participation—not money

Recruit local people, share approved information, arrange no-cost hosts, witness signatures properly and return the originals through a reliable statewide network.

What the organization actually needs

VOLUNTEER FUNCTION	PRACTICAL APPROACH
Coordination	An unpaid operations coordinator and local captains schedule manageable shifts and keep the return routes working.
Training and review	Seek voluntary legal, technical and administrative help. Use one current instruction set and inspect a pilot before expansion.
Places to meet and sign	Seek accessible no-charge venues with permission. Do not promise payment, reimbursement or purchases on the initiative's behalf.
Petition and resource records	Track issued forms, custody, certification and actual resources received or used. A records coordinator is not automatically a statutory treasurer.
Public communication	Use the same accurate public explanation statewide. Keep initiative activity distinct from candidate campaigning and commercial book promotion.

No financial setup is presumed

This roadmap does not make a bank account, donation button, paid consultant, paid collector or committee-registration form a prerequisite to volunteering. It does not assume that any registration threshold has been reached.

Limited legal note: actual activity controls

Volunteer-only is not a blanket legal exemption. Qualifying contributions or expenditures exceeding \$5,000 can trigger ballot-question-committee obligations, with registration due within seven days; donated goods can matter. The compensated petition-business rule concerns paid management, not the model proposed here. Review a specific change in activity if it occurs; Letter B is an optional inquiry, not a mandatory startup step. [12] [16] [17] [18]

Who controls what

Most offices below are technical reviewers or implementation partners—not ballot-access gatekeepers.

OFFICE / BODY	RELEVANT RESPONSIBILITY AND REQUEST
Secretary of State / Elections	Application, official form, circulation instructions, validity review and ballot administration. Request process confirmation, not endorsement.
Ethics Commission — conditional	An optional source for an actual question about contributions, spending, mixed candidate activity or disclosures. No finance registration is presumed for this volunteer plan.
Legislative sponsor / Revisor	Sponsor-controlled drafting; form, allocation, integration, LR/LD tracking and deadlines.
OFPR / committees	Public fiscal estimate; likely Judiciary review, with Health and Human Services, Criminal Justice and Public Safety, and Appropriations input as referral warrants. Assignment is not predetermined.
Judicial Branch / AOC	Family procedure, scheduling, GAL administration, court technology, access, interpreters, safety and rules. Seek policy review, not intervention in pending cases.
DHHS / relevant program leads	OCFS screening/reporting interface, treatment and MaineCare capacity, child-support implementation, referral workload and confidentiality.
Attorney General / prosecutors	Legal-policy and criminal-drafting questions; statutory referendum explanation by the AG. Neither is the proponent's private counsel.
Education / clinical regulators	School-information implementation, minor confidentiality, professional scope and standards. Consult the relevant boards and program owners.
Municipal clerks / registrars / wardens	Signature certification and local arrangements. Staff are not the initiative's signature collectors.

Role map carried forward from the source packet, with the Ethics role narrowed to conditional guidance. No office is represented as having agreed to participate. [1] [6] [13] [15] [16] [20] [26] [28] [30] [34] [35]

Fix the mechanics before issuance

What the new draft addresses—and what still requires a decision.

DRAFT FEATURE	COORDINATED TREATMENT / OPEN RISK
History and continuity	Section 1 requires material chronological review and individual conduct findings. It does not admit every allegation or reopen every final judgment.
Filing and hearing access	The prior screening/report gates and numerical hearing cap are removed. Cure, urgency, service, meaningful participation and records access remain central.
Allegations and restrictions	Section 12-A separates factual support, continuing necessity and deliberate misuse. New 7/21-day reviews preserve earlier PFA protections; test capacity and service.
Fees and professional claims	The \$15,000 trigger is a budget/review mechanism, not a fee cap. The long civil professional-liability period and privilege boundaries remain high-priority approval issues.
Permanent improvement	Sections 1-B and 14-A add mandatory POLC functions, short evaluated tests, service-management capabilities, independent verification and correction. They do not prescribe a vendor or an adjudicative result.
Dates, rules and resources	Prospective effectiveness replaces January 1, 2027. New duties, rulemaking limits, the 90-day plan and 180-day transition require a coordinated, funded schedule.

Sources: historical rev08a [1]; accompanying rev9 bill [49]; existing rulemaking [20], best-interest law [21] and emergency protection [22]; administrative duties and methods [50–56]. These are drafting conclusions, not a judicial determination of constitutionality.

The approval package must show the remaining disagreements

Do not conceal significant revisions behind a new cover. Send the bill's section-change map and unresolved-decision appendix with the full text. Seek specific legal, fiscal, safety, access and operational objections before final issuance.

Make accountability legally durable

Correct unsupported restrictions without requiring proof of deliberate bad faith.

Three determinations—not one label

First, determine what the evidence supports under the governing burden. Second, determine whether each restriction remains necessary and proportionate. Third, determine deliberate misuse only under its separate elements and heightened proof. An unsubstantiated, withdrawn, dismissed or unprosecuted allegation alone does not establish bad faith. Genuine safety reporting remains protected. [21–23] [49]

Criminal and professional accountability

The coordinated review no longer proposes the prior broad new alienation and attorney-facilitation crimes. It preserves conduct-specific civil remedies and independent referrals under existing law. Criminal liability still requires the State's charging process, elements, proof and defense rights; a family-court finding is not a substitute. The section 13 civil claim's long limitations period and privilege displacement remain unresolved risks. [24] [49]

Fees, care and confidentiality

The \$15,000 fee threshold now requires advance budgeting and review rather than an absolute ceiling. Necessary representation must remain accessible. Child treatment, relationship work, evaluation and parenting education have distinct roles. No equal-meeting requirement should force an abuse survivor into joint treatment, and no general parental-access promise should erase minor-consented care or protected records. [21] [23] [49]

Modernize administration without experimenting on rights

Short tests may change a form, handoff or notification process under lawful authority. They may not randomize custody, protection, access to counsel or the legal burden of proof. Metrics must not favor custody transfers, a desired rate of abuse findings or closure at the expense of safety and participation. Public dashboards must not identify children. [49–55]

The final review team

Seek voluntary election-law, family-law, protection-order, civil-liability, appellate, clinical/privacy and disability-access review, plus independent implementation and cost analysis. Record disagreements and proposed fixes. Neither professional agreement nor a polished PDF proves that the proposal is feasible or legally sufficient.

09A / NOTICE AND REPEATED NONCOMPLIANCE

Notice must lead to compliance

A repeated proven failure is not automatically another first misunderstanding.

The coordinated bill applies this principle to individual conduct and to institutional service failures. Identify the actual duty and capacity before assigning fault. Specific notice is evidence to evaluate, not a shortcut around the governing burden or a reason to punish a child. [49]

REQUIRED QUESTION	WHAT THE RECORD SHOULD SHOW
What was the duty?	Binding source, responsible actor, required act and applicable deadline—not merely a request or preference.
What notice was established?	What was communicated, when and how; receipt, prior clarification and earlier findings where relevant.
What is the actual explanation?	Concrete evidence of ambiguity, inability, a safety concern, missing resources or another impediment. A label alone is not an explanation.
Is the recurrence established?	Compare proven conduct with prior notice and correction; repeated allegations are not themselves proof of a pattern.
What action follows?	Responsible person, required action, lawful deadline, interim safeguards, verification and the next review.
What response is authorized?	Apply the governing proof and defenses; give notice and an opportunity to be heard before sanctions. Do not attribute one adult's conduct to the other by calling it mutual conflict.

The institution must retain its own memory

Sections 1-B and 14-A require persistent owners, original clocks, handoff records and escalation. A new employee, reassigned case, reopened ticket or replacement vendor must not erase unresolved age. Administrative acknowledgment is not implementation.

Draft status: these requirements appear in the proposed rev9 Act, not existing law merely because they are printed here. An outreach letter does not create a new binding duty or authorize a sanction.

09B / MANDATORY CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Improve. Verify. Repeat.

A permanent operating duty—not a one-time technology project.

New sections 1-B and 14-A require continuous process improvement under the State Court Administrator and Chief Justice. Existing 4 M.R.S. §17 already assigns operational study, docket, statistics, business-method and fiscal responsibilities; proposed subsection 19 adds defined execution and verification requirements. [49] [50]

MANAGEMENT FUNCTION	PRACTICAL REQUIREMENT
Plan	Name the service failure, lawful objective, baseline, risk, measure and test.
Organize	Assign resources, owner, backup, dependencies, handoff and decision authority.
Lead	Provide training, timely decisions, usable staff and user feedback, and protected escalation.
Control	Compare actual results with legal duties and targets; investigate, correct and verify. It means quality assurance—not control of families or adjudicative outcomes.

Short cycles with evidence

Each active priority improvement receives an evidence review at least every 30 calendar days, ordinarily using two- to four-week bounded tests. Record the hypothesis, observed result, side effects and decision to adopt, revise or stop. A blocked test needs an owner, interim protection and dated escalation—not a generic progress report. No unsafe release is required. [49] [52] [53]

Proposed implementation sequence

30 days: ownership and work register. 90 days: costed plan, baseline and data dictionary. 120 days: first pilot. 180 days: operating controls and initial dashboard. Quarterly thereafter: public results and unresolved work. Twelve months: first independent operational/fiscal assessment; eighteen months: broader child-and-family impact evaluation. All run from the Act's lawful effective date. [49]

These are new proposed duties and clocks. The POLC and PDSA methods inform the design; their source organizations do not endorse this bill. No pilot may suspend a hearing right, withdraw protection or experiment with a custody outcome. [52–55]

Show the work. Show the result.

Track what serves a child's life—not what makes a dashboard look successful.

MEASURE	KEEP THE DISTINCTION VISIBLE
Time and continuity	Receipt, acceptance, service, urgency review, hearing, decision and implementation; original elapsed time survives transfers and reopenings.
Protection and implementation	Necessary protection, disputed restriction, reported action, verified action, proven refusal and institutional delay are different categories.
Access and record quality	Correction loops, missing records, fee-waiver and refund time, accommodation fulfillment, service wait and historical findings coverage.
Reliability and cost	End-to-end transaction success; alternatives during outages; staffing, recurring defects, contracts, actual payments, acceptance tests and credits.

PSA capabilities—not a brand or a risk score

Professional services automation here means task and service-management capabilities: controlled intake, owners, clocks, workload, dependencies, incident/problem/change records, audit trails and verified completion. Existing or equivalent systems may supply them. It does not mean an automated public-safety assessment or compulsory commercial software for parents. [49]

A payment is not proof of a delivered benefit

The program must distinguish financing authority, appropriation, commitment and actual expenditure; statewide platform and local facility costs; accepted deliverables and unresolved defects. Claimed savings need a baseline and verification. An independent assessment must test performance and financial evidence. Existing lawful contracts and oversight jurisdictions remain intact. [49–51]

Enough data to account—not enough to surveil

Use only necessary, lawfully available information. Preserve meaningful denominators, pending-age measures, percentiles, missing data and correction history. Publish privacy-safe results. No custody quota, desired allegation-outcome rate, secret evidence, blanket monitoring or automatic adverse conclusion is permitted. [49] [55]

The supplied project material is not an independent audit finding that a specified amount was stolen. This revision requires the records needed to test spending and performance, without treating an accusation as a fiscal conclusion.

10 / LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Ask for a sponsor—not just sympathy

Request a drafting decision, an accountable contact and a concrete next step.

A complete decision package

Send the current rev9 CPI bill, its purpose summary, section-change map, unresolved-decision appendix and implementation/funding questions. Identify the website's rev08a as the historical public baseline until an approved replacement is actually published. The Haughty Legalise Edition is an optional advocacy presentation, not different legislative text.

The request

Ask a legislator to serve as primary sponsor, a cross-chamber cosponsor or sponsor by request; authorize the drafting submission; obtain the LR number; and designate a contact. A citizen's letter to the Revisor is not itself a sponsor-authorized request. Ask specifically for whole-child history and the mandatory continuous-improvement provisions to remain central. [26] [27] [49]

Do not leave implementation until after enactment

Have the sponsor request review of the proposed 4 M.R.S. §17(19) insertion, final Title 19-A placement, rulemaking coordination, independent audit arrangements, access and staffing costs, data limits and procurement obligations. The new calendar must be workable without making families pay for an unfunded promise. [15] [20] [49–51]

Calendar and hearing treatment

Confirm the next session's actual joint rules and deadlines; do not reuse 132nd-Legislature cloture dates as 133rd-Legislature deadlines. Ordinary second-session bills have a narrower admission route; a qualified initiative follows its own constitutional process. The public-hearing rule for a qualified initiative and its two-thirds waiver provision remain distinct from petition validity. [14] [25] [26]

One accountable follow-up sequence

Day 0: one individually addressed message. Day 7–10: one courteous follow-up or staff call. Day 21: record sponsor, cosponsor, review only, decline or no response. Proposed response dates are requests, not invented legal deadlines. Keep considering other offices; silence is not support.

A narrower implementation bill may be considered only as an expressly partial measure. Track what was omitted and continue the broader review; do not represent a limited enactment as passage of the full initiative.

One town is a starting point—not a limit

An unpaid statewide network: public advocacy, field collection, records and independent notarization.

VOLUNTEER ROLE	OWNERSHIP
Proponent / policy lead	Justin: draft direction, public explanation, sponsor relationships and final approvals. Do not personally own every collection route.
Operations coordinator	Inventory, training calendar, county coverage, packet movement and weekly reports.
Records / process coordinator	Version control, custody records, instructions and actual-resource questions. No automatic treasurer or fundraising role is assigned.
16 county coordinators	Recruit local captains; arrange no-cost hosts and returns; ensure each active town has a responsible route.
Municipal captains / circulators	Use the current packet, witness signatures, log custody and deliver verified packets through the assigned route.
Independent notaries	Seek no-fee notarial availability; the notary provides no other services to initiate or promote this initiative.
Quality-control reviewers	Reconcile packet IDs, dates, municipal routing, affidavits, certification and unresolved issues.

Capacity model—not a prediction

Illustration: **400 active circulators × 10 signatures weekly × 26 weeks = 104,000 raw signatures**. At 80% assumed validity, that is 83,200 valid signatures. A higher threshold, lower participation or worse validity defeats the example. Count reviewed returns—not names on a volunteer list.

Let **T** be the official threshold and **v** the observed validity rate. Reforecast gross need as at least **T ÷ v**, then add a reserve for duplicates, age, disputes and whole-sheet defects. A starting target of **1.4 × T** assumes, but does not guarantee, an adequate buffer.

Weekly volunteer dashboard

Active trained circulators • raw returns • locally certified count • estimated duplicate/age losses • packets awaiting oath or certification • oldest signature date • unfilled municipal routes • unresolved process questions.

A 16-county operating plan

Suggested meeting and return hubs—not confirmed venues, endorsements or population-based quotas.

COUNTY	SUGGESTED COORDINATION HUBS	SHARE
Androscoggin	Lewiston / Auburn	9%
Aroostook	Presque Isle / Houlton / Fort Kent	6%
Cumberland	Portland / Brunswick / Bridgton	19%
Franklin	Farmington / Rangeley	2%
Hancock	Ellsworth / Blue Hill / Bar Harbor	4%
Kennebec	Augusta / Waterville / Gardiner	10%
Knox	Rockland / Camden	3%
Lincoln	Damariscotta / Wiscasset	2%
Oxford	Norway / Paris / Rumford	5%
Penobscot	Bangor / Old Town / Lincoln	12%
Piscataquis	Dover-Foxcroft / Greenville	2%
Sagadahoc	Bath / Topsham	2%
Somerset	Skowhegan / Pittsfield / Jackman	4%
Waldo	Belfast / Unity	3%
Washington	Machias / Calais / Eastport	2%
York	North Berwick / Sanford / Biddeford / Wells	15%

The illustrative workload shares total 100%. Multiply the current gross target by each share, then rebalance using real volunteer capacity and return quality. These are campaign planning allocations—not legal county quotas, demographic targeting or predictions of support.

Use the official municipal directory for the registrar route for each signer’s municipality. The Secretary of State’s directory provides a downloadable statewide CSV, listed as updated October 2, 2026. A county hub is not a certification authority. [30]

Distribute the work, not loose clipboards

Every location needs a trained volunteer, a permitted venue and a return route.

CHANNEL	HOW TO USE IT
Local volunteer referrals	Ask each trained person to recruit one more volunteer and one permitted host. Use the same clear statewide explanation.
Scheduled signing sessions	Seek accessible no-charge community rooms or private venues with permission. Publish times only after host and circulator confirmation.
Fairs / markets / public events	Ask about no-fee noncommercial advocacy access, insurance conditions, placement and rain plans. Select workable no-cost locations; a permit is not endorsement.
Election-day collection	Arrange with the clerk in advance and warden on the day. Collect only after the voter has voted, in the designated place and within all restrictions.
Libraries / town facilities	Request neutral meeting-room, bulletin-board and solicitation policies. Keep staff functions separate from volunteer advocacy.
Statewide associations	Request a public announcement, voluntary technical review or local-host referral under the association's rules. Do not request member or service-client lists.
Digital / printable information	Use one landing page, a QR code and shareable event cards. Keep volunteer intake separate from the official petition; no donation button is part of this plan.

Election-day collection is subject to 21-A M.R.S. §§682–683, including restrictions involving candidates or questions on that day's ballot. Because JTforME has also been used for candidate activity, have Elections review clothing, signs and links used near a voting place; an initiative table cannot become candidate advertising. [31] [32]

Never leave a petition unattended

A store may host a trained circulator for an agreed shift. It should not leave an open petition on a counter for unsupervised signing. Owners, staff and visitors must be free to decline without pressure. [8] [9]

Build a reliable chain of custody

Local certification is a checkpoint—not a substitute for the Secretary of State’s final review.

STAGE	MINIMUM RECORD
Issue	Official version, packet ID, circulator, intended municipality, issue date and return deadline.
Collect	First/last signature dates, sheet count, training and any exception needing review.
Verify	Independent notary eligibility, completed oath, affidavit and packet integrity; no invented or repaired signatures.
Certify	Municipality, submission date, sheet count, receipt, expected return and authorized pickup person.
Reconcile	Return date, municipal certified count, unresolved marks, possible duplicates and remaining signature life.
Submit	Two-person inventory of originals, required affidavits/disclosures, delivery route and dated state receipt.

Proposed JTforME.com/initiative workflow

Keep the public draft, version log, safety/due-process explanation, status and official-source links visible. After a functioning intake system exists, add clearly labeled routes to **volunteer**, **host an event** and **find a signing session**. Do not label a web button “sign the official petition” when it only gathers a pledge.

Collect only what volunteer coordination needs: name, municipality, contact method, available role and consent to follow up. Restrict access, use multifactor authentication, maintain secure backups and do not publish signed sheets, home addresses or personal case narratives.

Do not promise anonymity for a statutory petition. Ask Elections about public inspection, protected addresses and authorized procedures before collecting from someone with a confidentiality concern. Never request a child’s case details as the price of participating. [3] [33]

Document the next action

A process question should have an owner, a recorded answer and a follow-through date. Keep volunteer mistakes correctable before filing; never alter a signature or invent a certification to repair a defect.

Start with the responsible offices

Office contacts are carried forward from the source packet; confirm current staff and delivery instructions.

OFFICE	CONTACT / ROUTE	USE
Elections Division	cec.elections@maine.gov 207-624-7650 184 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333-0101	A
Ethics Commission	ethics@maine.gov 207-287-4179 135 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333	B Optional
Revisor of Statutes	revisor.office@legislature.maine.gov 207-287-1650 Room 108, State House, Augusta, ME 04333-0007	D
Legislative sponsor	Use the current House/Senate directory; recheck after the 2026 election. No sponsor or committee chair is presumed.	C
Administrative Office of the Courts	207-822-0792; official AOC contact/directory. Request family-matter policy and rules routing, not a trial-court case clerk.	E
DHHS / program review	Official DHHS contact page; request OCFS and relevant treatment, coverage and child-support program leads.	F
Municipal clerks / registrars	Statewide directory and CSV. Confirm actual certification recipient and business hours.	G
County clerk associations	MTCCA county-association directory. Seek neutral administrative routing, not official promotion.	H

Source-packet routing references: Elections, Ethics, Revisor, legislative workflow, AOC, DHHS and directories. [28] [29] [27] [26] [34] [35] [30] [43]

The Elections inquiry is the practical first contact. **Letter B is optional** and reserved for an actual unresolved question—not a required finance filing for volunteers. Other notices are preliminary correspondence unless law or official instructions require a filing. No new legal duty to respond to a campaign letter is claimed.

Ask for a defined form of help

These organizations are prospects or reviewers only. None is represented as a supporter.

ORGANIZATION	VERIFIED CONTACT / FIRST ASK
League of Women Voters of Maine	info@lwvme.org • 207-622-0256 Ask about civic-education or public-review opportunities and relevant local contacts.
Maine Association of Mediators	Administrator@MaineMediators.org Ask for mediation-sequencing, capacity and safety review; optional member notice under its policies.
Maine Children's Alliance	outreach@mekids.org • 207-623-1868 Ask for child-impact, evidence and policy-design review—not an assumed endorsement.
Maine Children's Trust / Prevention Councils	info@mechildrenstrust.org • 207-623-5120 Ask about statewide public-review routing and voluntary local host introductions; no service-client solicitation.
Maine Volunteer Lawyers Project	contact@vlp.org Use the non-intake channel for policy correspondence. Ask for access-to-justice feedback or an appropriate referral.
Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence	mcedv.org/contact-us/ Use organizational contact, not the crisis helpline. Request protection-order and coercive-control safeguards review.
Maine Coalition Against Sexual Assault	mecasa.org/contact.html Use organizational contact for child-safety, reporting and confidentiality review.
Maine Town and City Clerks' Association	mtcca.org/About/Counties Ask whether neutral certification or logistics information may be circulated through a permitted channel.

Directory sources. [36] [37] [38] [39] [40] [41] [42] [43] [47]

Also invite local civic clubs, granges, labor and professional associations, community centers, faith organizations and private hosts through their public channels. Use the same general invitation; do not tailor pressure to sensitive personal circumstances. Public charities should assess their own lobbying limits and grants before agreeing to advocacy. [44]

CORRESPONDENCE / A

Secretary of State: volunteer initiative

DRAFT FOR REVIEW • Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: Maine Secretary of State, Elections Division • cec.elections@maine.gov

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Pre-application planning: volunteer-only For Our Children and Families initiative

Dear Elections Division:

I am preparing a Maine citizen-initiative proposal, An Act To Strengthen Maine Family Court Accountability and Protect Parent-Child Relationships, whose historical public draft is at JTforME.com/initiative and whose coordinated rev9 review is enclosed. My objective is the 2028 statewide ballot, with 2030 as a contingency, while also seeking legislative sponsorship.

The initiative is volunteer-only: no paid circulators, paid staff or compensated petition manager is proposed. The enclosed rev9 review includes whole-child history, allegation-integrity safeguards and mandatory continuous process improvement. It is not an issued petition. I will provide the finalized proposed law and matching purpose-and-intent summary with a complete application.

Please provide the current application, drafting and petition instructions, and the procedure for submitting the law and summary. This inquiry is not an application and does not authorize circulation.

Please confirm how the signature threshold will be established after the November 2026 gubernatorial election; the controlling 2028 filing and municipal-certification dates when available; the interaction of issuance expiration and signature age; and the process for a later cycle if needed.

Please provide the current volunteer circulator instructions and affidavits, including any approved nonresident procedure; independent-notary and oath instructions; authorized-signature accommodations; and print/packet specifications. Please distinguish any forms applicable only to compensated petition businesses from those needed for this volunteer effort.

Please identify restrictions on election-day collection where branding has also been used for a candidate campaign, a staff contact, and any rules or court orders superseding older guidance. I will keep campaign materials separate from official forms and will not claim official endorsement.

Respectfully, Justin A. Tahai North Berwick, Maine justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Pre-application inquiry, not a petition submission. Use the State application and required signatures under §901 when ready. Sources [4], [6], [9], [10], [11], [12], [28], [31], [32], [33].

Optional: clarify volunteer-only scope

OPTIONAL DRAFT • Use only for a specific unresolved question.

To: Maine Ethics Commission • ethics@maine.gov

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Specific guidance request, if needed: volunteer-only initiative

Dear Commission Staff:

I am preparing the volunteer-only *For Our Children and Families* initiative at JTforME.com/initiative. The plan does not include paid circulators, paid staff, paid petition management or a fundraising program. I am not requesting committee registration through this inquiry.

The specific unresolved facts are: [Describe the actual resource, expenditure, contribution, existing committee relationship or proposed communication requiring guidance. Do not invent transactions or submit this optional letter without a real question.]

Please identify whether those particular facts create a registration, reporting, accounting or communication-disclosure obligation, the controlling authority and the applicable deadline. Please distinguish unpaid individual participation from any reportable resource or payment described above.

JTforME branding has also been used for candidate activity. If that is material to the facts supplied, please identify the specific separation or disclosure steps required; do not assume that the volunteer initiative is operating as the candidate committee.

Please advise what additional facts are needed for a reliable answer. I seek precise guidance about the situation described, not requirements for a paid campaign that is not proposed and not a blanket exemption from applicable law.

Respectfully,
Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Optional only. The volunteer work plan does not depend on sending this letter or forming a committee. Use it for a concrete unresolved issue; the limited conditional legal note is on page 9. Sources [16], [17], [18], [19], [29], [48].

CORRESPONDENCE / C

Legislator: sponsorship and accountability

DRAFT FOR REVIEW · Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: [Representative or Senator and verified official address]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Request for legislative sponsorship: For Our Children and Families

Dear [Representative/Senator] [Name]:

I ask you to sponsor formal legislative review of the enclosed rev9 CPI bill, For Our Children and Families. I am building a volunteer-only citizen-initiative route for 2028 while seeking effective legislation sooner. The website's rev08a is the historical baseline; the enclosed version and change map identify the proposal now under review.

A child's life does not restart at the latest motion. The first substantive duty requires material whole-child history, each parent's conduct over time, reasoned evidence rulings and reviewable findings. Workable orders must identify responsibility, action, deadlines, practical alternatives and timely review.

The institutional duty must be equally concrete. Sections 1-B, 14 and 14-A require continuous process improvement: POLC management, small evaluated changes, service-management capabilities, original elapsed-time records, public-money controls, independent verification and corrective escalation. A committee, purchase or software installation alone cannot establish performance.

Please retain the distinction between evidence supporting an allegation, continuing need for a restriction and deliberate misuse. A parent need not prove bad faith to obtain review of an unsupported or disproportionate restriction. Genuine reporting, safety, notice and the governing proof requirements remain protected.

Will you authorize a complete drafting request, identify the LR number when assigned and designate a staff contact? Please arrange fiscal, constitutional, rulemaking and implementation review. The fee-budget model, long professional civil-liability period and new deadlines require candid scrutiny, not assumed approval.

As an expressly partial first step, I am willing to discuss a narrower implementation-and-access measure while the full proposal proceeds through review. Please respond by [requested date] with sponsorship, cosponsorship, a policy discussion or a decline. A concrete next step is the requested result.

Respectfully,

Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Attach the current standard bill and its change/decision appendices. No sponsor, LR number, deadline or endorsement is presumed. Sources [15], [20], [25]–[27], [49]–[56].

CORRESPONDENCE / D

Revisor: drafting and integration

DRAFT FOR REVIEW • Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: Office of the Revisor of Statutes • revisor.office@legislature.maine.gov

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Routing and drafting requirements: coordinated family-law proposal

Dear Revisor's Office:

I am the proponent of For Our Children and Families, pursuing legislative sponsorship and the Secretary of State's citizen-initiative process. The enclosed rev9 CPI review supersedes the earlier review text for drafting purposes; it has not yet replaced the historical website draft.

Please confirm the technical-review route and actual next-session drafting requirements. [Where authorized: The primary sponsor is ___ and the LR number is ____.] This letter does not bypass sponsor authorization or the official initiative application.

Please review the proposed 19-A M.R.S. §1653(3-A) and 4 M.R.S. §17(19) insertions, allocation of the remaining substantive sections, definitions, cross-references from permanent law to unallocated Act sections, prospective liability and the effective/operative-date schedule. The proposal must not overwrite the existing Family Division, advisory commission or another occupied section.

Please identify required coordination with judicial rulemaking under 4 M.R.S. §8, Article III, civil and family procedure, interim protection, appellate and electronic-record rules, the funding entitlement and independent assessment arrangements. New administrative milestones must not be confused with individual hearing deadlines or existing waiting periods.

Public fiscal and procurement provisions require a real appropriation decision and careful treatment of existing contracts and audit jurisdiction. Please identify the preferred editable format, redline conventions and separation of operative provisions from review notes and advocacy.

I will maintain distinct public, sponsor, Elections-review and issued-petition versions. No amended text will be circulated under an earlier issued form. Please identify the proper recipient and the materials required to complete the next drafting step.

Respectfully,

Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Routing correspondence, not personal legal representation or an official drafting authorization. Sources [6], [20], [25]–[27], [49]–[51].

CORRESPONDENCE / E

Judicial Branch: continuous improvement

DRAFT FOR REVIEW · Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: Administrative Office of the Courts · [current policy/rules contact]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Technical review: whole-child history and mandatory service improvement

Dear Administrative Office of the Courts:

Please identify the policy and rulemaking channel for review of the enclosed rev9 CPI proposal, For Our Children and Families. This concerns prospective statewide administration, not intervention in a private pending case. The website still contains the historical baseline.

Existing 4 M.R.S. §17 assigns continuing operational study, docket analysis, statistics, administrative methods and fiscal responsibilities. The new proposed subsection 19 would require a defined operating program: named ownership, POLC functions, short evaluated tests, service-management capabilities, preserved elapsed time, acceptance evidence, quarterly reporting and independent verification.

Please identify current processes serving these functions, gaps in authority or capacity, existing data definitions and reliable baselines. Address acceptance-to-presentment delay, hearing and decision age, implementation review, service and record failures, repeat corrections, staffing, accommodation fulfillment and verified contract deliverables. No confidential family record is requested.

Please examine the proposed 30/90/120/180-day rollout, monthly cycle reviews, first twelve-month audit and correction/escalation clocks against actual staffing and rulemaking requirements. Earlier individual protective deadlines would continue to control; an administrative pilot cannot suspend safety, a hearing or a governing burden of proof.

The draft preserves the distinction between advisory review and independent assessment, limits data collection, prohibits custody and allegation-outcome quotas, and does not authorize an auditor or software vendor to decide a case. Please identify concrete constitutional, procedural, fiscal, privacy, security or procurement conflicts and a workable correction for each.

Please designate an accountable contact, identify the authorized submission route and propose a date for technical discussion. An explanation of a constraint is useful when it identifies the next decision, responsible office and feasible action.

Respectfully,

Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: This letter creates no new legal response deadline. Use AOC policy channels, not a trial judge or case clerk. A separate scoped request may seek existing lawful public operational records. Sources [20], [34], [49]–[56].

CORRESPONDENCE / F

Agencies: scope, capacity and safeguards

DRAFT FOR REVIEW · Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: [DHHS policy office / OCFS / appropriate agency program lead]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Technical review: family-law proposal and implementation responsibilities

Dear [Office/Program Lead]:

I request technical review of the enclosed rev9 CPI proposal, For Our Children and Families, insofar as it affects your office. The proposal seeks earlier legislation and a possible 2028 citizen initiative; the website's rev08a remains the historical baseline.

Please identify duties within existing authority, additional authorization or funding needed, and changes that could unintentionally delay protection, care or reporting. The revised bill no longer makes screening or completion of an investigation a prerequisite to court access.

For DHHS, please examine OCFS and mandated-reporting interfaces, treatment and coverage capacity, referrals, support implementation, safe interagency handoffs and the minimum lawful information needed to distinguish a referral, a scheduled service and completed action. Do not assume that court software can obtain confidential clinical records without authority.

For education and clinical regulators, please examine parent notice and lawful access, adolescent confidentiality, clinical independence, professional roles and the difference between treatment, evaluation and legal decision-making. For legal-policy review, please address the narrower civil remedies and independent existing-law referral routes; the prior broad new criminal offenses are not retained.

Please assess the new continuous-improvement program's staffing, definitions, privacy controls, baseline data and corrective responsibilities, without merging agency jurisdiction with judicial decision-making. The public implementation plan must include recurring costs and safe alternatives when services are unavailable.

This is a request for system-level analysis, not private client records or a judgment on an individual family. Please identify the proper program contact and provide specific corrections or assumptions for the next drafting pass.

Respectfully,

Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Send separately to the responsible offices and retain only relevant review paragraphs. Sources [15], [21]–[24], [35], [49]–[56].

CORRESPONDENCE / G

Municipal clerk: neutral logistics

DRAFT FOR REVIEW • Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: Municipal Clerk / Registrar of Voters, [Town or City]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Advance planning request: citizen-initiative certification and collection arrangements

Dear Municipal Clerk/Registrar:

I am planning the proposed *For Our Children and Families* citizen initiative, with a 2028 ballot objective. The draft is published at JTforME.com/initiative. It is not currently represented by this correspondence as an approved petition or qualified ballot measure.

Please confirm the appropriate recipient, physical delivery location, normal hours and preferred appointment procedure for submitting properly verified petitions for municipal signature certification. I would also appreciate your instructions for receipts, pickup authorization and return arrangements, particularly during holiday or winter closures.

For any future permitted collection event, please provide the municipality's applicable meeting-room, bulletin-board, solicitation and public-property policies. If collection at a voting place is proposed after official issuance, please identify the advance-arrangement process and the role of the election warden.

I am not asking municipal employees to endorse the measure, solicit signatures, provide private contact lists or use public resources outside established policy. Any collection will be conducted by campaign volunteers under the applicable instructions and permissions.

Please identify any practical preference that would reduce the burden on your office, including organization of packets by municipality, labeling and scheduling. Our local coordinator will contact you before delivering a batch.

Respectfully,

Justin A. Tahai

North Berwick, Maine

justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633

JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Reuse individually for every participating municipality. Use the official statewide directory and confirm local instructions. This is not a demand for endorsement or a substitute for timely certification submission. Sources [3], [8], [30]–[32].

Associations: statewide volunteer routing

DRAFT FOR REVIEW • Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: [Municipal / clerks' / professional / statewide association contact]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Request for an appropriate statewide communication channel

Dear [Association Contact]:

I am organizing *For Our Children and Families*, a public-review proposal addressing Maine family-court implementation and accountability, at JTforME.com/initiative. I am seeking legislative sponsorship and preparing a volunteer-only 2028 initiative effort.

The project must reach statewide. Does your association have an appropriate channel for a brief public-review notice, technical feedback, or introductions to local people willing to discuss lawful event or administrative logistics?

For municipal and clerks' associations, the request is limited to neutral process information and routing. I am not asking officials to promote the initiative, collect signatures in an official capacity or imply municipal endorsement.

For other associations, an optional invitation or no-cost discussion should follow your participation policies and applicable law. No payment, fundraising or paid staff commitment is requested. No membership list, client list or private information is needed.

Please identify a suitable newsletter, public calendar, policy committee or contact. A referral is useful even where your association takes no position. Any public description of participation will distinguish a referral, review, hosting and express endorsement.

Respectfully,
Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Select the applicable association paragraph. Do not use indiscriminate mass CC. County clerks' associations are administrative networks, not campaign branches; participating organizations assess their own legal obligations. Sources [43], [44].

CORRESPONDENCE / I

Organizations: volunteer review or hosting

DRAFT FOR REVIEW · Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: [Organization's public policy or administrative contact]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Invitation to review or host: For Our Children and Families

Dear [Organization Contact]:

I invite your organization to review the enclosed rev9 CPI proposal, For Our Children and Families. I am pursuing earlier legislation and a volunteer-only citizen-initiative route for 2028 if needed. JTforME.com/initiative contains the historical public baseline; the enclosed review identifies current changes.

The proposal begins with whole-child history and individual conduct over time, then workable orders, protected access, proportionate restrictions and timely review. It also requires continuous institutional improvement with short evaluated changes, meaningful measures, public-money controls, independent verification and correction.

Good-faith protection must remain possible while deliberate misuse is examined on evidence. No reporting outcome alone establishes bad faith, and correcting an unsupported restriction does not depend on proving misuse. The fee model, professional civil claim, implementation schedule and constitutional boundaries deserve candid review.

Help could take the form of voluntary technical feedback, a no-cost open discussion, a general volunteer invitation under your policies or an introduction to a willing host. After official issuance, a host could accommodate scheduled signing staffed by trained unpaid circulators. No payment or fundraising assistance is requested.

There is no expectation of endorsement or signature collection. I welcome specific objections about safety, privacy, access, costs and unintended burdens. Your name or logo will not be used as a supporter without express permission.

Please identify an appropriate contact and any role the organization would consider. No service-client list, private family record or individual case detail is requested.

Respectfully,

Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Use the same general invitation. Hosting, logo use and endorsement require separate permission. Sources [36]–[44], [49]–[56].

Volunteers: county coordinator invitation

DRAFT FOR REVIEW • Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: [Prospective volunteer or consenting public contact]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Help build the [County] volunteer team for a statewide Maine initiative

Hello [Name]:

I am building the volunteer-only team for *For Our Children and Families*, the family-court accountability proposal at JTforME.com/initiative. The plan is to seek earlier legislation and prepare a lawful 2028 citizen initiative.

I am seeking an unpaid coordinator for [County] to recruit local volunteers, find permitted no-cost meeting or signing locations, organize training and maintain a dependable return route. This is not a request for money, legal advice or management of anyone's private case.

No official signatures should be collected before the Secretary of State issues the approved petition and you have the current instructions. Before that, the work is building a local team, reviewing the draft and identifying hosts. Later work includes witnessed collection, packet tracking and municipal certification logistics.

Please reply with your municipality, a role you would consider and a reliable contact method. One recurring shift, one host introduction or one training session is useful. Do not send private child, medical or court records.

The effort should not depend on one person driving everywhere. It should depend on trained local volunteers doing manageable work and returning it correctly. A commitment is useful when it has a clear task, a responsible person and a completion date.

Respectfully,
Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Obtain consent before adding a volunteer or publishing contact details. County coordinators must not also perform this initiative's circulator notarizations. Sources [8], [9], [10].

CORRESPONDENCE / K

Independent notary: no-fee availability

DRAFT FOR REVIEW • Replace bracketed fields before sending.

To: [Notary public / notarial-services provider]

Date: [Insert date]

Subject: Availability inquiry: independent no-fee circulator-oath services

Dear [Name/Office]:

I am planning the volunteer-only *For Our Children and Families* citizen initiative. I am seeking an independent notary willing to administer circulator oaths without charge after an official petition is issued.

Please confirm that you are authorized to perform the act and will provide no other services to initiate or promote this initiative. Maine law restricts who may administer its circulator oaths; even unpaid non-notarial campaign work can create a disqualification.

Please identify any no-fee availability, service area, appointment process, required identification and recordkeeping procedure. We will provide the current Secretary of State instructions and organize packets to reduce administrative burden. No paid engagement or endorsement is requested.

We will not ask you to certify facts beyond your lawful notarial role, backdate a certificate, omit an oath, notarize incomplete or inaccurate declarations, or use remote/electronic procedures without clear authorization for this petition process.

Please indicate whether a schedule could support prompt completion and onward municipal certification. If no-fee service is unavailable, a referral to an eligible independent provider is welcome; do not treat this inquiry as authorization to incur fees.

Respectfully,
Justin A. Tahai
North Berwick, Maine
justintahai@gmail.com | (207) 651-5633
JTforME.com/initiative

Preparation note: Independence is substantive, not a job title. Retain current instructions and confirm eligibility. The circulator witnesses voter signatures; the notary administers the required oath. Sources [8], [10], [33].

A clear invitation to participate

General public copy—separate from an official petition or summary.

FOR OUR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

A child's life does not restart at the latest motion. Children need decisions grounded in material history, individual conduct and present safety—not disconnected snapshots or orders that exist only on paper.

I am seeking legislative sponsorship while building a volunteer-only citizen-initiative route for 2028, with 2030 as a contingency. The coordinated rev9 review requires whole-child history, workable orders, timely review, protected access and continuous improvement in court administration.

The institution must show who owns the next step, what was done, whether it worked, what it cost and how a verified failure will be corrected. Short, evaluated changes should replace endless cycles of announcements and unresolved work. Speed must not replace safety, fair process or meaningful evidence.

Genuine protection remains protected. An allegation's dismissal alone does not prove dishonesty, and an unsupported restriction must be reviewable without first winning a separate bad-faith dispute. Significant legal and fiscal questions remain open in the draft.

This is not an issued petition or a qualified ballot measure. Volunteers, no-cost hosts and candid technical reviewers are welcome. No money, private child records or personal litigation history is requested. Contact justintahai@gmail.com with your municipality and a task you would consider.

Before publication: attach the approved current PDF or update the website only after approval. Until then, JTforME.com/initiative is the historical baseline, not proof that rev9 has been posted.

At a future authorized signing table

Use only after official issuance: "This is the official petition for the proposed law titled [issued title]. Before deciding whether to sign, you may read the official summary and fiscal-impact statement. I can show you the full text. Signing this petition is not casting a ballot on the measure." [7]

One follow-up, without pressure

"Is there a suitable contact or channel for the invitation below? A brief decline is helpful. I will not list your organization as a supporter without permission."

Apply legally required disclosures; do not substitute this advocacy for the official summary, conceal controversial provisions or imply qualification. [7] [19]

18 / FIRST 90 DAYS

Turn the packet into accountable work

A volunteer planning schedule from October 13, 2026—not the Act’s future legal timetable.

WHEN	ACTION / EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION
First 7 days	Review this three-document set; resolve release choices; send Letter A when approved; name unpaid operations and records coordinators; invite five additional proponents; create the version and outreach registers.
By day 30	Record Elections guidance or follow-up; seek sponsor discussions; invite volunteer legal and implementation review; recruit county leads and independent no-fee notaries. Use Letter B only for a real unresolved question.
By day 60	Resolve major drafting choices, including the fee model, civil claim and continuous-improvement controls; assemble public fiscal/staffing inputs; confirm the new threshold when available and actual session deadlines.
By day 90	Have a sponsor-authorized request or alternate plan; reviewed application-ready text; county coverage register; tested privacy-conscious volunteer intake; and one controlled instruction/return procedure.

Before the next stage

Before public claims: verify status, version, threshold and dates. Before collection: obtain the issued form, train volunteers and arrange independent notarization. Before filing: reconcile originals and every controlling deadline. An actual change in money or resources calls for review of that change; it does not imply that a paid campaign is necessary.

Outreach register

Recipient; verified public contact; purpose; letter/version; date; requested response date; actual response; permission to share name/logo; follow-up owner; status; next action. Keep contacted, reviewing, hosting and endorsed distinct.

The 2028 decision checkpoint

By late summer 2027, compare observed returns, validity and active volunteers with the target and legal clocks. Adjust early. Expired issuance or changed text calls for a new plan—not relabeling old signatures as a 2030 reserve.

The separate 30/90/120/180-day institutional milestones on page 14 would begin only from the Act’s lawful effective date. Do not confuse campaign planning dates with proposed duties of the Judicial Branch.

What changed—and what remains open

Full-volume coordination with the rev9 CPI review bill.

Source fidelity and version control

This edition updates the supplied 38-page volunteer-only roadmap. It retains the two-track 2028/2030 strategy, calendar assumptions, statewide structure, directories, all eleven letters and all forty-eight original references. Revised policy pages and letters now follow the accompanying rev9 CPI text rather than treating rev08a as the current proposed bill. Two operating-model pages and a source page are added. [49]

Preserved organization; corrected drafting descriptions

No paid staffing, paid circulation, fundraising program, mandatory finance lead or automatic committee setup is added. Letter B stays optional. The old screening gates, blanket hearing limit and broad new criminal offenses are described as superseded. Whole-child history, separate misuse analysis, notice-based correction and mandatory continuous improvement now lead the policy explanation.

Current proposal is not current law

The new review, improvement, reporting and audit clocks are drafting choices. The law's effective date and the 180-day core transition remain contingent on lawful enactment. Rulemaking authority, statutory allocation, service, proof, clinical confidentiality, privacy, funding and the long civil claim require final review. No new legal duty arises from a draft outreach letter. [20–24] [49–56]

Calendar and contact limitations

The source packet's future-cycle calculations remain provisional, not official 2028 or 2030 notices. Obtain the post-November-2026 threshold and written date confirmation before reliance. Unchanged contacts and research are carried forward rather than represented as a fresh verification of every source. Do not infer endorsement from a directory entry or silence. [2–5]

Publication, advocacy and privacy

The standard and Haughty Legalise bill editions share identical operative text. The haughty preface is separately labeled advocacy; the approved personal website statement is not rewritten into statute. The R6 archive is accessible, but no website update has been made. This packet sends no letter, proves no private allegation and makes no finding of fraud from reported public spending.

Before release, approve the full text, resolve listed high-risk policy choices, confirm final versions and source dates, and reconcile the site's overview, FAQ, red-team register, changelog and downloads. Planning assumptions and borrowed methods are not assurances of qualification, constitutionality or effectiveness.

Sources and verification links

Reviewed October 13, 2026. Follow links for the current text; statutes and forms can change.

[1] JTforME, For Our Children and Families, public-review bill, rev08a (May 2026)

<https://jtforme.com/initiative>

[2] Maine Constitution, Article IV, Part Third, §18 (constitutional text reproduced by FindLaw)

<https://codes.findlaw.com/me/maine-constitution/me-const-art-iv-pt-3-sect-18/>

[3] Maine Constitution, Article IV, Part Third, §20 (constitutional text reproduced by FindLaw)

<https://codes.findlaw.com/me/maine-constitution/me-const-art-iv-pt-3-sect-20/>

[4] Maine Secretary of State, Citizen Initiative Application Packet

<https://www.maine.gov/sos/elections-voting/peoples-veto-or-citizens-initiative-resources/citizen-initiative-application-packet>

[5] Maine Secretary of State, Deadlines for Current Citizen Initiatives

<https://www.maine.gov/sos/elections-voting/peoples-veto-or-citizens-initiative-resources/deadlines-for-current-citizen-initiatives>

[6] 21-A M.R.S. §901, Petitions; application, drafting review and official forms

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec901.html>

[7] 21-A M.R.S. §901-A, Petition requirements; summary and fiscal statement

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec901-A.html>

[8] 21-A M.R.S. §902, Verification and certification

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec902.html>

[9] 21-A M.R.S. §903-A, Circulation; training, affidavits and paid-circulator disclosure

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec903-A.html>

[10] 21-A M.R.S. §903-E, Disqualification from administering circulator oaths

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec903-E.html>

[11] Gilbert v. Secretary of State, 2026 ME 59, July 10, 2026 (opinion reproduced by Justia)

<https://law.justia.com/cases/maine/supreme-court/2026/2026-me-59.html>

[12] 21-A M.R.S. §903-C, Compensated petition-organization registration

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec903-C.html>

Sources and verification links

Reviewed October 13, 2026. Follow links for the current text; statutes and forms can change.

[13] 21-A M.R.S. §905, Petition review and judicial review deadlines

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec905.html>

[14] 21-A M.R.S. §907, Legislative public hearing on a qualified initiative

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec907.html>

[15] 1 M.R.S. §353, Attorney General explanation and fiscal impact estimate

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/1/title1sec353.html>

[16] Maine Ethics Commission, Ballot Question Committees

<https://www.maine.gov/ethics/committees/ballot-question>

[17] 21-A M.R.S. §1052-A, Committee registration and amendments

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec1052-A.html>

[18] 21-A M.R.S. §1052, Campaign-finance definitions

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec1052.html>

[19] 21-A M.R.S. §1055, Political public communications

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec1055.html>

[20] 4 M.R.S. §8, Supreme Judicial Court rulemaking authority

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/4/title4sec8.html>

[21] 19-A M.R.S. §1653, Parental rights and responsibilities

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/19-A/title19-Asec1653.html>

[22] 19-A M.R.S. §4108, Temporary protection orders

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/19-A/title19-Asec4108.html>

[23] 22 M.R.S. §4011-A, Reporting suspected abuse or neglect

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/22/title22sec4011-A.html>

[24] 17-A M.R.S. §5, Pleading and proof in criminal proceedings

<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/17-A/title17-Asec5.html>

Sources and verification links

Reviewed October 13, 2026. Follow links for the current text; statutes and forms can change.

[25] **Maine Legislature, Joint Rules, including Rules 201–210; current-session dates are not future deadlines**
<https://web.mainelegislature.org/joint-rules>

[26] **Maine Legislature, Follow a Bill Through the Legislature**
<https://web.legislature.maine.gov/follow-a-bill-through-the-legislature>

[27] **Maine Legislature, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, contact and drafting resources**
<https://web.legislature.maine.gov/ros>

[28] **Maine Secretary of State, Bureau of Corporations, Elections and Commissions contact**
<https://www.maine.gov/sos/elections-voting/about-bureau-of-corporations-elections-and-commissions>

[29] **Maine Ethics Commission, Contact Us and subject-matter routing**
<https://www.maine.gov/ethics/contact>

[30] **Maine Secretary of State, Municipal Clerk and Registrar Directory; CSV dated October 2, 2026**
<https://www.maine.gov/sos/elections-voting/find-a-municipal-clerk-or-registrar>

[31] **21-A M.R.S. §682, Election-day political activities and 250-foot restrictions**
<https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec682.html>

[32] **21-A M.R.S. §683, Regulated signature gathering at voting places**
<https://web.legis.maine.gov/statutes/21-A/title21-Asec683.html>

[33] **Maine Secretary of State, Agency rules index; notarial rules and referendum materials**
<https://www.maine.gov/sos/rulemaking/agency-rules/departments-secretary-state-rules>

[34] **Maine Judicial Branch, Administrative Office of the Courts contact and court-rule links**
<https://www.courts.maine.gov/about/contact.html>

[35] **Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Contact DHHS**
<https://www.maine.gov/dhhs/about/contact>

[36] **League of Women Voters of Maine, statewide and local contact directory**
<https://www.lwvme.org/contactus>

Sources and verification links

Reviewed October 13, 2026. Follow links for the current text; statutes and forms can change.

[37] Maine Association of Mediators, Contact

<https://mainemediators.org/Contact>

[38] Maine Children's Alliance, mission and organizational contact

<https://mekids.org/>

[39] Maine Children's Trust, county prevention-council network

<https://mechildrenstrust.org/mctpol.asp>

[40] Maine Volunteer Lawyers Project, Contact Us; non-intake correspondence

<https://www.vlp.org/contact-us>

[41] Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence, organizational contact

<https://www.mcedv.org/contact-us/>

[42] Maine Coalition Against Sexual Assault, organizational contact

<https://www.mecasa.org/contact.html>

[43] Maine Town and City Clerks' Association, county associations

<https://mtcca.org/About/Counties>

[44] Internal Revenue Service, Lobbying by tax-exempt organizations

<https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/lobbying>

[45] Maine Secretary of State, July 10, 2026 explanation of the circulator-jurisdiction ruling

<https://www3.maine.gov/sos/news/maine-supreme-court-affirms-secretary-states-decision-invalidate-petition-signatures-collected>

[46] Maine Secretary of State, Process for People's Veto or Citizens' Initiative

<https://www.maine.gov/sos/elections-voting/peoples-veto-or-citizens-initiative-resources/process-for-peoples-veto-or-citizens-initiative>

[47] Maine Prevention Council Network, statewide organization and contact

<https://mainepreventioncouncils.org/>

[48] Maine Ethics Commission, Political Action Committees

<https://www.maine.gov/ethics/committees/political-action-committees>

SOURCES / 5

Coordinated-revision sources

New references; original [1]–[48] are retained on pages 37–40.

[49] Coordinated rev9 CPI review set

Supplied 49-page bill and 38-page roadmap; new complete Act and companion editions, October 13, 2026. The R6 website archive remains unchanged.

[50] 4 M.R.S. §17 — State Court Administrator

Existing administrative duties; proposed subsection 19 adds the new mandatory program.

[51] 3 M.R.S. §§991 and 994 — OPEGA and Government Oversight Committee

Existing audit/evaluation roles; no assumed authority over the merits of a judicial case.

[52] U.S. GAO — Agile Assessment Guide, GAO-24-105506

Incremental software implementation and assessment; design guidance, not Maine governing law.

[53] Institute for Healthcare Improvement — Testing Changes

Primary PDSA method: small tests, observation, side effects and iterative correction.

[54] OpenStax — Introduction to Business, §6.1

Integrated planning, organizing, leading and controlling framework; no textbook instrument reproduced.

[55] National Center for State Courts — CourTools

Primary court-performance measurement framework; the new bill adds child-specific safeguards.

[56] Maine Constitution, Article I, §19

Source of “Promptly and without delay.” Secondary reproduction; not a specified new statutory clock.

Use sources for the claim they actually support

The original [1] remains the rev08a historical website source. The current review text is [49], not proof of a published website replacement. Framework sources inform the new drafting; none supplies the bill’s proposed deadlines or endorses the initiative. Check current official election instructions and legal text before formal submission.