League of Women Voters Intro:

Party Neutral. Protect all voters. Don't Oppose Parties, simply favors VOTERS, not parties.

No electoral system perfect.

Chart – abbreviated ideas regarding:
RCV (Ranked Choice Voting) &
STAR (Score, then automatic runoff – aka 'Score Runoff')

Debate among reformers props up the status quo.   RCV and other alternative methods **share a common goal – democratic reform**. Expanding our choices is better than the status-quo of plurality (a left over British system – without the elegance of Downton Abbey).

For executive or single winner elections, LWV thinks that RCV is best all-around system (to date), but other reforms are also trying to tackle the problems of plurality – and someday another system may beat out RCV in our view. Perhaps not yet.   Its problems are few, rare and often overstated; its benefits are many. [We did not study STAR voting in either LWV Oregon –or local LWV Rogue Valley.]

Both STAR and RCV have the ability to eliminate "bother and cost" of 2nd elections when current rules (like Lane County) require a Delayed Runoff (of 2-round runoff). [Many advocates point to the fact they could even eliminate primaries and their cost if the will was there.]

Delayed (or 2nd) runoffs have their own problems, like – more money spent (by candidates & taxpayers, inconvenience to voters and worst, lower turnout, which means fewer people are part of the decision-making election).
RCV and Star overcomes those issues.

	STAR (Score, then Automatic Runoff)	RCV
Expressive Ballot	Excellent - VERY expressive ballot. Voters can express more nuanced views ["Cardinal" ratings.]	Fairly good 'Slots' or Ranks for preferences are clearer than current plurality. Up or down for each round, not as nuanced.
NON-competitive elections *LWV has no position* on non-competitive elections – as we are an organization based on government voting	STAR may be great for non-competitive elections (with no "governing consequence"– not a derogatory term)	(personal opinion of author, B. Klein) Compared to RCV, STAR may show equal or better results for Internal or non-profit organizations or private companies, where **goals are the same**.

Experience Where In use?	Nowhere in government elections of "consequence. " Might be interesting to see real world results in private organizations or private companies/ corporations to find out how it works in reality. Almost passed in Lane County (close election supporters winning 42% against 46% from opposition NO vote) [Currently, they use a 2-election runoff. Delayed Runoff.] >	Experience in US and around the world. Locations now so many and amassing so quickly, it's suggested you visit 'where used' at Ranked Choice Voting Resource center: https://www.rankedchoicevoting.org/where_used Examples of current locations: Decades in Australia and Ireland. Also, New Zealand, Scotland (often with multi-winner type) **Maine** - RCV for federal elections, 1st state to elect a U.S. senator and two members of House. (Previously used in Portland Maine.) **New Mexico** - Santa Fe. NM has a 'turnkey' operation for adopting RCV. Las Cruces NM will join them in 2019 **California** (4, soon 6) : San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, San Leandro San Francisco made history electing its 1st African-American woman mayor. Davis and Santa Clara County CA have approval for use. Colorado (3) : Basalt, Carbondale, Telluride Minnesota (2 , soon 3) Minneapolis, (22 offices both single & Multi winner) followed by St. Paul. St. Louis Park, MN will join in 2019 Maryland in Takoma Park: (2006 Cambridge, MA almost 80 years (before computers) in multi-winner RCV form for the nine seat city council and six seat school board elected citywide. Amherst, Massachusetts will also use RCV starting 2021
Strategic **Susceptible to voting tactics** Point of disagreement as to importance. Well-informed voters get an advantage to voters who are less-sophisticated. Advantage to those 'in the know.'	STAR may be susceptible. May fall prey to some of the same issues plaguing other scoring methods. Like Approval, bullet voting (as seen at Dartmouth College) where voters start voting for only one candidate. [See below.] ** A different strategy is to take a big risk and rate your 2nd (but stronger) much lower – so a weak candidate makes into runoff against your favorite. VERY risky. **NOTE**: Some reformists believe that strategy can be good. They may be correct, but the LWV just doesn't agree.	Sophisticated & less-sophisticated voters - all the same. No real sense in voting for any candidates but your favorites – in other of preference. NO benefit or roadmap for using strategy. Ranking candidate is straightforward, even if not as 'expressive' -- pays to vote sincerely.

* Later No harm expressing **preference beyond** the favorite should not harm the favorite (Sightline institute)	STAR given **fail grade** for this. Good side– MAY avoid bullet voting tendency of approval or range - as wouldn't help in 2nd round) But there are **2 ways that indicating support for a 2nd favorite can help defeat favorite**. 1) Can help a stronger opponent reach the runoff, who could beat **your** favorite, rather than a weaker opponent 2) Grading (scoring) others can cause favorite candidate to end in 3rd place by total score - cutting them out of runoff entirely.	LWV believes this is a very important criterion for which to consider methods. RCV has strong (perhaps the best) marks for this. Not all criteria equally importantly in the real world of our ballot.
Condorcet – Gold standard.- Beats ALL in one-to-one match up	Neither RCV nor STAR guarantees election of the Condorcet candidate. Because it has no data to draw upon, it is not known how STAR would perform.	Neither RCV nor STAR guarantees election of the Condorcet candidate. ….However, RCV tends to elect the Condorcet candidate as a rule (out of 100 elections in Bay area, EACH has elected the Condorcet winner).
Inconsistent Personal Translation of Preference into Score <u>My Story</u> – 4th grade teacher (bad grades) – 5th grade teacher (good grades). I didn't change in few months between grades but she (in 4th grade) was a **hard marker** - he in 5th wasn't.	*** "Internal Scoring" *** In STAR voting, you and I may totally agree on a candidate, BUT our grading <u>philosophy</u> may differ: May be a 5 to me & only a 4 or 3 to you This problem was seen w/ Netflix & some areas of Youtube – both abandoned the 5 score system. [Replaced with an Approval type system–thumbs up/ down.] ■ Above online example (in my view) where RCV would be ridiculous and difficult to use.	RCV - a slot for 1st place need not be defined, as it is understood as only one place. You only get one choice per one round. Thus 'translation' into what that choice means doesn't play into it. ← Youtube and Netflix example of when Approval could be more effective. No <u>governing consequences</u> however. [There is no honest 'INTERNAL' score within us – whereas a position or RCV 'slot' is clear.

Nullify votes * Strategic issues resurface.	Nullified votes are possible – even LIKELY. STAR - niffy idea to use one ballot for both rounds (like RCV) – but could be a challenge for voters to have their scores used for 2 different purposes. For those who have voted with equal SCORES, their votes are disqualified. May lead to strategic voting. **LWV wants every vote to count.** If during 'runoff' – 2nd phase – any voter(s) who gave candidates the same score will not have their vote count. Only those with different scores for 2 remaining candidates will count. Considering 0-5 scale, in a field of more than 5 candidates this will be frequent. Any time more than 6 candidates in race, this will happen – voters will *have* to give 2 or more candidates same score. In 2016 Republican primary for president – 15 candidates. Would have many duplicate scores. – and likelihood of many disregarded ballots.	With RCV, all ballots continue to count and only if the voter doesn't participate in the round (meaning they stop ranking) does it change – like in a Delayed Runoff where the voter refuses to return to the polls (or in Oregon which has no polls, voter doesn't vote a 2nd a ballot).
Hand count audit	Probably possible – likely more difficult than RCV, clearly more difficult than current 'vote-for-one' system.	These days, paper trails of ballot are vital and hand audits sometimes necessary. RCV not as easy to audit as current 'vote-for-one' plurality but it's doable. Even for multi seat. [In Cambridge MA, the entire election was counted by hand using RCV for over 5 decades *before computers*.]
Reduces Negative Campaigning?	Doubtful, but unknown.	Expected to reduce negative campaigning. Such has been demonstrated. "If I can't get your 1st vote – how about second." 2018 - San Francisco Mayor race ran videos and took out ads this way.

Monotonicity
 	
Difficult to explain, but
 	
After counting the ballots,
 	
*ranking higher should never HELP towards a loss,
 	
*Ranking lower, should never help elevate.
 	
--- 	
 	
Ranking or rating a candidate higher should never cause that candidate to lose, nor should ranking or rating a candidate lower ever cause that candidate to win, *assuming all other candidates remain rated or ranked the same*.
	Score and Range don't have this particular problem. They pass this criterion
	(although they fail one we think is more important which is **Later-No-Harm**).
	
	But STAR may have a problem here too (compared to straight Range –or Score-voting).
	
	If in the runoff a ballot lists both candidates as a '5' then the ballot doesn't count, (see nullified votes above).
	
	So rating one candidate higher might actually help defeat them.
	A sophisticated voter may rely on this – and would be able to act on it in advance.
		No system perfect
		Mathematical possibly that RCV can fail this criterion.
		Rare, but possible.
		
		For this to happen:
		    1) *several* candidates have to have very similar vote totals, AND
		    2) Their supporters need to split their 2nd & 3rd choices roughly evenly among remaining candidates.
		
		MORE important - no <u>strategic</u> relevance
		1. **Can't really know ahead of time** – so doesn't affect sincere voting
		(would be **folly** to try to convince voters to change their votes based on some theory that it would help your particular scenario.)
		Would have to know 'unknowable' info.
		
		2. Also it is the rare chance this could happen, while problematic criteria shown in other systems happen (or could) *consistently*.
		
		To be clear - getting more first preferences, by itself, can *never* cause a candidate to lose with IRV.
		The actual cause of a non-monotonic flip with IRV is the shift of support among *other* candidates.

Machinery is an issue	Unknown.	All the major vendors of election machines now claim they have the ability to run ranked elections. They continue to charge big price tag software fees for implementing them, but they all have the ability. This is improving.

Majority or '**mutual majority**' criterion If more than 50% of voters favor same 1-choice candidate, that candidate should win. (Sightline Inst.)	With STAR it's possible for the 1st choice of majority voters to lose. (Depends on how other candidates are rated – if voters too 'generous' scores.) Plurality, 2-round runoffs, & STAR fail this criterion. Also …… Top 2. **Mutual Majority** EX: Contest w/ 5 Democrats & 2 Republicans. Majority favors Democrats, but divided over which one. Still in this case it's obvious a Republican should not win over the Democratic majority.	For a single seat race, where majority is best level of winning, RCV guarantees a majority win in the final round of counting (like a Delayed Runoff). **RCV passes this criterion**.
Results of Representation	Results would assure greater representation than plurality, and in runoff would guarantee a majority in final round. No reference or clear use for at-large elections.	Majority guaranteed in final round of counting (for a single winner). Proportional Representations is result for at-large or multiple winner elections.