

Instant Runoff Voting –May, 2009

Public Comments

IRV Work session

7.21.09

Positives:

- Voters could express more complete opinion than traditional one vote.
- More feedback to government.
- Utilized tools and precedent for greater transparency.
- Reduced campaign time for elected officials.

Sample Ballot Data Stings

Image File	Mayor Clean	City Council Clean
A0010001.TIF	4, 2, 3, 1	2, 1, 4, 5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
A0010002.TIF	4, 0, 0, 0	4, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
A0010003.TIF	2, 1, 3, 4	3, 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 2
A0010004.TIF	1, 4, 0, 0	7, 2, 4, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
A0010005.TIF	1, 0, 0, 0	3, 8, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0

Negatives:

- Basic premise is flawed---that an “instant runoff” will produce same result as traditional run-off.
- Prevented focused elections with small field of candidates.
- Press could not thoroughly cover large field.
- Voters could not analyze large field.
- Issues took back seat to advertising.
- Drives need for expensive campaigns.

-Complex tabulation method— Reduced Voter confidence.

- Public does not understand tabulation math.
- Tabulation methods allowed mathematical anomalies.
- Some votes did not reflect voter intent from attempted “votes against.”
- Caused some voters to “bullet vote” and not participate in runoff.
- Greater number of spoiled ballots, -- particularly in mail-in absentee ballots.

-Different tabulation methods under consideration would have created different winners.

	Method 1	Method 2	Method 3	Method 4	Method 5
Seat 1	D. Johnson	D. Johnson	D. Johnson	D. Johnson	D. Johnson
Seat 2	Torre	Behrendt	Frisch	J. Johnson	Torre

Method 1 – Official Election Procedure.

Method 2 – Two Vote Sequential Elimination.

Method 3 – One Vote Sequential Elimination (Restart after first seat).

Method 4 – One Vote Sequential Elimination (No Restart).

Method 5 – IRV version of traditional runoff.

- **Decreased Voter Participation in “Run-off”**

- 36% voted for 3 or fewer CC candidates.

- Over 50% voted for 4 or fewer CC candidates, accepting the risk of not participating in a run-off election.

- Voter drop off was far greater than in traditional run-off elections.

•Current methods/statutes subject to litigation potential in future elections:

- Tabulation method allowing non-monotonicity appears counter to CO law.
- Charter provisions are unclear, and inconsistent with written procedures
- IRV procedures are sometimes ambiguous, resulting failure to apply.

- Forcing “majority” through elimination rounds is an unfair method of gaining majority support for a candidate.
- IRV complexity discouraged sufficient software testing, caused a failure to detect errors, and led to misstated results.
- IRV tabulation method subject to change at every election without voter approval.

Recommendations:

- Approve Nov. 09 ballot question for voters to determine whether to revert to pre-2007 Charter requirements for traditional run-offs.
- Maintain transparency by utilizing electronic scanning and recording of ballots, and sharing ballot data with public.
- Encourage and support reviews of IRV and all election processes to maintain voter confidence.
- Maintain precinct election (not mail in only) in Nov. 09 to maintain voter confidence.

QUESTIONS?

COMMENTS?

Thank you!