

The following email from Terry Reilly makes misleading and false claims about ranked choice voting (RCV), also known as instant runoff voting. Reilly also published his message as a news article in the Hawai'i Free Press. The referenced undergraduate paper was attached and like Reilly's email should not be mistaken for being either unbiased or thorough. The paper has serious problems that render most of its results not credible. Reilly's mention of spoilage rates begs the question of how RCV compares to the traditional, two-round runoff system that RCV replaced and ignores a broader view of RCV's advantages. The paper did not even attempt to investigate actual vote exhaustion rates among racial/ethnic groups nor did it compare vote exhaustion rates to the previous system to see if there was an improvement.

The "strange results" that Reilly highlights refer to RCV being non-monotonic. Reilly's claim that it is unique to RCV is false. For example, traditional two-round runoff systems are also non-monotonic. Reilly's claim that "your vote can hurt your candidate rather than help them" is conceptually confused and easily misunderstood to mean something that is not true. Like all other election methods, there are situations with RCV where voting strategically can give a better election result for some voters. An important advantage of RCV is that the opportunities for strategic voting tend to be less than with traditional or other alternative election methods.

**From:** Terry Reilly <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** June 25, 2012 [REDACTED]  
**To:** Terry Reilly <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Racial and Ethnic Disparities in RCV

There has not been much research by unbiased parties concerning Ranked Choice Voting. The attached academic paper received Stanford's prestigious 2012 **Firestone Medal for Excellence**.

The paper, entitled: "**The Unanticipated Inequalities of Electoral Reform: Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Voting Behavior under Oakland's Ranked Choice Voting Program**" is extensively researched and takes an honest look at many of the claims of RCV advocates.

This research clearly shows higher spoilage rates by minorities. It also shows minorities did not use most of their ranks, which lead to higher number of ballots tossed out of the vote count.

It points out some strange results with RCV such as "**Raising a candidates's rank on one's ballot does not always increase that candidate's chance of winning and in fact may decrease a candidate's chance to win**" (p.21) - *which means your vote can hurt your candidate rather than help them*. This phenomenon is unique to the RCV style voting.

At over 80 pages, it is extremely thorough and worth the effort to read.

Best Regards,

Terry