

From: [Linda Templin](#)
To: [Statewide Initiatives](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Initiative 201 Prohibit Ranked Choice Voting
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 12:37:23 PM

Via email to: statewide.initiatives@coloradosos.gov
Subject: Initiative 201 Prohibit Ranked Choice Voting

Date: April 3, 2024

To: Title Board Members: Theresa Conley, Christie Chase, Jennifer Sullivan
Office of the Colorado Secretary of State

From: Linda Templin, Patrick Dillon, and Caryn Ann Harlos, Colorado Registered Electors

Grounds: Violates single-subject rule & unclear language

A.

Text is confusing, it is the prohibition of a voting method that has never been used.

Descriptions of Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) include that

- voters “vote for more than one candidate”. (section 2b1a)
 - Multiple court rulings for over 100 years have ruled that there is no violation of one vote per voter per seat to be filled.
 - Accurate language is that the voters rank as many or as few candidates as they wish in order of preference.
- “Reassigned” votes is an imaginary concept not found within Colorado rules. (section 2b1b)
 - RCV has been used in US municipalities for over 100 years. In the majority of races, the winning candidate has passed the majority threshold in the first round of count. In the less common occurrence that no candidate has a majority of the support, there is an instant runoff. The candidate with the fewest first choices is eliminated, but not their voters.
 - Accurate language is that “only the ballot originally cast for an eliminated candidate are then counted for the voters’ next preference”

- “Other than the first tabulation” contradicts the standard set in section 2a that prohibits RCV ballots. (section 2b1c)
 - In the majority of races, the winning candidate has passed the majority threshold.
 - Accurate language is that the results are “plurality only”.
 - This means that in less than half, but still several races each cycle, there will be candidates who have not clearly demonstrated that win was truly earned. This occurred in the 1992 presidential race when Ross Perot split the conservative vote. All of Colorado’s electoral votes went to Bill Clinton and produced eight years of acrimony because many people felt that he did not earn that win.
- “declared” is inaccurate (section 2b1c1)
 - It implied that the votes are counted at the discretion of the election administrators. It ignores that there is a standard.
 - Accurate language is “has passed a majority threshold”
- “Single winner” is inaccurate (section 2b1c1)
 - RCV ballots may be used for multiple-winner races.
 - This provides proportional representation, where an increasing number of voters get their fair share of the say. This means urban Republicans get representation, and that rural Democrats get representation.
 - **It is not possible to tell what the accurate language would be. Do proponents mean to ban single-winner RCV which finds the consensus of**

a majority or multiple-winner RCV which more accurately reflects the voters?

- There is a reasonable argument to be made that single-winner RCV is best suited for only executive representation where the interest is that most people trust the Governor or Mayor.
- There is a reasonable argument to be made that multiple-winner RCV is best suited for deliberative, legislative bodies where a broader variety of viewpoints is desirable. For policy reference for members of the public, this is laid out in
 - “The Conservative Case for RCV” https://i2i.org/wp-content/uploads/IP-3-2021_b_web.pdf
 - “Over 200 Scholars Call on Congress to...Adopt Proportional Representation” <https://protectdemocracy.org/work/democracy-scholars-end-single-member-districts/>

--

Linda S. Templin, MPA
Executive Director
[RCV for Colorado](#)

Ranked Choice Voting for Colorado
[1536 Wynkoop Street, #908](#)
[Denver, CO 80202](#)
303-454-3335
www.RCVforColorado.org