Date of Hearing: April 27, 2022

<div align="center">

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Isaac G. Bryan, Chair
AB 2161 (Mayes) – As Introduced February 15, 2022

</div>

SUBJECT: Gubernatorial recall elections.

SUMMARY: Requires that the portion of a gubernatorial recall election to elect a successor to a successfully-recalled Governor be conducted using Consensus Ranked Choice Voting (CRCV), as defined, and establishes procedures for conducting elections using CRCV. Requires a candidate to succeed a Governor in a recall election to collect signatures of 7,000 registered voters in order to appear on the ballot, and eliminates filing fees for such candidates. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Requires, in a gubernatorial recall election, that a candidate to succeed the Governor submit an in-lieu-filing-fee petition, as specified, instead of paying a filing fee to qualify to appear on the ballot. Requires the forms for securing signatures on an in-lieu-filing-fee petition for this purpose to be made available when the Secretary of State (SOS) determines that 50% of the signatures required to qualify the recall petition for an election have been submitted, and allows candidates to begin collecting signatures on those petitions at that point.

2) Requires, in the case of gubernatorial recall election, that a successor to a successfully recalled Governor be elected using CRCV as specified. Permits a voter to assign a ranking to no more than 10 candidates who are eligible to be elected.

3) Establishes procedures to be used in elections conducted using CRCV for elections in which only one candidate can be designated as elected in the contest.

   a) Defines various terms for the purposes of CRCV, including the following:

      i) "Active ballot" to mean a ballot that contains a continuing candidate and has not reached an overvote, as specified.

      ii) "Continuing candidate" to mean a candidate who has not yet been designated as elected or defeated.

      iii) "Highest-ranked continuing candidate" to mean the ranking on a voter's ballot with the lowest numerical value for a continuing candidate.

      iv) "Overvote" to mean an instance in which a voter has given more than one candidate the same ranking.

      v) "Preference vote" to mean a vote awarded by a voter to the candidate in a comparison who on the voter's ballot has the higher ranking.

      vi) "Ranking" to mean the number assigned to a candidate that establishes the voter's order of preference among candidates. Provides that the candidate with the highest ranking is the one to which the voter assigns the lowest numerical value.

b) Requires a ballot in an election conducted using CRCV to allow voters to assign a different ranking to all candidates, including write-in candidates, unless assigning rankings to a lesser number of all candidates is specified by law.

c) Provides that in an election conducted by CRCV, the elections official shall provide ballot instructions that make clear the proper voting procedures for voting in a CRCV election. Permits the SOS to establish the required language for such ballot instructions.

d) Provides that in a single-seat election conducted by CRCV, tabulation of votes proceeds as follows:

   i) A comparison is made between each candidate and every other candidate.

      (1) The following apply to each comparison of a candidate with another candidate:

         (a) A preference vote for each ballot is awarded to the candidate who is ranked higher on that ballot. (A candidate who is not ranked on a ballot is considered to have a lower ranking than a candidate who is ranked on that ballot. When a ballot contains an overvote, any candidates ranked equal to or lower than the overvote are treated as though they were not ranked on the ballot.)

         (b) For each comparison, the candidate receiving the greater number of preference votes is the candidate preferred by the voters in that comparison.

      (2) The candidate who is preferred by the voters in comparisons with each of the other candidates is the consensus candidate and is the winner of the election.

   ii) Provides that if no candidate is the consensus candidate after this comparison is complete, tabulation of ballots proceeds in rounds using a process commonly referred to as ranked choice voting (RCV), as follows:

      (1) Each active ballot counts as a vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot.

      (2) If any continuing candidate has more than 50% of votes cast on active ballots, that candidate is declared the winner. If no candidate has more than 50% of the votes cast on active ballots, the candidate with the fewest votes is defeated. Establishes a procedure that allows multiple candidates to be eliminated in a single round through "batch elimination" if it is mathematically impossible for those candidates to be elected.

      (3) If two or more candidates are tied with the fewest number of votes and cannot be defeated through batch elimination, the candidate to be defeated is the candidate whose name appears last on a list of all candidates sorted according to the randomized alphabet used for the election, as specified.

      (4) Every ballot counting toward a defeated candidate is advanced to the next-ranked continuing candidate on the ballot, and another round of ballot tabulation is conducted. This procedure repeats until a candidate has 50% of the votes cast on

active ballots.

4) Permits the SOS to adopt regulations to implement provisions of state law related to CRCV.

5) Provides that the provisions of this bill relating to CRCV shall become operative only if an unspecified Assembly Constitutional Amendment is approved by the voters and takes effect.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Requires, pursuant to the California Constitution, that an election to determine whether to recall an elective state officer and, if appropriate, to elect a successor to be called by the Governor and held not less than 60 days nor more than 80 days from the date of certification of sufficient signatures. Permits a recall election to be conducted within 180 days from the date of certification of sufficient signatures in order that the election may be consolidated with the next regularly scheduled election occurring wholly or partially within the same jurisdiction in which the recall election is held, if the number of voters eligible to vote at that next regularly scheduled election equal at least 50% of all the voters eligible to vote at the recall election.

2) Requires a recall election to be conducted, canvassed, and the results declared in substantially the manner provided by law for a regular election for the office. Requires that nominations of candidates to succeed a recalled officer be made in a manner prescribed for nominating a candidate to that office in a regular election, except as specified.

3) Prohibits a candidate for Governor from having the candidate's name printed on the ballot at a primary election unless the candidate does both of the following:

   a) Files the following nomination documents with the county elections official:

      i) A declaration of candidacy, as specified; and,

      ii) Nomination papers containing the signatures of at least 65 registered voters, as specified.

   b) Pays a fee to the SOS for filing a declaration of candidacy equal to two percent of the first-year salary of the office, as specified. For the purpose of the 2022 gubernatorial primary election, that fee equaled $4,371.12. Permits a candidate, in lieu of paying this filing fee, to submit a petition containing the signatures of 7,000 registered voters. These petitions are commonly referred to as "in-lieu-filing-fee" petitions. Provides that if the number of signatures collected on an in-lieu-filing-fee petition is less than the total number of signatures needed to cover the filing fee, the filing fee shall be pro-rated based on the number of signatures collected on the petition.

   Provides that the area of law where these provisions are found does not apply to recall elections.

4) Provides that a candidate for voter-nominated office, which includes Governor, may be nominated to appear on the ballot pursuant to a specified procedure for independent nominations only if a candidate was not nominated at the primary election for that office. Requires, pursuant to that procedure, that nomination papers for a statewide office for which

the candidate is to be nominated be signed by voters of the state equal to at least one percent of the number of registered voters of the state at the time of the close of registration prior to the preceding general election.

5) Requires the following language to appear on the ballot at a recall election, except for a recall in a landowner voting district, with respect to the officer sought to be recalled:

The question, "Shall [name of officer sought to be recalled] be recalled (removed) from the office of [title of office]?"

To the right of that question, the words "Yes" and "No" with voting spaces for each option.

6) Requires the names of the candidates nominated to succeed the officer sought to be recalled appear under each recall question.

7) Provides that if a majority votes in favor of the recall question, the official is removed from office and the candidate who receives the plurality of the votes cast among the candidates to succeed the recalled officer is declared elected for the unexpired term of office.

8) Requires candidates' names to be arranged on the ballot in an order that is based on a randomized alphabet that is drawn by the SOS. Requires, in the case of offices that are voted on throughout the state (including Governor), that the order of candidates be rotated for each Assembly District, as specified.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. State-mandated local program; contains reimbursement direction.

COMMENTS:

1) **Purpose of the Bill**: According to the author, "A state as populous and democratic as California should not have the option to elect a governor with less than 50% of the vote. This legislation updates our recall process for the 21st century by using consensus voting to elect a governor if the recall is successful."

2) **Consensus Ranked Choice Voting**: This bill establishes a framework and procedure for conducting elections pursuant to CRCV, and for tabulating ballots for elections held using CRCV. Furthermore, this bill requires CRCV to be used in gubernatorial recall elections for electing a successor if the Governor is successfully recalled. All of the provisions of this bill related to CRCV, however, are contingent upon voter approval of an unspecified Assembly Constitutional Amendment. No Assembly Constitutional Amendment has been introduced that would permit gubernatorial recall elections to be conducted in a manner that is consistent with elections conducted using CRCV.

The concept of using ranked voting methods for conducting elections for public office is not unknown in California. As described in more detail below, RCV has been used in local elections in some California jurisdictions since 2004. Additionally, the Legislature has regularly considered legislation related to ranked voting methods; at this committee's most recent hearing, it considered legislation that would have prohibited the use of RCV in state and local elections in California.

CRCV differs in important ways from RCV, however, and committee staff is unaware of any prior legislation that would have authorized the use of CRCV in elections in California. From a voter's perspective, the mechanics of casting a ballot are similar under CRCV and RCV: each voter ranks the candidates for office in order of preference. The tabulation of ballots, however, is different under RCV and CRCV, and those tabulation differences can result in different candidates being deemed elected even where voters' rankings of candidates are identical.

For single-winner elections conducted using RCV, ballots are counted in rounds that simulate a series of runoffs until only two candidates remain. At that point, the candidate with the greater number of votes is declared the winner. Ballots in single-winner RCV elections are tabulated as follows: in the first round, every ballot counts as a vote towards the candidate indicated by the highest ranking on that ballot. After every round, if a candidate receives a majority of votes from the continuing ballots, that candidate is declared elected. If no candidate receives a majority, the candidate receiving the smallest number of votes is eliminated, every ballot counting towards that candidate is advanced to the next-ranked continuing candidate on the ballot, and another round of ballot tabulation is conducted.

While the vote tabulation system is more complex than how ballots typically are tabulated in California elections, no voter gets to vote twice and no vote is counted twice. In a single-winner system where the last place candidate is eliminated, voters who listed that candidate first on their ballot then get to use the second choice on their ballot once that first choice is eliminated. They may get two (or more) chances to use their vote, but they never get more than one vote.

The ballot tabulation under CRCV, as outlined by this bill, would proceed differently. Using voters' rankings of candidates, elections officials would begin by making a comparison between each candidate and every other candidate on the ballot for the same race. In each of these head-to-head matchups, the elections official would use voters' rankings to determine which candidate was preferred by a larger number of voters. After completing this tabulation for every possible head-to-head matchup between all the candidates in the race, the elections official would determine whether there was any candidate who was preferred to every other candidate on the ballot. If so, that candidate would be elected, and the tabulation would be complete.

This method of comparing candidates in a series of head-to-head matchups based on voters' rankings of the candidates is commonly known as a Condorcet voting method, and the candidate who is preferred over all other candidates when tabulating ballots using a Condorcet voting method is known as the Condorcet winner. A Condorcet winner, however, does not always exist. The hand game "rock paper scissors," for instance, does not have a Condorcet winner, since none of the three options beats all the other options (rock beats scissors but loses to paper, scissors beats paper but loses to rock, and paper beats rock but loses to scissors).

In those situations where an election conducted using CRCV does not have a Condorcet winner, this bill provides for the ballots to then be counted using a traditional RCV tabulation method. As is the case for elections conducted using RCV, no voter gets to vote twice and no vote is counted twice in an election conducted using CRCV.

Although RCV is used in some elections for local office in California, no elections for public office in California are conducted using CRCV or any other Condorcet voting method. In fact, the author and supporters of this bill have indicated that they are unaware of Condorcet voting methods being used in elections for public office anywhere in the world. In light of that fact, it is particularly difficult to evaluate how CRCV might operate in practice, and how voters would react to elections conducted using CRCV. In particular, ballot tabulation in elections using CRCV would be complex, especially in races with a large number of candidates, and would be especially difficult and time consuming to verify by a manual count. That complexity in ballot tabulation could create challenges for building voter confidence in the results of elections conducted using CRCV.

3) **Vote Tabulation and Uniformity**: Although this bill establishes basic procedures for conducting elections using CRCV and for tabulating ballots in those elections, it is unclear how ballots would be tabulated in any multi-county election conducted using CRCV, including gubernatorial recall elections. Under California law, statewide elections are conducted by the counties; when an election is held for a seat that includes all or part of multiple counties, each county typically conducts its own election, and the results from each of the counties are added together to determine the winner of the seat. This procedure for conducting elections for a seat that includes all or part of multiple counties would not work with CRCV, since the tabulation of ballots under CRCV requires making comparisons of candidate rankings on all ballots, rather than simply adding raw vote totals from multiple counties.

While this bill is silent on how ballots would be tabulated in a multi-county election, the tabulation of all ballots in such a situation would need to be coordinated. Furthermore, because California counties use different voting systems, it is unclear whether all ballots could be tabulated under CRCV without re-making large numbers of ballots so that all the ballots could be tabulated by a single voting system. In fact, it is possible that some counties would need to acquire new voting systems in order to conduct an election using CRCV, since not all California voting systems have been certified to conduct elections using ranked voting.

In fact, due to considerations that are relevant for ranked voting but that are not applicable to plurality voting methods, there would be strong policy arguments for requiring a single voting system to be used by all California counties if a ranked voting method like CRCV is going to be used for statewide elections, or at the very least to require greater standardization in voting systems used by counties. For instance, as described in more detail below, California counties that conduct elections using RCV have different limitations on the number of candidates that a voter is permitted to rank. For ranked voting methods to work properly, however, it is important that all voters who are voting in a contest have the ability to rank the same number of candidates. In the absence of such uniformity, the ballots of voters who are able to rank a larger number of candidates potentially would have greater weight in determining the outcome of the election than the ballots of voters who were limited to ranking a smaller number of candidates.

Finally, while some voting systems approved for use in California have been certified to allow for elections to be conducted (and ballots to be counted) using RCV, no voting system has been tested or certified to conduct elections using CRCV, and it is unclear whether

existing voting systems would need to be modified to permit elections to be conducted using CRCV. In the absence of approved voting equipment that is capable of conducting elections and tabulating ballots using CRCV, it is unclear how the provisions of this bill would be implemented.

4) **California Jurisdictions Using Ranked Voting**: In California, the charter cities of Berkeley, Oakland, San Francisco, and San Leandro have all conducted city elections using RCV. San Francisco adopted RCV in 2002 and has used it since 2004 to elect the mayor, city attorney, Board of Supervisors, and five additional citywide offices. Berkeley, Oakland, and San Leandro have all used RCV since 2010 to elect the mayor, city council, and other city offices. Additionally, in 2020 voters in the charter cities of Albany and Eureka passed ballot measures to use RCV in future elections.

The forms of RCV used in these jurisdictions varies somewhat. When San Francisco first starting using RCV in 2003, its voting system permitted voters to rank a maximum of three candidates in each race. San Francisco started using a new voting system for elections in 2019, however, and voters are now permitted to rank up to 10 candidates in each ranked-choice contest. In Alameda County (which conducts RCV elections on behalf of Berkeley, Oakland, and San Leandro), voters similarly initially were limited to ranking three candidates in each ranked-choice race, but now have the option of ranking up to five candidates in each ranked-choice race.

5) **New Voting Methods and Statewide Elections**: As detailed above, no jurisdiction in California currently conducts elections using CRCV, and only four California cities have used any form of ranked voting in public elections in recent history. Accordingly, only a small portion of California voters have ever voted in an election for public office that used a form of ranked voting. Furthermore, it is likely that very few Californians are familiar with Condorcet voting methods generally and with CRCV in particular given the lack of use of voting methods in elections for public office, as described above.

In light of these facts, if a new voting method like CRCV is going to be used for statewide elections, an extensive voter education campaign likely would be necessary in order for the election to be administered successfully. Voters outside of the cities of Berkeley, Oakland, San Francisco, and San Leandro—more than 96% of California's registered voters—likely would need significant education on how to properly complete a ranked ballot. A statewide voter education campaign explaining the basics of how ballots are tabulated under a CRCV election would be advisable, if for no other reason than to help promote voter confidence in the election results. Furthermore, for reasons described in more detail above, conducting a statewide election using CRCV likely would require significant changes to election administration procedures and may require procurement of new voting equipment. Making those changes likely would require significant lead time.

Gubernatorial recall elections have been relatively infrequent in California history—two such elections qualified for the ballot in the last 18 years, and those also are the only two *statewide* recall elections that have been held in California's history. Because recall elections are not regularly-scheduled elections, but rather are initiated by voters submitting petitions with a specified number of signatures, it is impossible to predict when the next gubernatorial recall election might occur. Once a gubernatorial recall *does* qualify for the ballot, the election generally is held on a relatively fast timeline after qualification (as detailed above, the state

Constitution generally requires state recall elections to be held between 60 & 80 days from the date of certification of sufficient signatures on the recall petition).

Given the unpredictability of when gubernatorial recall elections will qualify and the tight timeline under which such elections generally are conducted once they qualify, it seems especially risky to require that those elections be conducted using a voting method that is not otherwise regularly used in elections in the state. That's especially true in light of the voter education and administration challenges that would be associated with using CRCV, as described above. Given the relative infrequency of statewide recall elections, voter education has been crucial when those elections have been held even when those elections were not conducted using an unfamiliar voting method. For last September's gubernatorial recall election, for example, the SOS and county elections officials spent more than $18 million on voter education related to the election. In light of all the foregoing information, the committee should consider whether it is appropriate to authorize the use of CRCV for gubernatorial recall elections, and whether it is realistic to expect such elections to be conducted successfully using CRCV in light of the aforementioned challenges.

6) **Replacement Candidate Requirements**: Section 11381 of the Elections Code provides that nominations of candidates to succeed a recalled officer "shall be made in the manner prescribed for nominating a candidate to that office in a regular election insofar as that procedure is consistent" with specified provisions of the Elections Code related to recall elections. The nomination requirements for candidates for elective state office (including Governor) other than judicial officers in regular elections generally are found in sections 8000-8150 of the Elections Code. In the case of elections for Governor, those provisions require a candidate to pay a filing fee equal to two percent of the first-year salary for the office (or to collect 7,000 signatures on an in-lieu-filing-fee petition) and to collect at least 65 valid nomination signatures. There is ambiguity in the law, however, about whether those procedures apply to recall elections, because section 8000 of the Elections Code provides that the provisions of sections 8000-8150 do not apply to recall elections.

Sections 8300-8550 of the Elections Code also contains a procedure for nominating candidates for office, though that procedure originally was designed as an independent nomination process that would allow a candidate to appear on the general election ballot without having been nominated in the primary election. Those procedures require a candidate for statewide office (which includes Governor) to collect nomination signatures from a number of voters equal to at least one percent of the total number of registered voters of the state at the time of the close of registration prior to the preceding general election. (Based on registration figures for the November 2020 general election, this would require a candidate to collect approximately 220,000 valid signatures.) Since California replaced its primary election system with a top-two primary system, however, those provisions have effectively become inoperative as they relate to offices covered by the top-two primary system, including Governor.

Faced with this ambiguity in state law, the SOS historically has applied the requirements of Sections 8000-8150 of the Elections Code to the nomination of candidates in recall elections, including for the both of the gubernatorial recall elections held in California. Under these requirements, replacement candidates in the 2003 recall election had to collect 65 valid nomination signatures and pay a filing fee of $3,500 (or collect signatures on an in-lieu-filing-fee petition); candidates in the 2021 recall election had to collect 65 valid nomination

signatures and pay a filing fee of $4,194.94 (or collect signatures on an in-lieu-filing-fee petition). In the 2003 gubernatorial recall election, the names of 135 candidates appeared on the ballot; in the 2021 gubernatorial recall election, the names of 46 candidates appeared on the ballot. (During the candidate filing process for the 2021 election, the SOS also applied a law that requires candidates for Governor to file copies of income tax returns as a condition of appearing on the ballot. Although a court determined after the candidate filing deadline had passed that this requirement did not apply to recall elections, the fact that it was being enforced by the SOS during the candidate filing period may have affected the number of candidates who filed in the 2021 election.)

7) **Technical Issues**: In a situation where an election conducted using CRCV proceeds to a determination of the winner using RCV, and in the unlikely event that there is a tie among candidates to be eliminated using RCV, this bill requires that tie to be determined based on the randomized alphabet used for the election, as specified. This bill, however, applies only to gubernatorial recall elections; at statewide elections (including gubernatorial recall elections), the order that candidates appear on the ballot is determined by a random alphabet, but that alphabet is rotated in each Assembly district such that the names of candidates for statewide office appear in different orders for different voters throughout the state. That being the case, the language of this bill does not clearly establish the manner in which the randomized alphabet would be used to break ties among candidates to be eliminated.

This bill provides that its provisions related to CRCV will become operative only if an unspecified Assembly Constitutional Amendment is approved by the voters and takes effect. Because the California Constitution provides that a candidate who receives the plurality of the votes cast among the successor candidates in a recall election is declared elected for the unexpired term of office, it appears that a constitutional amendment would be required to allow gubernatorial recall elections to be conducted using CRCV, as envisioned by this bill. However, no such constitutional amendment has been introduced.

8) **Technical Amendments**: This bill defines a term—"preferred candidate"—that is not used in the text of the bill or in existing law. Accordingly, committee staff recommends an amendment to delete that definition from the bill.

To correct a drafting error, committee staff recommends the following technical amendment:

On page 6, line 17, after "using" insert: "consensus".

9) **Arguments in Support**: In support of this bill, the Independent Voter Project writes:

> The current process for California recall elections is undemocratic. First, anyone who can write a $4,000 check can exploit our election process to garner publicity. This inevitably results in a long list of candidates, many who have no intention of being serious candidates. More consequentially, a successor can be chosen with the support of far fewer voters than those who wished to retain the governor. It is absurd.

> AB 2161 is a thoughtful and deliberative election reform that incorporates many of the voter-centric aspects of "Ranked Choice Voting" that have garnered substantial support nationwide.

If the legislature doesn't act to address something that everyday voters can see is clearly undemocratic -- the voters' only remedy will be a voter initiative that may or may not be as thoughtful and deliberative as the platform AB 2161 provides for the legislature to legislate on their behalf.

We can prevent our recall process from being a serious eyesore on California's democratic process. It starts by seriously considering reforms like AB 2161 in the chambers of our democracy.

10) **Related Legislation**: AB 2808 (O'Donnell), prohibits the use of RCV for state or local elections in California. AB 2808 was heard in this committee on April 6, 2022, and was held in committee without recommendation.

AB 2582 (Bennett), which is also scheduled to be heard in this committee today, would require a recall election for a local officer to include only the question of whether the officer sought to be recalled shall be removed from office. If the recall was successful, the office would become vacant and would be filled in the manner that vacancies in the office otherwise are filled pursuant to existing law.

AB 2584 (Berman), which is also scheduled to be heard in this committee today, makes various changes to the recall process, including increasing the number of signatures required to be included in a notice of intention to recall an officer, and requiring that local recall elections be held with the first regularly scheduled state or local election occurring not less than 88 days after the recall qualifies, as specified.

SCA 3 (Allen), proposes to eliminate the ballot question of whether or not an elected state officer should be recalled, except for judicial officers. Instead, SCA 3 provides that if a recall qualifies against an elected state officer, other than a judicial officer, the name of the officer would be placed on the ballot as a successor candidate, unless the officer resigned, as specified. SCA 3 is pending in the Senate Elections & Constitutional Amendments Committee.

SCA 6 (Newman), proposes to eliminate the election of a successor candidate as part of a recall election for an elected state officer, and instead generally provides that if an elected state officer is recalled, that the office would become vacant and would be filled in the manner that vacancies in the office otherwise are filled pursuant to existing law, except as specified. In the case of a Governor who is removed from office by recall before the close of the nomination period for the next statewide election during the first two years of the Governor's term, SCA 6 provides for a special election to be held to replace the Governor for the remainder of the unexpired term, to be consolidated with the next statewide primary election and, if necessary, the subsequent statewide general election. Because SCA 6 would eliminate the replacement candidate portion of the recall ballot in gubernatorial recall elections, its approval by voters effectively would make the provisions of this bill inoperative. SCA 6 is pending in the Senate Elections & Constitutional Amendments Committee.

11) **Previous Legislation**: Since 2006 there have been numerous bills intended to permit local jurisdictions to use RCV for either regular or special elections. All of these bills either failed

passage in the Legislature or were vetoed by the Governor, including all of the following: SB 596 (Bowen) of 2006, AB 1294 (Mullin and Leno) of 2007, AB 1121 (Davis) of 2009, AB 2732 (Eng) of 2010, SB 1346 (Hancock) of 2010, and SB 1288 (Leno) of 2016.

Most recently, SB 212 (Allen) of 2019 would have permitted a city, county, or an educational district, and subject to voter approval, to conduct a local election using RCV, as specified. SB 212 was vetoed by Governor Newsom. In his veto message, Governor Newsom stated, "Ranked choice is an experiment that has been tried in several charter cities in California. Where it has been implemented, I am concerned that it has often led to voter confusion, and that the promise that ranked choice voting leads to greater democracy is not necessarily fulfilled. The state would benefit from learning more from charter cities who use ranked choice voting before broadly expanding the system."

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Independent Voter Project

Opposition

None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Ethan Jones / ELECTIONS / (916) 319-2094