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MR. PERALES: Good afternoon. My name is Cesar Perales and I have the honor of serving as Chair of the New York City Charter Revision Commission. And I welcome all of you to this June 12th meeting of the Revision Commission.

Let me begin, as I usually do, by asking the members of the Commission who are here to introduce themselves. And I'll start on my left with John.

MR. SIEGAL: Thank You, Mr. Chair. My name is John Siegal. I'm a practicing lawyer here in Manhattan. And I guess for purposes of this panel on elections, I've previously been a campaign aide and assistant to the mayor. As well as served as counsel to citywide campaigns from 1993 through 2009.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you. My name is Angela Fernandez and I'm the executive director and supervising attorney of the northern Manhattan Coalition for immigrant rights. And for the purposes of this meeting, I have worked as the district chief of staff for Congressman Jose Serrano and as a staff aide to U.S. Senator Bill Bradley.

MR. HO: Good afternoon. My name is Dale Ho
and I am the director at the ACLU's voting rights project here at the New York ACLU's national office.

MS. WEISER: Hello. I am Wendy Weiser and I direct the democracy program at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law. Thanks for coming.

MR. PERALES: My own background is that I'm a former secretary of State of New York, former deputy mayor of the City of New York. But perhaps most importantly and most relevant to this afternoon's discussion is that I am the founder of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense Fund, now known as the Latino Justice. An organization that's been very much engaged in voting rights.

MS. CLARKE: Good afternoon. My name is Una Clarke. I'm a former member of the New York City Council. I'm the first ever immigrant from anywhere as a woman to be elected to the City council. I am the product of the 89 Charter Revision, when the council was expanded from 32 to 51. I became lucky to be the first from the Korean-American community to be elected to public office. Since that time, my daughter is now a member of the House of Representatives and I have great interest in making sure that the doors of democracy is open for those who come and want to participate in our democracy. So I'm very much interested in this. I'm an educator by profession.

MS. ANGELO: Good afternoon. I'm Liran Angelo. I'm a senior research fellow at the Institute in local governance security. And I am a former budget person. Spent many decades, too many decades, of my life doing it on both the council and the mayor side.

MR. PERALES: Before we hear from Matt Gewolb, I just want to say a few other things.

For those of you who are not familiar with our work, today we will be focusing on the administration of elections and trying to make elections more meaningful and with greater participation by the citizens. I just want to say that when the mayor first asked me to serve as chair of this commission, he made a point of telling me how important he thought our election system was. And he thought that there was a real opportunity for us to improve it. So that today's discussion with experts and amongst the Commission members is very, very important and
goes to the crux of what our Commission was established for.

Having said that, the mayor also made a point of telling me that we are to look at the entire City Charter to see what changes we think ought to be made. In that context, we've heard from lots of people since we start -- first met as a group in April. We held forums throughout the City, in each of the boroughs. And we've heard some really creative and insightful ideas about improving our Charter.

As I indicated, today's topic is going to be meaningful participation in elections. And what we're doing today is that we've called together some experts who will give us their views on some of the more important issues cited by the people from whom we heard during our community forums. There will be no taking of public testimony today. We will continue to do that in other forms. But today it's really for the Commission members to engage this panel before us and the panel will follow on some of these topics that are not just interesting, but very complex. This meeting is being live-streamed and we've got language interpreters. And we also have a sign
language interpreter.
Before I get us started, I'm going to ask Matt Gewolb, our executive director, to explain the ground rules.

MR. GEWOLB: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. And thanks to you and the Commission members for all of your works so far, obviously.

The Commission has received over 60 recommendations relating to election administration. So this is a topic that was of tremendous interest to the public as we made our way around the City in the borough forums. We've heard comments election administration voter participation ranging from early registration to changing the deadline for our changing party affiliation. So a range of proposals. I'm looking forward to hearing from the panel. I know we're all eager to hear from the esteemed panel, so we'll turn to that now.

As you mentioned, Mr. Chair, a couple of the ground rules, so to speak. We're going to allow five minutes for prepared remarks from each of the panelists.

Thank you all very much for being here.
I'll give you a two-minute warning here so
you have a sense of the time. And with that, I think we're ready to get going. So we thought that we would begin with Harry Grossman.

Mr. Grossman is the voting rights attorney at the New York Civil Liberties Union. Thanks very much for being here and for your testimony today. MR. PERALES: Matt, if I might. MR. GEWOLB: Yes. MR. PERALES: I presume that after each one of the experts has spoken, we can ask questions immediately. And then perhaps at the end, having heard from all four, we can continue our questions.

Does that make sense?
MR. GEWOLB: Yes. Absolutely.
MR. PERALES: All right. Well, let me first
introduce each of the panel members.
Perry Grossman, as you just heard, is the voting rights attorney from the New York Civil Liberties Union.

We've got Susan Lerner, the executive director of Common Cause New York.

Katherine Gray, co-president League of Women Voters of New York City.

We're waiting for Jerry Vattamala, who is
the director of the democracy program at AALDEF, the Asian-American Legal Defense Fund.

And Andrew Wilkes, Director of Policy and Advocacy, Generation Citizen.

With that, let's begin with Mr. Grossman. And just before Mr. Grossman starts, just to clarify the record, because $I$ work at the American Civil Liberties Union. And because Mr. Brisbane works at the New York Civil Liberties Union, I'm going to excuse myself during his prepared remarks.

MR. PERALES: All right. So noted.
MR. GROSSMAN: Thank You, Mr. Chair and members of the Commission for this opportunity. Good afternoon.

I was asked to discuss the state of elections in New York. What is a state issue, and what is a City issue, and what is the proper focus of the Charter Revision Commission, and how we can improve the state of elections and political participation in New York City.

So I wanted to start with the New York State Constitution itself. And Article 1, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution begins, "No member of this state shall be disfranchised."

And Article 2, Section 1 begins, "Every citizen shall be entitled to vote."

But archaic election practices regularly abridge the voting rights of thousands of New Yorkers. We lack common sense modernizations widely adopted elsewhere.

According to the National Conference of State Legislators, early voting is available in 37 states and D.C., but not New York. No-excuse absentee ballots are available in 27 states and D.C., but not New York. Automatic voter registration is available in 12 states, including Jersey and D.C., but not New York. Same-day registration is available in 17 states and D.C., but New York requires voters to register 24 -- 25 days before an election. Electronic voter registration is available in 37 states and D.C., but not New York. Last week I spoke with Kristen Rouse, of the New York City Veterans Alliance, who worked with election officials while serving in Afghanistan with the US Army. She told me that electronic voter registration was available in Afghanistan, but not New York. The results are embarrassing.

In November 2016, New York ranked 47th out
of 50 states and D.C. in registration and 44th in voter turnout. Obsolete election practices make voting a more costly and time-consuming exercise that places the heaviest burden on our most vulnerable voters; low-income, minority, and immigrant citizens. We bear high cost to maintain an old broken-down system at a time when increasing civic engagement is a moral imperative. Some reforms require state-level action. No-excuse absentee balloting and same-day voter registration will require amendments to the State Constitution, as will ending the partisan duopoly over state and county boards of elections that continues to stifle valuable reforms. Automatic voter registration, the deadline for party registration changes, primary consolidation, and early voting outside of local elections will require statutory fixes. But the City can and should ensure that its citizens' constitutional voting rights are protected by improving the quality of election administration provided to New York City voters. The City appropriates the Board of Elections' entire 115 million dollar budget. The City's unique diversity, economy, infrastructure
and geography raise unique challenge that require local solutions. The City and its constituents are entitled to election administration that meets these challenges with modern and cost effective systems consistent with the Board of Elections' statutory mandate, quote, to encourage the broadest possible participation -- voter participation in elections. Some solutions are already in maturity.

For example, Section 1057 C already requires the Board of Elections to place notices on former poll sites that give voters the means to find out where their new poll site is. The City should exercise its authority to make further reforms to local laws and be prepared to enforce them.

To that end, there are five proposals for the Charter that will increase participation and also save taxpayers money. Electronic poll books, E-poll books permit more efficient, accurate and cost effective management of voter data and polling places than paper poll books. They will shorten lines at the polls, help poll workers direct voters to their correct polling places, and save printing costs.

Most importantly, E-poll books can store the
full set of registered voters in New York City, while paper poll books omit inactive voters. Voters left off the rolls are forced to cast affidavit ballots that are less likely to be counted later. E-poll books will result in more voters casting ballots that get counted.

Finally, E-poll books can get New York ready to implement early voting and election day registration. For counties in New York State, Onondaga, Cayuga, Orange and Cortland, have already successfully piloted the use of electronic poll books.

The electronic transmission of registration forms. Right now the DMV assists New Yorkers in registering to vote and electronically transmits those forms, photostatic signatures and all, directly to the Board of Elections. Which receives them instantaneously and securely. Motor voter accounts for approximately 28 percent of all registration statewide. In New York City, many residents have no business with the DMV.

The City Board of Elections only receives about 10 percent of registrations through motor voter. But plenty of other City agencies come intact -come in contact with unregistered but eligible
voters and currently have or could adopt the same technological capabilities as the DMV. New York City agencies should adopt these technologies and transmit registrations electronically to the Board of Elections. Registrations in New York City should not be subject to a more costly time-consuming and less secure process than elsewhere in the state.

Early voting. Absentee ballots are not easily available. Working family obligations, health and transportation issues, and unexpected obstacles can make it difficult to vote in person near home on a Tuesday. Early voting in local elections can make sure that all voters have a convenient time to vote and allow New York City to serve as a model for the rest of the state.

Language assistance. The Federal Voting Rights Act is a floor, not a ceiling, for the extent of the language assistance that the City can provide voters. Others here will testify more competently on this point. But we echo their call to ensure that the language assistance provided to New York City voters better reflects the diversity of the City.

And finally, the right to vote. The Charter
is a place to affirm the City's fundamental commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and the essential role of political participation in protecting both. To that end, the City Charter should offer express protection for the right to vote in local elections. An express right to vote sends an unambiguous message that the health of our democracy depends on clinical participation and that New York City thrives when more of its residents are engaged. It also sets the stage for New York to consider joining other cities that have expanded access to the franchise in a number of ways $I$ think other members of the panel can discuss more thoroughly.

I thank the Commission for the opportunity to share these views with you today and I look forward to answering your questions.

MR. PERALES: I'll exercise the prerogative of the Chair and ask the first question.

I am still not clear as to what it is that the City can do without violating state laws. For example, you mentioned absentee ballots, their importance. I have to believe that if we had a more flexible way of letting people vote or an absentee ballot would make a big difference.

But as I understand it, state law, which draws to authority from our constitution, State Constitution, seems to limit the grant of an absentee ballot to people who are seriously ill or disabled. Could -- is it your opinion, Mr. Grossman, that we could expand that? Could we, for example, in New York on its own, decide that people with childcare responsibilities that they can't avoid, could they, for example, ask for an absentee ballot and receive an absentee ballot? That's just an example. But it's one that obviously comes to mind.

MR. GROSSMAN: It's an excellent question, Mr. Chair.

I would say it's sort of a facial matter, right. The no-excuse absentee issue comes directly from the New York State Constitution. Which is, frankly unfortunately, obnoxious. So it does limit who can have access to an absentee ballot to people expressing good cause. Your question is, can the City of New York help define what -- what could cause its right. So the -the constitution, as I recall off the top of my head, talks about, in addition to the disabilities you've described, people who will be
absent from the jurisdiction on Election Day, right. I am not aware of anything that necessarily cabins the City's authority to describe what good cause is. And to push it in directions that potentially expand the definition, I would suggest that the City is better off begging for forgiveness than asking for permission on this score. The fact is a lot of this has not been litigated, so we don't know what the courts have said on it. We don't have a lot of statutory guidance. And so, to the extent that there is an inkling that there are causes that the City thinks that are especially worthy of further consideration, $I$ would urge the Commission to put it on the record. And, at a minimum, you know, it's setting the groundwork for important state reforms later. But as I sit here, $I$ can't give an authoritative opinion on whether the City could unilaterally do that. But I would say that where the law is ambiguous, it is always better to push in the direction of expanding access to democracy, rather than contract it.

MS. CLARKE: I'd like -- I'd like to just follow up with a question on absentee ballots and the way they get counted.

We all know that on election night everybody get excited and they call a winner. Which means if the winner gets X amount of votes, nobody knows when the absentee ballots are counted. Or if those absentee ballot can -- would overturn somebody's victory.

What is your thought on that?
MR. GROSSMAN: With great respect, Chairman Clarke, Commissioner Clarke, I don't have a view on that. But perhaps one of my co-panelists does.

MS. GRAY: My understanding -- Catherine Gray, from the League of Women Voters. My understanding from the Board of Elections, they count the ballots -- open the absentee ballots on Friday after the election. And they do count them all. But -- and they don't certify the election results until that is done. That's the reason why the election results are not permanent -- what's the word?

MR. GROSSMAN: Certified.
MS. GRAY: Certified. Thank you.
Early -- I mean, they don't certify them election right.

MR. PERALES: Wendy will go next.
MS. WEISER: Okay. Thank you.
So one is a clarifying question to what you just were asked.

Is your proposal that the City define good cause for no excused absentee -- for every absentee ballots for all races or only for municipal races? The same question about early voting. I'm assuming that you are recommending only for municipal races, not for all races; is that correct?

MR. GROSSMAN: That is correct.
MS. WEISER: And so a follow-up question, then on the -- so but -- but for the absentee ballots, you're -- is the proposal similarly limited to municipal?

MR. GROSSMAN: That -- that's correct. But only because $I$ haven't done the research to suggest it could go further. I'm not saying that it could not. And again, my position is the extent the law is ambiguous, state law's ambiguous, the constitution is ambiguous. Push it.

MS. WEISER: And the follow-up question there is, is your suggestion that the Home Rule

Law then allows New York City to make changes as it applies to municipal elections? So it's not really an interpretation of the state races, it's actually just governing its own races; is that correct?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's correct.
MS. WEISER: And then -- so now on the early voting, $I$ just had then a practical question.

The -- since this will apply only to municipal elections, have you given any thought as to whether or not that might induce people to not vote in the non-municipal elections that are on the race by voting early for a municipal race, and then not voting in the others? And how do you -- how have you weighed that or -- I'm just questioning --

MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. Let me just make sure I understand it for answer.

So would expanding early voting for municipal elections decrease participation in non-municipal elections?

MS. WEISER: Yes. That are -- that are on the same --

MS. GRAY: That are on the same ballot. DA, judges, etc.

MS. WEISER: Yes. The ones that are -- that we're voting for in the same election. And if so -- so have you considered that question? Or if not, is that something that is worth considering? And if it is, I'm just wondering if that proposal could be made for municipal elections where that happened when there aren't also other races at the same time.

MR. GROSSMAN: So let me answer that in --
MS. WEISER: Yes.
MR. GROSSMAN: -- a couple of different parts.

The first is, $I$ don't -- I don't have any statistical studies to suggest what the impact would be. So I haven't done that analysis. You know, again, I think expanding -- part of what I would like to encourage the City to do is to lead, right. And to the extent we can expand early voting in one area, $I$ think it's likely to lead to early voting in other areas shortly thereafter. So my hope is that, should we come across the conundrum where we have municipal, where we saw we have early voting for some local offices but not others, that that's not something we have to live with for a very long time. But,
right, obviously for at least one election, that would be a possibility. So my suggestion would be the -- the gains made by expanding early voting and by allowing more people to participate are much more likely to outweigh any loss that might occur from people voting early and not voting for certain offices. Because the people you're going to capture voting early are people who might not have voted on election day at all. And so by bringing new voters into the system, and this is maybe a much more normative argument, but voting is a habit. And the more we can get people into the habit of voting, the more they're going to do it.

MR. PERALES: Let me just -- point of clarification because this is getting my own mind a little bit confused.

We talked a moment ago about the restrictions on absentee ballots that exist in state law. Are you suggesting that we could go beyond the current ability or opportunities to get an absentee ballot if we had, quote, a municipal election? Or are you suggesting that we assume that we can push it for all elections?

MR. GROSSMAN: So I can -- I can sit here
and speak confidentially about municipal elections --

MR. PERALES: You're confident that the state restrictions do not apply to City elections?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's -- that is my understanding. Is that state -- the Home Rule Law gives New York City and -- and other municipalities in the state, extensive control over their own elections and government. And New York City has allowed a lot of leeway to -- to do things to its own elections. To the extent that they don't interfere with state elections. You know, there are more ambiguous areas that we can discuss. But the City has extensive control over its own elections.

MS. ANGELO: Hi. I wanted to ask a couple of questions on electronic registration and electronic, $I$ guess, registration books. The things you go to see when you go to vote. Do you have -- can you have one without the other?

MR. GROSSMAN: Can you have -- just to make sure. Can you have electronic poll books without electronic registration?

MS. ANGELO: Correct.

MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
MS. ANGELO: Do you have a sense of the cost of implementing each of those, electronic poll books and electronic registration.

MR. GROSSMAN: I don't -- I don't have cost estimates as I sit here today. But we are talking about cost savings, not cost to the City, right. We are replacing printed paper poll books which contain only, you know, a fraction of the City's voters. And those -- those costs are instead replaced with reusable electronic poll books that can be updated regularly without having to reprint and be used year after year after year. With respect to electronic registration -- and when I say electronic registration, $I$ don't want to confuse the notion of people registering fully online with Social Security numbers and whatnot. I am simply talking about the very limited reform of replicating what the DMV does. Where you are there, you sign your name, they basically take a picture of it, and they send it to the Board of Elections, and the Board of Elections receives it electronically. Right now other forms have to pass in paper over the desk and there's a
tremendous drop-off. So if we have a system whereby New York City agencies were able to replicate what the DMV does, which is not a technological marvel by any stretch of the imagination, I think you would see a substantial reduction in cost because you are going to see, one, for your forms printed. Two, less -because there's -- they're sort of instantaneous transmission and greater security, forms are going to be received with a greater accuracy that require less human correction on the back end. But we can certainly look into what those cost savings would be. But I do think they are cost savings and not cost generation.

MS. ANGELO: And there's no state prohibition on this?

MR. GROSSMAN: None.
MS. ANGELO: Thank you.
MR. PERALES: I'm told we're spending too much time on one panelist. But I'm going to let them -- Wendy follow up with one clarification question.

MS. WEISER: Do you have a -- you recommend electronic voter registration at City agencies automatic voter registration, as well, or just
electronic at this point?
MR. GROSSMAN: So sitting here talking about the City Charter, what I'm recommending is end to end electronic transmission of voter registration. I think automatic voter registration is great public policy and it should absolutely be enacted. Don't sit here today with a view as to what the City's authority to enact automatic voter registration is. I'm certainly not saying they can't do it. But $I$ don't want to sit here and tell you that you can.

MR. PERALES: Thank you, Mr. Grossman.
Let's move on as quickly as we can to Susan Lerner.

MS. LERNER: Thank you very much to the Commission for this opportunity to talk about this fascinating and complex question of improving election administration and voter turnout. There is no easy answer and no magic silver bullet, unfortunately. And, as I think Perry Grossman has indicated, the State of New York state law doesn't help us in this endeavor at all. And, in fact, there is an ongoing controversy between the New York City Board of Elections and the New York City Council and the
mayor's office as to what the responsibilities of the New York City Board is in following City law. So you're talking about a difficult and gray area. Let me give you two quick examples. On when we're talking about expanding language access, which is something which Common Cause strongly supports, we have a vivid example of how the New York City Board of Elections refused to follow New York City law last November, when the city council appropriated additional monies to provide Russian language and Haitian Creole translators and the mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs recruited and trained nonpartisan translators to go out to voting locations, polling places, where you have a need for those translators. I personally witnessed the fact that the New York City Board of Elections threw the translators out of the polling places and required them to stand 100 feet away from the entrance to the polling place, significantly interfering with their ability to offer their services to people who might need it. Secondly, we have another example. The City Charter, as it currently stands, has a provision which requires the New York City Board of

Elections to provide a voter information portal that was added to the Charter in 2016, effective January 1, 2017. And as part of that requirement, the New York City Board of Elections is directed to include information which will allow a voter to track the progress of their -the receipt and mailing of their absentee ballot application and absentee ballot through a barcode system that conforms with the requirements of the U.S. Postal system. The Board, to my knowledge, has never discussed that requirement and it certainly has not implemented it.

This past month -- actually, at the end of April, it turns out that the Brooklyn Postal Service, U.S. Postal Service, delivered over a hundred thousand absentee ballots on April 24 and 25 to the New York City Board and said, "oops, we lost them." These were ballots -- absentee ballots which should have been delivered of -- in relation to the New York City November 2017 general election. And over a hundred thousand New York City residents were disenfranchised because their absentee ballots were untraceable because of the Board's failure to follow City law. So I think you have an interesting proposition in front of you. Which is, you can consider a lot of reforms. But if the Board is going to ignore the requirements and the City is not going to enforce the requirements, then we're going to have a very interesting theoretical discussion. So I have some very specific suggestions as to what can be done to strengthen the City's argument. Which frankly, I think is going to have to be resolved through litigation.

First, we believe that the Charter should be amended to very specifically amplify the state constitutional right to vote. There is a public policy interest in New York City in expanding and protecting the franchise of its residents for New York City elections and I think that should be expressed. And I think that the City voters should have an opportunity to adopt that for the Charter because, frankly, I think it will strengthen the argument that the City Board must follow City law.

Secondly, I believe that we should be using the budget process to ensure greater accountability of the Board of Elections. Currently the State of -- New York State law by statute, and as explained and interpreted by case
law, indicates that the Board has absolute discretion without any oversight to hire and fire its staff up to the maximum budget allocation for staff provided by the local legislature. It is absolutely silent on oversight for other issues. And so I know, for instance, that there was some discussion at the Council level about instituting electronic poll books and being willing to pay for it. Apparently, that went nowhere because you can't get cooperation from the Commission. So I believe that the terms and conditions process and the reporting process in the budget could be used to provide more accountability and more reporting. And I recommend some areas for that in my very summary written testimony.

Additionally, we believe that the Charter could clarify that the City Conflicts Of Interest Law applies to the Board of Elections. There is a 1996 Corporation Counsel decision which says that the Board is exempt from those requirements. We believe that is outdated and incorrect. And we believe that a simple addition to Charter Section 2604(b)15 to include commissioners of the Board of Elections among the offices subject to the Conflicts Of Interest Law would be a worthy
addition to our City law. We believe that VAAC, the Voter Administration Assistance Commission, can be strengthened and expanded. We believe it should be an independent agency, with its own guaranteed budget. And we believe that there is a continuum of City programs that encourage participation in the broadest sense that include volunteerism and the continuum all the way through civic engagement to voting, which should be housed under one agency so that the message is clear to the public that our City endorses the broadest type of participation and that one type of participation interlocks with the other. So the people who are receiving information about volunteerism should be encouraged to become civically engaged in other forms and in voting. And people who are receiving information about voting should be receiving information about other forms of engagement. I think having this under one body will mean the City's efforts and expenditures in this regard will be much more effective, with a unified message, and we don't have unnecessary duplication or contradiction. Finally, we believe that the Commission should resist the temptation to load the Charter

Revision with a lot of election reform proposals. We have no election modernization and reform in our state and it would be inviting to add every single reform that we can think of. But I think that there are two reasons that would argue against that.

First, I think administratively you can't go from zero to 60 instantaneously. Every election administrator $I$ have talked to in states that have significant modernization has emphasized how it has been a gradual incremental process that allows the administrators to actually handle the changes.

Secondly, I think we should be picking an area where the argument is strongest, that the City can effect the change. And I would suggest to you that that is in the rank-choice voting area. You have to worry about contradictions in the Constitution of the state that may or may not apply. And I believe that rank-choice voting not limited to run-offs, which we'll talk about later, would be a very effective and transformative reform for the City to start with. Thank you.

MR. PERALES: Yeah. I sort of dominated the
questioning before. I'd like -- oh. I'd like to recognize the fact that Rachel Godsil, our Vice Chair, has joined the Commission panel.

Questions?
Well then I have one. I always have one. Ms. Lerner, I am intrigued by the fact that you talk about this one agency that you think will make a big difference in getting people involved in elections, as well as volunteerism. I'm going to play the devil's advocate.

We already have an agency that is supposed to encourage voting.

Do you know?
MS. LERNER: Yes.
MR. PERALES: So why bother trying to revitalize a dead horse?

MS. LERNER: So, you know, I think what we have seen with the last Charter Revision, which placed the VAAC in the Campaign Finance Board and transformed -- it now refers to itself as NYC Votes, providing more staffing and more funding has actually revitalized the City's messaging around elections and participation in a way that I think is positive and I think will have some long-term impacts. As we know, it's very
difficult to move the needle on voter turnout. There's no one silver bullet. But the fact that the City has made a commitment and is starting to speak more effectively and in a more unified voice, I think helps the prospects for improving voter turnout for the City. What I'm suggesting is not eliminating VAAC. I'm suggesting combining it and expanding it.

The -- my sense is that the agency that deals with volunteerism -- and I'm forgetting the name. I just looked at it on the internet and it's out of my mind -- is doing a pretty effective job of getting the word out. And we're seeing more advertising regarding voting. And there seem to be a separation in the public's mind about these different types of engagement. What I'm suggesting is pooling the resources, pooling the expertise, and making it clearer to the public that there are a lot of ways to be engaged. You engage in one, you should also engage in the others, as well. And I think that's more efficient economically and from a messaging point of view. So that's why I'm suggesting combining those efforts, expanding them, and giving them staff and budgetary independence.

MR. PERALES: Rachel.
MS. GODSIL: So I just wanted to try to understand the argument that you're making as to the concerns you have about the New York City Board of Elections.

Am I correct in understanding that because of those concerns and because of the degree to which you described the Board not following previous Charter Revision Commission adoptions, that there's -- that's the reason you think that this Board should be mindful? Or are you suggesting there's something that could be done in this -- by us in this process that could actually help implement and make alive that which has already occurred?

MS. LERNER: Well, that's -- that's why I make specific recommendations about including a very specific right to vote in City elections in the Charter. And also using the budget process, which I understand is being used --

MS. GODSIL: Is that how -- okay. I just want to understand.

If -- so your point appears to be that if there's a specific right to vote, which obviously
already exists at the constitutional level, it simply makes more robust a litigation effort? Because I'm not sure that I'm understanding precisely the direct link, causal link --

MS. LERNER: I think -- I think it does make more -- more robust a litigation position. And it might actually embolden the city council to try and enforce the law. Or the Corporation Counsel. There is nothing which stops our elected officials or appointed officials from enforcing the law, except that they don't have the courage to do so. If they had a direction from the voter, perhaps they would feel it's important to be sure that our election law is not being flaunted by what is actually a City agency.

MS. GODSIL: But as -- in terms of the number of -- in terms of the prioritization of choices that this Board makes, obviously it has to be thoughtful about the number that we put on the ballot. That would be high up on your list, as opposed to some of the other suggestions that have been made?

MS. LERNER: Yes. It is high up on my list.
MR. PERALES: John.
MR. SIEGAL: So we're going to have a panel later.

But if I understand your testimony, you're saying there are problems with the Board of Elections, that it hasn't implemented relatively ministerial mandate to prepare a Charter Revision. And if so, go slow on election reform. But the principle thing we should do is completely overhaul the ballot and the way that votes are counted and hand that to this agency that you're complaining about. And I really -- I wonder about that. Like can we put the merits of rank-voting aside --

MS. LERNER: Right.
MR. SIEGAL: Can it be implemented by this agency that Perry has indicated is the last bastion of partisanship and that you've indicated doesn't carry out small mandates, can we really trust that that will be implemented properly?

MS. LERNER: I think that there have been instances where the Board has been forced to comply, for instance, with federal law. And when a system has been set in place, where the requirements are clearly spelled out, they actually managed to do it. It's more a question of the clarity of direction and setting up a
clear management system. We, at Common Cause, were forced to sue the Board for compliance with the National Voting Registry Act. And the settlement based setting up a procedure for the Board to comply. And it appears that they are following that procedure. So I think it definitely can be done. And I think it has to be done. I think the voters of New York require an improved election administration. And the first step to that is bringing the New York City Board up to the requisite accountability and transparency.

MR. SIEGAL: Thank you.
MS. WEISER: Thank you for your testimony. A few questions.

So one is on the New York City Board of Elections.

Do you -- what -- have you thought about other mechanisms to ensure that they comply with the law? Things like actually a private right of action for some of the -- and have you thought about the limitations that it's also a creature of state election law and how does that affect your recommendations?

MS. LERNER: Yeah. I would actually be very
supportive of a private right of action that is specified in the Charter, in addition to just an Article 78, which is something act -- no -proceeding. Which is something that we look at on a regular basis.

And, I'm sorry, the second part?
MS. WEISER: And then I'm just wondering if there are other robust ways that you've thought through to ensure the Board actually complies or put in place through the (inaudible) of mechanisms. Because it sounds like the budget recommendations you were making are not actually Charter reforms that you're requesting. Or are they?

MS. LERNER: They are. Yes, they are. And I think the impetus behind conflict of interest requirement is specifically influenced directly through the appointment process to be sure with people who appointed to the Board. Also prioritize the interest of the political parties, as required by the State Constitution, but also hopefully required by the City Charter, the interests of the voters of New York City.

MS. WEISER: And then the last question relates to the VAAC recommendations.

Are you recommending that the VAAC be removed from the Campaign Finance Board, be made independent and merged with the Office Of Civic Engagement? Or are you -- or do -- are you recommending that the Campaign Finance Board be part of that, as well?

MS. LERNER: I would separate it from the Campaign Finance Board. And I think the entity that I'm thinking of is Service NYC. And what I really hope we do not see at the end of the process is that the mayor sends out some independent civic engagement officer that the VAAC exists in the Campaign Finance Board and now we create some new office of civic engagement and they're all basically trying to do versions of the same thing without coordination and in duplication of costs and staff. That's why what I'd like to see is one unified body that really thinks about this process. This is a continuum that all City agencies should be involved in and that there should be a vigorous public education and agency education process to hold all of the City activities accountable for encouraging more public participation.

MR. PERALES: We're going to need to move on.

Catherine Gray.
MS. GRAY: Thank you very much for inviting the League of Women Voters. We're a multi-issue nonpartisan volunteer organization.

Assuring fair and transparent elections and encouraging active and informed voters has always been the mission of the League. For many years members have regularly attended weekly meetings of the commissioners of the Board of Elections. Every Tuesday we have somebody there taking notes. We've had small successes by raising our hands and asking questions there. Such as convincing the Board to get rid of those little voter cards that was recommended in the Justice report and the Commission -- the independent commission that they hired. We got the Board to put the voting instructions on the privacy sleeves and tabs on poll books. A lot of people think that's kind of small, but it speeds up finding the button -- voters name in the book. Because it seemed to be that a lot of co-workers didn't know the alphabet. They didn't know R came -- didn't come after $B$.

The other qualification $I$ have is I am a coordinator. I had a poll site in Brooklyn. I've been working in the polls since 1998. Coordinators from 2-06, I think. When we proposed and created a poll site, specific street addresses instead of the big fat book for Kings County. And we work with college and with other good government grant groups to get sample ballots on the Board's website. We've also made suggestions and election night reporting that has reduced the waste of paper, time and accuracy. We have been frustrated by the Board's insistence that they are administrative agency created by New York state Election Law and not compelled to comply with New York City laws or directions.

So here's my recommendations that might improve the functioning. Because my direction was how to make the Board function better. All full-time jobs should be covered by the New York City Civil Service Law. Some suggestions are -in the same suggestions are in this report and by the outside contractor. Right now it's partisan and nepotism is the way you get your job there. You do not post. Better poll worker training, which used mock poll sites and emphasize hands-on training instead of lectures. Making -- giving the poll worker and the coordinator real-life situations to practice so that when they are confronted with the situations, they'd handle it better. Establish same-day registration for municipal workers. Increase the poll worker pay. Section 3420 of the New York State Election Law allows the mayor of the City of New York to raise the poll worker pay by an executive order. The rate of the pay should be reviewed every five years. People complained that for an 18 -hour day, the pay is not good enough. I know that you get paid -- you pay -- what you pay is what you get in workers. So if you're not paying for high quality workers, you don't get high quality workers.

The second is in the state law. If split shifts are now not only written in the law, but there now don't have to be half days. They could be four hours. The New York City Board does not want to consider the administration of this task, but it should be fairly easy for them. Because every poll worker gets a single bar code. And that would -- it would be all electronic. In my poll site, we did split shifts twice to -- the Board allowed our poll site to have split shifts
and we had no problems. Improve voter communications. Currently the state law requires the Board only to send out one notice. And it looks like a CBS flyer. And it gets lost in the shuffles. We would like to see something sent out right before the Board -- the general election saying, "please vote." A form should be created to allow family members to sign an affidavit notifying the Board of Election of a death in the family. This form should be at the poll site. When you're working in the polls, I can't tell you how many people tell us that their person is -- their family member's dead. And it sometimes 20 years and it's still in the books. This would help, you know, lots of ways to cut -create the books to be clean. Early voting for citywide elections, electronic poll books, improve Wi-Fi connectivity in all poll sites, increase the oversight of the control by the controller of city agencies in compliance with Local Law 29, which requires anybody that is working -- that has contact with the City agency should be able to get their signature or the wet signature sent to the Board of Elections and be able to do more. We also believe highly in civic
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education should be more mandatory in all ages of schools. And the League supports instant run-off voting.

Thank you for this chance to talk about --
MR. PERALES: Thank you.
Any questions from the commissioners?
Liran.
MS. ANGELO: My question is this, if we've been hearing nothing but problems in the Board of Elections. Why do we think any of these reforms could ever actually happen? Particularly the E-poll books. Because if the poll workers couldn't do the alphabet, how can we expect they could deal with E-poll books?

MS. GRAY: I do believe the E-poll books are things that they are looking forward to doing. And they can see the value of -- that would reduce on their work by having a -- every E book has a whole voter registration and it could be updated hourly. I don't think there's any problem there. They've implemented iPads at the poll sites. That is for the instruction of helping poll worker direct the voter to the right ED table. So they're not that far off.

MR. PERALES: I'm going to ask a follow-up
question. I think you can answer it.
It has to do with the fact that -- do you think that the City Charter should include a description of E-poll books or any other ministerial part of the election process?

MR. GROSSMAN: I think clarity and legal drafting is a good idea. I think that, to the extent the Charter can give more direction, the better. At the same time, the challenge is not to go so far that you end up limiting yourself, to where you define E-poll books into a way that cabins innovation later. But do I think that any definition of E-poll books? Yes. And I would actually define E-poll books in the Charter consistent with state law. If you look at -- off the top of my head, I want to say it's 5 -Election Law 5-106, which provides specifications for poll books. You can describe E-poll books that should be used by the Board of Elections to conform to the levels of resolution and clarity, efficiency, speed. All those things. To make sure that the City is on -- is on all fours with the technological solutions it's suggesting at the Board events.

> And if I may just go back to your question
about the Board of Elections, or something Mr. Siegal raised earlier, is the Charter needs to be a vital document, right. And so Susan's caution that we don't want to throw too many proposals out there because, you know, we don't want to make things too difficult for administrators and whatnot. You know, those are -- those are good prudential cautionary things. But at the same time, the City should make good public policy. And the City should be willing to stand by that public policy. The Charter should be the best statement of the City's public policy. And if the Board of Elections is going to be recalcitrant, then the City should enforce it and make the Board of Elections adhere to the best statements of the City's public policy. So I would say, let's not back down from the challenge just because we're facing resistance. I would say let's -- let's go stronger and -- and have a charter that reflects our -- our best ideas and brings as much force as we can to ensuring that New Yorkers have access to their state constitutional rights to vote.

MS. CLARKE: I just want to find out from either of you who have already testified, but more particularly the Board of Elections.

When 10, 15, 20 percent of registered voters can decide who the elected official is, is there something that we're not doing right? We'll go out, we register people. How do we get them to the polls and for them to believe that in the democracy, that is the way it work and, therefore, as a person they have an obligation? Is there any thought on that? MS. GRAY: It's something the League is challenged with on a daily basis, how to get the vote out. We're starting to use e-mail. I do believe the Board of Elections should have e-mail to keep telling the voters an election is coming. Especially for those special opens, when a thousand votes or 300 votes -- where actually one vote made a difference on a special election. I think education is needed in the high school so people understand why it is and what their jobs are supposed to be a good citizen.

MR. PERALES: Thank you.
Oh. You were going to say something before we move along?

MS. GRAY: Yeah. This is a question. Technically -- right now there are different
tools that can be used. Last November we had a pilot project where we're using text banking to occasional (inaudible) voters. And we increased their turnout rate for the New York -- from the 2016 presidential election to the City election by a considerable amount. From about 20 percent to about 32 percent turnout. It's the only group of voters I'm aware of that are large enough for the City election than turned out for the presidential election in New York State. There are techniques, but $I$ think it requires, again, a willingness to use creative solutions.

MR. PERALES: The next name on my list is Jerry Vattamala.

MR. VATTAMALA: Good afternoon. Thank you for having me. It's a -- we're always pleased when the Asian-American perspective can be heard. I am the director of the democracy program at the Asian-American Legal Defense and Education Fund. AALDEF was founded in 1974. We're headquartered right here in New York. Some of you may be aware that we conduct a national Asian-American exit poll and poll monitoring program every major election. Including the presidentials, the midterms, but even elections like last year for the New York City -- for New York City mayor and city council elections. We have several hundred volunteers that are stationed outside of poll sites that conduct interviews with voters after they have voted or been denied the right to vote. We also have teams of attorneys that conduct poll monitoring that are inside the poll site. So my comments are really going to focus more on language access. Particularly for Asian-American voters.

In 1990, after Chinese was covered for Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens, there were many problems with -- the New York City Board of Elections had. They had dispatched Mandarin-speaking interpreters to Chinatown, where everybody spoke Cantonese. The Cantonese-speaking interpreters in Flushing, where everybody spoke Mandarin. And they came back to us and said, "Well, isn't it the same thing," right? And so we -- we had some big problems there.

In 2000, after Korean was covered in Queens County, we had Korean interpreters in Chinatown. We had Chinese interpreters in Bayside, Queens, in Korean-speaking neighborhoods. So there were
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We still had a view with the City that requires them to have meetings with language advisory groups and to comply with their obligations. They still, unfortunately, consistently do not have the minimum number of Korean interpreters at the poll sites that are covered for language assistance. It's a consistent problem that we've seen over the years and it's still not being addressed.

We also had to sue the Board of Elections in 2013 for failing to comply with Section 203 for Asian-Indian language assistance in Queens County. The designated Indian language there is Bengali. The Board failed to provide Bengali ballots for five consecutive elections after that language was designated. The only way we were
able to get Bengali ballots in Queens was through litigation. We had to sue the Board in 2013.

In settling the case with us, the Board refused to establish a Bengali language advisory group. We have the same equivalent groups for Chinese and Korean. They refused to acknowledge or establish that advisory group, which we think is very problematic.

We have also apprised the Board of a demonstrated need for Bengali language assistance at targeted poll sites in the Bronx and Brooklyn. Now, the Board is not covered under Section 203 for Bengali language assistance in those boroughs. But if there was a way that, through some type of language in the Charter that could require the Board to provide language assistance when a certain magic number is reached, that would be extremely helpful. There are such provisions, for example, in the D.C. -Washington, D.C. Language Access Act in 2003. The magic number there is 300 . If you have 300 residents that need a city service that also require language assistance, or they don't speak English at all, the D.C. Language Access Act requires that agency to provide language assistance in those -- in those languages that show a demonstrated need.

Under that provision, we were able to send a demand letter before the 2014 midterm elections demanding that Chinese language assistance be provided at certain targeted poll sites. And the D.C. Board of Elections provided Chinese language assistance. We similarly did the same thing before the 2016 presidential election, requesting Vietnamese language assistance at a targeted poll site in Washington D.C. And the -- the Board there again complied.

So those are, you know, some of the issues that we're seeing is the lack of interpreters. Sometimes it's the wrong interpreters. Having the advisory groups established and having them meet with us twice a year, or having the Board meet with the advisory groups twice a years is very helpful. Because of the MOU for Chinese and Korean, we have these meetings twice a year. Our next meeting is on Monday, June 18th. And it's very helpful. If the Board had such meetings with the Bengali advisory group, having it establishing it and meeting with them, that also, I think, would like likewise be -- be very helpful.

We have comments that we'd like to submit regarding redistricting and rank-choice voting. But I understand there's other hearings on those. So we will reserve our comments for that.

MR. PERALES: Thank you very much.
Rachel.
MS. GODSIL: Of the concerns that you described, is there language specifically for the Charter that you would recommend that would address as holistically as possible to set up concerns that you described?

MR. VATTAMALA: Yeah. So we -- we would have to conduct some more research on our end before, you know, submitting something. Because we're not -- we're actually not sure what -- if it could be enforced, what we're seeking. I mean, I'm laying out the problems to you and leaving it to you to figure out and see if it's something that could be enforced. We're happy to work with you on that. We just haven't done the research to see if there were something in there that would require something beyond what the federal law provides if that could be enforced.

MS. GODSIL: So basically you're inviting --
you're inviting various solutions to the set of concerns you addressed?

MR. VATTAMALA: Right. Right. Regarding specifically Asian language assistance. And we know where the need is and where it's not being met.

MR. PERALES: Marco.
MR. CARRION: You mentioned the D.C.
Language Act. Two questions with that.
The first is, is this -- you said there was a threshold. Now, is that when services -- is this any City agency?

MR. VATTAMALA: Right. It's very broad. It says City services.

MR. CARRION: Okay. Could this also be pegged to students in a school? I know we look at that and we look at language needs, as well.

MR. VATTAMALA: Right. So it could absolutely be included for City services, including for students and schools and the families that are limited (inaudible) borrowing services from the school.

MR. CARRION: And when you say "broad," is it open to any language -- any language need? Or is there a subset of languages that are --

MR. VATTAMALA: There's no restriction.
MR. CARRION: So it could be any language?
MR. VATTAMALA: Right.
MR. HO: Thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. Vattamala. I understand you're not prepared today to suggest, you know, a particular language that could go into the Charter. And that's fine. But I think something that might be helpful in a subsequent submission would be if were to adopt something along the lines of the D.C. law that you mentioned at a particular numerical threshold -- it wouldn't have to necessarily by D.C.'s, it could be something else. It could be pegged to a particular geographic unit. Some understanding of, you know, how that would change New York City's existing language assistance obligations, which languages might then be covered in which places, you know. And some sense of what that might mean practically and cost-wise I think would help this body make an assessment as to whether or not that -- it's something that we should put on the ballot for November.

One question about something that you didn't address. Which is some suggestions that we heard
at some of our public hearings in the boroughs for changing eligibility requirements for voting in local elections.

Do you have any thoughts or views on proposals, say, for noncitizen voting in local elections?

MR. VATTAMALA: Right. You know, we're part of the coalition that's working on that effort to make that happen here in New York City.

We do believe New York City has the authority to implement noncitizen voting. And I should say restore noncitizen voting. We've had noncitizen voting in the City for several decades in the school board level. It was a bit different because that was enacted through state legislation. But the process has been done before and we didn't have any problems. And for Asian-Americans, actually, that was the one place before a certain time period -- and, for example, the 1990's -- the only place where there was Asian-American electoral success. Where Asian-Americans were being elected to the school board at very high numbers. But we are in support of noncitizen voting, restoring those rights. But we are still trying to work out --
there are several issues there. Some possible unintended consequences of noncitizens mistakenly voting in state or federal elections. And we're still trying to work within our group to have the best possible resolution to prevent that from happening.

MR. HO: Do you have any sense for how citizenship rates vary in the City among different race and ethnic groups?

MR. VATTAMALA: Actually, $I$ do not know the differences between the different racial groups. I do know that the turnout rates are low for all racial groups, unfortunately, but for Asian-Americans. So we tend to have one of the lowest turnout rates.

In terms of citizenship, that's something that -- part of our whole package that we do in the democracy program of encouraging naturalization and registration, coming out to vote. In certain neighborhoods there's actually a majority of residents that are noncitizens. For example, the city council level. And restoring voting rights to noncitizens would have a drastic and we think positive effect at city council, state assembly, and especially some of
these smaller legislative levels.
MR. PERALES: I'd like to move on now to Andrew Wilkes.

MR. WILKES: Good afternoon. Thank you to the Commission for allowing us the opportunity to share in the theme of meaningful participation in elections. I serve as Generation Citizen's director of policy and advocacy. And for context, Generation Citizen is an eight-year-old civics education organization, whose mission is to ensure that every child receives an action civics education. I lay out that mission because it's in response to what one of the members mentioned in terms of as part of the solution to making sure that we can have folks prepared to exercise their right to vote in a turnout. And I think civics education is a part of the answer there.

Generation Citizen in New York is our largest of six sites. And we remain honored to provide an experiential civics education to students in each of the five boroughs. Since 2011 our democracy coach and teacher-led models have equipped over 18,000 young New Yorkers with the civic knowledge and skills and dispositions
needed to be engaged civically over the long-term for our democracy.

And to strengthen the democracy, there are three specific positions that I want to put before the Commission for consideration.

The first is we propose that New York City should consider lowering the voting age in municipal elections from 18 to 16 . This voting reform is being successfully implemented in a number of cities in Maryland, including Tacoma Park, Hyattsville, and most recently Greenville, Maryland. It's also being implemented within the student elections of Berkeley, California. And is currently being considered by the city council in Washington D.C.

Lowering the voting age would enfranchise tens of thousands of New Yorkers. We believe it would instill the lifelong habit of voting within the context of support a family in wider community network, as opposed to apparently less simple context of college or some other post secondary environment.

Secondly, we encourage the Commission to implement and consider preregistration, authorizing individuals to register once they
reach the age of 16 . Allowing prospective voters to preregister before they reach the age of 18. We feel it's a commonsense policy that can improve the likelihood of young New Yorkers casting a ballot once they're eligible to do so. Then finally, I'm going on the remarks of my colleague. We recommend that New York City adopt the policy of noncitizen voting. This is a policy that affects our students and their families and is something that we want to put forward for consideration. Implementing this provision is projected to impact potentially over one million New Yorkers and would ensure that their ability to contribute to our local political system would mirror the contribution that's already being made to our local economy. Notwithstanding our support for this provision, we are concerned that -- in the administration of this policy, as an inadvertent outcome, that a substantial population of New Yorkers could potentially be exposed to risks concerning citizenship status and things surrounding their country of origin. So given this concern, we would urge the Commission, should it move forward with this proposal, to exercise discretion and maximum precaution on persuing this policy recommendation.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our testimony.

MR. PERALES: Una.
MS. CLARKE: Because New York City is a city of immigrants, I'd like to say not all communities are sophisticated about voting, registering, and the fact that there are so many communities that are now on -- in the nervous breakdown around issues with ICE, have you thought of any of those kind of sweeps that may take place once we give an okay that certain communities should participate civically and they start it? Have you thought of it?

MR. WILKES: I think that's an important consideration that -- I think that a number of groups are giving some -- some thought to. We're speaking specifically from the vantage point of students and their families wanting to participate in the process. Some of whom are already participating in the City's municipal ID program and would like to expand the range of their political participation. But you certainly note a consideration, I think, requires further investigation in order to implement with the sense of safety for those who are taking part.

MS. CLARKE: So then, would you do both civic education with caution that communities would really understand what some of the impact would be, inasmuch as there's an upside, that there may be a downside? How do you conduct the civic education during that?

MR. WILKES: Well, again, at our level, we're speaking most directly on behalf of our students that said -- I think what you proposed in terms of risk management is important. To make sure that the benefits are clearly understood, as well as what some of the potential risks assumed and incurred could be from expanding the franchise in this way.

MR. PERALES: Angela.
MS. FERNANDEZ: You mentioned that there's pre or early registration voting in Maryland. And -- do you have any information about what the impact that actually has been in increasing the participation of voters when they turn 18? I want to so -- I would like to see the connection between registering to vote at 16 and that it actually does deliver more voters at 18.

MR. WILKES: So just a quick clarification.
In Maryland, I spoke about lowering the voting age, and so -- as opposed to preregistration. What we've seen in Tacoma Park, for instance, is that voters between the ages of 16 and 18 tend to vote at higher rates thus far, than what younger voters do in the category of 18 to 24 . And so the results are preliminary. Tacoma Park is obviously a smaller city than New York City is. But we do see that as a promising case study of the fact that once 16 -year-olds are enfranchised, they show at least, in this instance, enthusiasm for exercising that right. MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MR. HO: Thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. Wilkes.

Have you given thought to how to administer a system in which we have different qualifications for voting for local elections, as opposed to state and federal elections? And, you know, I wonder what the experience of cities that have, you know, 17--16- and 17-year-old voting or noncitizen voting, what it looks like there, just sort of a practical matter.

Does the City maintain a separate voter
registration list for these voters? Are there separate ballots that these voters in particular get?

MR. WILKES: Sure. So in all of the cases that I've mentioned, it's specifically voting in a municipal and/or school board context. What happens in the case of Maryland cities is that there is a discrete and, I believe, separate voter database for those who participate solely at the City level. Not participating at the state level.

MR. HO: And then what happens if someone -when someone turns 18? Do they then have to reregister in order to be eligible to vote for state and federal elections? Or does the City somehow transfer that information over to the state so that that person no longer has to register again? I'm just wondering. And also with respect to noncitizens who, say, naturalize. MR. WILKES: Sure. I'm not certain of the particulars of that specific point that you raised. In terms of what it could mean in the context of New York, I think what you intimate sounds like a reasonable path. Which would be having the local Board of Election make sure that that information is fully captured for participating once you're 18.

MR. HO: Thank you.
MR. PERALES: With that, I want to thank the panel. We've -- we could go on forever with the five of you. But we've got another panel waiting. And again, my heartfelt thanks.

MR. GEWOLB: Well, Mr. Chair, as the next panel gets settled, do -- just a quick bit of introduction. We expect our -- some of our panelists to cover some of this material. But just a couple of brief notes for the commissioners.

Rank-choice voting, which is the topic of this next panel. The state election law now provides for a run-off where no candidate for mayor, comptroller or public advocate receives 40 percent of the vote in a party primary. That run-off is held two weeks after the primary. Under current law, there are no run-offs at the primaries for city council or borough president, just for the information for our commissioners. Mr. Chair, I would now hand it back to you for the introduction and the beginning of the second panel.

MR. PERALES: Thank you, Matt. Let me quickly introduce the panelists.

Rob Richie, president and CEO of Fair Vote. Jerry Vattamala, who was with us just a few moments ago.

The same goes for Susan Lerner, from Common Cause.

Grace Wachlarowicz, Assistant City Clerk, Director of Elections And Voter Services from Minneapolis.

David Kallick, the Deputy Director and director of immigration research at the Fiscal Policy Institute.

And Professor Craig Burnett, associate professor at Hofstra.

With that, let me immediately call on Mr. Richie.

MR. RICHIE: Thank you. And good afternoon to you all. And I'm -- I'm excited that you're doing this. This is terrific. And I wish every city in the United States would regularly do this. But $I$ think the -- the kind of discussion about encouraging participation dealing with our rights as citizens in our democracy is exceptional and important. So thank you so much.

So I'm Rob Richie. I work nationally with the organization Fair Vote. But we do plunge our work directly into a lot of cities. And we are particularly focused on rank-choice voting, instant run-off voting and -- so it's great to have an opportunity to discuss it.

So there's a handout that I assumed you've seen. I won't try to go through every one of these, what essentially are slides. But I'll just try to go through it quickly and be here with the panel to answer questions.

So first, this is not a new idea. This actually has been -- been out there for more than a century. We have, in fact, a century of use of it at a national level at Australia. It's in Roberts Rules of Order. So you see lots and lots of nongovernmental organizations using this system of rank-choice voting. The Oscars use it for best picture. It sort of has a lot of interesting uses. And there's a growing number of cities that are using it in the United States. And we're interested particularly because today the State of Maine is actually voting with rank-choice voting for their statewide primaries with crowded primary fields that really speak to the discussion about how it could work here in New York City.

And there's one thing I wanted to mention. There is a handout that you'll see at one point, but I think not today, which is the ballot that they're using in Maine. Which is different than they use in Minneapolis. And it's tied to the advances in voting equipment that we're seeing which are helping with the election administration, the rank-choice voting. That's where you list the candidates once -- we have the handout shows a kind of a little example of it. Where you would have the candidates listed once and then relatively narrow columns, where people have numbers and they can rank. And that seems to work quite well. The City of Santa Fe used rank-choice voting for the first time this year. And 99.9 percent of voters in a five-candidate race for mayor cast a valid ballot and about two in three ranked all five candidates. And that's what we're seeing is, you know, voters are kind of embracing the rank-choice ballot. There's some different handouts here I wanted to highlight one because of your focus on voter participation is that there's some -- in some
questions about whether rank-choice voting has an impact, pro or con, on -- on voter participation. Where it's clear is when it's allowing the replacement of an election that typically has low turnout. It, of course, increases turnout over that election. So you'll hear from Minneapolis. And they used to have winnowing primaries. And that had a very low turnout. And where you have post -- post election run-offs, you typically get a decline of a participation of about 35, 40 percent. And you'll see, though, that you were also starting to see is, I think, candidates learn how to run rank-choice voting elections and it's kind of the playbooks getting out there into American political culture. You're seeing that the incentives it creates, which is, you know, reaching out to people, seems to be having this positive impact on turnout. So there's one handout just showing for recent city elections and their sort of patterns of participation I think it's quite promising.

San Francisco just voted with rank-choice voting last week. And in an interesting factoid, more people voted for mayor in a rank-choice voting ballot which was down ballot, than voted
for governor at the top of the ballot or voted for senator. So that, you know, that was the race that seemingly was driving participation. So I won't go through how it works, but there's a series of slides that does that. But it's -- so some key principles is the voter has one vote. They don't have a vote that counts for more than one candidate at a time. But through their ranking candidates, one, two, three, those rankings provide direction on how they vote -they would want their vote to be counted if their first choice loses or their first choice finishes last. To just jump to the final two candidates, so the two candidates who get the most first choices, would advance to a second round of counting. Everyone else's ballot would count for one of those two, based on -- on whether which one is ranked higher. Or you can do it sequentially, which is how most places do it. Where you knock the last person out. So there's sort of two clear ways we've seen it being considered and adopted in the United States. One is to replace run-off elections. And so New York City has your citywide run-off election, and that's been the focus of debate. One handout I
have $I$ just wanted to flag is the analysis we did about the 2013 citywide run-off for public advocate. And the composition of the electorate. One, it dropped precipitously in just overall participation. But also the electorate changed. And was -- sort of one example by age, turnout in the primary -- in the primary over 70 voters were 31.5 percent of those who voted in the run-off there were over 40 percent of those who voted. So you get kind of older, whiter, wealthier electorates that participate in these typically lower turnout run-offs. And run-offs have a lot of other, you know, issues that -- you get a second look at the candidates, but there's a lot of downsides that often mean people want to replace them with an instant run-off. You also can have these crowded primary fields. And that's what we're seeing a lot this year across the country. More than two people running. And when you have more than two people running, you often, as a voter, may want to say there's something than just one. You might as well -- I actually do have a second choice or a third choice and just allows the voter the freedom to do that. And to use the freedom and it allows
you to basically have winners win with more votes over a traditional plurality system. And New Yorkers may address that more.

So there are, of course, pros and cons. There's no perfect system. And that will be absolutely clear, that that's true. I do think the evidence is -- is strong that rank-choice voting is an improvement of plurality, an improvement over run-off elections. But you do have to do things, like deal with the voting equipment issues and deal with your vendor. And the good news from our perspective is that's all getting better. There's a group called the Rank-Choice Voting and Resource Center. Which provides lots of good information about how that's happening. You need to address legal issues and look closely at state and city law. But, you know, those are ones that obviously can be surmounted. And I know one of the discussion points is going to be how voters handle the ballot. Are there any differences by income, race and so on. I think there is some really encouraging evidence on that perspective. We're going to hear, I think, something about -talking about the history of rank ballots in New

York City. Which are actually quite promising from a voting rights perspective. But I'll give one example that I'll end with from San

Francisco. Which is in this mayoral election that just took place, the -- the candidate who did quite well but ultimately didn't make the final two was a Korean-American woman named Jane Kim. And she was particularly sort of strong among younger voters and among Asian-American voters. And she went out. And when she went out, almost all her ballots stayed in play. 95 percent of her voters ranked someone second or third. And so that meant that they sort of stayed part of that conversation in San Francisco stayed -- part of the most of the great majority of them stayed part of the final decision. I think in a run-off election, if she had not been there, those voters might not have been there. At least not in the same in numbers. Because that was true and the candidates knew it, there is a dynamic where they start trying to reach out to more people. And San Francisco, the top two candidates were both ranked by more than 60 percent of voters. So both the final two, where they were limited to three rankings there, had
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done an effective enough work in an
eight-candidate bill to be ranked in the top
three. Which was filled with the incentive of the system to reach out to people.

So thank you.
MR. PERALES: Do we have any questions?
Angela, and then John.
MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you for your
presentation.
I was looking at the graphs that you shared and I had a question. I noticed that Oakland, in rank-choice voting, the participation went down. And then I also noticed that in Santa Fe, I don't see a graph or line graph connected with rank-choice voting. But with pre-rank-choice voting, there seemed to be a slight up-tic. And those two look very different from Minneapolis and St. Paul. And so I was wondering if you could walk us through why that is. MR. RICHIE: Yeah. Thank you.

So in Santa Fe, there's little -- little different color of numbers for the -- our city election. So Santa Fe first used rank-choice voting this year. So the only rank-choice voting election was in 2018.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Oh. I see.
MR. RICHIE: So in fact, turnout was -- was up and the highest it had been in a long time. I'm going back to, I think, '98 or something like that. Or some pre-2006.

Oakland had a particularly, I think, exciting election for voters maybe in 2010. And it was like a very strong front-runner who was a senate majority leader who spent a whole lot of money. And -- and he ultimately was defeated by an Asian-American woman, who kind of pulled together an electoral coalition. And I think that election kind of just happened to kind of catch -- catch a wave. It also was part -- this happens at the same time as general elections. So what's going on nationally -- this happened -these are November of even-year elections. And so that does affect who was voting. So it's not just the City election driving turnout.

Santa Fe was the -- the top of the ballot was rank-choice voting. In Minneapolis, the top of the ballot was rank-choice voting. And St. Paul, top of the ballot was rank-choice -- or was the mayoral race. So that is kind of, in some ways, a clear indicator of -- of where the
system or the dynamics of the campaigns are having an effect.

MS. FERNANDEZ: This incumbent that won, that you said was in 2010, this exciting candidate one in 2014, the participation, the turnout, went down. But was she incumbent?

MR. RICHIE: She was the incumbent and she was a disappointment to some people. And she actually lost that -- that race. And -- but I would say, to be fair about participation in that -- those is that the top of the ticket races, governor -- which 2010 was when Jerry Brown was first winning. And back when he was running against Meg Whitman. It was a pretty big race. He was kind of coasting in 2014, the reelection. And that kind of affected the overall turnout. So that's why I think these other ones, where it's at the top of the ticket.

It is, I think, indicative, though because -- because you have to make these decisions. Every system has these trade-offs. Oakland used to have a system where you would vote in June. You could win in June if you got over 50 percent. So when Rob Delanos won in 2006, he got just over 50 percent in June. So he
didn't go to a November election. So that obviously meant the participation was lower. And you always have to sort of make these tradeoffs when you're having two rounds of election. Which one's going to be the lower turnout one. And that's one value of rank-choice voting, as you just said. This is the one to vote in and voters have that. The candidates know that and you just focus all your energy on it.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Okay. Great. Thank you.
MR. PERALES: John.
MR. SIEGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I have an open mind about this proposal, which I'm just learning about. And I must say that the -- the advocacy that we've seen from this proposal through this process and the local New York advocates, clearly there's an organized effort. And they're doing a very effective job. I want to ask three questions.

First, is there any system you know of where rank-choice voting is used, but the threshold is not 50 percent, but something more like the 40 percent, which is the New York Election Law for city-wide offices?

MR. RICHIE: There -- where it's used today
it's all 50 percent and, because you can do that -- in one election I think the tendency is to do that, right. But you could establish the threshold what you will. If you establish it as lower than 50 percent, there is one feature that you really need to do. Which is to make it a top two form of instant run-off. Meaning that you would only advance the top two candidates. Not doing the sequential elimination. And you can realize why. Because if you have a 50 percent threshold, only one candidate can get over 50 percent. You have a 40 percent threshold, two candidates could get over 40 percent. And the order of elimination in over 40 kind of arbitrarily, right. So we would strongly suggest if a 40 percent threshold were maintained, essentially, in New York, although we would argue that's really not worth maintaining. But if you did maintain it, to only advance the top two finishers to the second round of counting.

MR. SIEGAL: Second question. The charge of this commission is to enhance democracy. And we've had two national elections in the last 20 years in which the candidate who got more votes was not elected. We had one election in which there was a prolonged election count, ending in what many of us considered to be a real tragedy for the electoral and legal system in the country. And I look at the San Francisco situation, where a week after the election, they've been counting votes. It's totally unclear what's going on. And so it's sort of two subparts to this. One is, wouldn't it be a more -- which enhances democracy more; if in San Francisco Breed and Leno had been campaigning this week on their competing philosophies on vision of government, or the citizens sit there and watch some algorithmic count that's not really transparent? And I -- I guess the provocative way to ask the question is, would this create some sort of algorithmic local electoral college, where we're going to end up with a lot of elections, where the number one vote-getter doesn't get elected?

MR. RICHIE: Good question. I think one part I want to be clear about. Which is the count in San Francisco, the time it takes to do has nothing to do with rank-choice voting. If you follow California elections, all their races take days and days to count. Hilary Clinton's
margin grew by millions -- literally millions between election day and like three weeks later in California because it just takes them a long time to process ballots. Once they process ballots, it's -- they're actually in the first (inaudible) 45 minutes after the polls closed with the processed ballots, they have -- they just haven't processed the rest of the ballots. It has actually nothing to do with rank-choice voting. I do agree there's like a perception to -- that as the count comes in and its really close and it changes, I think part of it is that that perception issue would happen anyway if it were really close and the margin was changing, right. If this was a run-off and it took one day one person moved ahead and one person moved the other, it's like, oh, my gosh, it changes. And it's a close election, right. It's -- it's within .3 percent.

MR. SIEGAL: Well, in a close election. You would agree it was ten percent ahead after the votes.

MR. RICHIE: Well, she was with 36 percent of the vote, right. So 64 percent didn't vote for her and they have never elected anyone in San

Francisco without a majority. They actually have a majority system. It's just whether you do run-offs or whether you do an instant run-off. And if they had ballots processed instantly, they would have instant results.

Santa Fe, as sort of one example, and actually using technology that's more like what New York has, you don't have nearly as many ballots to take as long to count, basically, as California. I guess you have some. But anyway, it takes a long time to get there. But Santa Fe doesn't have many ballots like that. They -they have the results the night of the elections, you know. And -- and I think Minneapolis -we'll hear from the Minneapolis clerk. But they had multiple races that did change hands. So the City council president was defeated after leading in first choices. She was defeated by an African-American transgender man in a really interesting election. But they've used it three times. The media reports elections and people accept it. And actually, there was a survey done in Minneapolis that we may hear more about. But what's really interesting to me was the percentage of people that don't want to keep
rank-choice voting keeps declining. So it's actually down to only 16 percent don't want to keep the system. The system has really kind of become accepted, essentially, in three -- through uses of it. But it is -- there's a transition to it and it's accepting the fact that, you know, a candidate with 36 percent may not win. I think London Breed actually will win, by the way, in San Francisco and -- you know, at the end of the count. And I will say, also, that's an interesting finding is that since they've used rank-choice voting in the Bay area, there's 53 offices elected by the system. In the four previous elections for those 53 offices, people of color, one -- two of those out of five of those races, a little less than 40 percent. With rank-choice voting, they've won about 60 percent of those races. So people of color are actually winning more offices. London Breed's likely success is kind of that pattern. And I think it comes with a -- having maximum turnout and those voters having sort of real choices. And I think the candidates having incentives to try to run affirmative campaigns rather than negative campaigns. And I think that's been good for
democracy.
MR. SIEGAL: If I might, just one more thing that's a New York specific thing that I think we need to correct the record on here.

The 2013 public advocate run-off, which you've been citing, is a total aberration. It was a race in which there were two candidates in a run-off. Each of whom were elected officials in Brooklyn only. No city-wide recognition. No city-wide base. After a mayoral primary, where the two leading candidates were also from Brooklyn. And there was extraordinarily low turnout in the run-off. But when we've had mayoral run-offs in New York, the participation and the turnout is huge. And I have the numbers. I would like to read them in the record.

We've had three mayoral run-offs. In 1973, we had 783, 133 voters in the primary. The run-off had 900,538 . So significantly increase. In '77, it went the other way. 900,217 voters in the primary. With 787,835 voters in the run-off. Probably the disaffection of many Sutton and Badillo voters. I don't know. People argue about saving money. I think most New Yorkers would pay 10 million dollars to watch Ed Koch and

Mayor Cuomo campaign. That's in hindsight. In the most recent run-off, 2001, the participation went up by 5,000 votes in the run-offs. So it was 785,365 in the primary. 790,019 in the run-off. We can argue about what would have happened in those elections and who would have won with instant run-off versus run-offs. But I just think that we need to think long and hard about adopting a system on a premise that voter turnout is so low that we need to change the voting. Because when we have mayoral run-offs, they are a huge participatory and democratic in the small lead sense events.

MR. RICHIE: Well, I will let New Yorkers comment more on that. But $I$ will say this. I think of the numbers you gave, one had a very sharp up-tic, that 73 one. I think the next one is indicative. You have the people of colored candidates didn't make the run-off and turnout went down into presumably disproportionate among people of color. I think if you think about, say, the 2013 race that did not got to a run-off. But you think about John Liu. You think about his candidacy and how the other candidates treated his base. Which he did very well among

Asian-American and Chinese-American voters. And they didn't seek his voter second choice, right? Because he was going to be their chose. With rank-choice voting, it would have been plausible. People would have thought he was not going to make it. They would have been aggressively pursued, right. So -- so it's not only who is at the polls, but how they're treated when they're there and the incentives that it creates among the candidates to reach out to more people. And I will say again, you know, we will hear that like, oh, you know, Mark Leno, or London Breed, whoever wins, will not get, you know, 50 percent in the final round or the first round. However, they were ranked by more than 60 percent of the voters. They made connections that were affirmative and important connections that they thought could help them win. And that's, I think, the politics that rank-choice voting creates.

MR. SIEGAL: Thank you. MR. PERALES: Any other member of the Commission with a question? Dale. MR. HO: Just a short one.

Thank you for your testimony today.
Mr. Richie, you know, we have -- I'll just make this really simply.

Are there different considerations for city-wide as opposed to district-based elections with respect to rank-choice voting? Because we have, you know, a different run-off system for city-wide elections here. And just -- if you're looking at our current status quo, are there different things that we need to take -- we need to think about when we're thinking about shifting to rank-choice voting for some or all offices?

MR. RICHIE: That's a good question. I mean, it's -- it's interesting. Over the years -- and we've been responsive to people in New York, right, who have said, hey, this makes a lot of sense to do instant run-off. Like replacing that run-off, which is expensive, creates campaign finance changes and often creates lower turnout, but not always, that it would makes sense to -- to go to an instant run-off. What I'm hearing now, and in some ways what we're, perhaps learning from the more greater use of rank-choice voting is that it could make sense for the non-run-off elections, right, the -- the City council and borough presidents. And I touched based in my slides about the fact there are actually quite a number of races that are running pretty low. I think it was eight City council district races in the primaries in 2013, where one was less than 37 percent. So now, those winners could very likely be very credible, you know, accurate winners. But they didn't win as many votes as they would with the rank-choice voting system, right. And -- and essentially the system would have created incentives for them to try to make connections with -- with more voters. I think the voters can handle a mix of balance. That's one factor, you know. A rank-choice contest and a non-rank-choice contest, we've seen a mix of -of ballots and handled that fine. In fact, the San Francisco ballot was like that, right. They used rank-choice voting for mayor, but not for the state and federal offices. But I think there is a certain voter education opportunity to say, hey, that's how we vote in these primaries and let's rank them for mayor and let's rank them for the city-wide offices. And let's go ahead and do that for borough president and City council. And, you know, it's up, in a sense, to the candidates to step into that space and organize with it and try to reach out to more voters. So at this point $I$ would suggest, or at least it's a -- it's a different consideration than in some ways we had, over the years talked about in New York, which is to consider it for all the primaries just as a way to -- to encourage candidates to -- to try to get more votes.

MR. PERALES: Let's move along.
Thank you very much.
MR. RICHIE: Thank you.
MR. PERALES: Jerry, let's move along, please.

MR. VATTAMALA: Thank you to the Commission again for letting us testify here.

Our comments will be very brief. AALDEF has supported rank-choice voting or instant run-off voting in the past. We're very supportive of the system that we had in place for school board elections. And we also submitted a letter of support, I think when San Francisco was considering rank-choice voting. So we've been supportive in the past and we've seen that it's worked very well when there's a large pool of
voters. So when looking at the school board elections, as I mentioned in the last panel, that was open to noncitizens, including undocumented parents. The only requirement was that they had a child in the New York City school system. So when you had that large pool of voters, including noncitizens and undocumented folks, in addition to citizens, there are -- it produced very good results for the Asian-American community. The school boards were the only place where there was Asian-American electoral success and it was because of rank-choice voting in large part. We did resist and object to the Board of Elections' move to reduce the rank-choice voting from picking the top nine candidates to going to the top four. That was back when we had preclearance. The Department of Justice agreed with us and prevented that change, which we believe would have resulted in fewer Asian-Americans being elected to the school board. So basically, we do support it. There -it's not a perfect system. But we've seen it work well. And to the extent that we could recreate the type of environment, the situation that we had for the school boards, we could see
it working very well again in New York City.
Thank you.
MR. PERALES: If there are no pressing questions, I'd like to move right on to Susan Lerner. And then we can ask both the last two speakers questions.

MS. LERNER: Great. Thank you. And thank you for the opportunity to address this topic, as well.

We believe that it is time in New York City conceptually to move beyond the idea of instant run-off voting to rank-choice for all of the races because I think we need to recognize one of the strengths and benefits of our campaign finance system. Which is that we are the beneficiaries of very competitive races. Particularly at the City council primary level, where the campaign finance board allows community members to be able to run. And it is not at all unusual in an open seat to see anywhere from four to eight candidates supported by the campaign finance system running. We believe that rank-choice voting is a way in which to ensure that the ultimate elected official has aggregated enough support within the district to be
representative and to -- that using rank-choice voting ensures a healthier democracy, where more of the council constituents have an investment and have chosen -- have ranked the particular winner of the election. And that's why we're arguing that we should be talking about rank-choice voting and moving beyond a limited concept of instant run-off. Which most voters don't expect to see on a regular basis. But that the primary actually is something that everybody engages in. I'd like to also point out there's a reason why rankings are clickbait. People do instinctively understanding ranking system. So our experience in other states and other cities indicates that the voter education is very doable.

And I'd also like to caution the panel.
From our point of view as voting rights and election administration modernization advocates, that there can sometimes be a turnout trap. That if we focus only on the question of, well, will this guarantee five percent or ten percent more turnout on an election, that we limit our purview. Because, frankly, our experience is there were virtually no silver bullets for turn out. And the things that do seem to reliably increase turnout, increase them at relatively small percentages. But there are a lot of factors that influence whether people feel connected to their elected officials and have confidence in their elections that have nothing to do with turnout.

So I believe that a healthy democracy requires that we look at a plethora of factors in determining what election reforms we should be engaging within. I was very encouraged by the mayor's instruction that the panel should look towards a healthy democracy and not just focus on turnouts. So I know that is often very compelling, for people to just focus on that. But I urge you to look beyond it.

MR. PERALES: Thank you.
MR. SIEGAL: Questions?
MR. PERALES: I'm looking for questions. And I know that John Siegal is really into this subject, but he doesn't have a question. With that, we will move on to the City of Minneapolis.

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair and commissioners. My name is Grace Wachlarowicz and
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I am the Assistant City Clerk, Director Of Elections and Voter Services for the City of Minneapolis.

On behalf of the City, the City Clerk, Casey and Carl and I, it is an honor to be here before you today to provide you with information on administering that rank-choice voting from the Minneapolis Method or the Minneapolis model.

Before you, I provided several materials, as well as a flash drive. We have extensively documented every aspect of the process. The journey from when it began in 20-- 2006 through last year's election. It would be impossible to go through all the details in two to three minutes. So I provided that information so at your leisure you can review it.

Today I'd just like to touch real high on the administration of rank-choice voting and voting outreach and education.

First off, the City of Minneapolis has the municipal elections once every four years. We have all municipal offices up, 22 of them. Which includes the mayor, 13 council members, represented of the wards, and various park board and board of estimentation. So it's a
combination of all.
In 2006, the voters in Minneapolis chose to use rank-choice voting as the method to vote for their municipal office. Previous to that, it was the traditional balloting of a primary and then subsequently a general election with the two top candidates.

So the next thing I want to talk about is the process in which we do the tabulation. And I want to bring this up specifically because, even if you have an automated system or not, the process that we call the Minneapolis Method is an -- is an easy way to understand the process of tabulation.

So briefly I'll just kind of go through that on a high level. First and foremost, you need to understand that in Minnesota, The Election Law requires that voting equipment, both the hardware and software, must be certified by the standards of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. Currently there are no standards to certify a rank-choice voting system. So we are forced to use creative ways in which to tabulate our ballots.

We came up with what we call the Minneapolis

Method. Which is the process of sorting ballots and counting the unique three-choice combination for each ballot -- excuse me -- each office. Then we have data entry and analysis that is performed in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Using -- it's basically a large calculator using only cut and paste and basic math functions, we are able to do -- replicate the concept of actually manually touching those ballots. Specifically piling, distributing it by voter intent, which in rank-choice voting we call normalization, and by just actually counting the ballots. So that process expedited it. The City of Minneapolis has 240,000 registered voters. So we're tinier than you, but a lot of ballots that we cannot manually count them, as the City of St. Paul does.

With that, the key best practice is to really focus on process improvements and lessons learned. It's really critical after each process that you look at the system honestly, objectively, and identify the components and steps that should be eliminated, enhanced or replaced. By doing so, we were able to significantly expedite the tabulation process
from 2009 to '13, from 2-13 to 2017 without compromising the integrity or accuracy of the election.

Most significantly is the purchase for new equipment in 2013. The same equipment that the City of New York has. Which is the DS200 Optical Scan Tabulator, with its operating system ElectionWare from the company Election Systems and Software. Through this system, there is a software that can generate a record or a report data analysis that can combine those three unique choices for each office. And from that, we were able to export it into that Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to continue with the tabulation. That in itself reduced a lot of time for us. So I'd like to -- you can consider it just from an educational standpoint, as also as an election administrator, it's very helpful to understand how to implement that.

Quickly with voter outreach and education, I want to just point out that we were very focused on consistent messaging. That we provided materials, videos and informational forums in order to keep that message constant. We provided this information on our website, so it was
downloadable so that all outreach organizations, campaigns and the media has the same information and the same materials.

Regarding in the informational forums, that was open to the public, campaigns, and also the media. This also reinforced the consistent messaging and it promoted that transparency. The key is one week before the election to have that public forum to explain what to expect on election day. It was there that we demonstrated the actual tabulation process so everyone understood it. We also explained how the results would come in, how it would look, when it would be posted, when the winners would be declared in a realistic timeframe in which this whole process will be completed.

With that, I thank you for your time and I'm welcome to any of your questions.

MR. PERALES: Yes, Liran?
MS. ANGELO: I'm somewhat worried about the complexity of the internal calculations. I mean, I'm a Ph.D in economics and I could not follow you. And I -- and I think that there's just -it may just be something really good about saying, you know, she got 500,000 votes and I got 500, 010 and I win. Because we kind of all understand that. So I just wanted to share that with you.

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: I appreciate that. I'll be honest with you, I started with the City of Minneapolis in 2012. My boss, City Clerk Casey Carl, started in 2010. We did not develop the process. We were not there in 2006, when it was passed, or in 2009. We implemented the 2013 election. We learned it, we processed it, and provided significant process improvements. It's very simple and basic. And I strongly encourage you to look at the videos and the information -information on your flash drive. Because it is simple, but it takes time to explain it and keeping the consistent messaging.

But I do appreciate your concern.
MR. PERALES: Does anyone else have a question?

Go ahead, Annetta.
MS. SEECHARRAN: I apologize if I -- if I missed -- if this was covered in the previous testimony that I missed.

But I wonder what was the cost implications for the City in implementing rank-choice voting?

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: I have limited information on the preparation and implementation in 2009. But I can say anecdotally that it was -- there was an outlay of expenses to prepare for it and to process it. We were the first ones that did it in this particular manner, so we had to go through a lot of -- we did a lien process, in fact, to get down to the effective processes. I can tell you in 2013, in 2017, there really was no different than the cost of doing our traditional primary to now just our single election. The cost, quote unquote, savings where the money we would have expended for a primary, we focused on voter outreach and education. So that's -- so it really was no change in cost.

MS. SEECHARRAN: So I understand that you have the same voting equipment that New York City does. And apparently one of the concerns that's been raised for New York City about rank-choice voting despite, obviously, a lot of strong arguments for it, is that the equipment malfunctions will potentially kind of imperil the whole enterprise with computer malfunctions, if there have been any.

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: Fortunately, that is one
that I can say that I have not had to worry about. We have not had any malfunctions with the tabulators. It had nothing to do with rank-choice voting, per se, if it did. No, that was not an issue whatsoever.

MS. SEECHARRAN: And just to reiterate my colleagues question.

If you were to explain the process and why you think rank-choice voting creates a healthy democracy, and several other panelists have argued to a voter in sort of a few sentences, what would you say?

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: First and foremost, this is a nonpartisan position. I am at the pleasure of our policymakers. It was the choice of the voters. I have no opinion, so I cannot promote or not, as far as --

MS. SEECHARRAN: I'm not -- I'm not asking you to promote. Simply to explain.

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: I just wanted to make that on the record.

The simplest one we state is, go to the restaurant. You have turkey, ham and chicken. You have three choices. You want to have turkey, geez, they're out of it. What is the second
thing you want? Ham. I'm fine, I'll take ham. They're out of ham, we'll go with the chicken. So you're ranking your choices based on your preferences.

Another example that I use is the primary scenario, where it's whittled down to two. You vote for somebody in the primary. They didn't make it. Don't you make a second choice in the general, with the two candidates that are left? That would be your second choice. So there's a lot of comparisons. And our voters have not had an issue with understanding it in that respect.

MR. HO: Thank you so much for coming up all the way from Minneapolis.

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: Thank you.
MR. HO: It's nice to hear the perspective of an election administrator.

Just one quick question.
Other than the public education piece, are there other election administration challenges that were issues that have arisen in the move to rank-choice voting? Or is that really the principle issue?

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: I hope that the City of Minneapolis has developed enough of a foundation
from our lessons learned that my fellow colleagues around the country who are considering rank-choice voting can use our experiences and it's not that difficult. It's a different method -- methodology. But I administer this election no different than a traditional election. It's just slightly different, but not something you cannot overcome.

MR. PERALES: Thank you very, very much. We do appreciate your travelling to New York City. MS. WACHLAROWICZ: It was a pleasure and an honor. Thank you.

MR. PERALES: David Kallick.
MR. KALLICK: Thank you. Thank you for inviting me.

I -- so I'm the deputy director of the Fiscal Policy Institute. And I'm going to say a little bit about why I care about this issue and also why I think, of all the people you've heard from, why you should pay the least attention to me.

So I think the -- it's -- to me, what's really important about rank-choice voting is it allows people to have a candidate in the election that they really care about and really excites
them. And I think that is what -- I mean, in terms of voter turnout, $I$ think that is what makes for people voting. I think there's long evidence of that. And I think if you compare the idea of an instant run-off or -- instant run-off or a rank-choice voting system to the idea of what we do today, you kind of have to combine what would be the impact of both of those elections. And I think that there's good reason to think that you would have not the higher turnout in a single rank-choice voting system, or maybe even higher than that because you have everybody in. If you imagine, for example, you know -- what would happen within the Puerto Rican community if there's a Puerto Rican candidate or within the Chinese community if there's a Chinese candidate, or from Staten Island, if there's a Staten Island candidate in a -- in, for example, a mayoral race. A big turnout for that. If you have that -- even from that constituency. If in the -- if then in the run-off, the person who is from that base isn't there, you have -- you have a lot of drop-off in exactly that same constituency. And I think you actually -- I haven't looked at this before, but Rob -- Rob's
numbers I think show that, right. In this -- so the run-off election, as I pointed out, is the run-off just for public advocate. And even though run-off elections generally skew more towards whiter, wealthier -- what you see actually is an increase in the black turnout from the -- compared to the primary. But a decrease -- significant decrease in the Latino turnout because you have a black candidate but not a Latino candidate, I would surmise. So I think it's -- I think it's important to have a candidate in the race who you're excited about. And then I think it's also important what the dynamics are within the election itself. So Rob touched on this, but it seems to me that, you know, when you have a candidate who is clearly going to dominate -- because Staten Island -- I'm making this up, right, to take it away from personal. If you have a Staten Island candidate who is running for mayor or for comptroller, very likely you would have other candidates saying, I'm going find my base because I'm going to run with -- and, you know, not much point in spending time in Staten Island because how am I ever going to get those votes. Whereas if you have a
rank-choice system, you do the opposite, right. You're going to say, oh, that person I like. I kind of think they're not going to win anyway. Of if they do, then I guess I don't win. But so I'm going to go after not only my base, but also the people who I think might be most likely among the other candidates to put me as their second choice. I think that makes for a healthier election and more engagement -- not just turnout, but more engagement from the voters all around.

All right. So I think, in fact, I just -- I think you can say you get to vote for someone you love and you're more likely to get someone you like, or at least somebody you don't hate.

So why pay least attention to me? I was asked to talk primarily about the fiscal impacts, since we spent some time looking at this. In fact, I'll say we're going to put together a report, a short report, that we'll publish within the next couple of days. I'm sorry I don't have it published already. But so this -- I -- I would say don't cite these numbers yet. But if you could wait a few days, I'll send you final ones. But I'm pretty confident these are pretty close to right, at least.

So my main takeaway would be -- on why I would say don't pay too much attention to me is I don't think there's a big fiscal impact one way or the other. I think that it's never a big impact around the country and New York City. In fact, $I$ think there would be a savings by going into the system. But I don't think that's why you should do it or not do it. I think, obviously, it's about democracy.

All right. So let's talk about the numbers. Where's my second page? So in terms of the best analysis that we've seen so far of the fiscal impact has been in Maine, where I spent some time talking with the Secretary of State. And there was a letter from the Secretary of State about this. I'm sorry. The Secretary of State's office. Okay. Telluride, (inaudible), as well, but it's a very small city. So in Maine, I would say in terms of the cost relevant to New York City, what they saw was -- was, leaving aside the question of voter education and voter -- and voter outreach, which I would say we should think about separately and I would say just spend more time thinking about. But leaving aside the question about outreach and education, the cost
relevant to New York City were about \$50,000 this year. So a tiny fraction of what they spend in Maine. And about 20,000 next year. So this would be the first year of implementation, \$50,000. In a kind of bare bones version of it. Maine is smaller than New York City, but -- in terms of population. Although bigger in terms of geography and different kind of (inaudible), which might be a factor. Most of the costs would be about the same, though, because it's primarily about the program and the software.

In any case, we're talking about an order of magnitude that it really, in my opinion, negligible in the service of -- of democracy. So those costs are primarily about -- so in -- in Maine, the costs were primarily about poll workers -- I'm sorry. This was -- this is the problem with not having a finished report. Thank you. In Maine the -- that was primarily about -that's not the right thing. Well, maybe I'll come back to that.

All right. Okay. In terms of the cost relevance in Maine -- that's what I have here -it -- it was just about the programming costs.

And then they had some other issues about how do they transport the ballots things that aren't really relevant in New York. And they also -they had an initial estimate that was much higher than some of you may have heard. That essentially was an error on their part. They have included outreaching costs, which are there anyway. And they also changed how they transport their ballot system.

MR. PERALES: Is there a bottom line, David? Is it -- did they -- didn't save much money? Is that what you're saying?

MR. KALLICK: It didn't cost much money. MR. PERALES: It didn't cost much money. MR. KALLICK: So in Maine what $I$ have is -maybe I can shift gears to what I can see in front of me clearly. But so -- but in Maine it cost -- it cost them about -- about $\$ 110,000$ total this year. 384,000 in total for next year. And of the cost that would be relevant for New York City, those costs in Maine were more like 15,000 this year and 20,000 next year. What I want to say is I think that you can save a good deal of money doing it in New York because we have this run-off system. So every time you run an election -- a run-off election, it costs money. There's been some -- so 2013 is the last time we -- you know, we have some good numbers on that. It cost about 11 million dollars for us to run that election. Now again, I would say, 11 million dollars would be well spent on an election if it makes it a better -- a more democratic process. But $I$ think that if you can save 11 million dollars and have a more democratic process, as I think you do, all the better. In fact, what $I$ would do is turn that money back into voter outreach and voter education.

MR. PERALES: Thank you. Wendy, you have a question. MS. WEISER: This is one question which I don't know which panelist would be best equipped to answer it. But it was occasioned by your testimony.

In the places that have already used rank-choice voting, are there people who don't rank or just rank their first choice? And if so, what percentage of people, so that it doesn't actually function as a ranking system?

MR. PERALES: Maybe Minneapolis can tell us.

Is there a lot of bullet voting, as they said?
MS. WACHLAROWICZ: It will vary based on your office and the candidates. The majority of our -- we have a survey which will be provided on your -- we have a detailed report. We've actually done a rank-choice voting survey both in 2009, 2013 and 2017. And that does address that, as well.

We've seen an increase of more individuals ranking one or two, but occasion for the third choice. So as it progressed, it increases. But again, it sometimes determines on who the candidates are. If it's -- and the choices. It always comes down to who's on the ballot. But traditionally, it does increase.

MR. RICHIE: I know Craig's going to get into this, so let -- we'll let him share his important numbers. But I'll say that one of the New York City school board elections were some data you can look at, right, because those -- the one reason why the Department of Justice didn't preclear a change away from the system is that, in fact, voters were -- were really ranking candidates. And that was for nine seats, right. So it was a pretty long ballot. But people, more
than one very, very are commonly. When you're only electing one person, there's almost a different psychology. But we're seeing that when the race is like mayor, it's typically 85 to 90 percent of people will rank more than one. But that does mean not everyone's doing it. There is a pattern that the people most likely not to rank are supporting the frontrunner. And there's a real logic to that -- to that decision because their ballot will almost never -- you know, super unlikely to not go to their first choice only. I think your ballot only goes to your second choice if your first choice loses, right. So -- but you know, that's -- that's kind of seemingly the pattern about one out of ten, you know, big race will choose to only vote for one person in a one winner race.

MR. PERALES: Now we can pass to Burnett and maybe he can move right into his comments.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you to the Commission for having me. And thanks to -- for the promotion. I'm still assistant professor, for the record.

I'll -- I'll give you the numbers you asked for. I think you guys got this as -- as part of the pre-packet. I included my publication on this -- this question. In Oakland, the year under study that I was look at, it was 87 percent had one candidate only. In Pierce County, Washington, it was 26 percent. San Francisco was 11.7 percent. And San Leandro County was 16.4. I don't have the current numbers in San Francisco. We'd have to do ballot scans to be able to do that, the numbers that $I$ have in front of me. So I'll just start. What I would tell you guys, the first thing I would note is that every electoral system has a tradeoff. There's no perfect system. Rank-choice voting is not it. Primary run-off system is not it, either. There are -- you can devise elections in any way you want and there is going to be a deficiency of some kind. There's just to solution there. One I -- one thing I would point out is -is, you guys, an opinion about quality democracy here is to ask yourselves what is the solution you're trying to drive here? Is there a problem you're trying to solve? In the case of Maine, what we are now actually experiencing, oh, state-wide rank-choice voting. They have a problem, All right. They have a third party. And sometimes that third party -- he was a strong independent streak and a plain spoiler. And they had experienced this into something voters wanted. It's not clear to me exactly how that fits in with the New York case. But this is something that you guys, as your ears to the ground, would know better, certainly, than I would.

So we talk a lot about primary run-off
systems and I think we can identify some ways in which they fall short. Certainly, Mr. Richie has done a good job of laying out how perhaps rank-choice voting is better than that system. But I would like to -- to spend some time talking about ways in which rank-choice voting may not be as good as -- as a primary run-off system.

For me, it has two important deficiencies to consider. The first is a concept we call ballot exhaustion. This is something where your ballot, no matter how it was filled out -- and it could be you had one choice ranked, two choice ranks, or perhaps even the entire allowed candidates to rank. But your ballot does not make it to the final round of tabulation. This means that, effectively, when it comes to decide the winner,
your ballot does not factor into that number. This is not an avoidable problem. We've seen this everywhere. This is now, I think, pretty well documented. It's not something we can simply just legislate out. It is a part of a process. That doesn't mean this always happens, but it does happen --

MR. PERALES: Can you explain that a little better? How does the ballot not get counted in a vote?

MR. BURNETT: So if you say it ranked three candidates. Your allotted systems allow you to rank three. So let's stick with that. You rank three. You have a preference. You identify your first choice, your second choice and your third choice and then send your ballot in to be tabulated. In the process of tabulation, your first choice is eliminated. Then you go to your second choice, right. That's where your vote would count. Your second choice gets eliminated. You get distributed to your third choice. Let's say third choice gets eliminated. Now you're no longer a part of the process. Your ballot has been cast and it's been cast completely and correctly. But in terms of actually weighing in on the final --

MR. PERALES: I must be missing something.
What if I voted for -- there were five candidates and I voted for one of the ones that got the least votes. Are you saying my ballot was not very valuable or worthwhile?

MR. BURNETT: Well, it depends. It depends on who you ranked second --

MR. PERALES: No. If I didn't rank any -on the current system, if $I$ just vote and it's somebody who doesn't do well, I mean, you're suggesting my ballot was worthless.

MR. BURNETT: Not worthless. You got to express your voice. And it's clear to us who you prefer. Then you subsequently have a chance, potentially, if there was a run-off. So going to weigh in on -- weigh in on --

MR. PERALES: I see. I get it now.
MR. BURNETT: In this case, in this example, though, you're not afforded that opportunity. This is why I them as fundamentally different. And that when your ballot is exhausted -- the winner is declared. No matter what, Right. We do arrive at a winner. Under a primary run-off system, you are afforded the opportunity to go in and weigh in again. Whether you choose to do that is up to you as the voter. Or you can express yourself by actually not going to the polls. But that is an expression that we can understand what that is. Under exhaustion, it's nearly impossible to know what the intent of the voter actually was. We don't know. We can't say, well they might have voted for this person or maybe they just didn't see anybody who was worth voting for. We don't know, all right. It's a great unknown and, unfortunately, I think this is a deficiency that we should think about. Especially when we're thinking about quality of democracy and we're thinking about representation, how well people are being represented -- being represented in the process. What are the rates of exhaustion? It ranges. And it depends on the quality of the election. It could be as low as, say, a couple of percent points. It could be zero. It could be as high as almost 30 percent. And I've seen it in the work I presented to you guys. That is actually a number that's true in San Francisco. It reaches 27 percent of us. So unlike these people who show up, and they show up in the run-off, who are afforded a chance, those voters don't get a chance to do so.

The second issue that I would like for you guys to consider when you're thinking about rank-choice voting is the fact that it doesn't usually produce a majority winner. It actually produces a plurality winner. And if you do the calculations in the way that most people who study electoral systems would, which is we would consider the percentage of votes for the winner, divided by the total number of votes cast. Not just the total number of votes that are still left. That often reaches in the 40 percent. 44, 45. Depends on the election you're looking at. But that means that that person, whoever is the eventual winner, did not actually receive a majority from all of the people who showed up in that election. They received a plurality of the vote.

For example, if you look at one of the handouts that I provided today, this recent election in San Francisco, one that we're actually still counting, one, the exhaustion rate was eight and a half percent. Meaning, we don't understand what those eight and a half percent of voters would have done if they had had a chance to weigh in in some sort of run-off format. We just don't know.

The second is that the winner's total share as of Monday is 46 or 45.6 percent. Not a 50 percent majority. And this is something we observe in many elections. In my paper we have four elections here. None of them received the majority, either. This is actually -- tends to be, I think, more common than not, actually, from what I've observed in my own observations.

The third thing I would say is that there are some new concerns that are emerging in the rank-choice voting formats. One is a question about how well the system does with racial and ethnic minority groups. Jason McDaniel, professor at San Francisco State, has done some work on this. And he actually finds that it doesn't necessarily do well for turnout amongst these groups.

And part of the packet I provided, I'm giving you hot off the press research that I've been conducting that looks at how it shakes out in terms of the precinct and its racial and ethnic minority makeup, and how it looks in terms of exhaustion and completeness. And the take-home point is this. Generally speaking, racial and ethnic minorities are less likely to provide a complete ballot. Which means that they're actually at a higher risk of exhaustion, right. Because we know that if you don't complete your ballot, you're more likely to be exhausted. However, due to the nature of the elections under consideration here in San Francisco and Oakland, racial and ethnic minority groups each had a candidate that they strongly preferred. And that candidate made it to the last round of tabulation. So they actually didn't end up getting exhausted as much. However, that doesn't mean that they couldn't in future elections, right. If your candidate doesn't make it to the last round of voting, you're actually more likely to be exhausted. So this, to me, the take-home would be that it is the potential to harm. It doesn't necessarily mean it will harm. But that the capacity is there.

I thank you for your time.
MR. PERALES: Thank you very much. I'm just curious.

Mr. Richie, do you have a comment to the contrary to what's just been said?

MR. RICHIE: Thank you.
Let me -- let me start off by agreeing with Craig that there's no system that's perfect, right. So we're talking about relativity here. I think that on the issue of exhaustion, there's sort of two points of comparison. When you compare it to the plurality of voting elections -- it's kind of the point that you were making about the current system, where you only get a single choice, and that's it, right, if you vote for someone who doesn't -- who finishes last, you know, that's it, right. And this would allow you to have a say in the final two. Or this is sort of the classic way that people think about, you know, rank-choice voting states through the context of a presidential election, let's put Ralph Nader on the ballot or some such election. Then compare it to -- so it's doing more than you can with plurality. When you are looking at a run-off election, there are times that turnout does go up. It's actually quite unusual in general. Like so we looked at all the federal run-offs. A lot of states, particularly
in the south, have run-off elections. Texas just had a run-off election, for instance, for governor. And, you know, some big offices. The turnout dropped more than 50 percent in Texas. The average decline in turnout in run-offs -federal primary run-offs over the past, 200 of them is more than 35 percent. So yes, there will be exhaustion in that sense of like in the San Francisco race -- San Francisco mayoral race it was 8.5 percent. So that consent was a turnout decline. One way of measuring it of 8.5 percent. But the relative changes is usually much more, when you're looking at the run-offs. We looked at the last -- well, we looked at all the rank-choice voting elections that have taken place with multiple rounds in the United States since -- in the last 20 years of usage. So there are 77 of them. The winner on average, the sort of the median, was 48 percent of the first round. So correct, the median was just under 50. The median of run-off elections in San Francisco, when they had had run-off elections was 37 percent. The median in those federal primary run-offs was also 37 percent. So again, I would say rank-choice voting is standing up quite well
by a measure of participation versus run-offs. And, of course, versus plurality voting, it's always getting higher.

MR. PERALES: Thank you.
Rachel.
MS. GODSIL: So I'm curious, Professor Burnett, how you would compare the concerns that you raised about ballot exhaustion with the two points made by the previous panelist. One is this notion that with rank-choice voting, there is considerable incentives for the candidates to pay attention to a broader swath of voters, being more robust (inaudible). So that was one sort of upside to rank-choice voting. And then the second is, in thinking about ballot exhaustion and the effects that you described, isn't under our current system, where we -- one only gets one vote, isn't it the case that a significant percentage of voters will take into account who they think will win in deciding who the single person will vote for will be. Whereas a rank-choice voting system, absent a more nuanced way of conveying one's choice. And so I'm just curious in thinking about, first, the point that Mr. Richie made, as well, this idea of only playing to one base and the reasonable choice made in a traditional primary or traditional method with rank-choice voting. There being different incentives and this idea of being able to reflect our preferences more honestly in a sense in a rank-choice voting system than we can if there's a primary, where we're concerned that, frankly, to the Chair's point, if we vote for someone who's not a frontrunner, what's the point anyway because he will lose.

MR. BURNETT: Okay. So with regard to candidates coordinating, there is going to be some idiosyncrasies to every election. So it may be on average there is incentive to coordinate. That essentially was what a partisan primary does, right. It requires the party to focus on a single candidate to put forward, So (inaudible). But that doesn't mean that if I'm a candidate who thinks that I'm going to win, maybe I don't want to coordinate. If I don't think that I need your second votes, it may actually not be in my best interest to, right. Because I don't necessarily want to expand the size of my coalition if I don't need to. This is speaking about how most politicians usually view elections, right. They
don't necessarily, if they don't think they need it, reach out to other voters.

MS. GODSIL: Just for a second.
Isn't the whole purpose of rank-choice voting the inconsistencies of very competitive elections in which there's not a clear frontrunner, otherwise this is all kind of resolved and moot anyway? So isn't that a slightly not particularly helpful response?

MR. BURNETT: Well, there are oftentimes (inaudible) don't quote me, but they don't coordinate with other candidates. In fact, most candidates will (inaudible). In those elections, the coordination will probably be near zero. So perhaps in competitive elections you could see it. I'm just saying. It is competitive. Yes. Unfortunately, I can't give you some sort of step by step playbook in every single election. It just happens to be who's running, are they an overwhelming frontrunner? If they are, then they don't need to pay attention to other candidates. They don't seek the votes, their second choice or third choice votes. If it's ten candidates running, they all got about ten percent, perhaps, right. And maybe in a city like New York, where
it's easier to get polling data because there's a lot of money in campaigns, that's possible. Yeah, I'd say that, you know, knowledge about where you stand is maybe a little easier to discern. But that's probably not true in a lot of places.

So to your second question, though, about strategic voting. That again requires the voters to know who they think is going to be a reasonable shot to win. And my experience in looking at local elections tells me that voters are not very good at figuring that out. And the data suggests that's true, too. In three of the cases I looked at in the 2015 paper, even the people who marked three candidates, the exhaustion rates were 7.8 percent in Oakland, 22.5 percent in San Francisco, and 2.7 in San Leandro. (Inaudible) because there are only four people were running and they filled out three. So your chances of exhaustion are fairly low. But the analogs are closer to Oakland and San Francisco in New York, where you're going to get more candidates running. And probably even closer to San Francisco, because like San Francisco, New York has reasonably generous public financing for elections. That's San Francisco's case in a nutshell. So I think you're more likely to see the types of elections where 10, 13 people, 15 people are running. And voters are not going to necessarily going to know of those 10 or 13 who is going to be in the final two. That's actually a fairly sophisticated piece of information that most voters won't have.

MS. CLARKE: I just wanted to -- I wanted to just find out from who has the greatest information. The power of incumbents. When an incumbent who is already known is running, versus some young bright person who may do just as well as the incumbent, how do you factor in for the power in the incumbency, somebody who's already known, to an unknown?

MR. RICHIE: Like most elections, when there's an incumbent running, a lot of challengers will just not enter the race. The few cases I've looked at, though, a turnout in San Francisco in 2015 was down because it's pretty well understood that Ed Lee was going to win and he did, Right. There was no need to count. There was no need to coordinate. So that doesn't mean you'll find cases where that's true,
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where a poll -- you could have somebody who is a challenger that could build a broad coalition. And that's probably going to be easier to do in a rank-choice environment. I'd certainly agree with that.

MS. CLARKE: And -- and in communities of minorities, where a -- where they now feel that my community is matured enough, we've paid our price in the democracy and we want to get up and run, how do you account for new energy in -- in the process?

MR. BURNETT: In terms of rank-choice voting?

MS. CLARKE: Yeah.
MR. BURNETT: I mean, I actually would defer to -- to Rob on that. I'd let him speak about that.

MR. RICHIE: Why don't we stop for a moment with Grace and then I'll --

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: Okay.
MR. BURNETT: Can I tell you something, too?
MS. WACHLAROWICZ: Thank you. I just have a few comments from the Minneapolis perspective.

First off, I'm not an expertise, as far as campaigning. However, I can give some anecdotal information, as far as the incumbent in the campaign process.

In 2017 our incumbent did not win. So it does occur. Most of our campaigners have different -- it's a different way to campaign, period. It's different from what you are used to right now. When you are going out, you do have to develop a base other than your primary base. Most of our candidates, for example, say okay, you work for a candidate X. I appreciate that. I respect it. But would you choose me as your second choice? And so you're building that broader base. And, in fact, that was one strategy that occurred in 2013.

I'm not an expert. I can't promote it. But I know there are different strategies. It's just a different education, both for the candidates, as well as the voters.

As far as exhaustion rate, I think you need to understand there's a difference in how elections are being administered in general. You, from what I understand, have the primary and then the instant run-off. So then Craig's surmising uneducated voters or lack of education, they need that second run-off would be valid. If
you don't have a run-off system like in Minnesota, it's the majority wins. Our voters are educated on every level because they know that is the choices that are going to make it to the general or the final vote. So it really depends upon what your voters are used to and how to educate them appropriately. But I do think our voters do understand.

And as far as our diverse populations, it's relative to any election. It does not make a difference whether it's rank-choice or not. So I have to respectfully disagree on that point. MR. BURNETT: If you don't mind, so I just wanted to follow on what Ms. Clarke was saying, and also Ms. Godsil.

I think we haven't talked about the longer term impacts. So I think a lot of the focus and I think it's right, it's about in a given election what is the dynamic going to be. And I think you got people -- you know, you got the people turning out for their community or their particular. But I think there's also the question of, what does that tell you, regardless the information, what's the revealed choice of voters when somebody has been actively appealing to them, what does it look like then the next time, right. Then so you just have a much better sense of -- in a community that's been under represented, for example and maybe the mainstream candidates are thinking, ah, well, they don't vote very much. We're not going to -- what happens when you've got somebody they're really excited about and who do they -- what does that look like. And I think that has an impact, of course, in the election where that's happening. But it also has an impact on the political parties on the candidates that time around and the coalitions that are going to be based around it.

MR. RICHIE: So lots of good questions. I'll just touch base on a few things.

The one on incumbency, it's interesting, we run into that question, not surprisingly sometimes when we talk to city councils about this. And we did a deep dive in the Bay area where they've had the most use, 53 offices. And interestingly, it was exactly the same incumbency retention rate pre and before. I think that a -you know, a weak incumbent will have likely more competition and -- and have to, you know, stand
up and earn their 50 percent. But, you know, it seems like incumbents are good at doing that, so -- but they at least have to work for it.

On race, there's some interesting dynamics. One is, we are seeing -- and I don't think it's coincidental -- an increase in people of color winning and the sort of diverse like Minneapolis, St. Paul. First elected black mayor in the most recent election, the Bay area. In the Bay area, we looked at the nature of the electorates from which candidates were winning to. And where the biggest increase was -- was in white plurality, non-white majority districts. That's where the biggest increase of people of color candidates winning was. Which I assume is tied to a certain kind of coalition building dynamic that rank-choice voting promotes. And it's really -the Bay area is like New York, exceptionally diverse, within its diversity. And it's interesting to think about that in relation to some of these conversations about two-step elections. Like Boston had an open seat mayoral race in 2013. The first and second finisher in the run-off were two white Irish candidates. White men. The third through sixth candidates were people of color candidates. And none of them advanced, right. So it was the just two -top two finishers. In Minneapolis, if you translate their first choices in 2017 into what could have happened under their old system, where they used to have a primary, the top two finishers were two white men. And then there were several also women, people of color, behind that. One of them was a woman named Nekima Levy Pounds. Who is an interesting woman who had led the Black Lives Matter movement after some of the police shootings that had taken place in Minneapolis. And she has become a big fan of rank-choice voting. In part because she was in the debate. She was in the discussion. She was raising her issues. And felt the other candidates addressed them. And she's a good person to talk to about how -- how she feels about the system. And then, right, because she wasn't knocked off in some low turnout primary. And -- what was the last thing I was going to say?

Last thing I actually will say. Which is, I think, is just this interesting aspect of engagement and why you might see some exhaustion.

Like -- so one thing to keep in mind for San Francisco or all these cities that we're talking about is their nonpartisan general elections, in a sense. Not probably what you're looking at here, which used to fit in the primaries. Maybe not as stark as like a person of a different party. But just, you know, they just really don't -- don't connect with their final choices. And that's their option. However, the woman who won, London Breed, or probably has won, London Breed, African-American woman. She's a Democrat. But she did a mailing to republicans in San Francisco, making the case, actually, their opponents said, look, she's reaching out to republicans. How shocking. But, you know, she's trying to get votes in what ended up being a very close election. What I found fascinating is that if you look at the top two finishers, she -- and I kind of -- Mark Leno, who is the other top finisher, they were ranked second or third by at least 20 percent, both of them, every other candidate in an eight-candidate field. So they had done their work, or had done their homework. They had done their connections with people. And that's the kind of, I guess, consensus building
that you're encouraging. You never achieve it, but you're encouraging it. And that seems to be happening in these elections.

MS. CLARKE: Have you look at the influence of money on the elections (inaudible) because that ends up being the influence of money on -on politics.

MR. RICHIE: I'll talk briefly and then hand it to Susan.

It completely does away with it. No. No. Money is still a factor. It is interesting. I would say this. We are seeing less of a connection in some ways of a certainty of a connection. And I think that it does promote a style of campaigning earning those second and third, fourth rankings. And I'll say, by the way, just in that sense of using the word fourth ranking, Santa Fe allowed more than three rankings. And, you know, two out of three people ranked five. Some of the exhaustion that you're seeing in San Francisco, about a third of the ballots this year were people who had ranked three who weren't in the final two. So I think if you allowed, say five rankings, you're more likely to have more votes count. And in Santa Fe 96 percent of ballots were counting in the final round. But anyway, Santa Fe's mayor's race, the person who spent the most money won, right, with some -- that's going to happen. If London Breed wins in San Francisco, she had more money at her disposal. However, you are not seeing in some ways the -- the direct connection. Because I think earning those second and third rankings seems to be connected well with engagement that is earning respect. And so that Oakland mayor's race in 2010, the candidate who lost outspent everyone by about five times, if you count his independent expenditures. But it's -- he didn't get out much. He didn't go to the debates. He wouldn't even go the neighborhoods. And that actually sort of, at the end of the day, means you -- you don't earn that kind of respect. So I think the last thing I'll say is it seems like particularly the independent expenditures are seeing patterns where you're still going to see them, people are going to try to win. They're going to use them, of course. But it doesn't seem like they are as effective as I think they are in, say, a two-person race.

MS. LERNER: So I did want to add a note
anecdotally from my colleague in New Mexico, who I talked about the Santa Fe mayor's race. And said what was striking to her is that at least in Santa Fe this is the first time that they used rank-choice voting.

In contrast to earlier mayor's race, the independent expenditures went way, way down because they couldn't figure out who to attack in a rank-choice voting system. So that's only one instance. But I think that that may be very helpful and somewhat relates to what Rob was saying. It -- it appears to diminish the impact of independent spending. Which is -- I see a huge problem and helps candidates connect more directly with voters. Which is what we in Common Cause want to see.

MR. PERALES: Thank you. We have -- I'm going to give John Siegal the last question because we have gone beyond our expectation in terms of when we would finish up.

John.
MR. SIEGAL: So at the risk of Commission exhaustion, is there like -- is there a threshold point of the number of candidates where this system makes sense? And do you find that it -- I
get that it -- it somehow empowers the voters of candidates who would otherwise be also-rans. We have a long history of people in third and fourth place just dropping off the political map in September. Do you find that in a current -- so I get that kind of keeps their voters in the mix. But does it encourage more candidates to run? Do you see a more increase in the number of candidates in the field? And is there some number like five, six, seven, eight, that really is needed before it optimally is effective? MR. RICHIE: I'll comment briefly. It might be interesting to hear from Minneapolis. They had 35 candidates for mayor in 2013. MR. SIEGAL: Yeah. And I counted, there are 16 here. There were eight in San Francisco. MR. RICHIE: Right. MR. SIEGAL: We tend to have four. MR. RICHIE: Yeah. MR. SIEGAL: Three or four. MR. RICHIE: Well, I'll -- I'll give you an example. There were -- governor of California, there were, $I$ don't know, 34 candidates or something for governor in a single choice election. I think a lot of it is really -- and
there were eight candidates for -- for mayor of San Francisco. I will say, by the way, this stat that jumped out to me. There were seven -- San Francisco voters, they were seven times more likely to invalidate their ballot when voting for governor in a single choice election than for mayor with a rank-choice election. And more likely to skip the race, as well. So I think, you know, people are handling the rank-choice ballot in that measure well in San Francisco. But I think that -- you know, that's more -probably more a question of ballot access rules and things than I think the system. It's really you might maybe see a little up-tic. But I would think in particularly -- and we're talking about the uses that you're talking about here, I would say probably it's not a connection. I will say you have a three-candidate race, it's a useful instrument if you have more than two candidates because you're allowing the voter to say something about two people rather than one. If you have ten candidates, it becomes even a more useful instrument. And when New York City uses the school boards and they have their -- their complexities -- but I think one aspect of it was,
there are nine candidates -- I mean nine seats. A lot of people ran. And, you know, voters actually handled the ballot well enough that the DOJ, you know, denied preclearance when they were trying to -- trying to change it.

MS. WACHLAROWICZ: Yes, we had 35 candidates for mayor in 2013. I think it has to do a lot with the culture and your community environment.

First and foremost, our city elections are nonpartisan. We do have political party endorsements. However, our -- each candidate has their political party or principle written. And in 2013, mayor, for $\$ 20$, you could be on the ballot and convey your political principle. So a lot of those candidates, it was an opportunity for them to have that exposure to particular causes. We subsequently increased our filing fee to 500, which reduced it to 16 . Not to say that money is the only issue. Individuals who can't afford it, they do have a petition process. So it is still open to anyone interested. But it's a community culture. It's an opportunity to express. If you typically have four to five candidates that run, I wouldn't see it significantly change.

MR. PERALES: The assistant professor will have the last word.

MR. BURNETT: Great. I'm sure my students would love that.

So I will say, you know, a couple of things just to -- to give Rob's points, too, about the machine not allowing enough people to rank, to rank as many candidates as they want. In Portland, Maine, there were 15 candidates on the ballot. The exhaustion rate was about 18 percent and they were allowed to rank up to all of 15. So it's not entirely because they weren't allowed to rank.

Now, the question about what is, sort of, an optimal number of candidates. That's hard to know. I will sort of give you some general thoughts on it. Which is that the more you ask people to do cognitively at the voting booth, the harder it is for them to figure it out, right. So if you're going to ask them to think about 10, 12, 15 candidates, that is a pretty difficult task. And thinking about how to rank 15 anything is actually pretty difficult. Something you might even know pretty well. You know, come up with your 15 favorite movies, for example. You

## 2018 CHARTER REVISION - 6/12/2018 - MANHATTAN

would spend way more time thinking about it than you probably should. So the fewer candidates there are, the easier it becomes.

And so for me, once you start to leave that threshold of five or six, I think then you're reaching a part of that area where voters are just -- they're going to struggle pretty mightily.

MR. PERALES: Listen, we have reached Commission exhaustion. But it's been fascinating, interesting, and more importantly, I think we've learned a great deal up here.

So thank you very, very much.
MS. GODSIL: Motion to adjourn.
MR. PERALES: Is there a motion?
MS. GODSIL: Motion to adjourn.
MR. PERALES: Is there a second?
MS. WEISER: Second.
MS. CLARKE: Second.
MR. PERALES: We are adjourned.
(Whereupon, at 4:08 P.M., the above matter concluded.)
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