



Minneapolis
City of Lakes

**Office of
Elections &
Voter Registration**

350 South 5th Street – Room 1B
Minneapolis MN 55415-1396

Office 311 or
612 673-3000
Fax 612 673-2756

December 29, 2009

Karen Kelley-Ariwoola
The Minneapolis Foundation
800 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Re: Grant ID 209155

Dear Ms. Kelley-Ariwoola,

Enclosed is the final report as required by the above referenced Minneapolis Foundation grant to the city of Minneapolis. This grant enabled the city to both produce informational materials to be used by RCV partners and to deliver a direct mail piece to every voter in the city.

The grant was of enormous help to the city in educating the voters on Ranked Choice voting and indeed, a recently complete Minneapolis voter survey by St Cloud State University indicated that 80% of the voters came to the polls on election day, aware that they would be voting via Ranked Choice.

We thank you for the financial support of our work and hope that this final report will allow you to evaluate the significant role the foundation played in the administrative success of this historic election in Minneapolis.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Franklin J. Parisi.

Sincerely,

Patrick H. O'Connor
Interim Elections Director
City of Minneapolis

C: Franklin J. Parisi,
Director of Strategic Partnerships

Minnesota Common Report Form Cover Sheet

Date of Report: December 31, 2009
Report Submitted to: Karen Kelley-Ariwoola
Vice President, Community
Philanthropy

Organization Information

Name of organization *Legal name, if different*
City of Minneapolis

Address *Employer Identification Number (EIN)*
350 South Fifth Street, Room M301

City, State, Zip
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Phone *Fax* *Web site*
612/673-2516

Contact person *Phone* *E-mail*
Franklin J. Parisi 612/673-2516 frank.parisi@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Grant Information

Grant ID, if applicable: 209155

Amount and support type: \$35,000 Date grant issued: August 15, 2009

2-3 sentence description of grant:
The Minneapolis Foundation provided funds to the City of Minneapolis to enable the City to
both produce informational materials to be used in connection with the first Ranked Choice
Voting election in the City and to deliver a direct mail piece to every voter in the City.

Check one:

Interim Report _____

Final Report X

Report Form to the Minneapolis Foundation

The City of Minneapolis conducted a public education and outreach campaign to inform voters about the new voting method now used in municipal elections called ranked choice voting (RCV). The objectives of this effort were to make voters aware of the change and educate them on how Ranked Choice Voting works. The Minneapolis Foundation generously provided financial support for “informational materials to be used by the RCV partners and to deliver a direct mail piece to every voter in the city.”

The City of Minneapolis RCV effort produced three types of informational materials for RCV partners. The first was an introductory brochure, which provided basic information about what ranked choice voting is and simple steps on casting a Ranked Choice ballot. This was distributed by volunteers to 18,000 individuals as part of National Night Out activities in August. Secondly, we produced a poster that visually demonstrated how an individual votes. The final piece was a direct mail piece that was sent to every individual with a postal address in the City of Minneapolis. Prior to developing the direct mail piece, the City of Minneapolis hired a usability consultant to ensure that the education materials were easy to understand for all audiences. The results of that testing and a summary of all the other educational activities that the city conducted are outlined in the **attached report**.

As a result of the usability testing, educational materials, and person-to-person engagement, voters were well prepared to use ranked choice voting on Election Day. A poll conducted by Minnesota Public Radio found that 90% of voters felt that they successfully voted using the new ranked choice voting system. The lessons learned from this outreach campaign are documented in the attached report and will provide guidance to the City of Minneapolis in future elections. These materials and the report will be available publicly for other municipalities to use for their own implementation of ranked choice voting.

Appendix F: Budget

Description of Expenses	Budget	Actual
Graphic Designer	\$7,500	\$9,111.13
Web site development	\$2,500	\$2,100.00
Materials	\$15,000	Direct Mail - \$7,332.00
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brochure • Poster • Door-hangers 		Poster - \$736.00
		Brochure - \$5,332.00

Direct Mail	\$25,000	Postage – \$24,595.83
Advertising	\$5,000	\$8,218.00
Miscellaneous	\$5,000	Usability testing \$2,500.00
Total Expenses	\$60,000	\$59,926.96

Note: Expenses were funded by the City of Minneapolis, in the budgeted amount of \$25,000 and by the Minneapolis Foundation Grant # 209155 in the amount of \$35,000. Actual expenditures were made first from foundation funds.

11.03.09

Ranked Choice Voting: It's Coming

**A Report on the
Education and
Outreach Activities**



*Developed by Tipping Point Strategies, LLC
On Behalf of the City of Minneapolis Election Department*

*Michael Dean
Tipping Point Strategies, LLC
<http://www.tippingpointstrategies.org>
1145 Blair Ave.
Saint Paul, MN 55104*

mike@tippingpointstrategies.org
612-770-6908



INTRODUCTION

On November 3, 2009, Minneapolis voters participated in the first ranked choice voting election in Minnesota history. By most accounts, despite new ballots and vote counting procedures, voters were aware of the changes and understood how to vote under the new system. Significantly, concerns about voter confusion were quickly laid to rest. According to a Minnesota Public Radio poll conducted shortly after the election, 90% of Minneapolis voters felt that they successfully voted using the new ranked choice system. This anecdotal information mirrors the low reported spoiled ballot rate, which was 4.1%, or 1,888 out of 45,968 completed ballots. To ensure the highest rate of success, every voter who turned in a spoiled ballot was offered a new ballot.

One voter commented on the Star Tribune website that, "I am skeptical of ranked-choice voting's efficacy as an electoral method, but I do have to say it went very smoothly this morning. The City arranged the ballot in a sensible way, making it very clear that one should vote for only 'ONE' first choice, 'ONE' second, and 'ONE' third on the multiple-seat races, which I thought had the most potential for trouble. Overall, I'm impressed with how they put it together."

Those comments were echoed by advocates for ranked choice voting: "the City of Minneapolis did a great job preparing for today's election in terms of its own processes and in terms of voter education," said Jeanne Massey, executive director of FairVote Minnesota. "The result appears to have been a smooth, trouble-free election. Most voters came to the polls knowing what to do and – when there were questions – election judges were prepared to help as needed. According to initial reports, we saw very few spoiled ballots and we have anecdotal reports indicating voters liked the new voting method."

The education and outreach effort played an important role in preparing voters for the change to ranked choice voting and properly educating them. The effort successfully used limited resources to target outreach into communities that have experienced a high spoiled ballot rate in previous elections.

In addition, our efforts reached voters through a wide variety channels, such as the www.voteminneapolis.org website, direct mail, and one-on-one conversations. Over 500,000 contacts with residents were made over the six-month period. Careful usability testing of the ballot and message testing of the education materials also ensured success.

These three reasons, combined with effective election judge instructions at the polls, made sure that voters were prepared for this new voting method.

I. EFFICACY OF TESTING

The education and outreach effort began in May 2009 with a test election. Over 40 members of the community participated in the election, which evaluated the ballot design, election judges' instructions, and potential problems that voters might face. As a result of the test election, we gathered valuable information that helped us develop our education materials and outreach plan.

One of the most important pieces of feedback that we received from the test election was regarding the ballot design. Many of the participants felt that aspects of the ballot were confusing,

which prompted an effort to redesign the ballot. We engaged a usability and design expert to make significant improvements to the layout of the ballot and instructions. Visual elements were added to the instructions that depicted correct and incorrect voting methods. Additionally, shading was added to the 2nd and 3rd choice columns to make it clearer that those columns were for the same race. Some of the suggestions could not be implemented because of limitations of the equipment or mandates in state law, but most of the improvements were incorporated. These changes played a critical role in making it easier for voters to understand how to vote with a ranked choice ballot. According to an Editorial in the October 29, 2009 *Pioneer Press*, "The Minneapolis ballot design is a winner."

In addition to the test election, we conducted a usability study of the voter education materials provided to voters via direct mail pieces as well as in the voting booth. The elections department hired a usability expert to conduct the test with 12 random individuals. The testing uncovered that the voter education materials as constructed did a good job of educating individuals about the new voting method. Yet, based on the feedback, more information was included to ensure that voters understood that they did not have to vote for more than one candidate.

Clearly, usability testing was a critical part of the success of this effort. Nothing replaces feedback from actual voters regarding ballot design and instructions. This testing really started the education and outreach effort out on the right foot.

II. COMMUNICATIONS EFFORTS

The ranked choice voting communication effort employed a wide variety of mediums to reach voters throughout the city. We utilized a hybrid approach that married general communications outreach to the entire city with targeted grassroots activities to engage specific populations.

Materials

The communication effort began with the development of a multifunctional brochure. This brochure was designed to generally inform voters about ranked choice voting and how to vote. Almost 70,000 brochures were distributed to organizations, candidates, and on National Night Out. In addition to the brochure, we developed posters to distribute to coffee shops, apartment buildings and other public spaces. In the end, about 2,000 posters were put up throughout the city, ensuring that ranked choice voting had a ubiquitous presence.

Other materials were created on an as-needed basis, such as a one-page handout that organizations could easily copy and widely distribute to members. To reach the maximum number of voters, this handout was translated into the Spanish, Somali, and Hmong. Further, we developed a one-page brochure that detailed vote counting when, during outreach events, the education team began to get many questions from individuals on how ranked choice votes are counted. Our ability to stay nimble and react to issues as they arose allowed us to effectively manage our time and resources while providing information the public needed.

Website

We knew that for our effort to be successful we needed a functional, engaging and visible web presence. The Vote Minneapolis website was created as a one-stop-shop for information on

ranked choice voting. It provided visitors with the basic information about ranked choice voting and utilized interactive media to demonstrate how individuals vote using this system. The website also provided detailed information about how ranked choice ballots are counted and how city residents could help spread the word about ranked choice voting, as well as allowing voters to ask questions about the new voting method. To ensure that the public received the best information, we regularly updated the website with new content and provided a listing of all community education and outreach events.

The website received over 11,500 visits, with the average visitor looking at 2.3 pages per visit. This means that people really utilized all the website had to offer and looked around for the specific information they wanted. Many visitors were directed to our website from the City of Minneapolis' website (33%), by typing the url directly into their web browser (36%), or by searching for it on Google (5%).

Direct mail

We also contacted voters directly through mail. In early September, all city residents received a notification about the new voting system with their utility bill. This reached about 102,000 city residents.

Then, approximately three weeks before the election, all Minneapolis residents received a postcard explaining ranked choice voting and inviting them to attend an information session in a location near them. This went out to all residents throughout the city.

Media coverage

The ranked choice voting effort received a significant amount of media attention during the four weeks prior to the election. Regular press releases went out to the major media outlets and community newspapers. Throughout the six months, at least 46 stories were written about the new voting method and they reached over 200,000 people. (See the Appendix B for the complete list of media hits.)

Advertising

To maximize our resources, we only engaged in free advertising opportunities for our large scale efforts. The campaign began by engaging Metro Transit to provide free advertising inside of buses that run Minneapolis routes, which provided us with space for approximately 1200 signs. Then, Clear Channel advertising offered to place ranked choice voting signs on their digital display ads at no charge.

The last month before the election, we placed ads in six community newspapers: Southwest Journal, Downtown Journal, Spokesman, Circle, North and Northeaster. The proximity to the election and the targeted nature of these publications allowed us to ensure that our advertising budget would have the biggest impact.

III. IMPORTANCE OF GRASSROOTS OUTREACH

The grassroots effort focused on having as many one-on-one conversations with voters as practicable. We learned from other engagement efforts that these interactions had the most success in educating voters. We focused our efforts on three communities that were likely to

benefit most from hands-on outreach activities: the elderly, people that speak English as a second language, and communities with an historically high rate of spoiled ballots. Research from other municipalities that have implemented ranked choice voting mentioned that these specific communities needed a higher level of engagement.

Speakers Bureau and Events

The grassroots effort developed a speakers bureau to make short presentations about ranked choice voting at community and cultural events throughout the city. A total of 27 people were recruited and trained as speakers. A wide assortment of community members volunteered to participate in the speakers bureau, including FairVote volunteers, election judges, and other community leaders.

Altogether, the speakers bureau members spoke at 119 events throughout the city. These events ranged from association meetings, resident council meetings, and voter education sessions. We also had a strong presence at nursing homes and other facilities that cater to seniors. (For a comprehensive list of events, please see Appendix E.) Approximately 5,000 people were engaged by the speakers bureau.

To complement these efforts, we engaged over 40 volunteers and 16 neighborhood associations to educate the public at National Night Out activities on August 5, 2009. Voter education volunteers attended 297 parties on National Night Out and reached 18,651 residents of Minneapolis.

Nonprofit Outreach

We sent letters to 500 Minneapolis-based nonprofits seeking their help to engage their members and the public. In particular, because of their close ties to the community, we wanted to engage neighborhood associations, cultural organizations, and civic organizations. To ensure participation, we followed up with a targeted list of nonprofits by phone and email.

Neighborhood Associations

We had four “asks” for neighborhood associations:

1. Include information about ranked choice voting in their newsletters, websites, emails, etc.
2. Promote our “Tour of the City” educational event series.
3. Have someone speak about ranked choice voting at their meetings or events.
4. Assist with our neighborhood canvass.

We contacted 68 neighborhood associations through phone calls, letters and emails. The City Minneapolis Community Engagement Coordinator for the City of Minneapolis assisted in getting the neighborhood associations more involved with ranked choice voting education and outreach.

Over one-third of the neighborhood associations put information on their websites and newsletters. Speakers bureau members spoke at 20 neighborhood association meetings about the new voting method. At the beginning of this effort, we hoped that neighborhood associations would be very engaged in reaching out to their community. Unfortunately, that did not materialize because of the funding shortages that are hitting many of the neighborhood associations and other nonprofit partners. Given these limitations, we were still able to engage those who serve on neighborhood association boards. These community thought-leaders helped spread the message virally from person-to-person.

Cultural Organizations

We worked with 25 cultural organizations, including the Brian Coyle Center, Somali Action Alliance, and the Southeast Asian Community Council. Presentations were made to their staff and materials were provided to them to share with their members and clients. The city's office for multicultural services also assisted in engaging various ethnic and cultural groups in Minneapolis.

Civic and Labor Organizations

We had one major labor partner: Working Partnerships, a community service program that serves a variety of unions in the Twin Cities. Working Partnerships had two staff members participate in the speakers bureau, conducting 16 meetings with a dozen different unions. Working Partnerships also sent information about ranked choice voting to all of the union members that utilized its services since 2007. The Service Employees International Union also sent a mailer about ranked choice voting to all of its Minneapolis members.

In addition, we worked with the Civic Engagement Table, a coalition of nonprofits including Wellstone Action!, Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, Somali Action Alliance, and the Minneapolis Highrise Representative Council (MHRC).

The MHRC was one of our strongest and most effective nonprofit partners. MHRC is an organization that represents 5,000 public housing residents in Minneapolis. Three MHRC members were on our speakers bureau. Thanks to a donor secured by FairVote, we were also able to hire two residents (as well as four Somali residents who served as interpreters) to canvass public housing. These canvassers reached almost 700 public highrise residents who we identified as likely voters.

MHRC members on our speakers bureau talked to 15 resident councils, including the MHRC annual celebration and at their regional meetings in the fall. Ranked choice voting information appeared in the MHRC newspaper, *The Highrise Lowdown*, and MHRC also coordinated the distribution of the city's ranked choice voting materials to all of the highrise buildings in the city.

Candidates

Candidates played an important role in educating voters on how to vote. We organized a series of trainings for candidates and their staff, educating them on the best ways to talk to voters about ranked choice voting. (See Appendix E.) In addition, the candidates assisted in distributing the education materials that the City of Minneapolis produced and included ranked choice voting language in their own education materials. Their assistance allowed us to reach populations that had a high probability of voting in the municipal election.

Senior Outreach

The senior community was an important community of interest for our voter education activities. Early on, we met with the city's Senior Citizen Advisory Committee and worked with the city's ombudsman on senior outreach. We reached out to every nursing home, assisted living housing, senior apartment building, and senior center in Minneapolis to conduct a voting training or distribute materials to residents. Some nursing homes with higher-need patients declined ranked choice voting training, but we successfully engaged 31 different groups of seniors through the speakers bureau.

Canvass

Running a canvass operation was not part of the original education and outreach plan. However, the need for a canvass became evident towards the end of the summer and the canvass operation was launched in mid-September. The city has no natural base of volunteers beyond election judges; therefore, recruitment was difficult and we relied heavily on lists provided by FairVote. We picked precincts for canvassing based on three factors: number of spoiled ballots in past elections, percentage of the population that are seniors, and the density of likely voters. Based on these criteria, we canvassed the following precincts:

Ward 2, Precincts 3 and 6
Ward 4, Precincts 1, 3, and 6
Ward 5, Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
Ward 6, Precincts 5 and 7
Ward 8, Precinct 5
Ward 9, Precinct 10
Ward 10, Precincts 5 and 9

In total, we knocked on 6,778 doors and had one-on-one conversations with 1,551 voters.

CONCLUSION

The ranked choice voting education and outreach effort was successful not because of any single strategy or tactic, but rather because the combination of efforts we employed worked to reinforce key messages. As a result, we achieved our main objective: a well-informed voting population that participated in a smooth election day. As the City of Minneapolis looks forward to the next ranked choice voting election, it should consider ways that it could continue to educate voters.

Four years is a long period between elections and voters will likely forget that the ranked choice voting method is used for municipal races. The City of Minneapolis should plan on running a similar voter education campaign before the 2011 election to refresh voters' memories. This will ensure that future elections run as smoothly as the 2009 election.

More importantly, the next election cycle will likely have a higher voter turnout that will necessitate additional education efforts targeted at infrequent voters who likely did not participate in 2009. A voter education campaign would need to reach to this group, as well as the other targeted communities that we mentioned earlier, to ensure that there is not a higher level of voter error in future election.

In the end, the act of ranked choice voting was not complicated for voters to understand. Voters are often smarter than the pundits give them credit for and, with continued education efforts, voters should not have any problems in the next municipal election to be held 2013 and beyond.

Appendix A
Total Contacts

<i>Type of Contact</i>	<i>Number of Contacts Made</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<i>Grass Roots Contacts</i>		
National Night Out	18,651	
Speakers Bureau Meetings/Events	4,987	
Canvassing	6,778	
Businesses / Coffee Shops Flyered	2,000	21 coffee shops allowed RCV flyers.
Flyers in Schools	1,000	-posted flyers in 49 schools, 4 schools published info in their newsletter.
Direct Mail to all MPLS residents	200,000	# of pieces mailed
Direct Mail to Utility Bill Recipients	102,000	# of pieces mailed
Church Newsletters/Postings	600	-posted flyers in 17 churches, 7 churches put info in their newsletter.
<i>Total Grass Roots Contacts</i>	336,016	
<i>Media Contacts</i>		
RCV Youtube Video	465	views
MPR RCV Youtube video	2,483	views
Southwest Journal	35,000	circulation of paper
Downtown Journal	30,000	circulation of paper
Spokesman Recorder	10,000	circulation of paper
The Circle	10,000	circulation of paper
Northeaster	34,500	circulation of paper
North News	29,000	circulation of paper
La Prensa	14,200	circulation of paper
Facebook contacts	349	349 facebook "fans"
Website Hits	11,500	
Metro Transit PSA	12,000	Estimate based on 100 people seeing each sign.
<i>Total Media Contacts</i>	180,497	
<i>Total Contacts</i>	516,513	

Appendix B
Media Listings

Ranked-choice voting a go for November election

Downtown Journal

6/22/09

“A pair of decisions this month have guaranteed that Minneapolis will implement ranked-choice voting in the November election.”

<http://www.downtownjournal.com/forPrint.php?story=13898&page=65&category=96&action=forPrint&publication=downtown> □

DATELINE MINNEAPOLIS; Residents try hand at new voting system; Instant-runoff voting is easier to cast than count.

Star Tribune

8/19/09

“Second, they need to learn a new voting system that no one else in the state is using.”

<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-206175360.html>

Rank Choice Voting, GC and TP

Marcus Harcus Campaign Website

8/20/09

“Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) is the new voting system being implemented this year by the City of Minneapolis.”

<http://www.marcusharcus.org/blog/?p=81>

Ranked choice voting means no primary Tuesday in Mpls.

KARE 11

09/04/09

“Voters who show up at their normal polling places Tuesday will be greeted by a sign that says “There is no primary today.”

http://www.kare11.com/news/news_article.aspx?storyid=824444&catid=14

Primary election Tuesday in St. Paul, none in Minneapolis

Workday Minnesota

9/13/09

“In Minneapolis, voters will go to the polls just once this fall...”

http://www.workdayminnesota.org/index.php?news_6_4157

Mpls. Skips Primary Due to New Voting Method

KSTP

9/15/09

“Minneapolis voters will not head to the polls for a primary election Tuesday”

<http://kstp.com/news/stories/S1138028.shtml?cat=206>

Absentee Ranked Choice Voting Begins

The Mayor Blog

10/1/09

“The City of Minneapolis is geared up and ready to go with its new Ranked Choice Voting system.”

<http://themayorblog.com/2009/10/01/absentee-ranked-choice-voting-begins/>

Minneapolis voters get 1st, 2nd and 3rd choices

KARE 11

10/2/09

“Foes say it's confusing, inefficient and a slap against the principle of "one person, one vote."”

http://www.kare11.com/news/news_article.aspx?storyid=827648

Election Day: Minneapolis voters try new voting system

KARE 11

10/3/09

“After months of training, anticipation, and some uncertainty, Minneapolis has arrived at Election Day 2009”

http://www.kare11.com/news/news_article.aspx?storyid=827684

Ranked Choice Voting official in Minneapolis starting November 3

Twin Cities Daily Planet

10/5/09

“Minneapolis voters in 2006 approved the new voting system, called Ranked Choice Voting (RCV)”

<http://www.tcdailyplanet.net/news/2009/10/05/ranked-choice-voting-official-minneapolis-starting-november-3>

IRV offers new strategies for Minneapolis candidates

MPR News Q

10/16/09

“...voters won't notice a big difference when the city begins using Instant Runoff Voting on Nov. 3, but candidates and their supporters already are...”

<http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2009/10/16/irv-voting-minneapolis/?refid=0>

Minneapolis begins IRV learning sessions tonight

MPR News Q

10/19/09

“The city of Minneapolis begins a series of public educational meetings on Instant Runoff Voting Monday night.”

<http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2009/10/16/irv-voting-sessions/?refid=0>

Minneapolis launches IRV education campaign for Nov. 3 elections

KARE 11

10/21/09

“The city of Minneapolis has launched an effort to educate voters about instant runoff voting.”

http://www.kare11.com/news/news_article.aspx?storyid=826820

Mpls. To Teach Voters To Use Ranked Choice Ballots

WCCO

October 19th, 2009

“What this did is it actually combined the primary and the general election into one event,” said Mike Dean, a City of Minneapolis employee who led a workshop Monday night on the new system. It's the first of 14 workshops over the next 14 days to educate voters.”

<http://wcco.com/politics/minneapolis.ranked.voting.2.1258324.html>

Election night wins might be tough to call in Minneapolis

Star Tribune

10/22/09

“Not only will it take weeks before all results are known from the first attempt at ranked-choice voting in Minneapolis, but some of the election-night results will be misleading.”

<http://www.startribune.com/politics/65698537.html>

Minneapolis officials spread the word on ranked-choice voting

MPR News Q

10/22/09

“Dean explained that the biggest change in the system will be how the votes are counted, particularly for multiple seat races.”

<http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2009/10/22/irv-meetings/>

VOTING DAY BASICS // voter's guide 2009

Downtown Journal

10/26/09

<http://www.downtownjournal.com/index.php?&story=14576&page=65&category=125>

Independence Party fields impressive candidates for Minneapolis City Council seats

Examiner.com

10/26/09

“The Minnesota Independence Party has endorsed several candidates in what officially is a non-partisan election.”

<http://www.examiner.com/x-19844-Hennepin-County-Independent-Examiner~y2009m10d26-Independence-Party-fields-impressive-candidates-for-Minneapolis-City-Council-seats>

Ranked Choice Voting Basics

KFAI

10/26/09

“St. Paul residents are going to decide whether they want it and Minneapolis residents are actually going to use it on Election Day next Tuesday, November 3rd.”

<http://www.kfai.org/node/23712> □

Rank Choice Voting BUST and Tainted Ballots – Get this: In North Minneapolis!

The Independent Business News Network

10/27/09

The fake undercover video

http://ibnn.org/tainted_ballots_nompls/ □

IRV voting to be unveiled in Minneapolis on Nov. 3.

MNDaily.com

10/28/09

“Officials say rank-choice voting will promote fairer local elections based on competition and civic duty.”

<http://www.mndaily.com/2009/10/28/irv-voting-be-unveiled-minneapolis-nov-3>

Minneapolis tries ranked-choice voting

Star Tribune

11/2/09

“...a lot less confusing than it sounds...”

<http://www.startribune.com/politics/local/65955557.html?elr=KArksc8P:Pc:UHDaaDyiUiD3aPc:Yyc:aUU>

Video: Minneapolis Voters on Ranked-Choice-“Easy”

Daily Kos

11/3/09

““Ranked Choice Voting” seemed to go very smoothly Tuesday.”

<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2009/11/3/201341/820>

Mpls. Voters Adapt Easily to Ranked Choice Voting

KSTP News

11/3/09

“Election officials said ranked choice voting in Minneapolis was a success.”

<http://kstp.com/article/stories/S1231640.shtml?cat=89>

Election Day: Minneapolis voters try new voting system

Kare 11

11/3/09

“When voters get their ballots Tuesday, they won't just choose one candidate for elected offices, unless they want to. Instead, they'll have the opportunity to rank their first, second and third choices.”

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/33604762/>

Success For Ranked-Choice

Star Tribune

11/4/09

“Minneapolis voters seemed to adjust to ranked-choice voting with relative ease on Tuesday...”

http://www.startribune.com/politics/local/69018792.html?elr=KArks8c7PaP3E77K_3c::D3aDhUHc3E7_ec7PaP3iUiacyKUUr

Ranked Choice Voting in Minneapolis – St Paul

Election Law Blog

11/4/09

“Minneapolis voters were apparently unfazed by the debut of ranked-choice voting Tuesday...”

<http://electionlawblog.org/archives/014692.html>

Minneapolis Voters Find Ranked Choice Voting Easy

Daily Motion

11/4/09

“Months of planning apparently paid off in Minneapolis...”

http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xb14b9_minneapolis-voters-find-ranked-choi_news

Ranked Choice Voting, HINI New For Election Day

WCCO

11/4/09

“It's called Ranked Choice Voting, and it could help minority candidates.”

<http://wcco.com/local/election.day.Minnesota.2.1289877.html>

Minneapolis Voters Find Ranked Choice Voting Easy

Veoh.com (video)

11/4/09

“Months of planning apparently paid off in Minneapolis as the city's first election using "Ranked Choice Voting" seemed to go very smoothly Tuesday.”

<http://www.veoh.com/browse/morelike/v19316397cBw8T78K>

Turnout is low for debut of Minneapolis' instant-runoff voting

TwinCities.com

11/4/09

“Multiple-choice questions weren't enough to drive Minneapolis voters to the polls Tuesday night.”

http://www.twincities.com/news/ci_13707562?source=rss □

November 3rd is Election Day!

Votekimv.com

No date

http://voteforkimv.com/?page_id=163

General Election, Tuesday, November 3

AFL-CIO

No Date

“Election Day 2009 lacks the drama of last year's presidential contest, but voters this year will be voting in important local races Tuesday, November 3.”

<http://www.minneapolisunions.org/index.php> □ □

Ranked Choice Voting Debuts in Mpls Tues

AOL Video

No Date

Video about ranked choice voting.

<http://video.aol.co.uk/video-detail/ranked-choice-voting-debuts-in-mpls-tues/1962125564>

Instant Runoff Voting- Making Democracy Work

MPIRG

No Date

“On the ballot, voters rank the candidates in order of preference...”

http://www.mpirg.org/current_issues/ranked_choice_voting.html

Rank Choice Voting (link to voteminneapolis.org)

minneapolisparcs.org

No Date

“On Nov, 3, voters in Minneapolis will be able to rank...”

<http://www.minneapolisparcs.org/default.asp?PageID=1166>

Appendix C

Memo

To: Cynthia Reichert, City of Minneapolis Elections
From: Mike Dean, Tipping Point Strategies
RE: Test Election Feedback

The City of Minneapolis Election Department conducted a test election to help the staff evaluate the procedures for implementing ranked choice voting. Over the course of week, Tipping Point Strategies interviewed members of various organizations and interested members of the public to gather input on the ranked choice voting process and ballot design.

The over 40 individuals that we met with provided the following feedback:

Ballot Design

- Many commented that repeating all of the candidate names in every column makes it look as though the three ranking columns are actually three separate races. Suggestions for fixing this point of confusion included using thicker lines between offices and creating one heading with the name of the office that spans all three columns.
- Since the ballot machines only detect some types of voter errors, many voters made mistakes that were not caught. These mistakes included skipping rankings and voting for the same candidate more than once. Election judges expressed surprise at the large number of spoiled ballots cast during the test election. As a result, their biggest concern is having enough ballots for the actual election.
- The most common mistake was, luckily, one that is detectable by the ballot machines: choosing more than one first choice in the multi-seat (park board at large and board of estimate and taxation) races. Many voters were extremely confused that two or three people were to be elected but they were only able to *rank* two or three candidates instead of *voting for* two or three candidates.

Election Judge Instructions

- Voters found the explanation of how to fill out their RCV ballot given by the demonstration election judge helpful but overly long. Many admitted to “tuning out” midway through the explanation. Instructions on the ballot and plentiful explanatory posters in the polling place will be key to reducing voter error.
- Election judges also wanted to create a climate in the polling place in which voters feel comfortable asking for a new ballot if they make a mistake. Many voters who made mistakes during the test election were extremely embarrassed about asking for a new ballot.

Voting Method

- Some people felt that the process in which the winner is determined in the multi-seat election is complicated and confusing. This will require additional levels of education for those that are interested in the process.
- Many voters expressed anger about how multi-seat races were determined using RCV. A common comment was “this is not what I voted for in 2006.”

Appendix D
Usability Evaluation from Straight Line Theory
on Voter Education Materials

What We Tested

- Ranked Choice Voting Ballot
- Voter Education Card (Versions A and B)

Who Participated

- 14 participants
- Mix of ages, genders and ethnicities

Results

- People had few problems filling out their ballots
- People found the voter education card helpful and instructive
- People made fewer mistakes with Version A than Version B
- None of the participants made mistakes with Version A
- 3 people made mistakes with Version B
- 1 person marked the same candidate for 1st, 2nd and 3rd choices
- 1 person over-voted by marking more than one candidate in a column
- 1 person marked only a 2nd choice candidate, skipping the other columns
- Most participants understood how to mark only a 1st choice
- Marking only a 1st choice was more common with Version A
- Nearly all participants would ask for a new ballot if they made a mistake
- 2 people questioned how votes would be counted and/or why Ranked Choice Voting is better

Recommendations

Given that the materials tested well and the tight timeline for making changes, we recommend the following refinements.

1. Use Version A of the voter education materials.
2. Change the right-column heading from 'Things to Keep in Mind to 'Important Voting Information' or 'How to Avoid Mistakes'. Lead with the three common mistakes. Follow with instructions to fill out both sides and what to do if you make a mistake. Close with reminder that you vote the same for all races, but simplify the language for less-sophisticated voters.
3. Include a concise statement about how votes are counted; combine with "Election officials will not use your second or third choice unless your first choice has already been eliminated or elected."
4. In the introduction, consider rewriting to speak directly to the voter ('You' versus 'voters in Minneapolis'). Consider using color and/or a bold font to emphasize the phrases "rank your choices" and "up to three different candidates." This recommendation would apply only in the version that will appear in the voting station, not in direct mail.

5. While participants made few mistakes unaided, the orientation from the election judge on Election Day will help. The orientation should explain the correct and incorrect ways to fill out the ballot and remind voters to ask for a new ballot if they make mistakes.

Appendix E
Contact Logs

Candidate Contact Log

Candidate	Office	October 21 event	Outreach Status
Dick Franson	Mayor	Left Message	Trained
Gregg A Iverson	City Council		Trained 7/25
Scott Vreeland	Park & Rec Board	may show up for drop in	LM
Laura Jean	City Council		Trained 7/25
Michael J Katch	City Council	emailed info has to talk with scheduler	LM
Brent Perry	City Council		attending
Diane Hoftstede	City Council		trained
Meg Tuthill	City Council		trained
Lisa Goodman	City Council		LM
Barbara A. Johnson	City Council		LM
Jordan Brandt			Trained 7/25
Todd J Eberhardy	City Council	emailed	attending
John Charles Wilson	Mayor		Trained 7/25
Gary Schiff	City Council		LM
Gregory McDonald	City Council	attending	attending
Robert Lilligren	City Council		trained
Tom Nordyke	Park & Rec Board		LM
Troy Parker	City Council		attending
Kevin Reich	City Council		LM
Elizabeth Glidden	City Council		trained
Sandy Colvin Roy	City Council		LM
Carol Jean Becker	Board of Estimation & Taxation		LM
Anita Tabb	Park & Rec Board		trained
Liz Wielinski	Park & Rec Board		trained
Steve Barland	Park & Rec Board		trained
Don Samuels	City Council	number wrong on website	lm
DeWayne Townsend	Board of Estimation & Taxation		trained
Meg Forney	Park & Rec Board		trained
Dan W. Peterson	Park & Rec Board	left message	LM
John Quincy	City Council		Trained 7/25
Kim Vlajsvljevich	City Council		Trained 7/25
Phil Willkie	Board of Estimation & Taxation	attending	LM
Mark Fox	City Council	left message	LM
Betsy Hodges	City Council	attending	attending
Cam Gordon	City Council	left message	maybe
Jon Olson	Park & Rec Board		LM
John Erwin	Park & Rec Board	left message	LM
Brad Bourn	Park & Rec Board	try to attend on the 21st but will	LM