
Survey Overview

The Morris Leatherman Company, is pleased to present the results of this study to the City of Minneapolis. This section provides a brief introduction to the specifications of the survey and a guide to the organization of the written analysis.

While the most statistically sound procedures have been used to collect and analyze the information presented herein, it must always be kept in mind that surveys are not predictions. They are designed to measure public opinion within identifiable limits of accuracy at *specific points in time*. This survey is in no way a prediction of opinions, perceptions, or actions at any future point in time. After all, in public policy analysis, the major task is to impact these revealed opinions in a constructive fashion.

The Principal Investigator for this study was Dr. William D. Morris; the Project Director overseeing all phases of the research and analysis was Mr. Peter Leatherman.

Research Design

This study contains the results of a telephone survey of 800 randomly selected voters in the 2013 Municipal election in the City of Minneapolis and a 500 randomly selected non-voters in the 2013 Municipal election in the City of Minneapolis. Survey responses were gathered by professional interviewers across the community between November 18th and December 6th, 2013.

The average interview took fourteen minutes.

All respondents interviewed in this study were part of a randomly generated sample of the City of Minneapolis. The random sample of 800 voters yields results projectable to the respective universe within ± 3.5 percent in 95 out of 100 cases, while the random sample of 500 non-voters yields results projectable to the respective universe within ± 4.5 in 95 out of 100 cases.

Interviews were conducted by **Morris Leatherman Company** trained personnel from telephone banks in St. Paul, Minnesota. Approximately twenty percent of all interviews were independently validated for procedure and content by a Morris Leatherman Company supervisor. Completed interviews were edited and coded at the company's headquarters in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Statistical analysis and cross-tabulations were produced by the company's CfMC Mentor Analysis System and SPSS 19.0 FOR WINDOWS.

Organization of the Study

The results of this study are presented in the following order:

The *Analysis* consists of a written report of the major findings. The results contained herein were also presented verbally to the client.

The *Questionnaire* reproduces the survey instrument as it was used in the interviewing process. This section also includes a response frequency distribution for each question.

Any further questions the reader may have about this study which are not answered in this report should be directed to either Dr. Morris or Mr. Leatherman.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Residential Demographics.	6
Residential Demographics.	7
Age of Respondent.	7
Educational Level.	7
Ethnicity.	8
Telephone Service.	8
Zip Code.	9
Income.	10
Gender.	10
Summary and Conclusions.	10
Chapter Two: Voters.	11
Voters.	12
In Person or Absentee	12
Know Before about RCV.	12
Information Sources about RCV.	13
Level of Understanding.	16
Helpfulness of Election Judges.	17
Actually Rank Candidates.	18
Opinion of RCV.	22
Delay in Announcing Winners.	23
Confidence in Counting of Votes.	23
RCV Used in Future.	24
Different Winner.	25
Voting Behavior.	26
Summary and Conclusions.	27
Chapter Three: Non-Voters.	28
Non-Voters.	29
Reason for Not Voting.	29
Know about Use of RCV.	30
Information Sources about RCV.	31
RCV Simple or Difficult.	33
Opinion of RCV.	34
Fairness of RCV.	35
Confidence in Counting of Votes.	36
RCV Used in Future.	37
Future Voting Behavior.	38
Summary and Conclusions.	39
Chapter Four: Concluding Thoughts.	40
Concluding Thoughts.	41
Section Two: Election Judges.	42
Election Judges.	43

Section Three: Election Candidates..... 44
Election Candidates..... 45

Analysis

Chapter One: Residential Demographics

Residential Demographics

Respondents in the City of Minneapolis were asked a series of questions about their demographic backgrounds. These questions were asked to track any differences between subgroups and the rest of the population. Throughout the course of this study, subgroup differences will be discussed.

Age of Respondent

Respondents were asked:

What age group are you a member of?

The median age of a 2013 voter is 49.3 years old; the median age of a 2013 non-voter is 42.6 years old:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
18-24	5%.....	16%
25-34	12%.....	18%
35-44	23%.....	21%
45-54	23%.....	14%
55-64	18%.....	12%
65 AND OVER.....	20%.....	0%

It is noteworthy that 38% of the voters report ages of 55 years old and older, while only 12% of the non-voters report ages in that same range.

Educational Level

Respondents were next queried:

What is the last grade of formal education you completed?

They typical 2013 voter is a college-graduate; the typical non-voter has some college experience, albeit short of graduation:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
HIGH SCHOOL OR LESS.....	3%.....	4%
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE.....	17%.....	26%

VO-TECH/TECH COLLEGE.....	10%.....	12%
SOME COLLEGE.....	18%.....	18%
COLLEGE GRADUATE.....	40%.....	31%
POST GRADUATE.....	12%.....	8%
REFUSED.....	0%.....	1%

While 20% of the 2013 voters possess a high school education or less, 30% of the non-voters report the same education level. Similarly, 52% of the 2013 voters have college educations, while 39% of the non-voters report the same educational experience.

Ethnicity

Minneapolis residents were queried:

Which of the following categories represents your ethnicity – Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic-Latino, Asian-Pacific Islander, American Indian, or something else? What would that be?

Seventy percent of the 2013 voters self-report as “Caucasian,” while 58% of the 2013 non-voters identify the same way:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
CAUCASIAN.....	70%.....	58%
AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....	14%.....	21%
HISPANIC-LATINO.....	6%.....	10%
ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLANDER.....	6%.....	5%
AMERICAN INDIAN.....	2%.....	3%
SOMETHING ELSE.....	0%.....	1%
MIXED/BI-RACIAL.....	2%.....	2%
DON’T KNOW.....	0%.....	0%
REFUSED.....	0%.....	1%

African-Americans are 14% of the 2013 electorate; they compose 21% of the non-voters. Hispanic-Latino ethnic groups show roughly the same proportion.

Telephone Service

Respondents were asked:

Is your household telephone service by land line only, cell phone only, or both land line or cell phone?

Differences between the types of telephone service used by 2013 voters and non-voters are not significantly different:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
LAND LINE ONLY.....	14%.....	17%
CELL PHONE ONLY.....	24%.....	28%
BOTH LAND/CELL.....	61%.....	55%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%.....	1%

Majorities of both groups report both a land line and cell phone in their household.

Zip Code

Interviewees were next asked:

What is your zipcode?

Both 2013 voters and non-voters reflect the pattern of turnout across the community:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
55401	2%.....	2%
55402	1%.....	1%
55403	4%.....	2%
55404	5%.....	6%
55405	3%.....	3%
55406	9%.....	10%
55407	8%.....	10%
55408	4%.....	6%
55409	3%.....	4%
55410	7%.....	5%
55411	4%.....	6%
55412	7%.....	8%
55413	3%.....	1%
55414	6%.....	4%
55415	1%.....	1%
55416	2%.....	3%
55417	9%.....	8%
55418	8%.....	9%
55419	10%.....	7%
55430	2%.....	3%
55454	1%.....	1%
55455	1%.....	1%

Income

Respondents were asked:

Would you please tell me the range which best represents the total yearly income, before taxes, of all immediate family living in your household?

The median pre-tax yearly household income for 2013 voters is \$50,000.00; the median for 2013 non-voters is \$37,850.00:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
UNDER \$15,000.	3%	10%
\$15,000 TO \$25,000.	5%	15%
\$25,001 TO \$35,000.	13%	18%
\$35,001 TO \$50,000.	25%	21%
\$50,001 TO \$75,000.	25%	17%
\$75,001 TO \$100,000.	12%	7%
OVER \$100,000.	7%	5%
DON'T KNOW.	1%	0%
REFUSED.	10%	7%

Households reporting yearly incomes under \$35,000.00 are 21% of the 2013 voters group and 43% of the non-voters group. Similarly, households posting incomes over \$50,000.00 are 44% of the 2013 voters group and 29% of the non-voters group.

Gender

The gender of each respondent was noted:

	VOTER	NON-VOTER
MALE.	49%	50%
FEMALE.	51%	50%

There was no significant gender difference between the two groups.

Summary and Conclusions

2013 Minneapolis municipal election voters were more often than non-voters to be older, have more formal education, more often Caucasian, and members of higher income households.

Chapter Two: Voters

Voters

Identified 2013 Minneapolis voters were asked a series of questions about the ranked choice voter system. In general, knowledge about the system, confidence in the system and eases of voting were highly rated.

In Person or Absentee

Respondents were asked:

Did you vote in person or absentee?

Ninety-two percent report voting in person:

IN-PERSON.....	92%
ABSENTEE.....	8%
DON'T KNOW.....	0%
REFUSED.....	0%

Only eight percent report submitting absentee ballots.

“In-person” was indicated more often by:

- Caucasians

“Absentee” is cited more often by:

- Hispanic-Latinos
- over \$75,000 annual income households

Know Before about RCV

2013 Minneapolis voters were queried:

Before you voted, did you know you would be asked to rank your vote choices?

A very high 92% knew before they voted they would be asked to rank choices:

YES	92%
NO	8%
DON'T KNOW.....	0%

REFUSED. 0%

Only eight percent report they were unaware.

Knowledge increased among:

- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds
- Caucasians
- college graduates
- residents in the northeast area of Minneapolis
- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

It decreased among:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- African-Americans
- residents in the northwest area of Minneapolis
- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

Information Sources about RCV

Respondent were asked a general question:

How did you learn about ranked choice voting?

A list of eight potential sources was then read:

Newspapers?

Seventy-four percent learned about RCV through the newspapers:

YES	74%
NO	26%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- thirty-five to forty-four year olds

- \$25,000 to \$35,000 annual income households

Minneapolis website?

Twenty-four percent learned from the City of Minneapolis website:

YES	24%
NO	76%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents in the northwest area of Minneapolis
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- under \$25,000 annual income households

Mailed brochure?

Sixty-five percent learned about ranked choice voting from a mailed brochure:

YES	65%
NO	35%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis

Neighbor, friend or relative?

Forty-three percent obtained information from a neighbor, friend or relative:

YES	43%
NO	57%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- those with some post-secondary experience
- residents in the west central area of Minneapolis

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- Caucasians
- high school graduates or less
- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

Television news?

Sixty-nine percent learned about ranked choice voting from television news:

YES	69%
NO	31%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- men

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- high school graduates or less
- women

Radio news?

Twenty-six percent learned about it from radio news:

YES	28%
NO	72%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- under \$25,000 annual income households

Door to door?

Twelve percent learned about ranked choice voting from door-to-door interpersonal efforts:

YES	12%
NO	88%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those of other ethnicities

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- Caucasians
- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

Something else?

Eight percent reported learning about it from another source:

YES	8%
NO	92%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- \$25,000 to \$35,000 annual income households

Level of Understanding

Respondents were asked:

Prior to voting, would you say your level of understanding of how ranked choice voting functions was perfectly well, fairly well, not entirely understood or not at all understood?

Eighty-one percent either knew how ranked choice voting functioned “perfectly well” or “fairly well:”

PERFECTLY WELL.....	44%
FAIRLY WELL.....	37%
NOT ENTIRELY.....	13%
NOT AT ALL.....	6%

DON'T KNOW. 0%
 REFUSED. 0%

Twenty percent rated their knowledge lower.

“Perfectly well” is stated more often by:

- college graduates
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“Fairly well” is cited more frequently by:

- Caucasians
- those with some post-secondary experience
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Not entirely” is posted most often by:

- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- residents in the west central area of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

“Not at all” is selected more often by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- those with some post-secondary experience
- men
- under \$35,000 annual income households

Helpfulness of Election Judges

Respondents were asked:

In your personal opinion, did you find the election judges explanation of ranked choice voting very helpful, somewhat helpful, not very helpful or not at all helpful when you cast your ballot?

Eighty percent found the explanation of ranked choice voting by election judges either “very helpful” or “somewhat helpful:”

VERY HELPFUL. 42%
 SOMEWHAT HELPFUL. 38%

NOT VERY HELPFUL.....	8%
NOT AT ALL HELPFUL.	3%
DON'T KNOW.	8%
REFUSED.	0%

Only 11% were more critical in their evaluations.

“Very helpful” is cited at a higher rate by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- those of other ethnicities

“Not very helpful” is mentioned more often by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- under \$25,000 annual income households

“Not at all helpful” is posted most frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households

Actually Rank Candidates

2013 Minneapolis election voters were asked:

Did you actually rank any candidates after your first choice or did you only vote for your first choice?

Eighty-two percent report they “ranked some candidates after their first choice:”

RANKED SOME.....	82%
FIRST CHOICE ONLY.....	18%
DON'T KNOW.	0%
REFUSED.	0%

Eighteen percent ranked “only a first choice.”

“Ranked some” is stated most often by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- Caucasians
- college graduates
- women
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“First choice only” is indicated more frequently by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- those with some post-secondary experience
- men
- under \$25,000 annual income households

The sub-sample who reported “ranking some choices” were asked a follow-up question:

In your opinion, was it simple or difficult to rank your choices on the ballot?

Eighty-seven percent report it was “simple” to rank their choices on the ballot:

SIMPLE.	87%
DIFFICULT.	12%
DON'T KNOW.	0%
REFUSED.	1%

Only 12% report “difficulty.”

“Simple” is stated more often by:

- thirty-five to forty-four year olds
- college graduates
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“Difficult” is mentioned more frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- those with some post-secondary experience
- under \$25,000 annual income households

The sub-sample who ranked “first choice only” were asked a short series of follow-up questions:

Why did you not rank your vote choice?

A list of seven possible factors was then read:

I didn't know enough about the other candidates?

Sixty-one percent report their lack of knowledge about other candidates is a factor:

YES	61%
NO	39%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- fifty-five to sixty-four year olds
- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- residents in the northwest area of Minneapolis

None of the other candidates were acceptable?

Thirty-six percent found none of the other candidates acceptable:

YES	36%
NO	63%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- over sixty-four year olds

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds

I will always pick one candidate?

Forty-seven percent indicate they will always pick just one candidate, regardless of the ability to rank choices:

YES	47%
NO	53%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- high school graduates or less
- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

I didn't know I could rank candidates?

Twelve percent report they did not know they could rank candidates:

YES	12%
NO	88%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- under \$25,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- Caucasians
- college graduates

I didn't understand that part of the ballot?

Thirty-five percent report difficulty in understanding the ranked choice section of the election ballot:

YES	35%
NO	65%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- those of other ethnicities

I wanted to give an advantage to my favorite candidate?

Thirty-eight percent “bullet balloted” to advantage their favorite candidate:

YES	38%
NO	58%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

Some other reason?

Nine percent report another reason for choosing only one candidate:

YES	9%
NO	92%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- over sixty-four year olds

Opinion of RCV

2013 Minneapolis election voters were asked:

What is your opinion of the ranked choice voting system?
A) I prefer ranked choice voting to traditional voting in a primary or general election;
B) I prefer the traditional voting system; OR
C) It doesn't matter to me which system is used?

The group almost evenly splits: forty-one percent prefer the traditional voting system, while 39% prefer ranked choice voting:

STATEMENT A.	39%
STATEMENT B.	41%
STATEMENT C.	17%
DON'T KNOW.	3%
REFUSED.	0%

Seventeen percent are indifferent between the two voting systems.

“Statement A” is mentioned most frequently by:

- thirty-five to forty-four year olds
- college graduates
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

“Statement B” is posted at a higher rate by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- those with some post-secondary experience
- under \$25,000 annual income households

“Statement C” is indicated more often by:

- Caucasians
- college graduates

Delay in Announcing Winners

Minneapolis election voters preferring the traditional primary-general election voting system were reminded:

Automated tabulating equipment is not certified to be used in Minnesota. This meant final results in all races were not known until the Friday following the election.

They were then asked:

If there were no such delay in announcing the winners of a ranked choice voting election, would you then change your opinion about ranked choice voting?

Only eight percent report a lack of delay would change their opinion about ranked choice voting:

YES	8%
NO	86%
DON'T KNOW	6%
REFUSED	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Confidence in Counting of Votes

Minneapolis voters were asked:

Are you very confident, confident, not entirely confident, or not confident at all that votes were counted accurately using ranked choice voting?

Seventy-seven percent are either “very confident” or “confident” all voters were counted accurately using ranked choice voting:

VERY CONFIDENT.....	30%
CONFIDENT.....	47%
NOT ENTIRELY CONFIDENT.....	15%
NOT CONFIDENT AT ALL.....	4%
DON'T KNOW.....	3%
REFUSED.....	0%

“Very confident” is selected more often by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- Hispanic-Latinos
- college graduates
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“Confident” is indicated more frequently by:

- African-Americans
- residents in the west central area of Minneapolis
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

“Not entirely confident” is posted more frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- those with some post-secondary experience

“Not confident at all” is stated most frequently by:

- Asian-Pacific Islanders

RCV Used in Future

Next, 2013 Minneapolis election voters were queried:

Do you think ranked choice voting should be used in future municipal elections?

Fifty-three percent think RCV should be used in future municipal elections:

YES	53%
NO	37%
DON'T KNOW.....	11%
REFUSED.....	0%

Thirty-seven percent think RCV should not be used in future municipal elections, while 11% were undecided.

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- college graduates
- over \$50,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- high school graduates or less
- those with some post-secondary experience
- under \$35,000 annual income households

Different Winner

2013 election voters were instructed:

Suppose the outcome of this election had resulted in a different winner than there would have been in a traditional primary and general election.

They were then asked:

Which of the following best describes your opinion if this happened?

- A) I would prefer the ranked choice voting result because it is more accurate;*
B) I would prefer the traditional primary and general election result, because it is tried and true; OR
C) I wouldn't care which system were used?

While 41% would prefer “the traditional primary and general election result” in this situation, 37% opted for “the ranked choice voting result:”

STATEMENT A.	37%
STATEMENT B.	41%
STATEMENT C.	19%
DON'T KNOW.	3%
REFUSED.	0%

Twenty-two percent either had no preference or were uncertain.

“Statement A” is cited at a higher rate by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- college graduates

“Statement B” is posted more often by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- African-Americans
- high school graduates or less
- those with some post-secondary experience
- under \$35,000 annual income households

“Statement C” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- thirty-five to forty-four year olds
- Caucasians
- over \$75,000 annual income households

Voting Behavior

Last years’ municipal election were asked to classify themselves:

Would you say you were a regular voter, occasional voter, or you’ve never voted in past municipal elections?

Ninety-five percent report they are “regular voters:”

REGULAR VOTER.	95%
OCCASIONAL VOTER.	5%
NEVER VOTED.	0%
FIRST TIME COULD VOTE.	0%
DON’T KNOW.	0%
REFUSED.	0%

Only five percent were “occasional voters.”

“Regular voters” tend to be:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- Caucasians
- college graduates
- residents in the northeast area of Minneapolis
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Occasional voters” are typically:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- high school graduates or less
- residents in the northwest area of Minneapolis
- under \$35,000 annual income households

Summary and Conclusions

Eight percent of the 2013 Minneapolis municipal voters did so by absentee ballot; the remainder, in person. Ninety-five percent also classify themselves as “regular voters” in past municipal elections. Ninety-two percent also reported they knew they would be asked to rank their vote choices. The most effective sources of information about ranked choice voters were: newspapers, at 74% reach; television news, at 69% reach; and, mailed brochures, at 65% reach.

Eighty percent of 2013 municipal voters reported they at least “fairly well” understood how ranked choice voting functions. Eighty percent also thought the election judges explanation of ranked choice voting was “helpful.”

Eighty-two percent of municipal voters ranked candidates after their first choice; eighty-seven percent of this group found it simple to do so. The principal reasons for ranking only a first choice were: “I didn’t know enough about the other candidates,” at 61%; and, “I will always pick one candidate,” at 47%. Seventy-seven percent of 2013 voters are “confident” about the accuracy of the vote count using ranked choice voting.

Voters split on their preferred voting system – 39% prefer the ranked choice voting system, while 41% prefer the traditional voting system. Seventeen percent are indifferent between the two voting system. The absence of a delay in announcing election results have little impact on voters preferring the traditional voting system: only eight percent would change their opinion. Voters also split in their reaction to an outcome in which the RCV election results in a different winner than there would have been in a traditional primary and general election – 37% prefer the ranked choice voting result because it is more accurate, and 41% prefer the traditional primary and general election simply because it is tried and true.

Reflecting these concerns, a 53% majority thinks ranked choice voting should be used in future municipal elections, while 37% disagree.

Chapter Three: Non-Voters

Non-Voters

Non-voters in the 2013 Minneapolis municipal elections were asked a series of questions. First, their reason for not voting was ascertained, followed by an examination of their knowledge of the ranked choice voting system. Non-voters evidenced a consistent antipathy toward the new election system – finding it somewhat difficult, widely preferring the traditional primary-general election system, doubting its fairness, lacking some confidence in the system, and unsupportive about using the system in future municipal elections. Non-voters, then, did not embrace this election reform.

Reason for Not Voting

Non-voters were initially asked:

- Why did you not vote in this year’s municipal election, was it because you:*
- A) just didn’t have time;*
 - B) forgot about the election;*
 - C) don’t care for the ranked choice method of voting;*
- OR**
- D) don’t care much about voting in municipal elections?*

Thirty-three percent “didn’t have time,” and 28% ‘don’t care much about voting in municipal elections:”

STATEMENT A.	33%
STATEMENT B.	11%
STATEMENT C.	12%
STATEMENT D.	28%
ELSE	16%
DON’T KNOW.	0%
REFUSED.	0%

Only 12% specified they “didn’t care much for the ranked choice method of voting.”

“Statement A” is cited at a higher rate by:

- college graduates
- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

“Statement B” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents in the northeast area of Minneapolis

“Statement C” is stated more often by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- residents in the southeast area of Minneapolis
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“Statement D” is selected most often by:

- thirty-five to forty-four year olds
- African-Americans
- high school graduates or less
- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

Know about Use of RCV

Non-voters were next asked:

Did you know this election would use the ranked choice method of voting?

Sixty-three percent report awareness:

YES	63%
NO	37%
DON'T KNOW.	0%
REFUSED.	0%

Thirty-seven percent were unaware.

Knowledge increases among:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- over sixty-four year olds
- Caucasians
- those of other ethnicities
- residents in the northwest, southwest and southeast areas of Minneapolis
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

It decreases among:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- African-Americans
- Hispanic-Latinos
- high school graduates or less
- residents in the northeast and east central areas of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

Information Sources about RCV

2013 non-voters were asked:

How did you learn about ranked choice voting?

A list of eight potential sources were then read:

Newspapers?

Seventy-two percent report learning about ranked choice voting:

YES	72%
NO	28%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- college graduates
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- African-Americans
- those with some post-secondary experience
- under \$25,000 annual income households

Minneapolis website?

Eleven percent learned about RCV from the Minneapolis website:

YES	11%
NO	89%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- \$25,000 to \$35,000 annual income households

Mailed brochure?

Sixty-four percent read about ranked choice voting in mailed brochures:

YES	64%
NO	36%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Neighbor, friend or relative?

Forty-five percent learned about rank choice voting in discussions with neighbors, friends or relatives:

YES	45%
NO	55%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Television news?

Sixty-five percent report learning about ranked choice voting on television news:

YES	65%
NO	36%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Radio news?

Twenty-six percent learned about the new voting system from radio news:

YES	26%
NO	74%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Door-to-door?

Eleven percent were informed about ranked choice voting in door-to-door contacts:

YES	11%
NO	90%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- African-Americans
- those of other ethnicities

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- Caucasians

Something else?

Only five percent learned about RCV from another source:

YES	5%
NO	95%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents in the east central area of Minneapolis
- men
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- high school graduates or less
- women

RCV Simple or Difficult

2013 municipal non-voters were asked:

Based on what you know, would you say it would be simple or difficult to rank your choices on the ballot?

Non-voters divide on the simplicity of the ranked choice voting system: thirty-seven percent think it is “difficult,” while 33% think it is “simple:”

SIMPLE.....	33%
-------------	-----

DIFFICULT.	37%
DON'T KNOW.	29%
REFUSED.	1%

The remainder are simply unsure.

“Simple” is cited most often by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- college graduates
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Difficult” is indicated more often by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- those with some post-secondary experience

“Don’t know” is cited at a higher rate by:

- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- high school graduates or less

Opinion of RCV

Non-voters were queried:

***What is your opinion of the ranked choice voting system?
A) I prefer ranked choice voting to traditional voting in a primary or general election;
B) I prefer the traditional voting system; OR
C) It doesn't matter to me which system is used?***

By an over 6-to-1 majority, non-voters prefer the traditional voting system:

STATEMENT A.	9%
STATEMENT B.	57%
STATEMENT C.	20%
DON'T KNOW.	14%
REFUSED.	1%

Another twenty percent are indifferent between the two voting systems.

“Statement A” is selected at a higher rate by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- college graduates
- residents in the southwest area of Minneapolis

- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Statement B” is mentioned most frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- those with some post-secondary experience

Fairness of RCV

Next, 2013 non-voters were queried:

Personally, would you say ranked choice voting is very fair, fair, probably not fair or not at all fair?

Forty-three percent view RCV as “very fair” or “fair,” while 28% think it is “probably not fair” or “not at all fair:”

VERY FAIR.....	7%
FAIR	36%
PROBABLY NOT FAIR.....	21%
NOT AT ALL FAIR.	7%
DON’T KNOW.	28%
REFUSED.	1%

Twenty-eight percent are unsure.

“Very fair” is indicated most often by:

- Caucasians
- college graduates
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Fair” is posted at a higher rate by:

- eighteen to forty-four year olds
- \$25,000 to \$35,000 annual income households

“Not at all fair” is stated most frequently by:

- residents in the northeast area of Minneapolis
- under \$25,000 annual income households

“Don’t know” is posted most frequently by:

- forty-five to fifty-four year olds
- residents in the west central area of Minneapolis

Confidence in Counting of Votes

2013 Minneapolis election non-voters were asked:

*Are you very confident, confident, not entirely confident,
or not confident at all that votes were counted accurately
using ranked choice voting?*

Forty-two percent are “very confident” or “confident” votes were counted accurately using ranked choice voting; but, 33% are “not entirely confident” or “not confident at all:”

VERY CONFIDENT.....	8%
CONFIDENT.....	34%
NOT ENTIRELY CONFIDENT.....	26%
NOT CONFIDENT AT ALL.....	7%
DON'T KNOW.	23%
REFUSED.	1%

Twenty-three percent are unsure about the accuracy of the vote count.

“Very confident” is selected most frequently by:

- college graduates
- residents in the west central area of Minneapolis

“Confident” is posted more often by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- men
- \$25,000 to \$35,000 annual income households

“Not entirely confident” is cited more often by:

- those with some post-secondary experience
- women
- under \$25,000 annual income households
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

“Not confident at all” is stated most frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- Caucasians

RCV Used in Future

Non-voters were queried:

Do you think ranked choice voting should be used in future municipal elections?

Forty-nine percent do not think ranked choice voting should be used in future municipal elections, 19% endorse its future use:

YES	19%
NO	49%
DON'T KNOW.	31%
REFUSED.	1%

Thirty-one percent are uncertain.

“Yes” is stated more often by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds
- college graduates
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“No” is indicated more frequently by:

- over sixty-four year olds
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

Next, those opposed to the future were told:

Automated tabulating equipment is not certified to be used in Minnesota. This meant final results in all races were not known until the Friday following the election.

They were then asked:

If there were no such delay in announcing the winners of a ranked choice voting election, would you then change your opinion about ranked choice voting?

Eighty-five percent report delay or not, they would not change their opinion of ranked choice voting:

YES	9%
NO	85%
DON'T KNOW.	7%
REFUSED.	0%

Nine percent would change their opinion of RCV if there were no such delay in announcing the winners.

“Yes” is posted more often by:

- eighteen to thirty-four year olds

“Don’t know” is cited most frequently by:

- those of other ethnicities
- those with some post-secondary experience
- women
- under \$25,000 annual income households

Future Voting Behavior

Non-voters were queried:

Would you say you are very likely, likely, probably not likely or not at all likely to vote in future Minneapolis municipal election?

Twenty-three percent report they would be “very likely” to vote in future Minneapolis municipal elections:

VERY LIKELY.	23%
LIKELY.	35%
PROBABLY NOT LIKELY.	20%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY.	13%
DON’T KNOW.	8%
REFUSED.	1%

Another 35% are “likely” to do so.

“Very likely” is posted more often by:

- Caucasians
- college graduates
- over \$75,000 annual income households

“Likely” is cited more frequently by:

- Hispanic-Latinos
- \$35,000 to \$50,000 annual income households

“Probably not likely” is stated more often by:

- under \$25,000 annual income households

“Not at all likely” is mentioned more often by:

- African-Americans
- high school graduates or less
- men
- \$25,000 to \$35,000 annual income households

“Don’t know” is indicated more often by:

- under \$25,000 annual income households

Summary and Conclusions

Thirty-three percent of 2013 non-voters report they “just didn’t have time” to vote, while 28% just “don’t care much about voting in municipal elections.” Eleven percent “forgot about the election,” and 12% “don’t care for the ranked choice method of voting.” Sixty-three percent also report they knew this election would use the ranked choice method of voting. Three sources of information were instrumental in providing this information: “newspapers,” with a 72% reach; “television news,” with a 65% reach; and, “radio news,” with a 64% reach.

Non-voters split on their view of the difficulty of ranking choices on the ballot: thirty-seven percent view it as “difficult,” while 33% regard it as “simple.” By a 57%-9% majority, non-voters prefer the traditional voting system over ranked choice voting. Even so, by a 43%-28% margin, non-voters thought RCV is “fair,” and by a 42%-33% margin, are “confident” votes are counted accurately using ranked choice voting.

Non-voters are opposed to the use of ranked choice voting in future municipal elections by a 49%-19% margin. Few opponents would change their view even if delays in announcing the winner could be avoided.

Twenty-three percent of 2013 non-voters are “very likely” to vote in future Minneapolis municipal election, and 35% are “likely” to do so.

Chapter Four: Concluding Thoughts

Concluding Thoughts

1. 2013 municipal election voters were generally informed about the rank choice voting system prior to the election. Over four-out-of-five voters ranked candidates after their first choice. The voting process was viewed as simple and accurate. But, RCV did not expand the electorate to a significant degree: ninety-five percent report they were already “regular” municipal election voters.

2. 2013 municipal election voters do not overwhelmingly endorse the new voting system. They split almost evenly – 41% to 39% – in preferring the traditional primary-general election system to the ranked choice voting system. And, a small majority of 53% think RCV should be used in future municipal elections.

3. Non-voters in the 2013 Minneapolis election were less informed about the use of the RCV method – 63% awareness. They split on the simplicity of the new system: 37% thinking it would be “difficult,” and 37% deeming it “difficult.” They split over the fairness of the system, 43% to 28%, and confidence in the accuracy of the count, 42% to 33%.

4. Non-voters also overwhelmingly prefer the traditional voting system by a 57% to 9% majority. And, they do not think ranked choice voting should be used in future city elections by a 49%-19% margin.

Section Two: Election Judges

Election Judges

Minneapolis Election Judges were asked to complete a pen-and-paper survey at their polling places. 1106 election judges completed the survey out of a universe of 1595 judges, resulting in a response rate of 69.3%

1. Ninety-one percent rated their training for the ranked choice voting election as either “excellent” or “pretty good;” in fact, 42% called it “excellent.” Only seven percent were more critical in their evaluations.
2. Seventy-eight percent rate voters as either “very knowledgeable” or “knowledgeable” about ranked choice voting before they entered the polling place; thirteen percent rated voters as “not knowledgeable.” Twenty-four percent reported voters wanted to engage them in a discussion about the pros and cons of ranked choice voting at the polling place.
3. While 39% thought voters needed more time to complete ranked choice voting ballots than traditional ballots, 38% did not think so. The remaining 23% were uncertain. Among judges feeling ranked choice voting required more time, 58% believe it was a result of “first time learning a new way to vote,” 57% see it as a consequence of “RCV just seems to take more time,” and, 74% see it as a direct result of “the number of candidates on the ballot this year.”
4. Eighty-eight percent of the judges report they were “able to do their normal duties as a judge such as registering new voters and checking names to see if the voter is registered, plus answering questions about ranked choice voting.” In discussing the type of questions they answered, 27% reported they answered more questions “about how to fill out ballots,” while 12% answered more “about how votes will be counted,” and 29% thought they answered “equal numbers of questions about filling out ballot and how votes counted.”

Section Three: Election Candidates

Election Candidates

Minneapolis election candidates were asked to complete a mail-out survey and return it in a self-addressed and stamped envelope. 37 election candidates completed the survey out of a universe of 106 candidates, resulting in a response rate of 34.9%

1. Candidates split almost evenly on the impact of ranked choice voting on their campaign: 30% saw it as “negatively impacting,” 32% said it had a “positively impact,” and 32% deemed the system as having “little or no impact.” Similarly, candidates split on the advantage of RCV to their campaigns: forty percent saw it as an “advantage to my campaign,” and 32% said it was a “disadvantage to my campaign.” But, 19% saw RCV as an “advantage to my political party,” and 32% felt it was a “disadvantage to my political party.” Another 19%, though, reported they were “not affiliated with a political party,” and 30% were “unsure.” But, 65% of the candidates reported their campaign strategy changed because of ranked choice voting.

2. Seventy-three percent report confidence that all votes were counted accurately using ranked choice voting. By almost two-to-one, 62%-32%, candidates prefer the traditional voting system to the ranked choice voting system. Similarly if the ranked choice voting system resulted in a different winner than the traditional primary and general election system, 46% preferred the traditional system outcome, while 30% preferred the ranked choice voting outcome. But, even so, 49% regarded RCV as a “fair” method of counting ballots for an election, while 22% disagreed.

3. Candidates oppose the use of ranked choice voting in future municipal elections by a 49%-41% margin.