THE COMMITTEE FOR RANKED CHOICE VOTING

April 11, 2019

Members of the Vermont General Assembly and the General Public,

Thank you for the opportunity to share our experience winning and implementing the nation's first statewide Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) law in Maine. The Committee for Ranked Choice Voting led two ballot initiative campaigns to win and protect Maine's landmark RCV law; engaged in multiple litigation battles to defend this law and require its implementation; and, educated voters about ranking their choices in the nation's first RCV statewide elections in 2018.

My presentation today will focus on what Ranked Choice Voting is, how it works, and why it matters through the lens of the Maine experience. Below is an abbreviated timeline summarizing our arduous journey, as well as links to additional materials that may be of interest to you.

- On November 4, 2014, The Committee was founded and launched a citizen's initiative to adopt Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) in the midst of a gubernatorial election that was defined by voters' concerns about vote-splitting, strategic voting, and the possibility of a non-majority winner.

- On November 8, 2016, following a two-year voter education initiative and a ballot measure campaign, a majority of Maine voters approved Question 5 to adopt RCV in the second largest referendum vote by the people in our state's history. It became enacted on January 7, 2017.

- On October 23, 2017, the Maine Legislature disregarded the will of the people and repealed the people's RCV law in a special late-night session by a three-vote margin in the House.

- On February 2, 2018, volunteers with The Committee submitted more than 80,000 signatures that had collected in 88 days in the coldest winter in decades to place a People's Veto on the June 12, 2018 ballot to protect RCV.

- On June 12, 2018, Maine people stood up to the politicians in Augusta and approved Question 1, the People's Veto to protect Ranked Choice Voting, by a widening 8-point margin. Maine voters also made history by being the first in the nation to use RCV in a statewide primary election.

- On November 6, 2018, Maine voters became the first in the nation to use Ranked Choice Voting in a statewide general election for U.S. Senate and U.S. House.

Enclosed are additional materials for your consideration:
- Secretary of State RCV Tabulation, June 2018 Democratic Primary, Governor
- Secretary of State RCV Tabulation, November 2018 General, Congressional District 2
- *Portland Press Herald*, "Our View: Ranked-choice test run makes electoral history in Maine"
- *Boston Globe*, "Ranked-choice voting passes the test in Maine"
- *The American Interest*, Larry Diamond, "A Victory for Democratic Reform"
- *New York Times*, David Brooks, "One Reform to Save America"
- *The Economist,* "In praise of ranked-choice voting"

Kyle Bailey, Campaign Manager

EDITORIAL

Ranked-choice voting passes the test in Maine

Democrat Jared Golden (left), joined by wife Isobel, speaks to supporters as they wait for results in Maine's Second Congressional District election, in Lewiston on Nov. 6. Election officials declared Golden the winner Thursday after a federal judge denied Republican Representative Bruce Poliquin's request to halt tabulations under Maine's new ranked-choice voting system.

NOVEMBER 16, 2018

Maine is a commonsensical kind of state, with a pragmatic, problem-solving outlook. Its experiment with ranked-choice voting, currently in the news for replacing the preliminary plurality winner with a more broadly popular choice in Maine's sprawling Second Congressional District, provides a useful electoral reform for other states to imitate.

If and when the Pine Tree State's new vote-tallying method survives a federal court challenge by a beleaguered incumbent, that is.

Ranked-choice voting may sound complicated, but it's really not. It's basically an instant runoff in contests where no candidate has secured a majority of the vote. In ranked-choice elections, citizens don't just vote for one candidate
on Election Day. If they want, they
can rank them all, in order of preference. If no candidate wins a majority, the hopeful who received the least first-choice votes is dropped, and those votes are redistributed to the next choice of his or her voters. That process continues until enough candidates have been eliminated, and enough votes reallocated, to deliver one candidate a
majority.

Our View: Ranked-choice test run makes electoral history in Maine

June 14, 2018

Maine voters Tuesday became the first in the country to use ranked-choice voting in a statewide election, and despite predictions to the contrary, there was no widespread confusion or chaos.

Instead, ranked-choice voting and the related people's veto on the fate of ranked-choice itself appeared to boost interest in the June election, which in turn showed that the voting system worked much the way supporters said it would.

Related

Success of ranked-choice ballot question seen as 'turning point' in election history

From the time the ballots were printed, ranked-choice voting became part of the campaigns it would help decide.

The Republican Party unsuccessfully fought the use of ranked-choice voting in Tuesday's vote, and each of the candidates for that party's gubernatorial nomination opposed it. One of them, Mary Mayhew, went as far as to tell her supporters to vote for her – and only her.

Related

Read more Portland Press Herald editorials

In the end, however, few did, and Mayhew finished a distant third to businessman Shawn Moody, who, with more than 50 percent of the vote, was declared the winner. In this case, there was a clear favorite among voters, and thus further rounds of counting were not necessary.

But on the Democratic side, there was no clear-cut winner in the field of seven. Janet Mills and Adam Cote led the way after the first round, but because no Democratic Blaine House hopeful received more than 50 percent of the vote, the counting continues.

According to the Secretary of State's Office, the ballots will be brought to Augusta starting Thursday, and the tabulation process will begin. In the next round, the candidate who received the fewest first-place votes will be dropped. Everyone who voted for that candidate will have their second-place choices counted instead, and that process will continue until a candidate has received more than half the votes.

What will be left is a nominee who appeals broadly to the electorate – a candidate who received not only first-place votes but a lot of second- and third-place selections as well. A passionate minority won't be able to hijack a campaign featuring a large field like before, leaving the majority unhappy but stuck with the selection. No longer do we have to spend valuable time arguing over spoilers instead of debating the issues.

That dynamic is perhaps most useful in a general election, where candidates present a wider range of political ideologies. In that scenario, a candidate with extreme views and a relatively small group of dedicated followers can beat two or three opponents who more closely agree, and more closely match the views of the electorate.

Because of conflicts with the state constitution, ranked-choice voting won't be used in November's election for governor. But Tuesday's vote will keep the system in place for the general elections for U.S. House and Senate – and for all state and federal primaries. Voters made that certain with their clear support for Question 1, which won by a larger margin than when ranked-choice voting was approved for the first time – in the high-turnout 2016 presidential election.

The popularity of ranked-choice voting – despite all the effort to portray it as confusing, even un-American – means that one day it could be used in all elections, which could be accomplished through a constitutional amendment. After a successful run Tuesday, that day is a little closer.

filed under:
election 2018, Our View, ranked-choice voting

One Reform to Save America

By David Brooks
Opinion Columnist

May 31, 2018

There are a bunch of different ways to do democracy. In Western Europe, most countries have proportional representation and a lot of different parties representing voter interests. In this country we've gone with a two-party system and winner-take-all elections.

During the middle of the 20th century, it seemed like we'd chosen the right approach. The proportional multiparty system allowed an extremist named Adolf Hitler to rise to power with the initial support of a tiny fraction of Germany's voters. Both American parties, meanwhile, seemed to bend toward compromise, knowing they had to win over the median voter in order to get to 50.1 percent majorities.

But even then, as Lee Drutman of the think tank New America points out, America really had a four-party system. There were liberal Republicans from places like the Northeast and conservative Republicans from the West. There were liberal Democrats on the coasts and conservative Democrats from the South. The four groups floated into different legislative coalitions depending on the issue and the moment, allowing for flexible bipartisan majorities.

Now the two-party system has rigidified and ossified. The two parties no longer bend to the center. They push to the extremes, where the donor bases and their media propaganda arms are. More and more people feel politically homeless, alienated from both parties and without any say in how the country is run.

Moreover, the whole way of practicing politics has been transformed. Each party imagines that it is one wave election from destroying the other side and gaining total power. Therefore, as Drutman notes, there's no interest in compromise, just winning and losing, gloating and seething.

Partisans' chief interest is in proving that the other party is despicable — in ramping up fear, hatred and the negative polarization that is the central feature of contemporary American politics.

The result is that people, especially the young, lose faith in democratic norms altogether. There are over 6,000 breweries in America, but when it comes to our politics, we get to choose between Soviet Refrigerator Factory A and Soviet Refrigerator Factory B.

The good news is that we don't have to live with this system. There's nothing in the Constitution that says there have to be only two parties. There's nothing in the Constitution about parties at all. There's not even anything in the Constitution mandating that each congressional district have only one member and be represented by one party. We could have a much fairer and better system with the passage of a law.

The way to do that is through multimember districts and ranked-choice voting. In populous states, the congressional districts would be bigger, with around three to five members per district. Voters would rank the candidates on the ballot. If no candidate had a majority of first-place votes, then the candidate with the fewest first-place votes would be eliminated. Voters who preferred that candidate would have their second-choice vote counted instead. The process would be repeated until you get your winners.

This system makes it much easier for third and fourth parties to form, because voting for a third party no longer means voting for one with no chance of winning. You get a much more supple representation of the different political tendencies that actually exist in the country.

The process also means that people with minority views in their region have a greater chance to be represented in Congress. A district in Southern California, for example, might elect a Bernie Sanders-type progressive, a centrist business Democrat and a conservative.

The current system — wherein a vast majority of seats are safely red or blue and noncompetitive, with only a handful of fiercely contested districts — disappears. Every district becomes a swing district, each vote much more important. Congress begins to work differently because with multiple parties you no longer have stagnant trench warfare — you have shifting coalition-building.

There's a reason voters in proportional representation countries are less disenchanted with politics than we are. Their systems work better.

Over the last few decades, a lot of work has been done to fight gerrymandering, a reform that would have only a marginal effect on our politics. The good news is that attention seems to be shifting to ranked-choice voting, a change that would have much bigger and better effects.

In 2016, voters in Maine passed a referendum installing ranked-choice voting. The state's Legislature has done everything it can to fight it, but it looks like voters there will use the system for their June 12 primary, and have a chance to make the system permanent.

Representative Don Beyer of Virginia introduced legislation in Congress last year to make this kind of system national. Groups like FairVote champion the reform nationwide, and writers like Drutman are tireless advocates.

Right now our politics is heading in a truly horrendous direction — with vicious, binary political divisions overlapping with and exacerbating historical racial divisions. If we're going to have just one structural reform to head off that nightmare, ranked-choice voting in multimember districts is

the one to choose.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook and Twitter (@NYTopinion), and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter.

A version of this article appears in print on June 1, 2018, on Page A25 of the New York edition with the headline: One Reform to Save America

In praise of ranked-choice voting

A simple reform might fix America's dysfunctional politics

www.sweetforgovernor.com

📖 Print edition | United States ›

Jun 14th 2018 | PORTLAND, MAINE

"A LIBERAL," said Robert Frost, an American poet, "is a man too broad-minded to take his own side in a quarrel." An ad released less than a week before election day by Mark Eves and Betsy Sweet (pictured above), opponents in Maine's Democratic gubernatorial primary, seemed a paragon of Frostian liberalism. Ms Sweet, who resembles a slightly less caffeinated Elizabeth Warren, urged her supporters to vote for Mr Eves; while Mr Eves asked his supporters to back Ms Sweet. On election day the two gripped and grinned together outside an elementary school in Portland's lovely West End.

In fact, their alliance was not wet leftism; it was a strategic gambit. On June 12th Maine conducted the first-ever statewide election using ranked-choice voting (RCV), in which voters rank the entire field rather than just voting for a single candidate. Trailing in the polls, Ms Sweet and Mr Eves figured they could boost their chances by campaigning for second-place votes.

RCV has long been a darling of political scientists. But Maine's experiment should interest anyone frustrated by America's cripplingly partisan politics. RCV may be unable to force liberals and conservatives to like each other, but it could at least blunt the electoral effects of hyperpartisanship.

RCV is not new. Australia has used it for a century, Malta and Ireland for slightly less. Some Oscar winners are chosen by RCV, as are prizewinners at the World Science Fiction Convention. Several American cities—including Minneapolis, San Francisco, Portland (Maine) and Santa Fe—have recently adopted it, too. In an RCV election, voters rank the field by preference, from first to last (though they can always choose to vote for just one candidate). If one candidate gathers a majority of first-place votes when all votes are in, he wins. If not, the candidate with the smallest number of first-choice votes is eliminated, and his secondary, tertiary and so forth votes are redistributed. That process continues until one candidate eventually has a majority.

How long that takes varies. San Francisco's mayoral race took place on June 5th but the winner was not confirmed until June 13th. By contrast, three years ago Ethan Strimling won a majority of votes outright in Portland, Maine's mayoral race. As *The Economist* went to press, Sean Moody appeared to have won the Republican governor's race outright, while Janet Mills held a steady lead on the Democratic side.

RCV boosters say it changes campaigns and elections in three laudable ways. First, it encourages voter turnout. A study of 79 elections in 26 American cities found that RCV was associated with a 10% increase in turnout compared with non-RCV primary and run-off elections, and San Francisco's race had the highest primary turnout in years. Voters turned off by the front-runners have less incentive to stay home. They can give their first-choice vote to their favourite candidate, even if he might be a quixotic choice, while allocating their other choices strategically.

Second, it shifts incentives away from negative campaigning—because candidates are trying not just to turn out their base, but also to win as many second- and third-choice votes as possible—and towards alliance-building, as Mr Eves and Ms Sweet demonstrate. Finally, boosters argue that introducing RCV limits the efficacy, and therefore the amount, of money spent by single-issue campaign groups, because they often finance negative ads.

In theory, RCV elections will more often be won by candidates broadly acceptable to most voters. Kyle Bailey and Cara McCormick, who have led Maine's RCV campaign, said they have staged dozens of mock RCV beer elections in microbreweries (which abound in Maine: winter here is long, cold and dark) to show voters how the process works. Mr Bailey said the loudest backers would often argue for oyster stout, or some other niche beer style, but the most votes would inevitably accrue to a "middle-of-the-road IPA"—which perhaps had fewer or less ardent fans, but which everyone could drink.

Opponents argue that RCV is too complicated—and indeed, in Maine, people's enthusiasm for RCV sometimes outstrips their ability to explain it. (Though on election day Maine's secretary of state, whose office released a detailed video explaining RCV, said he had received no complaints about ballot complexity.) RCV support in the state has split along party lines: Republicans largely opposed it, while the RCV campaign's watch party offered six types of Kombucha (fermented tea) on tap.

Paul LePage, the abrasive and bombastic outgoing governor, won two elections without a majority, thanks to liberals splitting their vote. Perhaps Maine Republicans doubt their ability to appeal to a majority of voters, and instead must discourage turnout while pandering to their own base? The state party filed an unsuccessful lawsuit in May, tortuously arguing that RCV impinged on their rights of association under the First Amendment.

After Maine's voters approved RCV by referendum in 2016, Republicans in the legislature narrowly passed a bill blocking its implementation. But backers gathered enough signatures—in a frenzied, dead-of-winter campaign across the state—to pass a "people's veto" that retained RCV in this election, and asked Maine's voters on this year's ballot whether they wanted to use it again. Guardedly optimistic as results filtered in on election night, Ms McCormick vowed that, if Maine voters approved it (and it looks as if they did), she and her colleagues would take their campaign to more states. Get ready to rank, America.

This article appeared in the United States section of the print edition under the headline "Multiple choice"

A Victory for Democratic Reform

LARRY DIAMOND

The voters of Maine rejected political cynicism on Tuesday and endorsed one of the most promising reforms to our politics.

In what may be looked back upon as the most important election in the United States in 2018, the voters of Maine rejected political cynicism on Tuesday and preserved ranked-choice voting (RCV) for its future elections. To appreciate the historic significance of this vote for greater democratic choice, it's important to understand what Mainers were up against—a two-party duopoly in which "all the levers of power" (in the words of one grassroots activist) were overtly or covertly working to block political reform.

This was not the first time the state's electorate had voted on RCV. In November 2016, by a 52-48 percent margin, Maine's voters approved an initiative to implement RCV for all future state and federal elections (save for President). They did what a growing number of U.S. cities have done—opt for more open electoral competition and increased political civility. But Maine's establishment politicians, particularly in the Republican Party, then set out to negate the will of the voters. There ensued an epic 19-month struggle about much more than voting rules. It became a crucial test case for grassroots political reform. Against all odds, the people prevailed over the politicians on Tuesday, and this time by double the margin (eight percentage points). That margin was aided (and possibly enabled) by tens of thousands of Maine independents, who came out to vote in the primary election even though the referendum on RCV was the only item on the ballot for which they were eligible to vote.

On the surface, it's hard to see why RCV causes such a storm among party die-hards. It is perfectly compatible with both political parties and party primaries. Indeed, under the initiative passed in 2016, RCV was used on Tuesday—for the first time in U.S. history, and to apparently considerable voter enthusiasm—in Maine's gubernatorial primary elections. Under RCV, voters can weigh the merits of several candidates, and candidates may need to appeal for the second- or third-preference votes of their rivals' supporters. If no candidate wins an outright majority, the candidate with the lowest number of first-place votes is eliminated, and the second-preference votes of his or her supporters are redistributed to the remaining candidates. The process continues until someone wins a majority.

But here's the rub—and the hope. By requiring a candidate to win a majority, and by implementing if necessary a series of "instant run-offs" until that happens, RCV opens up the electoral process to independents and third-party candidates. In the general election, voters no longer need to worry about "wasting" their votes on fresh, unconventional and long-shot options. They can "vote with their hearts" in casting their first-choice votes and then rank second or third the candidates who stir them less but are still preferable to the candidate or party they most oppose. When used to fill individual seats, RCV still requires a candidate to emerge with a majority. So it is far from a death blow to the two-party system. In fact, it would figure to enhance the legitimacy of the governor in Maine, where nine of the past 11 victors have failed to win a majority of the vote.

But given that Maine has elected independents in the past—including Angus King as governor and then U.S. Senator—and that independent Eliot Cutler almost won the governorship in 2010, the two parties were not eager to open this reformist can of worms.

Opposition was particularly intense among Maine's Republicans, whose current governor, Paul LePage, only narrowly beat Cutler (with a mere 38 percent of the vote) in 2010. Under RCV, LePage would probably not have been nominated in 2010, and he certainly would have lost the general election (and possibly his re-election bid, too). A "belligerent, foul-mouthed and polarizing governor" who told the NAACP to "kiss my butt" and compared the IRS to the Nazi Gestapo, LePage is a big part of the reason why Mainers came to feel the need for an "instant run-off" system to produce a more consensual majority winner. In 2016, he drove outrage to new levels when he alleged that black drug dealers "come up here" from Connecticut and New York to "sell their heroin" and "half the time they impregnate a young white girl before they leave." Such attitudes and comments have made him one of America's most disliked governors.

Nevertheless, Maine's Republican Party has waged a relentless political and legal campaign to bury RCV. Along the way, many of the state's Democrats also publicly or surreptitiously joined the effort, not wanting to risk losing a future governor's race to an independent. Initially, the party establishments argued that the new voting method would be confusing to the voters and costly to implement and administer, or even (somehow) undemocratic. Some warned that voter confusion would diminish turnout. When none of this proved consistent with the available evidence—which has seen RCV work well in roughly a dozen U.S. municipalities, for over a century to elect the house of Australia's parliament, and successfully to nominate and select Hollywood's Oscar winners as well—and when Maine's voters adopted RCV in 2016, the opponents switched tacks. They charged that RCV violated Maine's state constitution, which requires that state general elections be decided by plurality vote. In a May 2017 advisory opinion, Maine's State Supreme Court agreed, but it left intact the use of RCV for all primary elections and for general elections for U.S. Senate and House seats. Rather than amend the state constitution to comply with the voters' will, or just let the court's mixed outcome stand, the legislature then seized the opportunity to kill RCV altogether. In October, it passed a law suspending implementation of RCV and giving Maine's voters until December 2021 to amend the constitution. Since that requires two-thirds of each legislative house (before it even goes to Maine's voters), this was a thinly veiled way of terminating RCV for all elections in Maine, forever.

But the people of Maine did not go quietly into that good night. Unique among American states, Maine's constitution provides for something called "the people's veto referendum." It enables any six registered voters to submit a proposed veto of a legislative bill to the Secretary of State, who then has ten working days to certify it. After that, advocates have 90 days from the end of the legislative session (in this instance, the same day the bill was passed) to gather the requisite number of signatures of registered voters (over 61,000) to place the referendum on the ballot. The state legislature passed the poison bill on October 23 in the middle of the night, in a special one-day session called for that lone purpose. That ensured the vote would take place in a primary election, when independents (who would be most likely to support RCV) would have no candidates to vote for. The timing was also nearly ideal for undermining a grassroots signature drive, which would have to wrestle with the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays and the depths of a harsh Maine winter.

But there was one potential silver lining. Ten working days from October 24—when the request to circulate petitions was filed with Secretary of State Matthew Dunlap—was a municipal election day in Maine, November 6, 2017. This still provided an opportunity to stand outside polling stations and collect signatures for the new petitions—if the Secretary of State released them in time. But Dunlap waited until 4:30 p.m. the day before to release the ballot question, and then with a wording of the proposition so convoluted that an ordinary voter could hardly determine from the text alone whether restoring RCV meant a "yes" or "no" vote. Nevertheless, instantly, within three minutes of Dunlap's release and with just 14 hours until the opening of the polls, the grassroots campaign for the people's veto began electronically sending out the petitions across the state to copy shops for duplication and then drove them to volunteer gatherers throughout the night. On Election Day, due to superior organization and determination, they obtained 33,000 voter signatures.

Some 1,800 volunteers continued to gather signatures through brutally cold days in December and January—with Portland's highs hovering at or mercilessly well below freezing. "Every week it was another blizzard, and there was even a weather phenomenon called a bomb cyclone," said Cara McCormick, whose Chamberlain Project managed the campaign along with Kyle Bailey and the Committee for Ranked Choice Voting. "Our fingers were frozen to the bone; we had to go into our cars to warm up." Voters asked, "Didn't we already vote for this a year ago? Why do we have to sign this again?" The political shenanigans of the establishment frustrated people, but it also fired them up. Even people and opinion leaders who hadn't voted for RCV the first time signed up for the second round. It had become not just a question of electoral method but of whether a bunch of politicians could simply trash the popular will.

When the petitions were due on February 2 of this year, the campaign handed in over 77,000 signatures. As momentum gathered during the signature drive and the advocacy campaign that followed, the campaign drew the support of Phish drummer Jon Fishman, who lives in Lincolnville and staged a supporting concert, and in the final days, the actress, Jennifer Lawrence, the New York Times editorial board, and two Nobel-prize-winning economists. It also raised over a million dollars in funding, much of it from national philanthropists seeking democratic reform. National political reform activist Peter Ackerman chaired the Chamberlain Project.

Once the signatures were certified, the state was obligated to suspend the legislature's repeal and implement RCV in this past Tuesday's primary election. Through their vote on the people's veto referendum, Maine's voters would then decide if RCV would ever be used again. Yet even for its first conditional use in the primary election, the opposition to RCV would not die. The Committee for Ranked Choice Voting had to keep going back to court to compel the Secretary of State and the state government to implement RCV in the primary. Opponents of RCV said funding was lacking and the legal basis for moving forward was conflicting. In an opinion on April 4, Superior Court Judge Michaela Murphy rejected those arguments and ordered the state to proceed with RCV, declaring, "Clarity, stability and public confidence are essential to ensure the legitimacy of Maine elections."

When the Republican Party failed to get Maine's Supreme Judicial Court to stop the use of RCV in the primary, it voted at its May 4 convention to change its rules to require a plurality vote to choose its nominees. Then it filed a lawsuit in federal

court claiming its First Amendment right of free association entitled it to reject the use of RCV in the primary. That bid failed, too. In a May 24 editorial, the *Portland Press Herald* noted the absurdity of this supposedly principled claim, given that "the Maine Republican Party selects its own state officers with a series of runoffs that is a functional twin to the same ranked-choice voting law that the party charges would violate its members' rights." Finally, as Maine's voters headed to the polls on Tuesday, Governor LePage declared ranked-choice voting—not terrorism, poverty, the opioid crisis, the ballooning deficit, or North Korea's nuclear weapons—*but RCV* "the most horrific thing in the world," and he threatened not to certify the election—an option he legally does not have.

Along with a growing number of municipalities, political scientists, thoughtful media, and democratic reformers, I have come to think that ranked-choice voting is the single most promising *achievable* reform for making our politics more open, more civil, more democratic, and more amenable to compromise. But I am a social scientist and a pragmatist, not a religious devotee of this one reform. Let's try it and see how it works—as we have tried the "top two" system in California and discovered its many unpleasant side effects. Let's try variations of RCV, even in multi-member districts for state legislature (though I have my serious reservations about that).

But here is what we should not do. We should not let a narrow, out-of-touch political class block a promising reform with half-truths and cynical maneuvers, simply so they can hold on to the continued prospect of victory with thin pluralities or half-hearted majorities of the vote, due to artificial barriers to competition. We are entering a new era of political reform in the United States, driven, like the last big one of a century ago, from the bottom up. And the voters of Maine have just given this movement its most courageous and inspiring victory.

Report Name	Summary Report					

OFFICIAL RESULTS

https://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/elec/results/results18.html

Election Name	General Election					
Election Date	11.06.18					
Office Title	Congressional District 2					

	Round 1			Round 2		
Candidate Names	Votes	Percentage	Transfer	Votes	Percentage	Transfer
Bond, Tiffany L.	16552	05.71%	-16552	0	00.00%	0
DEM Golden, Jared F.	132013	45.58%	10427	142440	50.62%	0
Hoar, William R.S.	6875	02.37%	-6875	0	00.00%	0
REP Poliquin, Bruce	134184	46.33%	4747	138931	49.38%	0
Ballot Exhausted						
By Overvotes	435		98	533		0
By Undervotes	6018		7820	13838		0
By Exhausted Choices	0		335	335		0
Continuing Ballots	289624		0	281371		0
TOTAL	296077		0	296077		0
Winning threshold by round	144813			140686		

Generated: 11/21/2018 19:36

Total = Ballot Exhausted by Overvotes + Ballot Exhausted by Undervotes + Exhausted Ballot + Continuing Ballots

Winning Threshold = [Continuing ballots/(Vote for [number] +1)] + 1

"*" symbol signifies elimination due to Tie Resolution.

Report Name	**Summary Report**

OFFICIAL RESULTS

https://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/elec/results/results18.html

Election Name	**Democratic Primary Election**
Election Date	**June 12, 2018**
Office Title	**Governor**

Candidate Names	Round 1			Round 2			Round 3			Round 4		
	Votes	Percentage	Transfer	Votes	Percentage	Transfer	Votes	Percentage	Transfer	Votes	Percentage	Transfer
Cote, Adam Roland	35478	28.13%	**2065**	37543	30.25%	**5080**	42623	34.79%	**11243**	53866	45.94%	0
Dion, Donna J.	1596	01.27%	-1596	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0
Dion, Mark N.	5200	04.12%	-5200	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0
Eves, Mark W.	17887	14.18%	**1634**	19521	15.73%	-19521	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0
Mills, Janet T.	**41735**	**33.09%**	**2307**	**44042**	**35.49%**	**5903**	**49945**	**40.77%**	**13439**	**63384**	**54.06%**	**0**
Russell, Diane Marie	2728	02.16%	-2728	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0
Sweet, Elizabeth A.	20767	16.46%	**2220**	22987	18.52%	**6957**	29944	24.44%	-29944	0	00.00%	0
Write-in	748	00.59%	-748	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0	0	00.00%	0
Ballot Exhausted												
By Overvotes	430		42	472		35	507		73	580		0
By Undervotes	5681		1887	7568		1488	9056		5099	14155		0
By Exhausted Choices	0		117	117		58	175		90	265		0
Continuing Ballots	126139		0	124093		0	122512		0	117250		0
TOTAL	**132250**		**0**	**132250**		**0**	**132250**		**0**	**132250**		**0**
Winning threshold by round	63070			62047			61257			58626		

Generated: 06/21/2018 18:45

Total = Ballot Exhausted by Overvotes + Ballot Exhausted by Undervotes + Exhausted Ballot + Continuing Ballots

Winning Threshold = [Continuing ballots/(Vote for [number] +1)] + 1

"*" symbol signifies elimination due to Tie Resolution.