

## Big No to Rank Choice Voting

One voter, one vote

Every vote should be counted with equal weight, and the outcome is decisive. But with RCV, this straightforward process becomes convoluted, diluting the principle of a single, direct vote for a single candidate.

RCV doesn't just confuse voters; it also introduces delays and uncertainty into the process. **RCV Does Not Reflect the Will of the People**

One of the most troubling aspects of RCV is that it can produce winners who lack a clear mandate from the electorate. Under RCV, it's entirely possible for a candidate who receives the most first-choice votes to lose the election after lower-ranked votes are reallocated. This process allows candidates to win based on second, third, or even fourth-choice rankings rather than on direct support from most voters. The winner of an RCV election might only have a lukewarm plurality of support rather than the solid majority that a traditional election requires.

It's not just hypothetical: RCV has a proven record of increased ballot spoilage due to voter mistakes. The instructions for ranking candidates are more complicated than traditional voting, leading to more spoiled ballots—ballots that are tossed out because voters made mistakes while navigating this convoluted system. In practical terms, this means more Connecticut voters could see their voices go unheard.

RCV has so many issues. Alaska is trying to dump it.

Sincerely

RJ.