



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: BEV EHLEN		PHONE NUMBER: 314-608-0168
REPRESENTING: LIBERTY LINK MISSOURI		TITLE:
ADDRESS: PO BOX		
CITY: WARRENTON		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 63383
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: JAMES HARRIS		PHONE NUMBER:
REPRESENTING: OPPORTUNITY SOLUTIONS PROJECT		TITLE:
ADDRESS: PO BOX 74		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY	STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: james@thejharrisco.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 12:12 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

My client, Opportunity Solutions Project, is a national group that is working to help promote opportunity for the people of America by supporting commonsense reforms to state policy. HJR104 will protect our elections by ensuring that our state will not have “ranked-choice voting” forced upon us by special interests. While ranked-choice voting is not in widespread use, we know the results – it tends to favor moderates, and indeed that is what its proponents have designed it to do. Ranked choice voting is also prone to producing unexpected outcomes. In 2018, Democrat Jared Golden was sent to Congress to represent Maine and declared the victor over incumbent Republican Bruce Poliquin, despite Poliquin receiving more votes. Because neither candidate received 50% of votes in the first round, the votes received by third-party candidates were redistributed to voters’ lower-ranked choices, giving Golden the win without him receiving even a plurality of first-choice votes. Voter confusion is also a serious problem that can produce outcomes that do not reflect the political will of the electorate. Many voters do not rank other choices, which can result in individuals receiving a “majority” of votes that only reflects a small segment of voters. For example, in a Board of Supervisors race in San Francisco in 2010, the winner received 4,321 votes, but 9,608 ballots cast had been thrown out due to “exhaustion” – this included votes only for candidates who had not made it through previous rounds of ballot counting and were thus not included in future counts. This means that a candidate won the election despite more than twice as many people specifically casting votes against them. Ranked-choice voting is wrong for Missouri, and HJR104 will protect the integrity of our elections.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: JEN HOUCEK		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: MATTHEW R. CROUCH		PHONE NUMBER: 202-329-0329
REPRESENTING: HERITAGE ACTION FOR AMERICA		TITLE: STATE DIRECTOR
ADDRESS: 1519 TRUMPET CT.		
CITY: LIBERTY	STATE: MO	ZIP: 64068
EMAIL: matthew.crouch@heritageaction.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 11:11 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Testimony of Matt Crouch, Missouri State Director Heritage Action for America February 20, 2024 Supporting: HJR 104 Submitted to the House Committee on Elections and Election Officials Chairwoman McGaugh and Members of the Committee, Thank you for the opportunity to present written testimony in favor of House Joint Resolution 104. My name is Matt Crouch and I represent Heritage Action for America, a grassroots organization with two million grassroots activists nationwide, including thousands of Missourians. Heritage Action urges the House Committee on Elections and Elected Officials to pass HJR 104. Ranked-Choice Voting (RCV) fundamentally changes the election process and is fraught with problems. RCV is confusing and complicated. This is true for voters because the system relies on them to not only know each candidate in a race, but also what each one stands for and how the voter would rank them in relation to one another. It is also confusing for election administrators who are tabulating votes and reporting outcomes of elections. In races where a candidate does not receive a majority of votes in the first round, the candidate in last place is eliminated, along with all of the votes cast for him or her. The votes are then re-tabulated based on those voters who marked second choices. This process continues until a candidate reaches a majority – not of all the votes cast – but of “all valid votes in the final round of tallying.” RCV is prone to errors. Alameda County, California officials admitted two months after a 2022 school board election that they had incorrectly tabulated the RCV votes and had certified the wrong person as the winner. Because of the overly complicated process of ranked-choice voting, no election official noticed the mistake until an outside advocacy group flagged the issue after the fact. RCV disenfranchises voters. Nearly one in three voters do not rank multiple candidates in RCV elections, whether due to a lack of understanding the process, being unwilling to cast a vote in favor of a candidate they do not support, or other reasons. Thus, they risk their ballot being thrown out in subsequent rounds of vote tabulation. In the 2021 New York mayor’s race in which 1.1 million votes were cast, by the eighth round, the ballots of more than 140,000 voters (more than 1 out of every 10 votes) had been thrown out because they did not rank all of the candidates. These voters were effectively disenfranchised due to “ballot exhaustion.” RCV undermines the democratic process. The ultimate winner in RCV is often not the choice of a majority of voters who participated in the election, and thus, does not have a genuine mandate to govern from a majority of voters. Our nation was built on the principle of consent of the governed. When citizens believe elections produce clear results between candidates holding differing ideas, they are able to live with the results even if they do not like the outcome. Ranked-Choice Voting is a gimmick that would undermine Missouri’s elections and all of the hard work done over many years to ensure voter confidence. Heritage Action urges you to pass HJR 104. Thank you for your time and attention on this important issue.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. AC "HONEST ABE" DIENOFF		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:		SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: CONNOR LUEBBERT		PHONE NUMBER: 573-291-2463
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI VOTER PROTECTION COALITION		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 227 JEFFERSON STREET		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 12:00 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: DENISE LIEBERMAN		PHONE NUMBER: 314-780-1833	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI VOTER PROTECTION COALITION		TITLE: DIRECTOR & GENERAL COUNSEL	
ADDRESS: 6047 WATERMAN BLVD			
CITY: SAINT LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63112
EMAIL: denise@movpc.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 10:22 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

The Missouri Voter Protection Coalition (MOVPC) submits this testimony in opposition to HJR 104, which proposes amending the constitution with unnecessary and confusing citizenship language, impede voters’ ability to establish or vote on forms of election and open the door to less secure election tabulation. The provision proposes to amend Art. VIII Section 2 of the Missouri Constitution, which guarantees all citizens of Missouri the right to vote, to be replaced by “only” citizens. This is duplicative and unnecessary - given that only citizens are eligible to vote — and designed to confuse voters. Indeed it is ballot candy designed to stoke fears by Missourians that somehow non-citizens are eligible to vote. They are not. And the language could further undermine the Missouri constitution’s protection of the right to vote, which “establish[es] with unmistakable clarity that the right to vote is fundamental to Missouri citizens.” *Weinschenk v. State*, 203 S.W.3d 201, 212 (Mo. banc 2006). The proposed resolution would further undermine the voices of Missourians by prohibiting their ability to consider alternative forms of voting such as ranked choice or approval voting, but limiting ranking votes or allowing a voter to cast more than one vote (something that is common in certain municipal or school board elections). We should not shut Missourians out of the process of determining voting practices that may be desirable to them in the future. The measure would also establish that only the person gaining the most votes in a political party primary election can be a party candidate, limiting options for Missouri’s voters. HJR 104 would also open the door to less secure and less accurate tabulation with its paper ballot and tabulation provisions. It is well known that hand counting ballots is more slow and error prone than machine tabulation. In truth, very few jurisdictions with more than 1,000 voters count votes by hand because it is so logistically challenging and results in significantly increased delay and error. The machines further allow a voter verify the accuracy of their choices before being tabulated. And importantly, many include functions allow voters with disabilities to vote privately and independently. HJR 104 is unnecessary, confusing and needlessly limits voters’ voices and choices. Accordingly, we urge this committee to vote NO on HJR 104. Sincerely, Denise Lieberman, Director & General Counsel MISSOURI VOTER PROTECTION COALITION 6047 Waterman Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63112 denise@movpc.org; (314) 780-1833 www.movpc.org



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LARRY R BRADLEY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Bradlar1@aol.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 9:16 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Chairman McGaugh and Members of the Committee, I am an Opponent of this Bill. I am testifying on behalf of myself as a subject matter expert on Ranked Choice Voting. I am Larry R. Bradley, a retired U.S. Army Infantry Officer. I am currently an activist on behalf of local, regional and national efforts to use Ranked Choice Voting in American elections. Some of the groups I am involved with include FairVote.org, Rank the Vote Nebraska and Better Ballot KC. I have recently had an OpEd published in the Wichita Eagle and several other newspapers about Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) and I will focus my remarks from that OpEd. Here is a link to the OpEd.

<https://www.kansas.com/opinion/article284175523.html> As I point out there, the antiquated ballot we use now in our elections has two flaws that cannot be fixed. Those flaws make that ballot completely inadequate for our modern society. First, we cannot guarantee a majority (50% plus one or better) winner with this ballot when there are multiple candidates for a single office. A key phrase in the Declaration of Independence is “the consent of the governed”. How do you have the consent of the governed when candidates are allowed to gain nominations and win elections with less than a majority of the vote? Answer: You cannot. You do not have the consent of the governed. We need a ballot that will guarantee a majority winner. The ballot we use now will not give us that guarantee. RCV will. Therefore, we should be looking to adopt RCV, not ban it. The second major flaw of our current ballot is that it creates the phenomenon of the “spoiler scenario.” To quote directly from my OpEd— Imagine you go to vote on Election Day and on the ballot there is one candidate you are totally opposed to, one you normally favor but aren’t satisfied with, and one you would like to vote for, but are afraid to — afraid because you know from bitter experience that doing so could enable the victory of the candidate you’re most opposed to with only a plurality of the vote. Let’s look at a real live example of this phenomenon. (I am refraining from using a Missouri example in an attempt to keep from raising partisan hackles so the committee can focus on the principals involved.) In the 2018 Kansas Republican Primary election for Governor, both Mr. Kobach and Mr. Colyer got 40.6% of the vote. The source I consulted said there were only 110 votes separating the two. Meanwhile, there were 59,128 votes for a total of 6 other candidates. With the ballot we use now, those votes were left twisting in the wind without the ability to weigh in on the final choice. If Kansas had been using RCV, then those voters could have expressed a secondary choice. They could have, in essence, asked themselves this. “I don’t want Kobach or Colyer, but if it comes down to a choice between one of those two, which do I prefer?” And the state’s Republican Party would have had a consensus, majority choice to go forward to the General Election. Missouri Republicans confront exactly this situation in August 2024 with 4 or 5 candidates per office for each of the statewide offices on the ballot. Please do not conflate RCV with the “Top 5” approach and its “Jungle Primary”. I am opposed to that approach and had another OpEd opposing it published in the Kansas City Star. Here is a link to it. <https://www.kansascity.com/opinion/readers-opinion/guest-commentary/article256459511.html> Let me

quickly address three misconceptions about RCV. Voters are not obligated to rank. Voters have the option to rank. Voters are only able to vote for one candidate in each round of voting. If rounds of voting are required in order to determine a majority winner, then in every round of voting the majority defeats the minority. Elections are hiring decisions, not horse races. We need a process that gives us majority, consensus results. The process is not confusing. Exit poll after exit poll where RCV is used have substantial majorities say that RCV is easy, that voters like RCV and they want to continue with RCV. Finally, I will say that RCV is the path to political peace for all of us. That's because when the final result is in, the majority of voters will be able to say one of two things about the winner. Either, so and so was my first choice and I'm glad they won. Or, so and so was not my first choice, but they were one of my choices and I'm glad they won. The losers will know without a doubt that they lost and that will have a calming effect on us as a society because the losers will know, like it or not, that they were the minority. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I welcome your questions.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LINDA REZNY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: lrezny@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 10:49 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Changing from ALL to ONLY may make possible a claim that certain people, while they are citizens to not have a guarantee right to vote. If this is "ballot candy" is it poisoned.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: LINDA REZNY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: lrezny@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 10:47 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

The proposed changes to Section 3 restrict the kind of election to the type we have had traditionally. There are other types which MAY be better suited in certain places. These other types could only be adopted if the voters in those situations agree to the change. Apparently the writer of this measure feels so threatened by other methods, that they want to deny other locations an alternative that many better fit the location. Making available different patterns for different locations does nothing to threaten other locations that would be free to keep their current pattern.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MARILYN MCLEOD		PHONE NUMBER: 573-239-3708	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MISSOURI		TITLE: PRESIDENT	
ADDRESS: 8706 MANCHESTER RD., SUITE 104			
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63144
EMAIL: marilyn_mcleod@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 11:08 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Changing the wording of the Missouri Constitution in regard to who is eligible to vote from “All citizens” to “Only citizens” is misleading in the ballot language since that is currently the case. It is an insult to the voters to use misleading language in order to confuse them into voting for an issue. HJR 104 would enact a constitutional provision that would require the plurality winner of a political party primary to be the single candidate in a general election. Adding this to the Missouri Constitution would prevent any other possible election method from ever being possible by local or state government. Other possible methods could open the field to more competitive races, more candidates, and ultimately determine the candidate with the strongest support. It also could encourage more civil campaigning which, we believe, is something all citizens would appreciate. Alternative methods of voting are a relatively new concept in the U.S. To have a constitutional prohibition that would eliminate them from even any future consideration is short-sighted. Leaving options available for review, discussion and consideration is the way a democracy functions best. The League position on this issue supports enabling legislation to allow local jurisdictions to explore alternative electoral methods, as well as supporting state election laws allowing for more options at both the state and local levels. Although the bill provides that voting machines be tested and certified in accordance with federal standards prior to each election, it also allows for the possibility that the General Assembly might prohibit the use of any voting machine. The alternative to voting machines is hand counting. National studies show that hand-counting of paper ballots is significantly slower and more error prone than machine counting. This would not only delay the counting, but there would have to be a substantial additional cost to local jurisdictions to pay people to count the ballots. Although hand-counts are an important tool in post-election audits, where officials count small samples to verify machine-tallied results, counting entirely by hand is impractical anywhere larger than the smallest jurisdictions. The League of Women Voters of Missouri goes on record in opposition to HJR 104.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MARLA MARANTZ		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: mjmarantz@aol.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 11:59 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I oppose raising the bar for initiative petitions. First, I object to the term "legal" voters. It suggests there are lots. of people voting who are not legally registered and signing petitions. We know this is not a problem. This only serves to ratchet up fear of the other, which in turn actually increases violence against those perceived as from a foreign country. It also outlaws ranked choice voting, and even run-offs, which means someone without 50% could be elected. Not majority rule. Please vote no.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: MichaelWesten.3up@protonmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 2:04 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I OPPOSE HJR 104 as originally drafted. My problem is with Section 25.1 and Section 25.2. I oppose the use of voting machines to count/tabulate votes. I think all votes should be hand counted in the presence of 2 representatives from each political party represented on the ballot. The only way I could get behind this bill is if it prohibits the use of voting machines.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HJR 104		DATE: 2/20/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: RACHEL MARY MACNAIR		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: rachel_macnair@yahoo.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/20/2024 10:56 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I attended the Lincoln Days event this last Saturday (February 17, 2024) and spoke to many Republican activists about the advantage of ranked choice voting. I found there just about the same level of support that I find discussing this with other members of the public: the vast majority support it once advantages is explained. In this case, I showed how using ranking in the Republican primary would lead to higher quality candidates since the winner would then have majority support rather than being someone who won with, say, a third of the vote. This would send a candidate into the general election with the best mandate from Republicans, as well as being the candidate most Republicans themselves supported at least somewhat. The same applies to a Democratic primary with Democratic voters, of course, but it was Republicans I was speaking with last weekend. I will cover this in more detail below, but first I want to address the problem of how we reached the peculiar situation in Missouri that there seems to be a partisan split on the issue. Missouri Citizens vs. Out-of-State Money "Final Four" had a Missouri state-wide petition drive a couple of years ago, mainly funded by out-of-state big money individuals. It had a complicated system including a non-partisan (jungle) primary and ranked-choice voting (RCV) at the end. They came shy of making the ballot, but may try again later. Also, Approval Voting does require a jungle primary. There is also out-of-state big money considering pushing this, and it's used in St. Louis now. The reason it's used there is that they have old voting machines that can't handle the superior ranking system. Most of the state has newer machines, and all new machines can handle ranking. I often find that when I come across people who say they're against ranking and then describe it, it's clear that they're mixing up approval voting and ranked voting. Simple ranking at the town, city, and county level is being worked on around the state, entirely by local citizens, with the elections run the same way as before except adding RCV. This saves taxpayer money by not funding a second runoff election. RCV is "instant runoff," allowing a runoff to be done on the spot without making voters come back again later. This alone makes it quite popular. Last year, we in Kansas City collected signatures for using RCV just in city races. After a lot of work under Covid-restriction conditions, we were finally ready to turn in the signatures – and the Final Four people begged us not to! I was still getting texts scolding me at the time we were turning them in. The big out-of-state money people had their own plans, and they didn't understand the concept that state citizens on a shoestring budget could work on plans different from theirs. I watched several different petitioners for Final Four get signatures. They told people the petition was for ranked choice voting on the state level, and that's all they told them. With that, I saw many people eager to sign. They never told them this also included a complicated system with a jungle primary. I know that the jungle primary is very unpopular among Republicans in Missouri. If you associate ranking with that, you may then not like ranking either. But I ask you to consider that an alternative strategy may work better: if you legislatively refer an amendment for ranking in the party's primaries, then you save the party's primaries. The thousands of people who signed the Final Four petition never wanted what the petition was actually offering. They

wanted to be able to have more choice at the ballot box. If you give them the opportunity to vote just for that, then the Final Four plan will probably get nowhere. . Primaries Get Better Candidates
If Republicans had used RCV in the 2022 US Senate primaries, they likely would have retained control of the US Senate. Here are US Senate seats that Republicans lost in winnable states in 2022, with the amount they won by in their primaries: Blake Masters, Arizona: 40.2% Dan Bolduc, New Hampshire: 37.1% Mehmet Oz, Pennsylvania: 31.2% So Republicans deliberately offered voters candidates who hadn't gotten majority support from Republicans. This made a weaker case to the general election voter. It also got candidates that didn't appeal to many general-election voters who voted for other Republicans. Ranked voting solves the problem when there are multiple candidates in a primary. Only candidates who can attract those second and third rankings can win. Those are much more likely to win in the general election – because they have majority support from their own party. Republicans used ranked choice voting in their Virginia governor's race in 2021, and this is how Glenn Youngkin won. No one had a majority at first, but he got enough rankings to win. He went on to win the general election. Election Self-Defense
In 2012, Democrat Claire McCaskill was an incumbent with a lock on her nomination for U.S. Senate. So she had many of her supporters vote in the Republican primary for who she thought was her weakest challenger. And it worked. That weakest challenger won the primary with 39.1% of the vote. She won the general election. And she bragged about this strategy. Democratic funders boosting the candidates they think are weakest. In 2022, Democrats spent \$53 million to get the election opponents they wanted. There's no magic bullet solution for this dishonesty, but ranking would help. Those who first selected one electable candidate could select another one second, and another third. If their first selection is voted down and therefore eliminated, then in the next round their votes go to their second selection – it's an instant run-off. In the final round, the candidate who wins has majority support of those still ranking. The candidates who are going to be weak in the general election are less likely to attract those second and third ranking. So they drop from consideration, while the stronger candidates stay in contention. Therefore, the winner of the primary would be someone with more support among Republicans. That would be someone more likely to win in the general election. More recently, in 2022 Democrats wanted to have Dan Kelly rather than Jennifer Dorow for the run-off against Janet Protasiewicz for the state supreme court. They thought he was the weaker candidate. They were right; Protasiewicz won handily. But had there been ranking, Kelly and Dorow wouldn't have been splitting a vote to let Protasiewicz come through. The easiest person to convince to give a Republican their second ranking is someone who just gave a Republican their first ranking.
Conservatives Speak on Ranked Choice Voting
Why ranked-choice voting is a win for Republicans
by Saul Anuzis, former chairman of the Michigan Republican Party and Stan Lockhart, former chairman of the Utah Republican Party
The simple truth is that we'd have a better chance of capturing the presidency if we selected our nominee using ranked-choice voting. And a new Citizen Data poll shows that voters are on board — 61% of Republicans are interested in ranking candidates in such a crowded field. Our traditional primaries seem to hurt Republican candidates again and again. Look at the Senate primaries in Arizona, New Hampshire and Pennsylvania last year. Republicans squandered tens of millions running negative ads against each other, Democrats meddled by donating to the least-electable candidates, and the “winners” in these contests earned only a third of the GOP primary vote. We lost badly in each state, and Democrats expanded their majority in the Senate . . .
Opinion