

The North Carolina Coalition for Verified Voting
Joyce McCloy, Director
September 7, 2010

Instant Runoff Voting, Voter Education and Voter Disenfranchisement

North Carolina's first statewide use of instant runoff voting could produce a train wreck in November. ~ Greensboro News and Record Editorial. ¹ This year North Carolina voters will be using instant runoff voting to fill the Court of Appeals seat vacated by Judge Wynn. Time is running out, North Carolina has less than 6 weeks to educate 6.1 million voters. Early voting begins on October 14, and absentee ballots go out soon. The only voter education planned is a single \$500,000 supplemental voter education mailer.

"IRV is an election method rarely used in this country." ~ says The North Carolina School of Government. *"A handful of jurisdictions have employed it in recent elections, but it is sufficiently rare that North Carolina's experience with its use in Hendersonville and Cary in 2007 is regularly cited by proponents and opponents."*² Cary's 2008 Bi-Annual Survey showed that 22% of voters surveyed didn't understand instant runoff voting at all.³

The Greensboro News-Record warns that voter confusion may muddle the election:

"...any candidate has a virtually equal chance as any other of winning by blind luck -- no matter his or her qualifications. Voters will have little opportunity to sort them out. Asking voters to choose three in order of preference further promises to confuse the issue.

*It will take extraordinary voter-education efforts to acquaint the public with this voting system, Gilbert said. Poll workers probably will have to spend additional time explaining how it works."*⁴

Voter Education protects voters' rights and the legitimacy of election results, says the Electoral Knowledge Network: *"voter education is essential to ensuring that voters can effectively exercise their voting rights and express their political will through the electoral process. If voters are not prepared or motivated to participate in the electoral process, then questions may begin to arise about the legitimacy, representativeness, and responsiveness of elected leaders and institutions."*⁵

Launching a new voting method with insufficient voter education may violate the Voting Rights Act. *"Under Section 5, a covered state, county or local government entity must demonstrate to federal authorities that the voting change in question (1) does not have a racially discriminatory purpose; and (2) will not make minority voters worse off than they were prior to the change (i.e. the change will not be "retrogressive")."*⁶ Voters must be prepared to rank a second and third choice, since those choices may decide the election outcome, as happened in Burlington Vermont's 2009 Mayoral contest. ⁷ Education about over-voting also is critical to ensure voters don't invalidate their choices.

¹ September 4, 2010 Editorial: On the wrong track. Greensboro News and Record http://www.news-record.com/content/2010/09/03/article/editorial_on_the_wrong_track

² January 15, 2009 report "Instant Runoff Voting: Goals, Standards and Criteria for Implementation and Evaluation http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/NCsBoE_IRV_Approved_1-15-2009

³ 2008 bi-annual citizen survey. Town of Cary http://www.townofcary.org/_shared/assets/2008BiennialSurveyReport10376.pdf

⁴ September 4, 2010 Editorial: On the wrong track. Greensboro News and Record http://www.news-record.com/content/2010/09/03/article/editorial_on_the_wrong_track

⁵ Basic Voter Education ACE The Electoral knowledge Network <http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/ve/vea/vea03>

⁶ U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division Voting Section. What is Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act? <http://www.justice.gov/crt/voting/misc/faq.php>

⁷ Burlington Vermont Center for Range Voting. "2009 IRV mayor election" March 2009. [Anthony Gierzynski](http://rangevoting.org/Burlington.html), Wes Hamilton, and Warren D. Smith <http://rangevoting.org/Burlington.html>

Voter Education Costs

You get what you pay for: The North Carolina State Board of Elections has announced it will spend \$500K on a voter education for 6,147,642 registered voters.⁸

In 2004, San Francisco spent almost twice that with \$776,000 on IRV voter education to reach 421,000 voters. Even so, in 2008, a civil grand jury ruled that San Francisco wasn't doing enough, and must step up its efforts to educate voters and poll workers.⁹

According to the Public Research Institute on San Francisco, even with massive voter education efforts, more voters came to the polls un-prepared to rank choices in 2005 than did in 2004. Research shows African American were less likely than other groups to know in advance of the election that instant runoff would be used.

“Nearly half (46%) of the voters we surveyed said they did not know they would be asked to rank candidates on the fall 2005 ballot. This is a considerably larger proportion than was found in the fall of 2004 (31%), and clearly puts some voters at a disadvantage. Those who were least aware tended to be the least educated and African-Americans. We see the issue of voter awareness as the main area of concern for San Francisco as the community moves forward with RCV elections.

....

In addition, a troubling proportion of voters said that they were unaware that they would be asked to rank candidates on the ballot.”¹⁰

In Maryland, a fiscal analysis for a bill proposing statewide IRV recommended allocating \$3 Million on voter education. for the first year, then \$1.5 million in subsequent years.¹¹ This is for a state with 3,135,773 registered voters, half as many as North Carolina. The bill did not pass.

Minneapolis, Minnesota spent approx \$60,000 on voter education for its first IRV election in November 2009. “According to a Minnesota Public Radio poll... 90% of voters felt they successfully voted using the new ranked choice system.”...The City of Minneapolis “made over 500,000 contacts with residents over the six-month period.” 45,968 ballots were completed. They “sent letters to 500 Minneapolis-based nonprofits seeking their help to engage their members and the public...”¹² Yet Minneapolis' voter turnout was lowest since 1902.¹³

⁸ North Carolina State Board of Elections website. Voter Registration Data. September 5, 2010.
<http://www.sboe.state.nc.us/content.aspx?id=29>

⁹ 2007-2008 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury. July 2008. San Francisco Superior Court.
<http://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1978>

¹⁰ Public Research Institute on San Francisco. An Assessment of Ranked-Choice Voting in the San Francisco 2005 Election. July 17, 2006. http://pri.sfsu.edu/reports/SFSU-PRI_RCV_final_report_July_17_2006.pdf

¹¹ Maryland Senate Bill 292 (Senator Pinsky, et al.) Fiscal Note History February 14, 2006
http://mlis.state.md.us/2006rs/fnotes/bil_0002/sb0292.pdf

¹² City of Minneapolis Election Dept “Ranked Choice voting. A Report on the Education and Outreach Activities” Tipping Point Strategies LLC on Behalf of the December 29, 2009
<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/elections/docs/rcv-education-outreach-report.pdf>

¹³ Low-key mayoral contest depressed Minneapolis turnout, officials say November 11 2009. Star Tribune. Steve Brandt
<http://www.startribune.com/politics/local/69814067.html?page=1&c=y>

Instant Runoff Voting, Voter Confusion and the North Carolina Experience

Hendersonville. The Times News reports:

Bill Modlin wasn't happy with his first experience with the new "instant runoff" voting when he cast his ballot for Hendersonville City Council on Thursday. ... "It doesn't make any sense to me, and I can guarantee you because of the way they have it set up there are people in this town that are going to lose their vote," he said. ... "I call it instant confusion," he said.¹⁴

Cary. USA Today reports: Don Frantz, the only official in North Carolina to be elected by instant runoff voting comments on voter confusion:

Winning candidate Frantz said he heard from many confused voters on the campaign trail. "I found myself, when I was at some places, that's all I was doing ... explaining the new voting system," he said.¹⁵

Cary. In an opinion piece in the Asheville Citizen Times, Debra Goldberg, former election official for Wake County, NC describes evidence of voter confusion:

"In the Cary IRV pilot, I can tell you that many voters left their backup choices blank, and that many other voters wrote in backup candidates with names such as 'Mickey Mouse' and 'Donald Duck.' This is direct evidence that many voters did not understand or accept IRV. Candidates involved in the IRV pilot in Cary have voiced doubts about the process."¹⁶

14 Oct 19, 2007 "Voter finds new system frustrating". By Harrison Metzger Times-News (cached)
http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/IRV_Oct_19_Voter_finds_new_system_frustrating.pdf

15 Oct 17, 2007 "[To stem runoff votes, new ballots have voters rank top 3](http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/IRV_Oct_17_USAToday_To_stem_runoffs_new_ballots.pdf)" By Jordan Schrader, USA TODAY. CARY, N.C. and
http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/IRV_Oct_17_USAToday_To_stem_runoffs_new_ballots.pdf

¹⁶ "Instant Runoff Voting is no solution, says election official who was there" Debra Goldberg • Asheville Citizen Times. August 27, 2008 <http://www.citizen-times.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=200880826043>
<http://irvbad4nc.blogspot.com/2008/08/north-carolina-instant-runoff-voting-is.html> (archived)

22.0% of Cary voters did not understand IRV at all

Cary North Carolina 2008 bi-annual citizen survey

Instant Runoff Voting

A set of questions was included in the survey to examine the Instant Runoff Voting Method. The respondents were first asked if they were registered to vote in North Carolina. Table 64 indicates that almost 92% of the respondents were registered to vote in the state. Those respondents registered to vote were subsequently asked their understanding of the Instant Runoff Voting Method (Table 65). A 9-point scale was used ranging from do not understand at all (1) to understand very well (9). The results indicate there was a level of misunderstanding among the respondents. The mean was 5.83 with 58.6% on the “understand” side (above 5) of the scale and 30.6% on the “not understand” side. This includes 22.0% who indicated they do not understand at all. Overall this indicates a degree of misunderstanding among the respondents. The respondents were next asked their support for using the Instant Runoff Voting Method using a 9-point scale from not supportive at all (1) to very supportive (9). The respondents were also informed the use of the method would save Cary taxpayers approximately \$28,000 by not having to hold a physical runoff election. Table 66 shows there is a relatively high level of support for using the method. The mean was 7.21 with 68.8% on the “support” side of the scale versus only 7.2% on the “no support” side.¹⁷

Table 64. Registered to Vote in NC.

Year	% Yes	% No
08	91.6	8.4

Table 65. How Well Do You Understand the Instant Runoff Voting Method (n=282).

Year	Mean	Do Not Understand at All 1	2	3	4	Neutral 5	6	7	8	Understand Very Well 9	% Above 5
08	5.83	22.0	5.0	2.5	1.1	11.0	4.3	10.3	8.9	35.1	58.6

Consider that Cary can also boast having the most Ph.D.s per capita in the U.S. for towns larger than 75,000 people.¹⁸ And that “Ninety-four percent of Cary’s citizens have access to the Internet at home or at work — about twice the national average.”¹⁹

¹⁷ 2008 bi-annual citizen survey. Town of Cary <http://www.townofcary.org/shared/assets/2008BiennialSurveyReport10376.pdf>

¹⁸ “Come Visit Cary”. Website. <http://www.comevisitcary.com/>

¹⁹ About Town of Cary – Cary Superlatives [http://www.townofcary.org/New to Cary /About Cary 272/superlatives.htm](http://www.townofcary.org/New%20to%20Cary/About%20Cary%20272/superlatives.htm)

Lack of Overvote Protection for the North Carolina IRV Ballot

Mis-marking ballots can invalidate some choices. Voting/ranking the same candidate more than once is an over-vote, because with IRV, voters are not permitted to vote for the same candidate more than once in a given contest. To do so, renders their 2nd and 3rd choices invalid.

Voters can be misled into overvoting the IRV ballot - by mistake or through malfeasance:

In an email to the State Board of Elections, Bob Hall described how one of the candidates for the Cary District B City Council race asked voters to rank him 1st, 2nd and 3rd:

“--during the campaign he (Nels Roseland) told his supporters to vote for him as their 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice, a confusing message that effectively instructed voters to pick nobody else as a second choice.”²⁰

North Carolina state law § 163-182.1. (b)(2)²¹ and the Federal Help America Vote Act²² requires that voters be notified of over votes. NC’s voting machines are unable to notify the voters if they have “over-voted” in the IRV contests, so this has to be addressed with voter education.

The State Board of Elections addresses the consequences of over-voting in an IRV contest and the need for voter education in the January 15, 2009 report “Instant Runoff Voting: Goals, Standards and Criteria for Implementation and Evaluation”²³

G.S. 163-182.1 directs that voters be given an opportunity to correct overvotes before their ballots are tabulated by the DRE or OS machine. In an IRV election, a traditional type of overvote will be easily caught by the voting machine and the voter will be given an opportunity to correct, as in traditional voting—that is, if the voter ranks two different candidates as his first choice in a vote-for-one field. But there is a kind of marking of the ballot that is unique to IRV and that might be considered an overvote. That unique problem occurs when a voter on an IRV ballot ranks a single candidate at two or more different rankings. A voter might mark Candidate Jones as his first choice, his second choice, and his third choice. The machines will not be able to give the voter a second chance in that kind of marking. Voter education will be required at all IRV polling locations to insure that voters are adequately instructed on the IRV method of voting. The SBE does not consider this marking problem to be an “overvote” within the meaning of G.S. 163-182.1 because the voter has the option of voting their choices and alternates and therefore it is not an overvote in their first choice.

Lack of over-vote protection resulted in some voters in Cary, North Carolina making invalid choices on their ballots. In the October 2007 Cary Municipal election, these types of overvotes were not reported by the voting machines, because our voting machines cannot see/read the 2nd and 3rd choices, so an important protection was lost. This is especially important considering that one of the Cary candidates was telling voters to rank him 1, 2 and 3 - many voters' 2nd and 3rd choices would not count in a "runoff".

See the next page for what the North Carolina legal code actually says about over-voting.

²⁰ Email to North Carolina State Board of Elections. November 11, 2007 Bob Hall author.
http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/Bob_Hall_Nels_Says_Vote_for_me_all_three_10_11_07.htm

²¹ NC Election Laws and Related Laws. NC Statutes current through 2009 Legislative Session.
<http://www.sboe.state.nc.us/GetDocument.aspx?id=2136>

²² Elections Assistance Commission. HAVA Overvotes and Undervotes. 2006 http://www.eac.gov/program-areas/research-resources-and-reports/copy_of_docs/eds-2006/overvotes-and-undervotes.pdf/attachment_download/file

²³ January 15, 2009 report “Instant Runoff Voting: Goals, Standards and Criteria for Implementation and Evaluation”
http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/NCSBoE_IRV_Approved_1-15-2009

NC State law regarding over-vote warning:

§ 163-182.1. Principles and rules for counting official ballots. ²⁴

(b) (2) Provide that if the voter selects votes for more than the number of candidates to be elected or proposals to be approved in a ballot item, the voting system shall do all the following:

- a. Notify the voter that the voter has selected more than the correct number of candidates or proposals in the ballot item.
- b. Notify the voter before the vote is accepted and counted of the effect of casting overvotes in the ballot item.
- c. Provide the voter with the opportunity to correct the official ballot before it is accepted and counted."

San Francisco Grand Jury Says More Voter Education needed for Instant Runoff Voting Some Voters and Poll Workers Still Do Not Understand IRV

In 2008 a San Francisco civil grand jury ruled that even previous voter education efforts for Ranked Choice Voting were insufficient and that more must be done. In spite of massive voter education efforts, and after several instant runoff elections, a July 3, 08 San Francisco Grand Jury Report stated that poll workers and voters do not understand instant runoff voting:

The 2007-2008 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury review of five elections for the city/county of San Francisco ²⁵

Excerpts of the Grand Jury Report

The 2007-2008 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury reviewed the materials provided by the Department of Elections for the November 2007 and February 2008 elections.

Ranked-Choice Voting and Absentee (Vote By Mail) Ballots RCV ballots were used in the November 2007 election for the offices of Mayor, District Attorney, and Sheriff. Some poll workers and voters told the Jury that they did not understand how to vote for candidates where RCV ballots were used. In the November 2008 election, RCV ballots will be used for some local offices. Additional education and outreach need to be provided to the voters to clarify the RCV process so that the ballots accurately reflect the intentions of the voters.

Findings:11. Some poll workers and voters do not understand the procedures for voting for candidates where Ranked-Choice ballots are used. Findings 14. While the DOE does meet these legal requirements, additional outreach efforts are needed on voter registration requirements and deadlines, the Ranked-Choice Voting process and the requirements for submitting a valid Absentee Ballot. V Recommendations 3. The DOE should publicly establish a date certain by which Sequoia must receive the Secretary of State's certification regarding the counting of RCV ballots. This date should be no later than September 15, 2008.

²⁴ NC Election Laws and Related Laws. NC Statutes current through 2009 Legislative Session.
<http://www.sboe.state.nc.us/GetDocument.aspx?id=2136>

²⁵ The 2007-2008 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury review of five elections for the city/county of San Francisco
<http://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1978>

An Assessment of Ranked-Choice Voting in the San Francisco 2004 and 2005 Elections.

Reports by the Public Research Institute on San Francisco's 2004 and 2005 IRV elections indicate that education efforts are not reaching all ethnic groups equally:

Take a look at some of the findings in these studies of San Francisco's 2004 & 2005 IRV election, conducted by the Public Research Institute at San Francisco State University:

An Assessment of Ranked-Choice Voting in the San Francisco 2004 Election ²⁶

SUMMARY

The majority of voters appear to have made the transition to Ranked-Choice Voting with little problem: about seven out of eight we surveyed said that, overall, they understood it "fairly well" or "perfectly well." However, that leaves one in eight who expressed some lack of understanding.

...We found differences across racial and ethnic groups in regard to their prior knowledge of RCV, their overall understanding, and their propensity to rank candidates on the ballot.

2005 was worse for voters than 2004:

An Assessment of Ranked-Choice Voting in the San Francisco 2005 Election ²⁷

IRV was re-named Ranked-Choice Voting because it can take days or weeks to get the results.

Prior Knowledge of Ranked-Choice Voting (RCV)

- A narrow majority of voters surveyed (54%) knew before voting that they would be asked to rank candidates for City Treasurer and Assessor in the 2005 election.
- The proportion of voters who had prior knowledge of RCV was lower in 2005 (54%) than in the 2004 election for the Board of Supervisors (67%).
- Those with lower rates of prior knowledge tended to be those who were less educated, reported having lower incomes, and spoke a primary language other than Spanish.
- African Americans were considerably less likely than other racial and ethnic groups (41.9%) to know they would be ranking their choices for these offices.
- The majority of voters reported ranking three candidates in the race for City Treasurer (57%), while 33% reported selecting only one candidate.*

²⁶ Public Research Institute on San Francisco. An Assessment of Ranked-Choice Voting in the San Francisco 2004 Election. May 2005. http://pri.sfsu.edu/reports/SFSU-PRI_RCV_final_report_June_30.pdf

²⁷ Public Research Institute on San Francisco. An Assessment of Ranked-Choice Voting in the San Francisco 2005 Election. July 17, 2006. http://pri.sfsu.edu/reports/SFSU-PRI_RCV_final_report_July_17_2006.pdf

Report on San Francisco's Implementation of Ranked-Choice Voting in 2004

A. Outreach and Education ²⁸

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors directed the Department to organize a grant program in order to educate voters on the City's new voting method. The program was designed to provide funding to community organizations that would work in partnership with the Department of Elections to educate the voters of San Francisco. The total funding for outreach and education was \$776,000, with \$210,000 specifically allotted to the community organizations for their efforts. Over a three-month period, the Department's Outreach Division along with 11 community-based organizations (CBOs) organized an outreach strategy covering the Supervisorial Districts that would be voting for a member of the Board of Supervisors using RCV for the first time. All RCV materials were translated in Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Russian, and Vietnamese to assist those with limited English-language proficiency. The Department's outreach and education plan also devoted efforts to other groups such as the disabled, elderly, and first-time voters. Voter education emphasized ballot layout design, proper marking of RCV ballot contests, application of the RCV algorithm to eliminate candidates and transfer votes, and the affect of overvoting or undervoting a ballot contest.

In addition to over 700 outreach events, the Department created the following materials:

- public service announcements
- newspaper advertisements
- ads placed in the interiors and exteriors of buses with routes in RCV districts
- brochures placed throughout the City
- material in the voter information pamphlet
- a citywide educational mailer
- educational materials sent to the absentee voters along with their ballot
- educational DVDs
- glossary of "conversational" terminology providing the pollworkers and translators additional communication tools
- an interactive internet site allowing voters to mark a sample RCV ballot card, and many other educational materials available on the Department's web site.

The Department also created an instruction sheet for voters that was distributed to each RCV precinct and placed on or near the voting machine that explained ballot condition messages from the Eagle machine the voters would see if they marked their ballot in a way as to generate an "undervote" or "overvote" message. This sheet was provided in multiple languages to assist those with limited English language proficiency and to allow for minimum pollworker interaction to ensure ballot integrity.

B. Pollworker/Field Election Deputy Training

Educating and training the pollworkers and Field Election Deputies was as important as educating the voters. The Department mailed materials to the pollworkers that provided a written introduction to RCV, a sample RCV ballot, and a Supervisorial District map showing which Districts would vote an RCV contest in the November election. The pollworkers' training classes were extended an additional hour to provide more comprehensive and hands-on training for RCV. The Department offered 150 training classes that began with an RCV video showing ballot marking and tabulation of an RCV contest, and incorporated role-playing to teach pollworkers the manner voters could mark an RCV ballot. The training also included instruction on the operation of the Eagle voting machine, changing Eagle tapes, answers to potential voter questions, and an update to the procedure for closing the polls. The Department offered each pollworker and translator a video or DVD (multilingual) on ranked-choice voting to take home to review. The Department also offered each pollworker a multilingual glossary of "conversational" RCV terminology to further assist communication with voters.

At the end of their training sessions, Pollworkers were tested to determine their level of comprehension of ranked-choice voting; 90% of the students demonstrated a strong comprehension. As a part of the polling place supplies, the Department included extra signage and brochures for the pollworkers to place in their polling place and inside the voting booths...

²⁸ Implementation of Ranked-Choice Voting. The City and County of San Francisco
November 2, 2004 Municipal Election
http://web.archive.org/web/20070714080934/http://www.sfgov.org/site/elections_page.asp?id=61472

The North Carolina State Board of Elections will announce next week how the election will be counted, once they figure it out. As the Greensboro News and Record said in an editorial, "An election train wreck may be unavoidable this November, but it shouldn't be allowed to happen again."²⁹

Future election experiments should be conducted in laboratory environments and not in real elections. There are several legal challenges possible with this election due to the IRV statute's clash with existing election laws.³⁰ In the end, this election may possibly elect a candidate not supported by most voters. We can't let that happen again.

About Us:

The North Carolina Coalition for Verified Voting is a grassroots non-partisan organization fighting for clean and verified elections. We study and research the issue of voting to ensure the dignity and integrity of the intention of each voting citizen. The NC Voter Verified Coalition has consistently fought for increasing access, participation and ensuring the voter franchise. Contact Joyce McCloy, Director, N.C. Coalition for Verifiable Voting by email at joyce@ncvoter.net or phone 336-794-1240 – see our website www.ncvoter.net

Joyce McCloy Bio

A voting activist since 2003, Joyce McCloy worked for a new law, passed in August 2005, that requires paper records on all voting machines and random post election audits. The law also requires machine manufacturers to explain how their equipment works. McCloy later sued to enforce provisions of that law. In 2006, McCloy worked for and obtained additional legislation to ensure that post election audits would be conducted in a more transparent fashion. In 2007, McCloy worked with The Brennan Center for Justice and Project Vote to eliminate the "No Match No Vote" rule in North Carolina. That legislation was signed into law on August 29, 2007.

McCloy led a 100 county push to encourage the purchase of optical scan systems instead of touch-screen. This led in a decrease of touch-screen counties from 40 to 23. Because of her leadership in the field of election integrity, the American Civil Liberties Union of North Carolina awarded McCloy its 2006 award "for a lifetime of contributions to civil liberties in North Carolina."

McCloy founded the NC Coalition for Verified Voting in January 2004 and continues to lead the organization. Writings by McCloy on electronic voting issues have been published by the Charlotte Observer, Raleigh News and Observer, the Asheville Citizen Times and the High Point Enterprise. In 2008 McCloy, assisted by the Brennan Center for Justice and the Advancement Project raised a statewide alert about straight ticket voting concerns, increasing media attention and direct voter education efforts statewide. McCloy currently edits a free national voting news letter that covers news about election integrity issues, voting machines, election fraud, voter access and legislation in United States and sometime internationally.

McCloy maintains the website www.ncvoter.net and an email list serve to provide information and education to the public about North Carolina voting issues. Additionally McCloy also operates a website www.instantrunoffvoting.us with the goal of educating and informing the public about problems with instant runoff voting. McCloy's national newsletter is available at <http://votingnews.blogspot.com>. McCloy hold a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice Administration from Bluefield State College, but has spent most of her working life in either business or banking operations.

²⁹ September 4, 2010. Editorial: On the wrong track. Greensboro News and Record. http://www.news-record.com/content/2010/09/03/article/editorial_on_the_wrong_track

³⁰ September 1, 2010. NC Coalition for Verified Voting. "North Carolina statewide Instant Runoff election and legal challenges" http://www.ncvoter.net/downloads/NC_Comments_on_IRV_and_2010_Judicial_Elections.pdf