More Merits of Fair Share Voting

- After discussion, a **quick** poll can pick many items. It reduces **agenda effects** such as leaving no money for the last items or going into debt for them.
- It lets subgroups fund items; so it's **like federalism** without new layers of laws, taxes and bureaucracy. And it funds a big group even if they are scattered.
- Each big group controls only its share of the money. This reduces their means and motives for **fighting**. It makes becoming the plurality tribe less profitable.
- **Fairness builds trust** in spending by subgroups & raises support for more. This can reduce spending at the extremes of individual and central control.

N€w ***N¥w***

New Tool

N£w ***N$w***

Merits of FSV for an Elected Council

- FSV gives some power to reps in the opposition, so Electing one is more **effective**, less of a wasted vote.
- They ease starvation budgets that damage projects. This makes project management more **efficient**.
- A voter can see grants from his rep to each project, tax cut, or debt cut; then hold her **accountable**.

Free AccurateDemocracy.com/eBook.pdf

3. Fair Share Voting means: Spending power for all, in proportion to their votes.

So, 60% of the voters can spend 60% of the fund, not all of it. Your ballot's share from the fund lets you vote to pay your shares of the costs for your favorite items.

Voting is easy: simply rank your choices, like in IRV.*

Your ballot pays one share for each of its present top ranks—as many as it can afford. A tally of all ballots drops the item with the fewest shares. Those two steps repeat until each remaining item has full funding.[3]

Paying one share proves you feel the item is worth its cost and you can afford it in your high priorities.

Some Merits of Fair Share Voting, FSV

- **Each winner is a popular priority worth its cost**: To qualify for funding from our group's source, an item needs our "base number" of voters or more.
- **FSV is fair** to an item of any cost and to its voters: A ballot pays a costly share to vote for a costly item.
  cost / base = 1 share *e.g.* $100 / 25 ballots = $4
  If more ballots divide a cost, each of them pays less.
- So, a ballot's money can help more low-cost items. This motivates a voter to give his top ranks to the items he feels give **the most joy per dollar**.
- See Ranked Choice Voting points 1 and 3 on page 14

* The first handout was about Instant Runoff Voting.

Fair Shares and Majorities

If a majority controls all the money, the last item they choose adds little to their **happiness**; it is a low priority. But that money can buy a high priority of another big interest group, adding more to their happiness.

In political terms: The total spending has a wider *base of support:* It appeals to more voters because more see their high priorities get funding.

In economic terms: The *social utility* of the money and winners tends to rise if we each allocate a share. Fair, cost-aware voting gives *more* voters *more* of what they want for the same cost = more satisfied voters. Shares also spread good opportunities and incentives.

Items
Goods
Services

Projects
Programs
Budgets

Fair shares
spread the joy and opportunities.

Plurality rules let **surplus votes** waste a big group's power and let rival items **split** it, as seen on page 16. The biggest groups often have the biggest risks.

FSV protects a majority's right to spend a majority of the fund. It does this by eliminating split votes, as did RCV, and surplus votes, as we'll soon see.

Budget Levels

A co-op that helped develop Fair Share Voting lets each voter rank **budget levels** for *some* items.

A budget level needs to get the **base** number of votes. It gets one if a ballot offers to share the cost up to that level or a higher level. cost / base = 1 share = 1 vote

The item with the weakest top level loses that level. Any money your ballot had offered to it moves down your ballot to your highest ranks that lack your support. This repeats until the top level of each item is fully funded by its supporters. Thus fair shares and backup ranks select a set of winners with **more supporters**.

Many voters must concur, this cost is a high priority within my budget.

A group with 100 members set our **base** number at 25 votes.[5] My first choice got just enough votes, so my ballot paid 4% of the cost. 100% / 25 votes = 4%.

My second choice lost; did it waste any of my power?

My third choice got 50 votes, so my ballot paid only 2% of the cost.* Was there any surplus? Did I waste much of my power by voting for this sure winner?

None. None. Not much.

A Delicious Voting Game

For our tabletop tally of **Fair Share Voting (FSV)**

- We each get three 50¢ voting **cards** to buy treats.
- We decided an item needs modest support from 6 of us to prove it's a *shared* good worth shared funding. So the **finish line** marks the height of 6 cards, and
- You may put only one of your cards into a **column**.
- A costly item must fill several **columns**. A column here holds $3, so a $6 item must fill two columns.

⇨ Rule B gives you an average 50¢ card, a short 25¢ and a tall 75¢ to let you help your top choice more. Four eager voters can fill a column. 4 x 75¢ = $3

- When an item wins, the treasurer hides its cards. We **drop** items that cost more than all the cards left. Then, one at a time, we drop the least popular item, the one with the lowest level of cards in its columns.
- **Move** your cards from a loser to your backups.
- **Stop** when we've paid up all items still in the game.

Only a few items can win, but all voters can win*!*

⇨ An **app** can show our cards popping into 60¢ columns. It pops a 17¢ dot into column 1 of each voter's favorite. Then 16¢ pops into each voter's next column, etc. to a round of 3¢ cards. A ballot's 15 cards still total $1.50 but average just 10¢. After it drops an item, those left regrow from zero.[2]