

Fair Share Voting

Items, Goods, Services.
Budgets, Projects, Programs!



for Schools, Clubs, Towns and More

Many voters must prove, “This cost is a high priority within my budget.”

**Fair Share Voting:
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 RCV.*

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. $\text{cost} / \text{base} = 1 \text{ share}$ e.g. $\$100 / 25 \text{ 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 each voter to give their top ranks to the items that give them **the most joy per dollar.**
- Ranked Choice Voting points 1 and 3 on page 14.

* The first handout was about RCV electing a rep.

Fair Shares and Majorities

If a majority controls all the money, the last item they buy is a low priority; so it adds little to their **happiness**. 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.

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 a majority of the fund. It does this by eliminating split votes, as did RCV, and surplus votes, as we’ll soon see.

N€w

N¥w

Free eBook

N€w

N\$w



AccurateDemocracy.com/AcDem.pdf **Free**

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. $\text{cost} / \text{base} = 1 \text{ share} = 1 \text{ vote}$

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 prove, "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. $100\% / 25 \text{ votes} = 4\%$.

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.

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 and raises support for more. This can reduce spending at the extremes of individual and central control.

Items Budgets
Goods Projects
Services Programs



Fair shares

spread the joy and opportunities.

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**.

A Delicious Game

For our tabletop tally of **Fair Share Voting**

- We each get three 50¢ voting **cards** to buy treats.
 - We decide 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 has several **columns** to fill. 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. $4 \times 75¢ = \$3$



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!

- ⇒ Rule C An **app** shows cards popping up on columns.² A tall card pops up on column 1 of each voter's fave. Each voter's next column gets a smaller card, etc. When all cards are placed, drop the weakest item. The remaining items restart from zero.