Question 1

This question asks voters if they would like to expand a 2013 "right-to-repair" law to include telematics. Many newer cars now contain telematics, which monitor and wirelessly send status reports on your car's mechanical health back to your car's manufacturer. Because MA's current "right-to-repair" law does not include telematics, this data can only be sent to automakers and not to independent repair shops and mechanics.

A **YES** vote on Question 1 would create a shared database for telematics data where car owners could elect to send their data to independent repair shops in addition to their car's manufacturer.

A **NO** vote would make no change to the existing law, and data would continue to be transmitted only to car manufacturers.

You can view a short video explaining ballot question 1 here.

What do proponents say?
Proponents argue that this change will allow local mechanics to better compete with car manufacturers in anticipating the needs of their clients and give car owners more options when looking to repair their car. Currently, car manufacturers can use telematics data to send car owners notifications when certain repairs are needed or parts require replacing. With these notifications, they can also send car owners offers to get their car repaired at one of the automaker's dealerships. As proponents of this change argue, this encourages car owners to go to car dealerships over local repair shops. Allowing data to be sent to local mechanics would allow these mechanics to compete and give car owners more choice over who is monitoring their car's mechanical health.

What do opponents say?
Opponents argue that creating a database for telematics data will make such data easier to hack and thus poses a security risk for car owners. They also argue that under current law, car owners still have the option to take their car to a local repair shop after getting a notification from their car's manufacturer and thus manufacturers do not have an unfair advantage over local mechanics.

You can listen to a full debate on Question 1 here.

Question 2

This question asks voters if they would like to enact Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) for "primary and general elections for all Massachusetts statewide offices, state legislative offices, federal congressional offices, and certain other offices beginning in 2022." RCV is a voting system in which, rather than pick a single candidate, voters have the option to rank candidates in order of preference. To win an election under the RCV system, a candidate must have greater than 50% of the votes. If no candidate gets the majority of votes when voters' first choice candidates are counted, the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated, and their votes are redistributed among remaining candidates, now counting these voters' second choice candidate. This process is repeated until a candidate receives greater than 50% of the votes. Massachusetts would not be the first place to use RCV; the City of Cambridge has been using a form of RCV for local elections since 1941, and Maine began using it in state-wide elections in 2018, to name just two examples.

You can view a short video on how ranked choice voting works here.

A **yes** vote on Question 2 would enact RCV for Massachusetts elections.

A **no** vote would make no change to our current voting system.

What do proponents say?
Proponents say that Ranked Choice Voting elects candidates who better represent the wants of the electorate, ensuring that the candidate with majority (>50%) support wins. This is most easily demonstrated by considering how RCV can minimize the "spoiler effect". Consider a race with three candidates, a Republican, Libertarian, and Democrat, where the Republican and Libertarian candidates are more ideologically similar than the Democratic candidate. With our current voting system, the Republican and Libertarian split the majority of votes, resulting in a win for the Democrat, even though a minority of voters supported this candidate. With RCV, <50% of votes is not sufficient to win, and the losing candidates' votes would be redistributed to reflect who the majority of voters prefer. By reducing the "spoiler effect," RCV gives voters more choice. Voters do not have to decide between placing a vote for a favorite candidate who is less likely to win and a vote for a safer candidate to protect against someone they dislike from winning. Instead, voters can vote for the "riskier" candidate, knowing that if this candidate loses, their vote will not be lost, but instead counted for their second choice. RCV also encourages more diverse candidates to run, with lessened worries about their candidacy splitting their party's vote. Lastly, as voters can still vote for a single candidate even if RCV is enacted, proponents argue that MA voters will easily be able to adjust to this new system.

What do opponents say?
Opponents argue that because RCV is more complicated, it will confuse voters and thus discourage people from voting. Further, because vote tabulation is less straightforward than in traditional systems, it will be more difficult for people to see how their individual vote is counted and further disenfranchise voters.

You can listen to a full debate on Question 2 [here](#).