

## AFD 295 Links and Notes - After Iowa:

- What changes were negotiated in the Democratic Party to the nomination process after 2016? Most 2016 caucus states eliminated caucuses
- <https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2020/01/31/how-will-recent-primary-reforms-change-the-democratic-race>

*The first is an effort by party chiefs to replace caucuses with primaries. Four years ago, 14 states held caucuses; only three (Iowa, Nevada, Wyoming, though Nevada and Wyoming will accept completed ballots) will do so this year (not counting Hawaii and North Dakota, which call their elections caucuses, but are really also primaries).*

*Second is a rejig of the primary calendar. States yearn for the influence that comes from holding elections early in the cycle. By March 17th, therefore, just six weeks after Iowa, states accounting for 60% of all delegates will have voted. That rises to 90% by May (see chart). The biggest calendar change concerns California, which has more delegates than any other state. It previously voted in June, but this year will join 14 other states in voting on Super Tuesday, March 3rd.*

*The final change concerns “unpledged” delegates, or superdelegates, who get a say in choosing the nominee in Milwaukee. Some 771 delegates, 16% of the total, fit this category. States send them to the convention, but they can back any candidate. They are traditionally seen as more loyal to centrists who are preferred by party chiefs. In 2016 Mr Sanders’s backers complained that unpledged delegates swayed the outcome by saying they preferred Hillary Clinton early on. This summer, their influence is reduced: they are barred from the first round of voting for a nominee unless the outcome is already blindingly obvious. The effect is probably slight, but could mean a small boost for Mr Sanders or Ms Warren*

- <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/04/us/politics/what-states-caucus.html>
- <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/nevada-democrats-debut-to-volunteers-new-ipad-based-tool-to-calculate-math-on-caucus-day-in-the-wake-of-iowa-fiasco> (trololololol)

*In interviews, volunteers said they received little information at the training beyond a rough outline of how the tool is supposed to function. They also were unsure how the party plans to carry out its four-day early voting period, which previously relied on the use of an app to capture people’s preferences. CBS News [first reported](#) the existence of an unspecified “tool” on Friday.*

- <https://www.ktvb.com/article/news/politics/voter-guide/idaho-2020-presidential-primaries-guide/277-257a326a-6fce-49fb-aa1a-92e218c89baf>

*The Idaho Democratic Party held county caucuses rather than a primary in 2016. Thousands attended the Ada County caucus at CenturyLink Arena and the Boise Centre. That was believed to be one of the largest single-site caucuses in the nation, but was also marked by long lines and a process that took several hours.*

*The party announced in 2018 that it would switch from using caucuses to a state-run primary for 2020.*

One caucus location for all of Ada County (population ~500K) was a nightmare. There was no chance of talking to other voters or trying to persuade. People were shunted into their location by their preference, filling an entire arena with thousands of people for Bernie, and the Boise Centre convention hall with people for Hillary. I lined up outside at 5:15ish, didn't get inside for about 90 minutes, and didn't get to leave until 11ish. Absolute logistical nightmare, and was absolutely undemocratic.

<https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/482196-iowa-democratic-party-reviewing-results-from-95-precincts-following>

- What the heck happened in Iowa?
- <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/06/upshot/iowa-caucuses-errors-results.html> *In some cases, vote tallies do not add up. In others, precincts are shown allotting the wrong number of delegates to certain candidates. And in at least a few cases, the Iowa Democratic Party's reported results do not match those reported by the precincts.*

*Some of these inconsistencies may prove to be innocuous, and they do not indicate an intentional effort to compromise or rig the result. There is no apparent bias in favor of the leaders Pete Buttigieg or Bernie Sanders, meaning the overall effect on the winner's margin may be small.*

*But not all of the errors are minor, and they raise questions about whether the public will ever get a completely precise account of the Iowa results. With Mr. Sanders closing to within 0.1 percentage points with 97 percent of 1,765 precincts reporting, the race could easily grow close enough for even the most minor errors to delay a final projection or raise doubts about a declared winner.*

- <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/06/upshot/iowa-caucus-satellite-votes.html> *The Iowa Democratic Party's answer, first evident when it released the results of satellite caucuses Wednesday night, differs from what was expected by at least one Democratic campaign and here at The Upshot, based on the state party's official delegate selection plan.*

*The difference between the two interpretations is a net 3.8 state delegates — small in just about any contest except one separated by 3.42 state delegates, as the Iowa race is right now.*