

Chair Wagner, Vice-Chair Girod, and members of the Committee;

Thank you again for taking up the issue of voting method reform this session. As you can see by the outpouring of testimony, it is of vital importance, and many people have strong opinions on the matter.

Unfortunately, some of what you heard at yesterday's hearing was factually incorrect.

Again and again, Ranked Choice Voting supporters claimed that RCV completely eliminates the Spoiler Effect. **This just isn't true**—with RCV strategic voting is still a good idea much of the time. In a significant portion of elections, voters will *think* it's safe to vote their conscience and end up electing their least favorite candidate, when if they had cast their 1st choices for the "lesser of two evils",

Again and again, Ranked Choice Voting supporters claimed that RCV guarantees that it will elect a "majority preferred candidate". **This isn't true either**—in fact, it's not always possible for such a candidate to even exist. All that RCV guarantees is that it will elect, from the two candidates remaining in the final runoff, the candidate that is preferred by voters who expressed a preference between the two finalists. STAR Voting does this too. (As does, it must be said, the current usual nonpartisan system of a primary and a top-two runoff.)

Frustratingly, some RCV advocates claimed that the statistical studies that STAR Voting supporters—the vast majority of testimony against RCV yesterday was from people who have discovered that there are better methods, STAR being among the best—are biased, done by statisticians who already favored STAR. **This is also false**—the studies of RCV's flaws have been around for decades. STAR Voting was developed in 2014.

If nothing else, two things are clear

- 1) Our current system needs to be changed.
- 2) Voting science is complicated!

I urge you to look into HB 3241, which would create a task force to examine all of our options, and find the right, best choice for Oregonians. (Spoiler alert: Ranked Choice Voting is not it.)

Thank you,  
Mont Chris Hubbard (Portland, OR)