Testimony Against HB 2004 and HB 3509

To the Oregon House Committee on Rules,

My name is Sass and I'm a resident of Eugene, OR. I am submitting this written testimony to request that the Oregon state legislature **not** pass bills HB 2004 and HB 3506, which establish Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) for various elections. In addition to my previous written testimony, I'd like to submit points in response to common claims made by others in the verbal testimony.

- Knowing how to rank does not mean that voters understand how RCV works, and that matters because [ranking candidates honestly isn't safe under RCV](#).

- RCV does not guarantee majority winners because no voting method can do so in an election with more than two candidates.

- RCV results are not transparent. Most of the ballot data is not used in the tally and it's difficult to navigate and measure support with the data that is reported.

- STAR Voting is a better upgrade that provides a fixed-width ballot, which is cheaper and easier to produce.

- [Improvements in candidate behavior are temporary and diminish quickly under RCV](#).

- [RCV does not eliminate vote splitting or the spoiler effect.](#)

- [In 94% of RCV races in the US with more than two candidates, the candidate with the most 1st choice votes wins](#), meaning RCV doesn't change outcomes much.

- Picking a winner doesn't mean RCV was successful. By that measure, our current system is just as successful. And even by that metric, RCV recently performed worse: election officials in Alameda County tallied all of their RCV races incorrectly in November 2022, [certifying the wrong winner in a race in Oakland](#).

- [The county election officials in Utah want to get rid of RCV.](#)

- Implementing RCV across counties would require rolling back important election security laws.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sass