

## HB 2004

### Submission – Ranked Choice Voting- Vote No

There are many things wrong with Ranked Choice Voting. I'll highlight a few:

- 1) It's too complicated. And politicians pushing RCV know this. It's asking that the voters be forced to choose not their favorite candidate they want to win, but five choices, and of those they have to make choices of who they don't want to win! And rank them.

If the voter did vote for only his favorite candidate, there's a real good chance his vote would be canceled out entirely, or would in fact garner him his least favorite candidate.

**Pew Research found that 34% of Republicans voters and 32.5% of Dems couldn't even name their own party's nominee for Congress; now voters are expected to have five informed choices in order of preference.** RCV is making the peoples vote needlessly complex. And it is odd that the Dems who scream for no voter ID, saying it puts too much of a burden on "people of color" [their chosen phrase] but RCV, which actually does disenfranchise voters by being too complex, they think is just great.

People should be able to vote for the candidate that want; their favorite candidate. There should not have to be a calculation, actually a contrivance to vote NOT for the candidate they really want..

**FairVote, which supports ranked-choice, found that under RCV, the "...prevalence of ranking three candidates was lowest among African-Americans, Hispanics, voters with less education and those whose first language was not English."**

Example:

**2009 in Burlington, Vermont.** Conservatives ranked their favorite candidate first and it got them their least favorite candidate as the winner. Had these conservative voters instead tactically placed their favorite candidate as second, then they would have gotten a much better outcome.

**Burlington Voters have since repealed RCV.**

- 2) RCV doesn't guarantee a majority. In fact in many cases, the candidate with the fewest actual votes gets elected.

**Ballot exhaustion is when a voter's ballot preferences get eliminated so that nothing carries over to later rounds.** This means that the majority RCV arrives at is only within the remaining ballots rather than the original ballots

**2010 race for San Francisco City Council.** After 20 rounds of tabulation, there were 9,608 exhausted (discarded) ballots, whereas the winner garnered only 4,321 votes. **The victor took fewer than 25% of the votes!**

**And 20 rounds of tabulation! And Oregon is a state that has declared “Math Is Racist” so it not like we have qualified people to handle these elections now, adding RCV would only make them worse.**

Much of the time ranked-choice voting isn't getting any kind of majority at all. Rather, it's contriving a majority by artificially narrowing down the candidate field. Any voting method that finds some way to knock out candidates until two remain will get a “majority.”

- 3) Voting should be simple. Oregon has turned voting into a miserable experience that takes WEEKS! The Dem-One-Party in Oregon is not pushing RCV because it will be easier for voters to vote. Because millions of people have complained that it is more complex. They send out voter pamphlets a month in advance, then send out ballots two weeks later, then give ANOTHER three weeks to vote! Oregon Dems just added on another week after Election Day, making it a five week experience that comes twice a year! That's 20% of a year!

**We used to vote in a day.** We used to go to our nearby church or school and vote. No fuss. We got election night results and in only a few rare cases was a contest not declared that night. Paper ballots and hand counts. Now it's out of control. And all that extra time to actually count the vote gives no one confidence in the vote. It points directly to manipulation.

- 4) Ranked choice voting helps those who traditionally are less able to raise money. And the candidates who are able to raise less money are the candidates that have the least amount of support from voters. RCV helps them to stay in the race when they really aren't in the running. And that means candidates that are not the voters favorite get preferential treatment when they should not.
- 5) Ranked Choice Voting is another Option, but it's not better than our current voting system in fairness or voter engagement. In fact they are already silencing votes because many voters think it's much more of a burden to vote RCV because of all the choices they are forced to make and also to consider ranking only to end up with a candidate that was NO ONE'S FIRST CHOICE.
- 6) I see RCV as another way for vote/ballot manipulation. We have had Mail-In-Voting since 1998 in Oregon and there has not been one audit in all that time. We are told that's it all fine but I don't believe that, and millions across America don't either. I've heard the narrative pushed by Dems and it's not believable. There is cheating in all 50 states.

7)

We have learned a great deal about how all 50 states in the US cheat in elections. Not all counties in all 50 states, but all states, red states and blue states. That's what we should be focused on. And RCV is not the way to make our elections more secure. The opposite is true.

I have zero confidence in the Dems one-party control of the elections. I know that dirty voter rolls, motor-voter registration, a huge transient population in Portland and Eugene, Multnomah and Lane counties, makes voter fraud very easy. Dems will say "oh sure there is some voter fraud, "but not enough to change an outcome of an election." I don't believe that. And millions of Americans know that the politicians and election officials, are cheating and silencing our votes, cancelling us out. And it is despicable.

8) This is not the venue to expand on every detail of RCV but here is another important point:

**University of Cincinnati Law Review Dec 2021: [Volume 90 Issue 2]**

**"One Vote, Two Votes, Three Votes, Four: How Ranked Choice Voting Burdens Voting Rights and More"**

**"Equal Protection Clause does not permit some votes to carry a greater weight than others. At the heart of this inquiry is whether RCV's rounds of tabulation function as one election or multiple elections. This article submits that RCV is the latter. In total, this Article identifies four primary burdens that RCV inflicts on voting rights."**

**"RCV operates as more than one election and in doing so, affords some voters a weightier and UNEQUAL opportunity to influence electoral outcomes."**

**"RCV direct election officials to engage in multiple "rounds" of vote disbursement."**

**FairVote, an organization dedicated to implementing RCV, describes the process as a multitude of runoff *elections* (yes, plural) where candidates are sequentially eliminated in *each* (yes, separate) election."**

**"RCV simulates a series of runoff *elections*."**

**"Each time the voters and candidates change, there is a distinct and separate election. In practice RCV does precisely that."**

**"But not only do the candidates change in the subsequent rounds of an RCV election, so do the voters."**

Ranked Choice Voting is not what Oregon needs. So don't shove it down our throats.