Submitter: Seth Woolley

On Behalf Of: Pacific Green Party

Committee: House Committee On Rules

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4018

I reiterate my testimony on the dash-6 amendment opposing campaign finance reform delay as a means to indefinitely kill it. I add this testimony:

My name is Seth Woolley, and I'm a 25 year volunteer and current Treasurer of the Pacific Green Party, opposing the dash-6 amendment.

By quick background, I'm currently a Principal Engineer at an atmospheric science technology startup company, and for over two decades I have worked for technology startups with emphases in scientific supercomputing, graph theory, human machine interfaces, marketplace management, and logistics planning. The RFP for this project said it needed to support a million transactions per year. I'm used to architecting and developing systems that involve a million much more complex queries per second, a million online users, with hundreds of millions of annual users.

Having reviewed HB4024, its rules and its RFP, and having seen the two amendments for a few hours, I've seen the justification for delay of reform first hinge upon an unnecessary and complex ORESTAR rewrite using the parallel claim that "We also need the rules before we can send an RFP to get all new software." In software architecture we would call this a bottlenecking forced serialization of non-blocking tasks.

I said you can put in the RFP that the rules software should be configurable – a standard feature of business software. The rules were published. The RFP was then published. The RFP said the rules should be configurable and thus did NOT need to wait for those rules. Serialization was debunked.

Again, the recently stated reason for asking for 25 million dollars was the 2027 timeline for the software.

But I pointed out that the statute only requires software updates – minor ones – in 2028, not 2027 when the limits are to take effect, and the RFP needs to reflect this. HB4024 itself only has minor changes in committee types and some dashboards. A few additional fields such as date of birth are required by the rules. These are minor changes by any software measure.

The dash-6 amendment appears and it does not move the limits deadline (dealing with those by eviscerating them in other ways). Instead it pushes software out to 2032. Dash-8 appears to attempt to also push limits out many years as well. But the

"give me the money or I'll kill your dog" dog in this case is at least the transparency requirements, which are also delayed for the time of the wholesale software rewrite. The same error, just slightly more narrow.

I also affirm other Honest Elections comments in opposition. Please reject these amendments.