

From: Sam <amisme@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 4:45 PM
To: SOS Elections * SOS <elections.sos@sos.oregon.gov>
Subject: Written testimony regarding LR 403 Explanatory Statement

Hello, I'm Samuel Monsen and I'm writing in regards to the explanatory statement and ballot title for HB 2004.

My professional background is in quality assurance testing. I have mostly worked on consumer electronics and web sites. Error detection and correction is my bread and butter. More recently, I have been turning a critical eye towards voting reform, in particular the Ranked Choice Voting movement.

It is concerning to me that the explanatory statement misleadingly refers to the winner gaining a majority of votes, but what is far more concerning is that it makes no mention at all that this different system requires centralized tabulation of votes. This is a massive change to the electoral process that is not even being mentioned. The explanatory statement and summary as written is tantamount to deliberately withholding crucial information from voters about what HB 2004 actually does to Oregon elections.

I can recall two recent tabulation failures in Ranked Choice Voting elections in the United States - a 2022 general election in Alameda County, and a 2021 primary election in New York City, New York. Neither error was caught by the Board of Elections overseeing the process. In one case, the error was found months after the election was certified and the wrong winner had been seated.

As someone who has made a living in the world of error detection and correction, these errors are mind-blowing. These are catastrophic failures in both the magnitude of the error and the failure to detect the error in a timely manner. Centralized processing and the opaqueness of the multiple rounds of results are the major contributing factors in how these tabulation failures happened.

In the products I worked on, errors of this magnitude would have been a crisis. Products would have been recalled, release dates would have been postponed, and major revisions would have been rushed through to correct a product that could fail so catastrophically. Somehow, in the political world, we've kept relatively quiet about these failures and the movement for Ranked Choice Voting has continued to move forward.

From the perspective of my QA testing background, it is recklessly irresponsible to push for voters to adopt such an error-prone system for something as critical as election to public office, and it is deeply disturbing that information on this aspect of HB 2004 is being withheld from the electorate. I hope that the committee will revise the summary and explanatory statement to reasonably inform the public on the contents of HB 2004.

Thank you for your time.

Samuel Monsen
Eugene, Oregon 97402