

Honorable Chair Faye, Vice Chair Bresse-Ivesosn, Vice Chair Kropf and committee members, I am opposed to SB166 that will basically take away our opportunity to get the Cast Vote Record from the Clerks.

This testimony is directed to the original SB166, as I do not know if the amendment will pass.

Clean Voter Rolls has been requesting the Cast Vote Record (CVR) to check the process of our vote record. It has been very difficult to get these records. In 2020 I requested the records and they were anywhere from \$30 from Clatsop and Polk Counties, \$159 from Multnomah County the largest County, 2nd largest county was Washington County was \$279.00. Other counties were hundreds of dollars.

The 2022 election was consistent with the 2 smaller counties and Multnomah was similar. But Washington County went up to \$65,000. The folks in Washington County appealed to the DA there and that DA said no to the higher price. His letter is enclosed with this testimony. His conclusion was that he could not justify the reason for the increased expense by 53,600%. He said that the ballot was a public record and that if the person put their name on the ballot, that was on them for giving up their identity. Jackson County submitted a nearly \$700,000 just for the Cast Vote Record. They wanted nearly a million dollars for all of the requests I had for the 2022 election. Some of those requests are also included. Many other counties also increased the price for the record from tens of thousands of dollars, to another one for \$63,000.

The public has a right to review the record to see if our election is being conducted correctly. All of the operations need to be public. Americans used to be the ones who conducted the election in their own precinct for hundreds of years until we involved the tabulator companies and they had proprietary software. More and more of the information is being kept from us. People are losing confidence because of this secrecy.

Some other comments on the bill:

On Line 22 the term "Harasses or "annoys"" another person is used. The term annoy includes just a minor irritation to Harassment which is much stronger term. The process of adjudicating or observing an election may annoy anyone inadvertently, but it is necessary to discover the process that is used to run our election. Please remove the term 'annoy' and leave the harassment term to convey they type of behavior that should be used to get a fine.

The only part of the election that should be off limits to observation are the key codes to the computers, and the keys to the election office. The computers being used nationwide have been exposed as having many problems including back doors through cell phones inside the tabulators that can change the outcome of the election. There is no way for the public to know if our election is fair if you prevent them from looking. I should be open source.

Why is the precinct # included as a restricted information? Page 4, Line 34 and 34.

The signature is restricted information. How can we verify the signature is adjudicated correctly? Line 15 on page 5. I have 5 witnesses just from Multnomah County that declare that the signatures were accepted when they did not match a great deal of the time. They gave example after example to the Clerk Mr. Scott.

Many older workers can not see at a distance in some counties so they have used their phones to focus on the signatures to see if they match. The problem could be resolved by allowing the observers a closer view of the signatures. Multnomah County does a great job of allowing observers to see the signatures.

The problem of people leaving identify marks on their ballots could be eliminated by having the election boards cover those marks with stickers when they are opening the ballot. They are already looking over the ballots for marks that would confuse the tabulators. They are required to cover the stray marks.

The cast vote record could then be required to be put on the county website as it is in San Francisco County: [https://sfelections.sfgov.org/all-pages-docs?](https://sfelections.sfgov.org/all-pages-docs?cof=FORID%3A11&ie=UTF-8&as_q=cast+vote+records&sfgov_node_type=Custom)

[cof=FORID%3A11&ie=UTF-8&as_q=cast+vote+records&sfgov_node_type=Custom](https://sfelections.sfgov.org/all-pages-docs?cof=FORID%3A11&ie=UTF-8&as_q=cast+vote+records&sfgov_node_type=Custom)

This saves the clerk from taking the time to answer many duplicate requests for the CVR from many people. They can just refer them to the link.

Thank you for considering my remarks,
Janice Dysinger
Clean Voter Rolls