

To: Members of Oregon Legislature
From: William Vollmer (on behalf of Consolidated Oregon Indivisible Network – COIN)
Re: testimony in opposition to SB 1502
Date: March 4, 2026

My name is Bill Vollmer and I am presenting testimony today on behalf of the Consolidated Oregon Indivisible Network (COIN), a coalition of over 75 grassroots groups throughout the State that work together to advance progressive legislation. COIN is proud to work with Honest Elections Oregon (HEO) and its partner organizations to promote good campaign finance reform in Oregon. The coalition, which includes HEO, the League of Women Voters of Oregon, Common Cause, the Independent Party of Oregon, the Oregon Progressive Party, and the Pacific Green Party among others, contains some of the State's leading experts on campaign finance law and also works closely with national experts on CFR. They also have been the prime mover behind much of the CFR that has occurred in Oregon over the last 20 years.

Honest Elections Oregon opposes SB 1502.

Frankly, it is hard to know what to even make of this Bill. It would appear that Legislative Leadership, after developing HB 4018 in collaboration with lobbyists from Business and Labor and then telling their members that they should vote for it because the only substantive change from the campaign finance bill (HB 4024) passed in 2024 is to allow more time for the SoS to implement that bill, now wish to direct the SoS to set forth changes to HB 4018 that would then be considered in the 2027 legislative session.

If HB 4018 truly just contains the needed technical fixes to HB 4024, what is there for the SoS to study? Since the contribution limits in HB 4018 don't even take effect until Jan of 2027, the SoS won't have had any time to look at the impact of this legislation. So what is this report to contain? Is the SoS being asked to evaluate the wording of the bill itself for potential problems?

Could it be, perhaps, that Leadership, in response to public outcry, strong opposition from the Honest Elections coalition, criticism of the legislation by national experts in campaign finance, and negative reports in the media, are now acknowledging that HB 4018 actually is the radical departure from HB 4024 that its opponents claim it to be? In that case, rather than enact a bad bill and then try to fix it next session, isn't a better course of action the following:

1. Do not approve HB 4018
2. Accept the technical fixes to HB 4024 as proposed by the Honest Elections coalition
3. Allow the extra funds and time the SoS claims is needed for implementation of HB 4024

I would add that, as regards the last point, testimony presented to the House Rules Committee on Feb 12, 2026 would suggest that it is still quite likely that the needed software can be developed in time for its needed rollout in Jan 2028 (almost two years away still) and at a fraction of the \$25 million that the SoS estimated it would cost. So maybe we will be in the fortunate situation in 2027 session that you can move the scheduled implementation of the disclosure guidelines back to the original schedule!