

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		,	
TESTIFYING: ✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: AL FRISBY		PHONE NUMBE	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: alfrisbyformerriam@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/27/202	ATE: 24 8:22 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

At the present time, I live in Merriam KS until 5/30/24. However, my wife and I purchased a home in Independence MO in Whispering Meadows a week ago. This is my 1st testimony as a citizen of MO. I have experienced using Rank Coice Voting here in KS. It was a simple process and afterwards I felt I had an influence on the election...voting for only one person does not. My vote with RCV allows me to be instrumental in ranking who I want to win the election, while giving support to a number of possible candidates based on my ranking. In other words, I felt like my vote mattered. Please support the concept.Al Frisby4447 S Davidson DrIndependence MO 66055



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: BECKY ARPS			PHONE NUME 314-368-0	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION AMERICANS FOR			TITLE: DIRECTO	R OF RESEARCH
ADDRESS: 1 NOB HILL LANE				
CITY: UNIVERSITY CITY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63130
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		·	
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: BEV EHLEN			PHONE NUME 314-608-0 °	
REPRESENTING: LIBERTY LINK MIS	SSOURI		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 312				
CITY: WARRENTON			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63383
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	DATE: 124 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	ted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: BEV EHLEN			PHONE NUME 314-608-0	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION WARREN COUNTY	N NAME: ' REPUBLICAN COMMI	TTEE	TITLE: CHAIRMA	N
ADDRESS: 19335 PRIMROSE I	RIDGE			
CITY: WARRENTON			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63383
EMAIL: bevehlen@yahoo.d	com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 8:00 AM
THE INFORMAT	TION ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D LINDER CHA	PTER 610 RSMo

As part of the MOGOP Platform Missouri Republicans state that we oppose Ranked Choice Voting.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			•
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: BYRON KEELIN			PHONE NUM 314-402- 0	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION FREEDOM PRINCI			TITLE: PRESIDE	NT
ADDRESS: PO BOX 15095				
CITY: ST. LOUIS			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63110
EMAIL: freedomprinciplen	no@protonmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/29/2	DATE: 024 8:22 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

On behalf of our members and supporters of the Freedom Principle MO, we want to offer this as our official support for SJR 78 sponsored by Senator Ben Brown (Dist. 26). This bill answers the most basic question about our elections. Do we want the voters of Missouri to choose who represents us in our local communities, Jefferson City, and Washington, D.C. or do we want out-of-state, dark money donors like George Soros picking candidates for us? This will happen if we don't ban Rank Choice Voting in all forms from Missouri's election process. SJR 78 is needed now. Dark-money groups are mobilizing their forces to try and get enough signatures to put Rank Choice Voting on the November 2024 ballot once again. SJR 78 will protect the integrity of our elections. SJR 78 includes: • Affirming ONLY U.S. citizens and residents of Missouri can vote in our elections • Specifies all ballots to be cast shall be paper ballots • Specifies that voters will only be entitled to one vote for each office or issue • Makes the candidate that receives the greatest number of votes in a political primary shall be the only candidate for that political party at the general election The right to vote is essential to our American democracy. Our Founding Fathers believed voting was a sacred trust of human beings to make sure we choose elected officials that reflect God's values and the values of our country. They believed American citizens must vote with thoughtfulness and intentionality. Rank Choice Voting is the opposite of what our Founding Fathers believed and valued. Our election process was shaken to its core in 2020 and we saw in November 2022 the disaster that happened in Alaska when they implemented Rank Choice Voting. It took months to determine a winner. Now citizens in Alaska are trying to remove Rank Choice Voting. We don't want Rank Choice Voting in Missouri and you can help stop it. The right to vote and the right to have that vote counted are essential to election integrity. Missouri residents must have confidence in the electoral systems, processes, and results. SJR 78 protects the integrity of our elections, and we urge the Senate Local Government and Elections Committee to support this important legislation and immediately bring it to the floor for a vote.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: CARLA GREWE			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: carlagrewe@me.c	om	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	ATE: 24 9:08 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	I IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.

Ranked choice biting needs to be banned



cabohl@fidnet.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: **SJR 78** 4/30/2024 COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials ✓** IN SUPPORT OF ☐ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME PHONE NUMBER: **CHERYL BOHL BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: 7IP· SUBMIT DATE: EMAIL: ATTENDANCE:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

4/30/2024 2:41 PM

Written

SJR 78, sponsored by Sen. Ben Brown (R-26) was passed in the Senate on April 9. The bill, SJR 78, if passed by the House, would present the amendment to the people to ban ranked-choice voting in Missouri on the November ballot. The bills states voters shall only be entitled to one vote for each issue on the ballot and the same amount of votes for each office as there are seats to be filled at the election. Under no circumstance would a voter be permitted to cast a ballot in a manner that results in the ranking of candidates for a particular office. The candidate that receives the greatest number of votes in a political party primary would be the only candidate for that political party at the general election. Left wing activists are pushing both ranked choice and noncitizen voting because they want to dismantle the political party system in America.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: CINDY DEGGEND	ORF		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: cindydeggen@gm	nail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	DATE: 124 6:39 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	IS PUBLIC RECORT	UNDER CHA	PTER 610 RSMo

I support SJR 78 because only citizens of the United States over the age of 18 who are residents of Missouri should be able to vote and there should be one vote for each issue. There should be no ranking of candidates for each office.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: GERALDINE THW	ING		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jimger5@sbcgloba	al.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/29/20	DATE: 124 5:15 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.				

No ranked choice voting!



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐	FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: HARRY ROTH			PHONE NUME 347-781-9 0	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: STOP RANKED-CHOICE VOTING COALITION TITLE: PROJECT MANAGER			MANAGER	
ADDRESS: 189-29 117TH RO A	AD.			
CITY: QUEENS			STATE: NY	ZIP: 11412
EMAIL: harry@saveoursta	ates.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	OATE: 24 8:40 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit my written testimony. We often hear from proranked choice voting groups and their supporters in the media about how their system is spreading like wildfire. But the story that often goes untold is that many state legislatures are going in the opposite direction and taking action to protect their voters. This is far from a partisan push; RCV bills have been vetoed by California Governor Gavin Newsom and former Governor Jerry Brown before him. Elected officials from both parties understand that the system lacks transparency and is susceptible to fraud. To date, six states have banned ranked-choice voting, with similar bills advancing in state legislatures around the country. This is a direct result of ranked-choice voting's many publicized failures. From weeks-long delays in Maine to voter confusion in Arlington, VA, legislators are right to fear it encroaching on their state. The beauty of SJR 78 is that it does more than just ban ranked-choice voting; it also bans non-citizen voting, which has broad bipartisan support in Missouri. I commend Senator Ben Brown for introducing Senate Joint Resolution 78 and urge all his colleagues to support it as well. If passed, this resolution could represent a rare bipartisan win in these extremely polarizing times. Thank you again for your time.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78					TE: 30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			•	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	□FOR	INFORMATIO	ONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: HON. J. KENNETH	BLACKWELL		PI	HONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	DN NAME:		TI	TLE:	
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			S	TATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: cei@americafirstp	olicy.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	,	SUBMIT DATE: 4/30/2024 8	3:21 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Good morning.I would like to submit brief written testimony on the issues of non-citizen voting and Ranked Choice Voting (RCV). I am Ken Blackwell, the former Secretary of State of Ohio and the Chairman of the Center for Election Integrity at the America First Policy Institute. I have served as a United States Ambassador at the United Nations, and as the former Chairman of the bipartisan International Foundation for Electoral Systems. First, non-citizen voting our elections should not be allowed. Such foreign election interference erodes both our national sovereignty and the integrity of American citizenship. American citizenship has an important meaning and is worth pursuing, which is precisely why millions do it every single year. As an American citizen, casting a ballot is a civic duty and a unique privilege. For naturalized citizens, this is a reward after tireless work, patience, and dedication put into the process of becoming a citizen. Sadly, some on the Left are diminishing and disrespecting the hard work of naturalized citizens and also black Americans who struggled for centuries to access voting rights, by expanding the privilege to vote in American elections to non-Americans. They are giving unfair preference to individuals who have not made an effort or made the sacrifices to obtain American citizenship. In states like Maryland, New York, and California, non-American citizens living there can vote in certain elections. Other states like New Mexico have even introduced legislation allowing non-citizens to vote. This is lunacy. Non-Americans should not be allowed to vote in American elections—period. Only American citizens should have that right. Does the government of Mexico allow non-citizens to vote in its elections? How about France or Germany? Of course, they don't, nor should they. Second, Ranked Choice Voting should not be allowed. It is becoming increasingly unpopular considering its track record of chaos and confusion. A Massachusetts Institute of Technology study on Ranked Choice Voting in Maine revealed that it "produced significantly lower levels of voter confidence, voter satisfaction, and ease of use. It also increased the perception that the voting process was slanted against the respondent's party. Similarly, [the study] found that it increased the amount of time it took to vote by nearly 12 seconds per candidate than voting using a plurality ballot" (Clark, 2021). The study also found that negative campaign ad spending increased after implementation of Ranked Choice Voting, in contrast to the claim that it increases civility in campaigning. The principle behind the democratic process of casting a vote is that each person has the right to equal and proportionate representation in government. Leaders are chosen by voters, comparing the candidates against each other and casting a ballot, If there are going to be multiple rounds of casting ballots, each voter should be able to weigh in actively and vote once in each of those rounds, and candidates should be allowed to continue campaigning after anybody drops out. Campaign strategies, media attention, and voter perceptions are bound to change anytime the field of candidates is shaken up; running a simulated algorithm is not a substitute for this important democratic process. Ranked Choice Voting prohibits a voter from knowing which candidates remain in subsequent rounds and therefore makes it impossible for voters to be able to

reassess the field accurately and consistently. Under Ranked Choice Voting, the voter does not have the ability to explicitly say who they would like to win compared to the other candidates because they do not know until after their only ballot is cast which candidates will be eliminated and which will remain.Additionally, implementing Ranked Choice Voting prolongs the elections process. States and counties already struggle to deliver election results within a reasonable timeframe, and this contributes to the lack of public trust in elections currently. Ranked Choice Voting adds in several more rounds of tabulating ballots, leading to longer waiting periods before election results are announced, and opening the door for more errors in the tabulation process, while placing even greater a strain on the election workers and poll watchers. A new Rasmussen poll shows that 42% of respondents had never heard of Ranked Choice Voting. Once the concept was explained, 60% of those polled did not agree with Ranked Choice Voting and only 23% agreed with it. And when the possibility that one candidate could have received the most first-preference votes in the election but that another candidate could win the election with the second-preference votes, 8% of Americans viewed Ranked Choice Voting as very favorable. The American people will not benefit from policies that implement Ranked Choice Voting. Thank you for your consideration of my testimony. The Hon. J. Kenneth BlackwellChair, Center for Election IntegrityAmerica First Policy Institute



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials				
TESTIFYING : ✓IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
	WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: HON. KENNETH T. CUCCINELLI, II		PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:				
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: kcuccinelli@electiontransparency.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/20	DATE: 124 1:12 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Statement of Hon, Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, IlChairman, Election Transparency InitiativeHouse Elections and Elected Officials CommitteeApril 30, 2024Chairman McGaugh, Vice-Chair Stacy, and members of the committee, thank you for affording me the opportunity to discuss Election Integrity and the Assembly's responsibility to implement such measures in Missouri, I am Ken Cuccinelli and I am the Chairman of the Election Transparency Initiative, where we work every day to help improve the transparency, security, accessibility and accountability of elections in every state, so that every American—regardless of color, creed or party affiliation—has confidence in the outcome of every election. I previously served as the Attorney General of Virginia, the Acting Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, and as a member of the Virginia State Senate. Top of mind for today's hearing is a constitutional amendment which we at ETI support, Senate Joint Resolution 78, to prohibit any elections in your state from being decided by the confusing, complex, and costly system of 'Ranked-Choice Voting' (also known as 'Instant-Runoff Voting' and 'preferential voting'), as well as to ensure that only U.S. citizens are able to register and vote in Missouri. The question before you is whether to give voters the opportunity to decide if state law should reflect the foundational, one person -one vote principle bestowed to American citizens, or further exacerbate an epidemic of disenfranchised voters whose ballots no longer are counted fairly and equally. Foreign-Citizen Voting: As you know, illegal aliens are flooding our country at historic levels, making it even harder for states to verify the accuracy of voting lists. But to the voices on the Left who contend that Foreign-Citizen Voting is not a problem worth confronting, it is worth remembering that under the Washington, D.C. Democrats' failed takeover of elections, states would have been required to register foreign citizens to vote. In fact, beginning in 2019 they advanced legislation which would have resulted in the automatic dumping of millions of legal and illegal aliens on to the voter rolls. Under H.R. 1, states would have been required to register illegal aliens to vote, state officials would be threatened with criminal liability if they attempt to interfere, and penalties for such illegal voting would be removed—cancelling out millions of American votes. Given how hard it would be to believe such outrages would be intentional policy in this country, here are the sections of H.R. 1 that would have accomplished the three outrages I mentioned: Section 1012: Mandates states to perform automatic voter registration of every adult on numerous state databases, without regard to citizenship, Section 1015; Decriminalizes foreigners voting in American elections if they were registered via H.R.1's mandatory voter registration provisions (i.e., via Sec. 1012). And to intimidate state and local folks from cleaning foreign citizens off the voter rolls... Section 1201: Introduces a new, vaguely worded criminal offense if a prosecutor decides a state official's efforts to keep their voter rolls clean may have 'interfered' with registering such person, again regardless of whether or not the registrant was a U.S. Citizen. The radical Left can't credibly say that they don't want illegals to vote nor that Foreign-Citizen Voting isn't an issue worth addressing. Had they succeeded in passing their federal takeover of elections into law via H.R. 1, Missouri would have

been required to automatically register foreign citizens to vote. Ranked-Choice Voting: Ranked-Choice Voting is a scheme that has made voting more confusing and difficult, reduced transparency, and put confidence and certainty at risk when implemented in public elections, with horror stories in Alaska, California, Colorado, Maine, New York, Utah, Virginia and elsewhere. The practice has been backed by anti-Election Integrity megadonors financing a nationwide campaign intended to dramatically push our politics to the Left, to elevate Left-leaning politicians, and to weaken political parties to their benefit. You have witnessed this firsthand in Missouri of course. As designed, Ranked-Choice Voting manufactures a majority winner by routinely 'exhausting'—or throwing out—thousands of ballots so candidates need only win a majority of the remaining votes, not a majority of all votes cast. Provided here is a comprehensive list of Ranked-Choice Voting horror stories: https://electiontransparency.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2023/11/RCV_HorrorStories.pdf Visit StopRCV.com to learn more, or view our fact sheet: https://electiontransparency.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2023/02/HEP-Ranked-Choice-Voting-Factsheet_1Bv2.pdf Ranked-Choice Voting and Foreign-Citizen Voting are the antithesis of Election Integrity and should always be prohibited.

content/uploads/sites/9/2023/02/HEP-Ranked-Choice-Voting-Factsheet_1Bv2.pdf Ranked-Choice Voting and Foreign-Citizen Voting are the antithesis of Election Integrity and should always be prohibited. Several states have already acted to ban Ranked-Choice Voting, and I urge you to carefully assess this information as you continue consideration of SJR 78. I would also like to commend Sen. Ben Brown for introducing this critical amendment, as well as Rep. Ben Baker for leading the House companion resolution. I am available to answer any questions regarding these important issues at your convenience. ###



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: JAMES HARRIS			PHONE NUME 573-761-7	
REPRESENTING: OPPORTUNITY SO	DLUTIONS PROJECT		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 122 EAST HIGH ST	TREET, SUITE 200			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE: 124 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		·	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JANET DABBS			PHONE NUMB	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: janetdabbs7@gma	ail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	OATE: 24 8:29 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	I IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

No ranked choice voting. Only legal citizens voting.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DAT 4/3	E: 0/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			•	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INI	FORMATIO	NAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:				
WITNESS NAME: JASON SNEAD				NE NUMBER: -649-0292	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION HONEST ELECTION	ON NAME: ON PROJECT ACTION		TITLE	CUTIVE DI	RECTOR
ADDRESS: 368 S. PICKETT S	T. #9956				
CITY: ALEXANDRIA			STAT VA	E:	ZIP: 22304
EMAIL: jason@jasonsnea	d.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 1/29/2024 1:	2:36 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on Senate Joint Resolution 78, a measure to ban noncitizen voting and ranked-choice voting in Missouri. My name is Jason Snead, executive director of Honest Elections Project Action, an advocacy group dedicated to preserving free, fair, and secure elections. I also serve as the co-chair of the Stop RCV coalition, a nationwide network striving to halt the spread of RCV. To be blunt, RCV makes voting harder and puts public confidence in elections in jeopardy. To understand why RCV is so corrosive to public trust in elections, consider how a rankedchoice election works. Though RCV has many names—"Final Five," "Instant-Runoff," and more—it is a scheme with a common goal: to do away with the American tradition of "one person, one vote," and instead to ask voters to rank numerous candidates for each office by order of preference. RCV computes winners through a series of elimination rounds. If no candidate wins a majority of the firstplace vote, the candidate with the least first-place votes is eliminated and ballots cast for them are redistributed to each voter's next highest pick. This process repeats until a single candidate claims a majority of the remaining votes.RCV makes every stage of the voting process more complicated, so much so that enormous effort must be put into reeducating the public. New York City spent \$15 million to teach people how to vote in an RCV election, while Maine was forced to produce a 19-page guide for voters. All of this takes more time than voters are accustomed to. First, voters must study the platforms of numerous candidates for each office, including many who are fringe or otherwise unelectable. Then they must decide which candidates to rank, and the order in which to rank them, for every RCV race on a ballot. One MIT study found that filling out a ballot takes 12 seconds longer per candidate compared to typical plurality elections. In a "Final Five"-style system, RCV adds a full minute per race. In other words, if RCV advocates succeed in replacing federal, state, and local elections with ranked-choice voting, the time it takes to vote could easily double, risking long lines, voter fatigue in down-ballot races, and potentially deterring people from voting altogether. Tabulating votes is also a challenge. With RCV, tabulation cannot begin until every ballot is received, meaning delayed results. Recounts only compound the issue. Candidates looking for any edge may demand recounts of close elimination rounds knowing that changing the order in which candidates are eliminated can upend the final results of the election. In other words, RCV increases the likelihood of post-election challenges, recounts, and litigation. Because of the complexity of RCV, it is possible that tabulation mistakes can go undetected. In fact, Oakland, California experienced this firsthand in 2022. Tabulators mistakenly eliminated hundreds of votes and certified the wrong winner in a school board contest. Were it not for an outside audit by outside RCV experts, that error would likely have gone undetected. Another significant issue is the problem of so-called "exhausted" ballots, that is, if voters do not rank every available candidate, and if their choices are eliminated before a final winner is computed, they no longer have a vote and their ballots are eliminated entirely. With each round of elimination, it appears

as though fewer people voted. For example, roughly 140,000 ballots were exhausted in New York City's mayoral race in 2021, while roughly 11,000 ballots were exhausted in Alaska's 2022 special congressional election. Eliminating exhausted ballots is the only way RCV can deliver on its signature promise to ensure that candidates win with majority support. But with RCV, this "majority" is merely manufactured by eliminating ballots and redistributing votes. Again, consider the Alaska special election: If the roughly 11,000 exhausted ballots are added back to the vote totals, Congresswoman Mary Peltola's margin shrinks from a 51.5% majority to a 48.4% plurality. The problems with RCV's majoritarian mirage run even deeper. A first-place vote clearly does not signal the same level of support for a candidate as a third-place vote. The latter may signify indifference, opposition—or perhaps nothing at all, if the mark was made randomly by an exhausted voter ranking his 50th candidate of the day. Yet RCV treats every ranking as a vote for a candidate, and manufacturers majorities based on second- and third-place votes. This is hardly the only area where RCV has fallen short of its promise. A 2023 study by the Hubert Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota concluded that ranked-choice voting failed to reduce political polarization, increase diversity among election officials, increase voter turnout, or decrease negative campaigning. In fact, one study of RCV in Maine found that "negative spending increased significantly...casting doubt on the claim that RCV makes campaigns more civil."With these deficiencies in mind, it is hardly surprising that so many jurisdictions have tried ranked-choice voting only to repeal it shortly thereafter. Proponents tout a Utah RCV pilot program that recruited two-dozen participants, yet over half of the original participants have withdrawn citing public confusion and RCV's failure to deliver on its promises. Polling suggests a clear majority of Alaskans wish to repeal RCV, and such an effort is presently underway. The push for ranked-choice voting is not an organic, bottom-up movement led by local activists. It is a concerted national campaign by a small group of elite liberal megadonors to remake elections across the nation. They are funding local advocacy groups, hiring lobbyists, facilitating media coverage, and spending tens of millions on ballot measure campaigns.RCV simply puts public confidence in elections at risk, which is why six states have banned it and many more are advancing legislation to stop its spread. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		·	
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JENNIFER GORE			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	DN NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jsg1263@yahoo.co	om	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	OATE: 24 5:23 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

I am in favor of SJR78. The people of Missouri do not want rank choice voting in our state.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSE	S
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: JOHN BAKER			PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			·		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: jjbaker9@live.com	1	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/20	DATE: 124 7:56 PM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	MIS BURLIC PECOP	D LINDED CHA	DTED 610 DCM	

This type of election gymnastics(ranked choice voting) has no place in free and fair election. It not only removes clarity, it removes choice. Please do not allow changes to what has always worked in the past.



Les.Larson@yahoo.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: **SJR 78** 4/30/2024 COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials ✓** IN SUPPORT OF ☐ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **LESLIE LARSON BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 2:11 PM EMAIL: ATTENDANCE:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am in favor of SJB-78. Ranked Choice voting is only a means for candidates who do not gain the majority of the voters to have a second chance. Bottom line is if a candidate has the support of the citizens, then the candidate will receive the majority of the votes cast. Ranked choice voting is a means where people can easily vote for more than one candidate. This bill clarifies the voting procedure in the State of Missouri

Written



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		,	
TESTIFYING : ☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ F	OR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: MATTHEW R. CROUCH		PHONE NUME 202-329-0 3	
REPRESENTING: HERITAGE ACTION FOR AMERICA/THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION TITLE: STATE			RECTOR
ADDRESS: 1519 TRUMPET CT.			
CITY: LIBERTY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64068
EMAIL: matthew.crouch@heritageaction.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	DATE: 1 24 2:25 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Testimony of Matt Crouch, Missouri State DirectorHeritage Action for AmericaApril 30, 2024Supporting: SJR 78Submitted to the House Committee on Elections and Elected OfficialsChairman McGaugh and Members of the Committee, Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 78. My name is Matt Crouch and I represent Heritage Action for America, a grassroots organization with two million grassroots activists nationwide, including thousands of Missourians. Heritage Action urges the House Committee on Elections and Elected Officials to pass SJR 78.SJR 78 takes important steps to protect the integrity of our elections both by clarifying that only citizens of the United States can vote in Missouri's elections but also by prohibiting Ranked Choice Voting in partisan elections across the state. Though we would prefer that it include all municipal and non-partisan elections as well. SJR 78 is still a significant step toward election integrity and we urge support. Ranked-choice voting (RCV) fundamentally changes the election process and is fraught with problems.RCV is confusing and complicated. This is true for voters because the system relies on them to not only know each candidate in a race, but also what each one stands for and how the voter would rank them in relation to one another. It is also confusing for election administrators who are tabulating votes and reporting outcomes of elections. In races where a candidate does not receive a majority of votes in the first round, the candidate in last place is eliminated, along with all of the votes cast for him or her. The votes are then re-tabulated based on those voters who marked second choices. This process continues until a candidate reaches a majority - not of all the votes cast - but of "all valid votes in the final round of tallying." RCV is prone to errors. Alameda County, California officials admitted two months after a 2022 school board election that they had incorrectly tabulated the RCV votes and had certified the wrong person as the winner. Because of the overly complicated process of ranked-choice voting, no election official noticed the mistake until an outside advocacy group flagged the issue after the fact.RCV disenfranchises voters. Nearly one in three voters do not rank multiple candidates in RCV elections, whether due to a lack of understanding the process, being unwilling to cast a vote in favor of a candidate they do not support, or other reasons. Thus, they risk their ballot being thrown out in subsequent rounds of vote tabulation. In the 2021 New York mayor's race in which 1.1 million votes were cast, by the eighth round, the ballots of more than 140,000 voters (more than 1 out of every 10 votes) had been thrown out because they did not rank all of the candidates. These voters were effectively disenfranchised due to "ballot exhaustion." RCV undermines the democratic process. The ultimate winner in RCV is often not the choice of a majority of voters who participated in the election, and thus, does not have a genuine mandate to govern from a majority of voters. Our nation was built on the principle of consent of the governed. When citizens believe elections produce clear results between candidates holding differing ideas, they are able to live with the results even if they do not like the outcome. Ranked-Choice Voting is a gimmick that would

undermine Missouri's elections and all of the hard work done over many years to ensure voter confidence. Heritage Action urges you to pass SJR 78. Thank you for your time and attention on this important issue.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	ted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: MELISSA THOMAS	3		PHONE NUM	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	N NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: casscentralchair@	proton.me	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/30/20	DATE:)24 11:42 PM
THE INCODMAN	FION ON THIS FORM	A IS DUBLIC DECOR	D LINDED CHA	DTED 640 DCMa

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

"I wish to voice my support for the passage of SJR 78. We need to do all we can to ensure the integrity of our elections. We do not want to leave loopholes that might be exploited to allow noncitizens/illegals or persons not 18 to vote in our elections. More importantly, we must ensure that rankchoice voting will never become a reality in Missouri. We have seen it rob the citizens in Alaska of their voice, and we do not want that in our State. I call upon this committee to pass this bill out so the Citizens of Missouri might ultimately have the ability to vote on it."



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE 4/30	::)/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Official	als			•	
TESTIFYING: VIN SU	PPORT OF	IN OPPOSITION TO		FORMATION	NAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZAT	ION:				
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL COMPTON				E NUMBER: 362-2250	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: FREEDOM PRINCIPLE MO			TITLE	:	
ADDRESS: 5 SE 230TH ROAD					
CITY: WARRENSBURG			STATE MO	≣:	ZIP: 64093
EMAIL: miketcompton@protonmail.	com	ATTENDANCE: Written		UBMIT DATE: /30/2024 12	:57 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I wish to voice my support for the passage of SJR 78. We need to do all we can to ensure the integrity of our elections. We do not want to leave loopholes that might be exploited to allow non-citizens or persons not 18 to vote in our elections. More importantly, we must ensure that rank-choice voting will never become a reality in Missouri. We have seen it rob the citizens in Alaska of their voice, and we do not want that in our State. I call upon this committee to pass this bill out so the Citizens of Missouri might ultimately have the ability to vote on it



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		,	
TESTIFYING : ✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: PAMELA K. GROW, M.D.		PHONE NUMBI	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: growmd@fidmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/30/202	ATE: 24 12:14 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Dear Chair McGaugh and Members of the Committee,I am a proponent of this bill. "All citizens" is permissive, not exclusive. As a two-term clerk, I know that non-citizens were registered and registering due to lack of understanding of the meaning of the word citizen, disregard of the affidavit statement on the voter registration application, and possibly more nefarious reasons. Once a non-citizen obtains a driver's license, they may use that as proof of ID when registering at the SOS online platform, with a postcard, or even at the desk of their local election authority. I know because I saw it happen while I was clerk. Please advocate for U.S. citizens who reside in our state and pass this bill. I am a registered voter and resident of this state. I am also against ranked choice voting. It is complex and the rank and file, the "governed" who must give their consent, will not understand it. Mathematicians argue in the statitstics literature about what it really means.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	}
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: SUSAN TAYLOR			PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: taylorsu27@gmail	.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE: 124 6:35 AM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	MIS BURLIC PECOP	D LINDED CHY	DTED 610 PSMo	

I support SJR 78 because we must protect the integrity of voting in Missouri. Ranked choice voting is deceptive, confusing, and discourages voters from participating in our elections. I strongly oppose ranked choice voting and am glad to see SJR 78 being offerred as a solution. Please support it.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		,	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: VIRGINIA ELLEN	YOAK		PHONE NUME	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: vyoak@centurytel	l.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/29/20	ATE: 24 7:25 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	I IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

I support SJR78 because it bans rank choice voting



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			ATE: /30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMATI	ONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: 9SARAH A. SWISHER		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:		•	
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: salswisher@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE 4/30/2024	3:43 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I oppose this bill, mainly for two reasons:It's unnecessary. We already have legislation stating that all citizens are entitled to the vote. Non-citizens are not citizens. That's what "non-citizen" means. I'm deeply opposed to the current trend to reject plain English in existing law and claim that additional provisions are needed in order for existing legislation to be followedRanked choice voting is a very attractive proposal that would solve problems in our current voting system - both the fact that third party possibilities currently work only as spoilers for the main candidates AND that making candidates appeal to people as a second choice reduces negative campaigning. This legislation would ban it. Why would we want to do that? I oppose this bill strenuously for both these reasons.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ F	OR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ABIGAIL CALVERT		PHONE NUMBE	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: abigailcalvert02@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/30/202	ATE: 24 11:59 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Senate Joint Resolution 78 is a disturbing attempt to take away the choice and representation of Missourians. Citizenship requirements for voting already exist and such language is just a ploy to make the initiative petition process, a process chosen by the people, even harder than it already is. Even through word of mouth and sharing through social media, I have personally seen how difficult it is to spread the word of a petition that Missourians want. Furthermore, I fail to understand how ranked choice voting is detrimental to Missouri. Is this not the 'Show Me State'? How would allowing the citizens of Missouri to have a better opportunity to truly express their choice of candidates, which candidates they actually want, be a bad thing? I thought the people of Missouri had the power of choice. Ranked choice voting would give the power back to the people of Missouri and instill some semblance of hope in a democracy we thought we had.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials				
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES	
	WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: ANNALISA DEATON		PHONE NUMBE	ER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:				
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: annalisa_deaton@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/30/202	ATE: 24 8:18 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. This bill is yet another in a series intended to confuse voters and ultimately it limits voter choice and voters' ability to advocate for desired voting options. I wish to preserve voter choice and voters' ability to advocate for desired voting options.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DAT 4/3	TE: 80/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INF	ORMATIC	NAL PURPOSES
WITNESS NAME					
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. AC "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVO			E NUMBER:		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:		STATE	<u>:</u>	ZIP:	
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:		JBMIT DATE: /30/2024 1	2:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.					



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: □ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: AUSTIN BROWN		PHONE NUMBE	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: arb6xb@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 2:00 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS BIRLIC DECORD LINDER CHARTER 640, DSM			

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill bans Ranked Choice Voting, as well as many other voting systems. This would be detrimental. Ranked Choice Voting gives people a way to voice their feelings on all the candidates, not just the one. It has had much success in improving communities where it has already been implemented.Don't let this possibility be taken from Missouri voters.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: BRITTANY KIEFER		PHONE NUMBE	R:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: brittany.kiefer@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/29/202	TE: 4 7:48 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I oppose SJR 78 and do not support any use of ballot candy to confuse voters. Elections should be fair and free and this bill only makes it more difficult for citizens of Missouri to fully participate.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials				
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES	
	WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: CAROL A. SCHREIBER		PHONE NUM	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:		·		
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: carolschrei@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/29/2	DATE: 024 4:48 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I oppose SJR 78 for the following reasons:• Voters are being fooled with the term "ONLY" citizens can vote, which, of course is already law.• I personally like paper ballots, but the voting machine is very accurate in processing my vote. However, this bill may lead to not being able to use any voting machines, which are necessary for many disabled voters.• Outlawing any new kinds of voting is premature. The use of ranked choice voting has been used very successfully in Alaska. When Primary Elections are the main election, that short changes voters who believe the General Election is the important Election. Let's do all we can to give voters a chance to vote in a way that has the most impact in their lives. Vote no on SJR 78. Respect voters and have fair elections. Sincerely, Carol Schreiber



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: CAROL KLINGSM	ITH		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			•	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: cklingsmith@gma	nil.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/30/2024 5:01 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS DIRE IC DECORD LINDER CHARTER 610, DSMO				

Bill says "ONLY" citizens are entitled to vote. This is already the case, and designed to confuse voters. Elections must be by paper ballot or by other mechanical method prescribed by law. Prohibits any kind of ranked choice or approval voting. This limits voter choice and voters ability to advocate for desired voting options.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elections	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	▼ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: CAROLE WEBSTE	ER		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			•	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: carole.webster53(@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/27/20	DATE: 124 12:49 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D LINDER CHA	PTER 610 RSMo

I am opposed to taking away any voting rights. I also strongly oppose any legislation that uses "ballot candy" that adds false statements to a piece of legislation to generate voter outrage such as by suggesting that foreigners that are not US citizens are currently voting in our Missouri elections.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			ATE: /30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		·	
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMATI	ONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: CHERI CROCKETT		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: chericrockett@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE 4/30/2024	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I oppose SS/SJR78. While rank choice voting is still a new concept, it has been shown to be a good way to break the partisan divide that is pitting our citizens against each other and is unhealthy for our democracy in the areas where it has been implemented. Rank choice voting has also been shown to increase voter participation and voter engagement which are good for democracy. Missouri has, in the past, been known as a state that is open to innovation and fairness. Let's keep an open mind and see what this type of voting can do to strengthen our democracy.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CHIMENE SCHWACH		PHONE NUMBE 573-874-164	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: SERVICES FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING			OF ADVOCACY, MENT & OUTREACH
ADDRESS: 1905 W. ASH STREET			
CITY: COLUMBIA		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65203
EMAIL: cschwach@silcolumbia.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/29/202	TE: 4 6:50 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Dear members of the House Elections and Elected Officials Comittee: Services fir Independent Living (SIL) submits this testimony in opposition to SJR 78, which proposesamending the constitution with unnecessary and confusing citizenship language, impede voters' ability to establishor vote on forms of election and open the door to less secure election tabulation. The provision proposes to amend Art. VIII Section 2 of the Missouri Constitution, which guarantees all citizens of Missouri the right to vote, to be replaced by "only" citizens. This is duplicative and unnecessary - given that onlycitizens are eligible to vote — and designed to confuse voters. Indeed it is ballot candy designed to stoke fears by Missourians that somehow non-citizens are eligible to vote. They are not. And the language could further underminethe Missouri constitution's protection of the right to vote, which "establish[es] with unmistakable clarity that the right to vote is fundamental to Missouri citizens." Weinschenk v. State, 203 S.W.3d 201, 212 (Mo. banc 2006).SJR 78 would further undermine the voices of Missourians by prohibiting their ability to consider alternative formsof voting such as ranked choice or approval voting, but limiting ranking votes or allowing a voter to cast more than one vote (something that is common in certain municipal or school board elections). We should not shut Missouriansout of the process of determining voting practices that may be desirable to them in the future. The measure wouldalso establish that only the person gaining the most votes in a political party primary election can be a partycandidate, limiting options for Missouri's voters.SJR 78 would also open the door to less secure and less accurate tabulation by allowing the legislature to ban use ofvoting machines, which many people with disabilities use to vote and not require any jurisdiction to use voting machines for purposes of tabulating votes. This would disenfranchise many people with disabilities who want to be able to vote independently without aid or assistance, and use the voting machines. It is wellknown that hand counting ballots is more slow and error prone than machine tabulation. In truth, very few 1jurisdictions with more than 1,000 voters count votes by hand because it is so logistically challenging and results insignificantly increased delay and error. The machines further allow a voter verify the accuracy of their choicesbefore being tabulated. And importantly, many include functions allow voters with disabilities to vote privately and independently.SJR 78 is unnecessary, confusing and needlessly limits voters' voices and choices. Accordingly, we urge this committee to vote NO on SJR 78. Sincerely, Chimene Schwach, Director of Advocacy, Development & Outreach Services for **Independent Living**



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: COLE MENDENHA	ALL		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mendenhallcole@	gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	OATE: 24 9:29 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORI	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D LINDER CHA	PTER 610 RSMo

The people need to have a voice and an opportunity to make that voice heard. Limiting the petition process hinders civic duty.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPO	ORT OF ☑IN OPPOSIT	ION TO FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NA	ME	
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: COLLEEN MCGRAW		PHONE NUM	MBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mcgraw.colleen@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/29/2	DATE: 2024 7:16 PM
THE INFORMATION ON TH	IIS FORM IS PUBLIC I	RECORD LINDER CH	APTER 610 RSMo

The Missouri legislature has no business throwing roadblocks up in front of my and my fellow Missourians' ability to mount a ballot initiative. Adding "ballot candy" to lure voters to vote against an already illegal thing is a cynical, deceptive, anti-democratic ploy. Cut it out.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: COLLEEN TEPEN			PHONE NUM	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: colleentepen81@g	gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/2 (DATE:)24 5:10 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS EOD	M IS DUBLIC DECOR	D HINDED CHA	DTED 610 DSMo

This bill contains confusing language to mislead voters. Missourians deserve clear language so that they understand the implications of the bill. I strongly oppose any bills that take away one person, one vote and that co rain confusing language that mislead voters.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ F	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: CONNOR LONG		PHONE NUMBI	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Appleton2email@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D. 4/29/202	ATE: 24 7:51 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

My name is Connor, I am a month away from my 18th birthday, and I will be voting in my first election come November. I don't desire to live in a democracy where I'm forced to choose between two candidates or spend a ballot on a third party candidate unlikely to succeed. The decision between bad and worse is not democratic, and it pressures people to vote for candidates who they don't sincerely believe in or not at all, which is even farther from democracy. Ranked choice voting encourages passionate political participation, and therefore it is a necessity for any healthy representative democracy, which I'd hope the representatives in the Missouri House strive to be.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ F	OR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: CONSWELIA MCCOURT		PHONE NUMBI	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: wicca@urbangreenfamily.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D. 4/30/202	ATE: 24 10:58 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill does not do anything to protect the integrity of our election or the individuals allowed to vote. We already have a process of voter registration in this state and law that limits voting to US citizens. There are multiple processes currently in place to ensure that only those who have a legal right to vote are allowed to vote and have their vote counted. To pretend for the media and individuals ignorant or just purposefully blind to this fact is not what our legislature should be doing. Creating more red tape between the people and their government is the opposite of what I, as a Missourian, was raised to believe. Everything from the openness of our capitol building, having one of the largest state house of reps, and our petition process for bringing amendments to the people are all the what made Missouri a state of her people not the elite. Do not defile and belittle that heritage by grandstanding and posturing for a national media that does not have love for this state and its people who are the heart of America. Prove to them that the heart is open to and listens to its people above all else. Through clean open communication and a simple and clear ability to bring our issue to Missourians through a uncomplicated petition process.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		·	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FO	OR INFORM <i>A</i>	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: CYNTHIA LEFTON		PHONE NUMBI	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: qu714@aol.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D. 4/30/202	ATE: 24 8:22 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. The right to speak is equally as valuable as the right to vote. The efforts to change Missouri's voting process by banning ranked choice and approval voting is a tactic that limits and takes away the voice from citizens who pay taxes and have the right to be heard. Attempts to limit and ban the voice of voters hurts the state immensely. People don't want to live or work in a state where their opinion and vote is limited and does not matter. My junior school Civics classes taught me that congressmen and women were elected to represent their constituents - seems like some representatives have forgotten that and replaced this important and honorable role with representing their own interests and personal views. Please do not ban approval voting or ranked choice voting. Eliminating these voting options takes away the voices of Missourians and limits our constitutional rights. Thank you.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSE	S
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: CYNTHIA MCEVO	Y		PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: ccarms311@netse	cape.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT II 4/29/20	DATE: 124 5:40 PM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS DUBLIC PECOP	D LINDED CHA	DTED 610 DOMO	

Please PLEASE leave the initiative petition process as it is!! Majority rule is ONE more than half and that is all it needs. VOTE NO to any changes to the process as it stands now and has stood for over 100 years.



cindy@kazoo-media.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: **SJR 78** 4/30/2024 COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **CYNTHIA WEGERER BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: 7IP· SUBMIT DATE: EMAIL: ATTENDANCE:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

4/30/2024 10:07 AM

Written

This bill is confusing, misleading and unnecessary on several fronts. The phrasing "ONLY" citizens (rather than "all" citizens) are entitled to vote is designed to confuse voters and is unnecessary as that is already the case. This opens up MO to a possible mandate to paper ballots, and our citizens want and deserve the choice. Both paper and mechanical methods are SAFE. Bans of any kind of ranked choice or approval voting (with grandfather exceptions for St. Louis municipal and KC mayoral races, where approval voting is already in use) takes away voter choice the ability and right for voters to advocate for desired voting options.



danasandweiss@gmail.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: 4/30/2024 **SJR 78** COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **DANA SANDWEISS BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP: ATTENDANCE: Written SUBMIT DATE: 4/30/2024 8:59 AM EMAIL:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I strongly oppose the MO Legislature changing the existing ballot initiative process, a system that has allowed for direct democracy and a right MO voters have had for a 100 years that has allowed them to have a voice in the laws of our state.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: DANIEL LEIB			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: daniel.leib@gmail	.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	ATE: 24 8:12 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.

Ranked choice voting is necessary for a functional representative democracy and must not be blocked.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: DAVE WEBSTER		PHONE NUMBE	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: dwebster30@comcast.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/27/202	ATE: 24 11:08 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill contains inappropriate and invalid language to entice voters to believe that people are allowed to vote illegally. The bill also takes away my freedom to choose. I want a candidate and representative that I feel is better for me, my family, my community and Missouri. SJR78 would prohibit that right in the future.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•		
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES	
	WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:				
WITNESS NAME: DENISE LIEBERMAN		PHONE NUMBER 314-780-183		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI VOTER PROTECTION COALITION DIRECTOR & GENERAL COUNSEL				
ADDRESS: 6047 WATERMAN BLVD.				
CITY: SAINT LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63112	
EMAIL: denise@movpc.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA- 4/30/2024	TE: 4 10:27 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Missouri Voter Protection Coalition (MOVPC) opposes SJR 78, which proposes amending the constitution with unnecessary and confusing citizenship language, impede voters' ability to establish or vote on forms of voting they desire. The provision proposes to amend Art. VIII Section 2 of the Missouri Constitution, which guarantees all citizens of Missouri the right to vote, to be replaced by "only" citizens. This is duplicative and unnecessary - given that only citizens are eligible to vote — and designed to confuse voters. Indeed it is ballot candy designed to stoke fears by Missourians that somehow non-citizens are eligible to vote. They are not. And the language could further undermine the Missouri constitution's protection of the right to vote, which "establish[es] with unmistakable clarity that the right to vote is fundamental to Missouri citizens." Weinschenk v. State, 203 S.W.3d 201, 212 (Mo. banc 2006).SJR 78 would further undermine the voices of Missourians by prohibiting their ability to consider alternative forms of voting such as ranked choice or approval voting, but limiting ranking votes or allowing a voter to cast more than one vote (something that is used in certain municipal elections). We should not shut Missourians out of the process of determining voting practices that may be desirable to them in the future. The measure would also establish that only the person gaining the most votes in a political party primary election can be a party candidate, limiting options for Missouri's voters. SJR 78 is unnecessary, confusing and needlessly limits voters' voices and choices. Accordingly, we urge this committee to vote NO on SJR 78.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elections	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	☐IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOS	ES
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: DON CROZIER			PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: ATTENDANCE: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 5:02 PM					
THE INCORMATION ON THIS CODM IS BUILD IC DECORD LINDER CHARTER 610, DSM					

SJR 78 has the same confusing citizenship language present in some of the IP bills and limits Missourians voting options by banning any kind of ranked choice or approval voting. Please reject this bill.



medlindonna10@gmail.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: 4/30/2024 **SJR 78** COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **DONNA MEDLIN BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: ZIP: STATE: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 5:57 PM EMAIL: ATTENDANCE:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Written

I am concerned about the language of this bill. It is intentionally confusing. It gives the impression that people other than citizens can vote. This is not true ALL citizens can and should vote. As a voter, I will this bill is trying to silence my voice and my ballot. As an elected official, you are expected to represent us rather than silence us.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: ELISA NEILSON			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: ekatwell@yahoo.c	EMAIL: ekatwell@yahoo.com ATTENDANCE: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 11:57 PN			
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD LINDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo				

Trying to trick the voters into not having their votes count, is un-American and is not patriotic!! One Vote=One Voice. Your ballot candy is an attempt of desperation!



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DAT 4/3	TE: 30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING: IN SUP	PORT OF VIN C	PPOSITION TO FO	R INFORMATIC	NAL PURPOSES	
	WITN	IESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ELIZABETH FRANKLIN			PHONE NUMBER:		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:			TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: eafrank711@gmail.com	om ATTENDANCE: SUBMIT DATE: 4/30/2024 10:57 AM		0:57 AM		

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Thank you, Madam Chair and Members of the Committee, for the opportunity to testify. My name is Elizabeth Franklin and I live in a rural area/on acreage outside Plattsburg MO. I do not support SJR 78 and am submitting testimony in opposition. Restating existing citizenship language can confuse voters. Currently, no non-citizen can vote in MO at any level of election and no local election officials change their rules such that a non-citizen could vote at the local level. This is ballot candy. As elected officials, I'd be more confident if this body acknowledged existing requirements of the MO Constitution and didn't play games with this critical AND existing requirement. Regarding use of voting machines and a shift toward paper ballots is disingenuous. I have the fullest of confidence in properly tested and calibrated machines. Earlier this year, I personally attended the Clinton County election official machine calibration and testing. It was publicly noticed in our local paper and the personnel performing these tests were professional, courteous, and carefully explained the process and testing protocol. I would certainly recommend NO restrictions to use of voting machines versus hand counting conducted by imperfect humans. I also use a calculator instead of a slide rule ~ Other measures prohibiting alternate forms of voting (ranked choice or approval) is a clear attempt to stop Missourians from determining voting procedures that may be preferable in the future. It appears this body is simply trying to make voting harder with restrictions, outdated ideas and using fear meant to cause citizens to vote against their best interest.l strongly urge you to vote NO on this legislation.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials				
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ELIZABETH HARI	DING		PHONE NUMB	ER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: pandemicover202	1@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	PATE: 24 12:20 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.					

Ranked choice voting is a much more democratic form of election than the current system.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Ele	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: ELLEN WENTZ			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: ellenwentz@gmai	l.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/20	DATE: 124 4:37 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D LINDER CHA	PTER 610 RSMo

This bill takes away many of Missourians options and freedoms to vote. Our voting is already extremely safe and effective and we should leave our voting system as it is.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ERIC THOMAS			PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: erock803@gmail.com ATTENDANCE: Written SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 9:21 PM					
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PURI IC RECORD LINDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo					

The people need to have a voice and an opportunity to make that voice heard. Limiting the petition process hinders civic duty.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024		
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES	}	
	WITNESS NAME				
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: EVELYN LA BELLE		PHONE NUM	MBER:		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:			
ADDRESS:		·			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:		
EMAIL: evelyn.renee.143@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/30/2	DATE: 2024 12:12 PM		

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Ranked choice voting provides individuals with an option other than the two major parties. It allows voters to participate in the voting process with improved decision-making abilities without creating a "spoiler" impact. Instead of believing that by not selecting the candidates from their primary party, they are wasting their vote, voters would be allowed to rank their selections. The number of people who are willing to speak up will decrease if RCV is completely eliminated from the voting process. Granting the public an opportunity to voice their preferences for local and presidential representatives gives them a voice in this democracy.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elections	COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials				
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: FREDA LAVON HO	OLLEY		PHONE NUMB	ER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: 1lessntx@sbcglol	bal.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	ATE: 24 8:25 AM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.	

Stop suppressing our votes!!



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			•
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	IATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: GARY MITCHELL			PHONE NUM	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mitch770@aol.com	m	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/30/20	DATE: 024 11:38 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.				



CITY:

holly.e.bernstein@gmail.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: 4/30/2024 **SJR 78** COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF **✓** IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES TESTIFYING: **WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **HOLLY ELLEN BERNSTEIN BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

ATTENDANCE:

Written

STATE:

SUBMIT DATE

4/30/2024 9:18 AM

7IP·

SJR 78 is problematic on multiple levels. The provision proposes to amend Art, VIII Section 2 of the Missouri Constitution, which guarantees all citizens of Missouri the right to vote, to be replaced by "only" citizens. Given that only citizens are eligible to vote already, this is designed to confuse voters and stoke fears that somehow non-citizens are eligible to vote, which they aren't. SJR 78 would further undermine the voices of Missourians by prohibiting their ability to consider alternative forms of voting such as ranked choice or approval voting. This measure wouldalso establish that only the person gaining the most votes in a political party primary election can be a party candidate. Both of these practices would limit the options of Missouri votes, and indeed prohibit practices that have been shown to reduce extremism and better reflect the will of the people. SJR 78 would also open the door to less secure and less accurate tabulation by allowing the legislature to ban use of voting machines and not require any jurisdiction to use voting machines for purposes of tabulating votes. It is well known that hand counting ballots is more slow and error prone than machine tabulation. Voting machines further allow a voter verify the accuracy of their choices before being tabulated. And importantly, many include functions allow voters with disabilities to vote privately and independently. SJR 78 is unnecessary, confusing and needlessly limits voters' voices and choices. Accordingly, I urge this committee to vote NO on SJR 78.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: HOLLY ROSE EVA	ANS		PHONE NUMBE	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: hollyrevans@gma	il.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/30/202	ATE: 24 5:10 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD LINDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo				

I am a firm believer in democracy, and I know you are too. Prohibiting certain election frameworks is denying your constituents to perhaps one day decide to change the way voting happens. We have the right to do so if we so choose, and denying this right is threatening a free and fair election process.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elect	ed Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JAMES ROBINSON			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jamesmrobinson11	7@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	OATE: 24 7:40 AM
THE INFORMAT	ION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORE	UNDER CHA	PTFR 610 RSMo

I am opposed to SJR 78 because I am in favor of ranked choice voting because ranked choice voting provides a check and balance against political party insiders.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JEAN M CAVENDI	ER		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jeancavender782@	@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/29/20	OATE: 24 6:00 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD LINDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo				

The state legislature just doesn't want to deal with the will of the people. The initiative petition process is fine as it is. Don't mess with a good thing.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: JEFF SMITH			PHONE NUME 314-323-0 9	
REPRESENTING: ACLU OF MISSOU	RI (AMERICAN CIVIL L	IBERTIES UNION)	TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 5380 MAGNOLIA				
CITY: ST. LOUIS			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63139
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	OATE: 024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024		
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING:	☐IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES		
		WITNESS NAME				
INDIVIDUAL:						
WITNESS NAME: JENNA ROBERSO	DN		PHONE NUM	BER:		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:			
ADDRESS:						
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:		
EMAIL: jroberson1181@g	mail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE:)24 10:26 AM		
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.						



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024		
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES		
	WITNESS NAME				
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: JESSI KOPP		PHONE NUMB	ER:		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:			
ADDRESS:					
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:		
EMAIL: jmk3482@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 6:26 PM		
THE INCODMATION ON THE FORM	LIC BUBLIC BECORE	LINDED OLIA	DTED 040 DOM:		

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I support Rank Choice Voting because I feel like it gives every US voter the chance to have their voice heard. Because even if a voter's first choice doesn't win, the second or third choice can be added to the votes and the peoples' voices will be heard overall. Taking away ranked choice voting as an option would only limit the peoples' power. And I don't want a government that over-reaches its power.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JESSICA LEFTON	l		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jess.lefton@gmail	.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 8:32 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.				

As a Missouri citizen, I am appalled at the ongoing efforts to cut people out of government. The language in this bill is confusing for voters, limits our ability to perform our civic responsibilities, and curtails our ability to vote. I am strongly opposed to this measure.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING:	SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMAT	TONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: JESSICA SHEPHERD			PHONE NUMBER	₹:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:			TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: jessieshepherdbarnes@g	gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DAT 4/30/2024	E: I 7:21 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

SJR 78 is a direct attempt to silence the voices of Missouri citizens. It is unfortunate that Missourians ever have to use the initiative petition process. However, we have had this process in place for over 100 years because we live in a Representative Democracy with a system of checks and balances in place that allow the people to take action when our elected officials have failed or flat out ignored us. The initiative petition process is already quite complicated. I personally have been a volunteer circulator for at least 3 petitions. It's not easy and the process certainly doesn't need to have higher thresholds for signatures or votes. There is NO logical reason to make this process more difficult other than to send a message the people that our legislature doesn't care what we want. It is a dirty. underhanded trick to include anything about citizenship requirements in the resolution. We already have citizenship requirements to vote. Furthermore, if the people of Missouri want ranked choice voting so be it! Ranked choice voting (RCV) has been proven to increase voter turnout, reduce negative campaign tactics and save money by eliminating the need for runoff or special elections in the event of a tie. If you vote in support of SJR78 you owe the public an explanation why you don't care what we want, why you think it's appropriate to lie to voters about citizenship requirements already in our state constitution, why you want policies in place that discourage less voter participation. Tell us why and when your done with that apologize for not being representatives of the people as you were elected to do. To my Representative, Ken Waller, you were our County Clerk. You know that noncitizens are already prohibited from voting in Missouri elections. This is you chance to do the right thing ethically and morally. If you have any integrity you will put people over party and speak out against manipulative ballot candy that serves no other purpose than to deceive voters.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JIMMY THWING			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jimger5@sbcglob	al.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 5:23 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHAI	PTER 610. RSMo.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: JODI MILLER			PHONE NUMBE	ER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: TITLE:			TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: sanybel@islandbi	reeze.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/29/202	ATE: 24 5:03 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

-This proposed bill provides that "ONLY" citizens (rather than "all" citizens) are entitled to votethis is already the case, and designed to confuse voters-Elections must be by paper ballot or by other mechanical method prescribed by law couldthis could open the door to future paper ballot mandates-Voters entitled to number of votes as there are seats to be filledprohibits any kind of ranked choice or approval voting (with grandfather exceptions for St. Louis municipal and KC mayoral races, where approval voting is already in use)-Limits voter choice and voters ability to advocate for desired voting options. -In a primary, only one candidate who receives the greatest number of votes in a political party can be a party candidate in the general election, with grandfather exceptions for STL municipal and KC mayoral races, where approval voting in already in use.) -Must be approved by voters.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	☑IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMAT	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: JOHN BOWMAN		PHONE NUMBER 314-322-444	==
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: ST LOUIS COUNTY NAACP		TITLE: PRESIDENT	•
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 210464			
CITY: SAINT LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63121
EMAIL: ibowman@naacpstlouiscounty.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DAT 4/29/2024	TE: 1 10:01 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

SJR 78 would further undermine the voices of Missourians by prohibiting their ability to consider alternative forms of voting such as ranked choice or approval voting. It proposes to amend the constitution with unnecessary and confusing citizenship language, impede voters ability to establish or vote on forms of election and open the door to less secure election tabulation.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			•
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	IATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: JOSH DANIELS		PHONE NUM	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:		•	
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: syateswilburn@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 4/30/20	DATE: 024 11:33 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Testimony from: Josh DanielsClerk & Auditor for Utah County, 2019 - 2023In OPPOSITION to SJR 78April 30, 2024Missouri House Committee on Elections and Elected OfficialsChair McGaugh and Members of the Committee, I write in opposition to legislation which would ban ranked choice voting (RCV) from being used in any elections in Missouri, at a time when RCV is not used at all in the state and before most Missourians have even had a chance to learn about it. I would also like to share my experience as an election administrator in implementing RCV in Utah, and why the number of Utah cities choosing to use RCV increased from two in 2019 to 12 in 2023.RCV is a beneficial option for a variety of reasons, but right now RCV is not being used by any jurisdiction for any election in the state. Legislatures should avoid proactive prohibitions that reduce jurisdictions' future options, especially while the state has other, more pressing issues to contend with.My experience with RCV is why I urge you to oppose SJR 78, which bans RCV from being used in any form in Missouri. A few other states are considering legislation to prohibit all forms of RCV with no differentiation in how RCV can be used. It would be a mistake for Missouri to follow their example. Utah Experienceln 2019, I was brand new to election administration in my executive role in the Utah County Clerk's office. During that year, after a transition in elected leadership and due to staff vacancies, our election team turned over by about 50%. Additionally, we adopted an entirely new election system (migrating from high levels of in-person voting and polling place balloting using the Dominion system to a vote-by-mail system using ES&S equipment and software), which necessitated training and reworking of all our standard operating procedures. In the midst of all this change, we also agreed to be the first county in the state to administer ranked choice elections for various municipal elections. We were warned by various clerks and election officials that this was risky and that administering ranked choice elections was fraught with complexity that might confuse voters and create operational challenges. Fortunately, these risks and challenges never materialized and our administration of these elections was as smooth as any other. Let me share some key considerations and lessons we learned after administering these elections: Voters understand ranked choice ballots One concern we heard was that a ranked choice ballot was inherently more confusing for voters. We tested ballot use by various groups in the community, including some groups with our oldest voters. We learned that the ballot was inherently intuitive despite voters never being exposed to RCV before. We also logged all incoming phone calls from voters during the election period and categorized calls to track voter questions and concerns. What we found was that very few (less than 2%) of all phone calls with questions or concerns were related to RCV specifically. Additionally, after the election, we surveyed voters who had voted using ranked choice to gather data about their experience. 84% of survey respondents reported that the ballot was "easy to use" and 83% reported that they wanted to continue using RCV or even expand its use to other elections. This was compelling feedback that ran counter to the criticisms and apprehension we had heard about administering RCV elections. Ballot design was simple Another

concern we heard was that the design of the ballots was more complex, leading to difficulty in administering an election. What we found was that the ballot design, while different, was not significantly more complex to design, program, or administer. We used our existing (ES&S) systems to design and program our ballots and election management system. We had mixed types of election races on a ballot (ranked choice races and plurality races) and scanned and tabulated ballots on existing equipment with no need for any type of segregation or differences in our processes. Election Administration was smoothSome have expressed concern that administering an RCV election is more complex than traditional elections. In our experience, this was not true. Nearly every step and part of the process was identical or very similar for an RCV race. We used all our existing certified equipment and systems. The only differences were a slightly different ballot design, an increase in adjudication & ballot review to confirm undervotes (for ballots that did not rank all candidates), and two additional steps at the end related to exporting results, running the instant runoff (IRV) process, and reporting results in a visual chart. ExpansionAs a result of this positive experience, the number of Utah cities where the city council voted to use RCV rose from two in 2019 to 12 in 2023. The positive experience has been repeated in two more elections since its first use, which explains why the Sutherland Institute is among organizations supporting the use of RCV in Utah cities. Conclusions Our use of RCV was successful and we received a lot of positive feedback from voters who used it. I would recommend states pilot the use of RCV, particularly in municipal elections and presidential primaries. One advantage is that overseas voters can be sure their vote for a particular candidate won't be lost or wasted in the event their chosen candidate drops out of a race prior to election day. Additionally, RCV helps avoid mere plurality victories in multi-candidate races by ensuring a majority through an instant runoff. For these reasons, states should avoid prohibiting RCV prematurely. Whether or not to use RCV in elections is a decision each and every community needs to make for themselves. At this point in Missouri, no jurisdiction even uses RCV in any election. Banning RCV in Missouri is banning something that doesn't exist in the state, and something most Missourians haven't had a chance to research for themselves. This distracts from urgent issues cities and towns are looking to the legislature to address, and closes the door on RCV before most folks have had a chance to even ask about it.As such, I urge you to oppose SJR 78. Thank you for your consideration, Josh Daniels Fmr. Utah County ClerkSaratoga Springs, UTj.alden.daniels@gmail.com, 801-234-0676



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: JUDY PLANK		PHONE NUMBER	R:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:		•	
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: jplank777@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/29/202	TE: 4 8:16 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill provides that "ONLY" citizens (rather than "all" citizens) are entitled to votethis is already the case, and designed to confuse voterselections must be by paper ballot or by other mechanical method prescribed by law couldthis could open the door to future paper ballot mandatesvoters entitled to number of votes as there are seats to be filledprohibits any kind of ranked choice or approval voting (with grandfather exceptions for St. Louis municipal and KC mayoral races, where approval voting is already in use)limits voter choice and voters ability to advocate for desired voting options. in a primary, only one candidate who receives the greatest number of votes in a political party can be a party candidate in the general election, with grandfather exceptions for STL municipal and KC mayoral races, where approval voting in already in use.) must be approved by voters.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	▼IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JULIE CAMPBELL	ROWE		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: 2dandjrowe@att.r	net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE: 124 2:55 PM
THE INCORNA	TION ON THIS EOD	A IO DUDI IO DECOD	D LINDED OLLA	DTED 040 DOM:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill does not improve the Missouri voting process in any way, nor does it increase accuracy. It does, however, increase voter confusion with unnecessary language designed to trick voters into thinking something needs to be "fixed" by inferring that non-Missouri citizens are currently allowed to vote. Well, you and I both know, they can't! But all of our voters??? Guess that's the reason for the add on "candy"--To pass this attack on ballot clarity and voter freedom.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: JUSTICE JADIN H.	ANCE		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			•	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: hancejustice@yah	noo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	OATE: 24 11:49 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Hello, as it sits if you ask most voters how they pick their preferred candidate they will answer with a modified version of ranked choice voting. While most people don't even know it's an official choice. Take this a step further to the people who feel like their vote doesn't count. It almost always comes down to them picking one of the "most likely to win" instead of who the actually want to vote for. Instead of removing ranked voting we need to be educating the public on their options. I, among many have been doing that all year. By limiting they way people know to vote will only decrease the amount of people willing to vote! Especially in this new climate with the younger generation yarning to learn about politics! By removing this option you are shutting out an entire group of voters, and silencing so many voices!



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: KATHY MARINCE	L		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kmarincel@yahoo	o.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 10:43 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

Citizens of Missouri want more not less partisanship.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	ted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: KEN ULMER			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	N NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kennethulmer@att	.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	DATE: 124 11:32 AM
THE INFORMAT	TION ON THIS FORM	I IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTFR 610, RSMo.

I oppose the adoption of sjr78 in that it unnecessarily increases the bar by requiring a majority of 8 districts as the threshold of affirmative votes to adopting a petition.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: KIMBERLY MAXW	/ELL		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kcmaxwell7@hotr	mail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 7:43 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Ele	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: L REZNY			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATI	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Irezny@hotmail.c	om	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 11:31 AM
THE INCODIA	TION ON THIS EOD	M IO BUBLIO BECOB	B LINDER OLLA	DTED 646 DOM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

There are multiple political parties and they should each be able to determine ON THEIR OWN what rules should apply to their own primary. There are multiple kind of political subdivisions with different political situations. Their constituents are best equipped to determine how to conduct their own elections. As long as everyone is given a fare chance to vote, how they regulate their election is their business. The proposal here are government over regulation interfering with local control. If you think the people of the Sate wanted enact these proposals, why the "ballot Candy"



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elections	cted Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: LARRY R BRADLI	EY		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Bradlar1@aol.com	n	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 1:42 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.

Will submit written statement and supporting attachments in opposition at the hearing.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			ATE: /30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMAT	IONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: LAWRENCE KENDALL MCCOY		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kendall0mccoy@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE 4/30/2024	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM	LIC DUBLIC DECOD	D LINDED CHART	ED CAO DOMO

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Limiting any option to select office holders does not hold to a principle advanced by none other than George Washington. He was against a political party system and in the origins of this country the president and vice president were selected on the basis of number of votes cast for each. Not by a political operation designed to divide the country.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: LESLIE V. HAHN		PHONE NUMBE	R:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Iffycreek@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/29/202	TE: 24 4:36 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Missouri State Legislature should propose a Constitutional amendment to implement Ranked Choice Voting (RCV), not one to restrict or eliminate it. There are several advantages to RCV over our current antiquated electoral process: In RCV elections, if no candidate wins a majority of first choices, those in last place are eliminated one by one. If a voter's first choice is eliminated, their vote instantly goes to their next backup choice. This avoids vote-splitting and upholds majority rule.RCV prevents wasted votes that occur when a candidate's name appears on the ballot after they have dropped out of the race. This is most common in military and other early mail-in voting.RCV produces nominees with strong and widespread support, even in a crowded field of candidates, RCV incentivizes candidates to build an inclusive campaign and appeal to the broadest group of primary voters — rather than target a single "base" of voters. With RCV, voters can rank the candidates they like best without worrying that doing so will help the candidate they like least.RCV gives voters the same power as enjoyed by inperson caucus-goers. If a voter's vote cannot help their first choice win delegates, their vote counts for their next preference instead. RCV allows the state to modernize the caucus process for realignment without the need for voters to appear in person and realign between rounds, a process that is timeconsuming and can depress voter turnout. RCV automatically transfers voters' ballots to their next choice when their first choice is eliminated n presidential primaries, RCV prevents plurality voting and runoff elections, and it holds up majority rule and positively changes the culture of politics. With RCV, candidates compete for second-choice votes from their opponents' supporters, which lessens the incentive to run negative campaigns.RCV allows more than two candidates to compete without fear that like-minded candidates will "split the vote". RCV saves taxpayers a lot of money — the entire cost of a second election when implemented to replace preliminary and runoff elections which have lower turnout than the general election.In multi-winner contests, proportional RCV allows diverse groups of voters, whether ideologically or demographically, to elect their candidates of choice.RCV lets voters rank candidates in order of choice. They know that if their first choice doesn't win, their vote automatically counts for their next choice. It eliminates "strategic" voting for "the lesser of two evils."With RCV, military and overseas voters rank candidates on a single ballot. If a runoff occurs, or if candidates drop out of a presidential contest, the ranked ballot applies. Six states use RCV ballots to include overseas and military voters in federal and some state runoff elections: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: LINDA KRAM			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: lindakram@charte	er.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/29/20	DATE: 124 5:04 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTFR 610, RSMo.

Any bill that limits voting is not in the best interest of the citizens.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: LISA BRENNER			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Ibrenner1@prodig	yy.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/20	DATE: 124 8:09 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS EOD	M IS DURI IC DECOR	D HINDED CHA	DTED 610 DSMo

I want to have the options of ranked voting in the State of Missouri. I believe it would help elect candidates that more broadly represent the community particularly in primary election with numerous candidates or in general elections areas that tend to be strongly one party. Please do not support a law that makes this option illegal.



BILL NUMBER: DATE: 4/30/2024 **SJR 78** COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **LISA O LANGLEY BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: ZIP: STATE: ATTENDANCE: Written SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 4:26 PM EMAIL: llangley902@gmail.com

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. I believe the legislature should not limit voting options that Missourians may wish to pursue!! think it

shows your ignorance to include that ONLY citizens are entitled to vote since THAT'S ALREADY THE LAW! Oppose, oppose opppse!



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	▼IN OPPOSITION TO □F	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: LUKE BARBER		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: luke.t.barber@umsl.edu	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D. 4/30/202	ATE: 24 2:58 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill would change Elections to Prohibit Ranked Choice Voting. Ranked choice allows citizens to vote for who they like and ensure that a Simple Majority of 50% or More occurs in every election ... This allows for Multiple candidates to run regardless of Party affiliation. While we don't currently have ranked choice voting, its important to recognize the flaws of our current election system. Currently candidates can win with less than 50% of the Vote as it is simply most Votes Wins ... Which means a candidate can win with about 48 to 49% in districts with 3rd party / independent candidates. We also have the flaws of Gerrymandering and Dark Money in politics, which ensures unfair and rigged outcomes. This allows for Corruption in Government, with No Accountability at all. We need a way to have Representative Government in a way that allows the Government to function accordingly, while also respecting the "Will of the People".



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: LYNNE CLOCK		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:		·	
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Iclock6178@aol.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/28/20	ATE: 24 7:50 AM
THE INCODMATION ON THE FORM	LIC DUBLIC DECOD	D LINDED CHAI	DTED CAO DOMA

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

SJR78 contains invalid and inappropriate language that would deceive voters into believing Missouri allows illegal voting. Importantly, the bill would prohibit me from voting for a candidate that I feel benefits me, my family, my community, and Missouri by taking away freedom of choice in the future. Please vote NO to SJR78.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MAHREE SKALA		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: skalamahree@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE: 124 7:49 AM
THE INCODMATION ON THE FORM	LIC DUBLIC DECOR	D LINDED CHA	DTED 640 DCMa

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Missourians should be able to adopt new voting methods as they evolve. This bill would restrict the ability for Missouri to keep up with modern technology and innovative voting methods, and it contains redundant language that would mislead voters. We should uphold the principle of one person, one vote and protect election security, but the restrictions in this bill are unnecessary and could be harmful.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			•
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MARILYN MCLEOD		PHONE NUM 573-239-	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MISSO	URI	TITLE: PRESIDE	ENT
ADDRESS: 8706 MANCHESTER RD., SUITE 104			
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63144
EMAIL: marilyn_mcleod@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT 4/30/2	DATE: 024 11:41 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The League of Women Voters of Missouri submits this testimony in opposition to SJR 78. We are proud that our state Constitution has an affirmative quarantee of the right to vote for all citizens. "All citizens can vote." Changing it to "Only citizens can vote" does nothing for election security. Putting this in a ballot measure is deceptive language that conveys a message that non-citizens can vote. That is not true and is designed to confuse voters. Because of the paper and hand counting provisions, this could open the door to future paper ballot mandates and would make any future attempt to modernize our elections more difficult. Hand counting in elections is less secure and can lead to delays and less accurate tabulation of the election results. Use of machine tabulation allows voters the ability to verify the accuracy of their choices before being tabulated. Many machines include functions which allow voters with disabilities to vote privately and independently. The League of Women Voters does not have a position on Ranked Choice Voting, however our public policy position on methods of voting supports enabling legislation that would allow local jurisdictions to explore alternative electoral methods. Why would we shut out the possibility of any new ideas for voting methods for the future by putting a prohibition in the Constitution? Another form of voting is Approval Voting. It is working well in the city of St. Louis and could work well for municipal elections in other Missouri cities. The League of Women Voters of Metro St. Louis supported Prop D for Democracy which passed in 2020 with 68 percent of the vote. Before Prop D passed, candidates often won city offices with less than 40 percent of the vote. The League of Women Voters of Missouri opposes SJR 78.--Marilyn McLeod, President



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MARLA MARANTZ		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mjmarantz@aol.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D. 4/29/202	ATE: 2 4 9:16 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Marla Marantz, Springfield, MO.Please do not vote to take away our freedom to decide how we can work together in the future. Any and every ballot issue should be able to win on its own merits, not rely on distracting and confusing voters. In this case, by stating only citizens can vote. It is already the law in Missouri that voters must be citizens to gain voting privileges. Worse, this statement alludes to the "big lie" that our election authorities have been lax in their duties and have allowed massive fraud in our voting process. This lie has already cost lives. Furthermore, it creates danger for those who administer our elections. We have just considered laws to protect our election officials and we are going to turn around and fan the flames of anger and mistrust? This alone should be enough to vote against this bill. However, there are other reasons to oppose SJR 78. This preemptive law does not allow for any careful, historic consideration and evaluation the mentioned voting methods. For example, I personally do prefer hand marked paper ballots, they are faster and cheaper. However, there are people who must use assistive technology to privately mark their ballot. Will this bill lead to less accessibility? It is difficult to anticipate all consequences, intended and unintended. I am not sure of where I stand on ranked choice voting or approval voting methods. I know when we have a single person win an election with only 30% of the vote it can be a problem. But I do know, we will never know if some of these methods increase participation or help us pick people who are interested in representing all of us if these methods are outlawed. That's the problem with pre-emption, we aren't carefully and rationally evaluating merits and challenges at all. We are making decisions based on fear and assumption. This bill will take away our freedom to work together to find ways to address problems in the future.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ F	OR INFORMA	TIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MARTINA BERGER		PHONE NUMBE 202-736-22	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER		TITLE: LAW CLER	RK
ADDRESS: 1101 14TH ST. NW, SUITE 400			
CITY: WASHINGTON		STATE: DC	ZIP: 20005
EMAIL: mberger@campaignlegalcenter.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DA 4/30/202	ATE: 24 5:26 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Tuesday, April 30, 2024House Committee on Elections and Elected OfficialsMissouri State Capitol201 W Capitol Ave. Jefferson City, Missouri 65101Via Online PortalRe: Campaign Legal Center's Opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 78Dear Members of the House Committee on Elections and Elected Officials, On behalf of Campaign Legal Center ("CLC") we write to express our strong opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 78 ("SJR 78"), which, if passed and approved by the electorate, would prohibit the use of ranked choice voting in all Missouri elections, with the exception of certain nonpartisan municipal elections.CLC is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing democracy through law. Through its extensive work on redistricting and voting rights, CLC seeks to ensure that every United States resident receives fair representation at the federal, state, and local levels. As such, CLC has supported the adoption of reforms that promote equitable representation, including ranked choice voting. CLC strongly opposes SJR 78 and urges the Missouri General Assembly not to adopt it. SJR 78 denies voters across the state access to a widely used and sensible election reform with documented benefits for electoral participation and engagement. Evidence shows that voters understand and have confidence in ranked choice voting, that ranked choice voting increases civic participation and allows voters to fully express their electoral preferences, and that jurisdictions can administer ranked choice voting elections cheaply and efficiently. Ultimately, SJR 78 is an overreaching response to a nonexistent problem. Local Missouri communities deserve the opportunity to decide for themselves whether to use ranked choice voting; St. Louis voters, for example, should not be allowed to dictate how voters in Branson decide to run their elections. SJR 78 unnecessarily intrudes on such local decision-making. I. Background on and Benefits of Ranked Choice VotingRanked choice voting ("RCV") makes a simple yet powerful change to how voters vote. Instead of selecting just one candidate in each race, RCV gives voters the power to rank candidates in order of preference: first choice, second choice, and so on. In an election to select a single winner—for example, a governor or mayor's race or any other race where there is only one seat available—the candidate with the majority of first-choice rankings wins. If no candidate wins a majority of first-choice rankings, then an "instant runoff" occurs: the candidate who received the fewest first-choice preferences is eliminated, and voters who chose the now-eliminated candidate have their ballots added to the totals of their nextchoice candidate. This process repeats until one candidate receives a majority of the votes and is declared the winner.1 Importantly, the steps required for RCV tabulation are carried out by election administrators, using voting systems and equipment specifically designed to run RCV elections. For voters, the process is as simple as ranking their preferred candidates. Studies show that RCV has a number of beneficial effects.2 For example, RCV's tabulation process ensures that no vote is wasted and every ballot counts: in any election requiring an instant runoff, if a voter's first choice cannot win, then their vote still counts for their next choice among viable candidates. In this way, RCV frees voters

to fully express their electoral preferences without the pressure to vote strategically or worry that their vote won't matter.RCV also reduces negative campaigning and rewards candidates who run civil campaigns.3 Traditional plurality voting, in contrast, incentivizes candidates to use negative tactics to ensure that they are the voters' only choice and that other candidate(s) are not. RCV rewards candidates who take a more positive approach by balancing their efforts to get first-choice rankings without alienating other candidates' supporters who might list them as second or third choice.4 RCV's ability to encourage more civil campaigns 5 can, in turn, reduce political polarization, 6RCV likewise promotes majoritarian outcomes and ensures fair minority representation. In races for single-winner offices, RCV requires that the winning candidate get support from a majority of the electorate, ensuring the winner has broad community approval. In races for seats on a multi-member governing body, multiwinner RCV gives minority communities a fair shot at electing representatives of their choice commensurate to their share of the electorate—unlike traditional plurality voting systems, which can shut out candidates preferred by minority voters.7In any type of election, RCV also encourages a greater number of candidates with more diverse views and backgrounds to run and have a chance to be elected.8 Because RCV mitigates the so-called "spoiler effect," more candidates can run without fear of splitting votes with another likeminded candidate. Candidates from historically underrepresented communities with similar platforms, for example, need not worry about competing for voters and may, instead, all run for office and work together to ensure representation for the group. In this way, RCV's structure benefits minority candidates, including candidates of color and women, as numerous studies have confirmed.9Finally, by allowing voters to express their full set of electoral preferences on just one ballot, RCV eliminates the need for costly primary and runoff elections. As a result, jurisdictions that have adopted RCV have achieved significant savings of both time and money—all while avoiding the decline in voter participation that makes primaries and runoffs more susceptible to less majoritarian outcomes.10 In New York City, for example, the use of RCV in local primary elections was projected to save the city up to \$20 million per election cycle, just by eliminating the need for runoff elections.11 And indeed, in just its first election using RCV, in 2021, New York City avoided 29 runoffs, saving taxpayers tens of millions of dollars.12 In Missouri too, localities face the prospect of costly runoffs that could be avoided through the use of RCV.13 Recognizing these many benefits, more than fifty jurisdictions across the country—including 2 states, 3 counties, and 45 cities—have adopted RCV for use in some or all elections.14 In total, approximately 13 million Americans across 24 states—including military and overseas voters in 6 states—rely on RCV to cast their ballot and express their voice in American democracy.15 Moreover, enthusiasm for RCV crosses party lines: the Virginia Republican Party, for instance, successfully used RCV to choose its statewide nominees in 2021 16 and the Republican-controlled Kansas Senate Committee on Federal and State Affairs introduced SB 202, the Kansas Ranked-Choice Voting Act, only last year, in February 2023.17In short, the benefits of RCV to democracy are numerous.II. **Dispelling Concerns About Ranked** Choice VotingOpponents of RCV raise various concerns about it, but evidence from across the county demonstrates that those concerns are unwarranted. Experience proves that voters who use RCV both understand and have confidence in its results. Data shows that RCV increases civic participation, particularly relative to primary and runoff elections that jurisdictions would otherwise need to conduct. RCV allows voters to more fully express their preferences without disadvantaging those who choose not to rank more than one candidate. And RCV's successful implementation by jurisdictions around the country proves the system's administrability. First, experience proves that voters understand RCV and have confidence in its results. Surveys conducted in jurisdictions that use RCV consistently show that the vast majority of voters find RCV ballots easy to understand.18 In New York City's first use of RCV in 2021, for example, 95 percent of voters found their ballot "simple to complete," and 78 percent of voters reported understanding RCV extremely or very well.19 No surprise then that broad majorities of voters who have used RCV are satisfied with it and want to continue using it.20 Concerns that RCV confuses voters or undermines their confidence in elections are unfounded and misplaced.21Second—and consistent with data regarding voter understanding of and confidence in RCV—evidence shows that use of RCV actually increases voter participation.22 For example, a nationwide study of RCV implementation found that use of RCV increased voter turnout rates by roughly nine percentage points compared to traditional primaries and runoffs.23 Increased turnout in RCV elections is particularly pronounced among young voters.24 Third, contrary to arguments advanced by RCV's opponents, RCV offers voters an expanded opportunity to express their preferences without disadvantaging those who rank only one candidate. RCV does not disenfranchise voters who choose to rank only one candidate if that candidate is unsuccessful. The fact that some voters will cast their ballots for a losing candidate is not disenfranchisement—it is democracy. In an election conducted without RCV, we do not view those who voted for the losing candidate as being disenfranchised. Instead, we recognize that those votes were counted, and supporters of the losing candidate had the same opportunity to express their preferences as the supporters of the victor. RCV improves this process by offering voters the opportunity—if they choose—to rank additional

candidates and thereby still have a voice in the race if their first-choice candidate falls short. Thus, RCV offers a voter the opportunity to more fully express her preferences without disenfranchising single-candidate voters.25Finally, experience proves that RCV elections are administrable. Dozens of jurisdictions around the country have implemented the system without issue, including two states—Alaska and Maine—and numerous city and county governments.26 And given widespread use, the necessary voting systems and equipment to administer RCV are readily available: the four largest voting system vendors used to administer elections in the United States—all of which operate in Missouri—already offer the capability to run RCV elections.27 Indeed, a state-specific assessment found that 113 of Missouri's 114 counties and 1 of Missouri's 2 independent cities—containing 95.04 percent of the state's registered voters—already have voting systems capable of conducting RCV elections.28 Any additional upfront costs to implement a new voting system like RCV would pale in comparison to RCV's potential cost savings in eliminating the need for primary and runoff elections.III.

SJR 78 Unnecessarily Interferes with Local Decision-MakingSJR 78 would preemptively ban local governments and voters from deciding for themselves whether to implement RCV in local elections. This is amid growing bipartisan support for legislation giving communities more local control over voting methods. The Utah Legislature, for example, overwhelmingly approved a "local options" bill in 2018 that gave local governments the option to adopt RCV.29 Virginia followed suit in 2021, Maine in 2022, and similar legislation has been introduced in several other states just this year.30 The Missouri General Assembly should not buck this trend by preemptively overriding Missourians' ability to manage their local elections. Local Missouri communities deserve the opportunity to decide for themselves whether to use RCV and SJR 78 unnecessarily intrudes on that local decision-making. For the foregoing reasons and to safeguard the right of Missourians to determine the best means of achieving equitable representation in their state and local government, we strongly urge you to oppose SJR 78. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully submitted, /s/ Martina Berger Martina Berger, Law ClerkAlexandra Copper, Litigation Legal CounselKevin Hancock, Director of Strategic LitigationCAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER1101 14th St. NW, Suite 400Washington, DC 20005 1 In races for multi-winner seats—e.g., city councils, and county commissions—and multi-winner primaries, votes are tallied in a similar fashion, except that each of the winners must receive a threshold percentage of votes that varies based on the number of seats, rather than winning a simple majority (50%+1). See FairVote, Proportional Ranked Choice Voting (last accessed Apr. 30, 2024), https://fairvote.org/our-reforms/proportional-ranked-choice-voting,2 See generally, e.g., Alexandra Copper & Ruth Greenwood, Campaign Legal Center, The Civic Benefits of Ranked Choice Voting: Eight Ways Adopting Ranked Choice Voting Can Improve Voting and Elections (Aug. 17, 2018), https://campaignlegal.org/sites/default/files/2018-08/CLC%20Issue%20Brief%20RCV% 20PDF.pdf.3 ld. at 1-3.4 ld. at 2.5 The capacity of RCV to foster civility is well documented. See id.; see also, e.g., Sarah John & Andrew Douglas, Candidate Civility and Voter Engagement in Seven Cities with Ranked Choice Voting, NATIONAL CIVIL REVIEW 25, 26 (2017); Todd Donovan, Caroline Tolbert & Kellen Gracey, Campaign Civility Under Preferential and Plurality Voting, 42 ELECTORAL STUDIES 157, 159-60 (2016); Caroline Tolbert, Experiments in Election Reform: Voter Perceptions of Campaigns Under Preferential and Plurality Voting, Presented at Conference on Electoral Systems Reform, Stanford University 11-13 (Mar. 15-16, 2014); Todd Donovan, Candidate Perceptions of Campaigns under Preferential and Plurality Voting, Paper prepared for the workshop on Electoral Systems, Electoral Reform, and Implications for Democratic Performance, Stanford University 10 (Mar. 14-15, 2014); Robert Richie, Instant Runoff Voting: What Mexico (and Others) Could Learn, 3.3 ELECTION LAW JOURNAL 501, 504 (2004); Steven Hill & Robert Richie, Success for Instant Runoff Voting in San Francisco, NATIONAL CIVIC REVIEW 65, 66 (Spring 2005); Haley Smith, Ranked Choice Voting and Participation: Impacts on Deliberative Engagement, FairVote Civility Report #7 4 (Jun. 2016).6 Copper & Greenwood, supra note 2, at 6-7.7 Using RCV, moderate, independent, and third-party candidates, for example, may run and champion their ideas without fear of spoiling the election for major party candidates, and voters may support these candidates without fear of wasting their vote.8 Copper & Greenwood, supra note 2, at 5-6 (citing studies).9 See, e.g., Cynthia R. Terrell, Courtney Lamendola & Maura Reilly, Election Reform and Women's Representation: Ranked Choice Voting in the US, 9

https://www.cogitatiopress.com/politicsandgovernance/article/view/3924/2154 (2021); Deb Otis & Nora Dell, Ranked Choice Voting Elections Benefit Candidates and Voters of Color: 2024 Update, FairVote (2024), https://fairvote.org/report/communities-of-color-2024/; Cynthia R. Terrell et al., In Ranked Choice Elections, Women WIN: RCV in the United States: A Decade in Review, RepresentWomen (July 2020), https://representwomen.app.box.com/s/9m839giwkro4wuhej2ponaytk98xqnzn.10 See, e.g., Hill & Richie, supra note 5, at 65. Primary and runoff elections are less representative, as they tend to have lower and more partisan voter turnout, which, in turn, can lead to the election of candidates who may not actually reflect broad voter preferences.11 Savings Options: Eliminate the Need for Citywide Run-Off Elections, New York City Independent Budget Office (Oct. 2018), https://ibo.nyc.ny.us/cgi-

POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE 332-34.

```
park3/2019/10/22/eliminate-the-need-for-citywide-run-off-elections/.12 Nora Dell & Deb Otis, Ranked
Choice Voting in New York City: An In-Depth Analysis 1, FairVote (Dec. 2021),
https://fairvote.app.box.com/s/ctfhwv6ts8c7af94ya5gitytbyr6n2kt. Other local and state governments
could see equally substantial savings by switching to RCV. For example, Chicago's Board of Elections
allocated $30 million for recent runoff elections. Similarly, Georgia's 2021 U.S. Senate runoff election
alone cost roughly $75 million. Worse still, Georgia had to do it all over again the very next year, when
Senate candidates again failed to win a majority of the votes, triggering another costly runoff. RCV
would obviate the need for any expensive runoffs like these in future election cycles.13 See, e.g., Date
set for runoff election in Willard, Mo. Mayor, KY3 (Apr. 17, 2024), https://www.ky3.com/2024/04/17/date-
set-runoff-election-willard-mo-mayor/ (runoff election to decide tied mayoral race could cost the City of
Willard roughly $24,500).14 See Ranked Choice Voting Information: Where Is Ranked Choice Voting
Used?, FairVote, https://fairvote.org/our-reforms/ranked-choice-voting-information/ (last visited Apr. 30,
2024).15 Id.16 See Get the FAQs: About Ranked Choice Voting, Virginia Dep't of Elections,
https://www.elections.virginia.gov/media/ranked-choice/1893-Elect-RCV-FAQ-d5-mech-nocrops-
041223.pdf.17 SB 202, Kansas Legislature, 2023-2024 Reg. Sess. (Kan. 2023),
https://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2023_24/measures/sb202/.18 See, e.g., Copper & Greenwood, supra
note 2, at 10-11 (collecting sources); see also, e.g., Deb Otis, Exit Surveys: Voters Love Ranked Choice
Voting, FairVote (Nov. 16, 2023), https://fairvote.org/report/exit-surveys-report-2023/.19 Rank the Vote
NYC Releases Edison Research Exit Poll on the Election, readMedia (June 28, 2021),
http://readme.readmedia.com/RANK-THE-VOTE-NYC-RELEASES-EDISONRESEARCH-EXIT-POLL-ON-
THE-ELECTION/17989282 ("NYC Exit Poll").20 See, e.g., Copper & Greenwood, supra note 2, at 10-11
(collecting sources); Otis, Exit Surveys, supra note 18. In New York City, for example, 77 percent of
voters surveyed in 2021 supported using RCV in future local elections—an increase from the 74
percent of voters who initially approved of RCV in 2019. See NYC Exit Poll, supra note 19; Bd. of
Elections in the City of N.Y., Statement and Return Report for Certification—General Election
2019—Elections Citywide at 4 (2019),
https://vote.nyc/sites/default/files/pdf/election results/2019/20191105General%
20Election/00050100000Citywide%20ELECTIONS%20Citywide%20Recap.pdf.21 Low ballot error rates
further confirm voters' understanding of RCV. In Maine's 2018 RCV elections, for instance, only 0.35
percent of primary ballots and 0.21 percent of general election ballots were exhausted due to
confusion. See Matthew Germer. An Analysis of Ranked Choice Voting in Maine 3. R Street Shorts No.
106 (Sept. 2021), https://www.rstreet.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Final-Short-106.pdf. Research
actually suggests that RCV elections produce fewer invalid ballots than traditional plurality elections.
See, e.g., Jason Maloy, Voting Error Across Multiple Ballot Types: Results from Super Tuesday (2020)
Experiments in Four American States 9 (Sept. 22, 2020), https://ssrn.com/abstract=3697637.22 See
generally Copper & Greenwood, supra note 2, at 9-10 (collecting sources).23 David C. Kimball &
Joseph Anthony, Voter Participation with Ranked Choice Voting in the United States at 12 (Oct. 2016),
https://www.umsl.edu/~kimballd/KimballRCV.pdf.24 Courtney L. Juelich & Joseph A. Coll, Ranked
Choice Voting and Youth Voter Turnout: The Roles of Campaign Civility and Candidate Contact, 9
POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE 319, 329 (2021).25 See generally Rachel Hutchinson & Alan Parry, What
If Voters Don't Rank All the Candidates? Inactive Ballots in Single-Choice vs. Instant Runoff Voting,
https://www.uvu.edu/herbertinstitute/docs/research_papers/2024inactiveballots.pdf (last visited Apr. 30,
2024).26 See Ranked Choice Voting Information, supra note 14.27 Major Voting Equipment Vendors'
Ranked Choice Voting Capabilities, Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center (May 2019),
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xBL_5-kREzX7r4eiddZH3twRQDnLFvvd/view.28 Missouri: Ranked
Choice Voting Readiness Assessment, 2023 Edition, Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center at 18
(2023), https://drive.google.com/file/d/12TIEmiZZndv1cVI4k3YIIRP7 CAyFFRj/view .29 See H.B. 35, 62nd
Leg., 2018 Gen. Sess. (Utah 2018), https://le.utah.gov/~2018/bills/static/HB0035.html.30 See Get the
FAQs: About Ranked Choice Voting, supra note 16; 2022 Ranked Choice Voting Year In Review,
FairVote, https://fairvote.org/report/2022-ranked-choice-voting-year-in-review/ (last visited Apr. 30,
2024); Ranked Choice Voting Legislation, FairVote, https://fairvote.org/ranked-choice-voting-legislation
```



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: MARVIN SANDS			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	DN NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mesj@swbell.net		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	DATE: 124 8:24 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This proposed legislation is entirely unfair and most of all undemocratic. Instituting language that is already the law is misleading, ambiguous and completely unlawful. The State of Missouri does not need this kind of legislation on its books or a part of its ongoing agenda. As written this legislation only submits to limit the freedoms of Missouri citizens and does nothing to move Missouri forward. It is extremely partisan, self-serving and intently selfish. Every member of the House and the Senate should overwhelmingly cast this legislation aside as bogus and not in the best interest of Missouri's citizens. It is, as currently written, one of the worst pieces of proposed legislation I've ever seen. Please, for the sake of the State of Missouri and its citizens, defeat this proposed legislation and rid the General Assembly forever of this terrible and intently prejudicial legislation that would set the State of Missouri back years.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials		·	
TESTIFYING:	☐IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL BERG			PHONE NUME 314-644-1 (
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION SIERRA CLUB MIS			TITLE:	
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 432010				
CITY: ST. LOUIS			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63143
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	DATE: 124 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSE	S
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL T. SCHI	MIDT		PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: sgschmidt@prodi	gy.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE: 024 10:07 AM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS EOD	M IS DUBLIC PECOP	D LINDED CHA	DTED 610 DCMA	

I oppose SJR 78 because I don't believe options like ranked choice voting should be prohibited. I believe rank choice voting is good for our democracy, and gives voters the opportunity for a greater choice of candidates. I also believe it should be up to the voters to decide on changes to our voting system, not legislators.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: MITCH WEBER			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mitchweber@gma	ail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/29/20	DATE: 124 10:14 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D LINDER CHA	PTER 610 RSMo

"The people need to have a voice and an opportunity to make that voice heard. Limiting the petition process hinders civic duty."



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: NANCY QUIGLEY			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: nancyquig@earth	link.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 1:41 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.				

Voters should be the decision makers when it comes to elections, not the legislators.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: PEGGY J HARRIS			PHONE NUMI	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: themixx@prodigy	.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 1 4/29/20	DATE:)24 7:32 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.				



WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: QUINNTON SHINING		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: qlynn1288@proton.me	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 2:46 PM
THE INCORMATION ON THIS FORM IS BURLED DECORD LINDED CHARTER CAS DOME			

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Rank choice voting is a fantastic way to know exactly what people want. It will make voting mor fair for everyone and it will be easier. It being band is not something that people would want on the future. Making voting easier and more accessible for everyone should be the goal and rank choice voting can and would make that happen



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials					
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: RACHEL MARY M	ACNAIR		PHONE NUME	ER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:					
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: rachel_macnair@	yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	ATE: 24 1:35 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.					

Will provide written statement in hard copy.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elections	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOS	ES
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: RITA WINTERS			PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: Ravwinters@gma	il.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/30/2024 9:09 AM		
THE INFORMA	THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS BURLIC BECORD LINDER CHARTER 610, BSM				

I find the bill's opening to be confusing since noncitizens currently can't vote. Wish it were removed so we could find out what citizens truly feel about the petition process. I am also not pleased with the timing since it comes at a tie when women are petitioning to keep reproductive health care freedom.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		·	
TESTIFYING: □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: RIVA CAPELLARI		PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:		·	
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: rivacapellari@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/28/202	ATE: 24 3:46 PM
THE INCORMATION ON THIS FORM IS BURLED DECORD LINDED CHARTER CAS DOME			

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

This bill addresses voter eligibility which is unnecessary as this stipulation is already law, ie, being 18 and a Missouri citizen. The real reason for this bill is to ban any possible use of ranked choice voting, which has already been successfully implemented in other parts of the country. Rank choice gives voters a broader range of candidates and puts pressure on each candidate to campaign on issues not party lines. Be honest about what this bill does and remove the unnecessary language.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			ATE: /30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials		•	
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐FO	R INFORMATI	ONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ROBERT BROWN		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: sambo63042rb@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE 4/29/2024	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I would like to oppose this bill SJR78; I believe Rank Choice voting gives our state the versatility to select the best candidate for me and not be pigeon holed to only vote for all one party for every position. I'm disgusted with my Republican party trying to limit my choices. Same as the attack on Clean and unions after the citizens have spoken. I will not vote for this party again.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Electe	ed Officials		•	
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: ROBERT SUBERI			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: suberirobert@proto	n.me	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	OATE: 24 10:52 PM
THE INFORMATI	ON ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

Rank Choice Voting has been passed in 62 jurisdictions across the country. It provides voters with meaningful choices of candidates. It eliminates candidates winning elections with only a plurality of votes. It gives voters more say and votes are not wasted. It's simply more fair. Who benefits from SJR 78? Not voters



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: ROSEMARY GANZ	z		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: rbganz50@gmail.c	com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/20	DATE: 124 9:32 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS EOD	M IS DUBLIC DECOR	D HINDED CHA	DTED 610 DSMo

I have had Rank Choice Voting explained to me in great detail and I have seen the results of it. It is confusing and it really disenfranchises voters. A voter goes to vote for a single candidate and it turns out that their vote gets "watered" down. Please keep Rank Choice Voting out of Missouri.



BILL NUMBER: DATE: **SJR 78** 4/30/2024 COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF **✓** IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: SAMANTHA DANIELLE HIGGINS **BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 2:09 PM EMAIL: ATTENDANCE: misc.middie@gmail.com Written

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I've lived in MO my whole life and have watched the voice of the people be constantly silenced. This is simply another attempt to silence the people, which is the exact opposite of what elected officials are supposed to do. Rank Choice Voting allows every Missourian to have their voices heard more effectively than we can now. I would only hope that the motives behind this continued attempt to silence the people is considered.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: SANDRA ENO			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: lynneno@swbell.r	net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/29/20	OATE: 24 6:24 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

I am in opposition to SJR78



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: SARAH FELTS			PHONE NUMB	ER:
REPRESENTING: ADVOCATES OF P REGION & SOUTH	PLANNED PARENTHOO	DD OF THE ST. LOUIS	TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 4251 FOREST PAR	RK AVE			
CITY: ST. LOUIS			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63108
EMAIL: sarah.felts@ppslr.	org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 4/30/20	ATE: 24 4:48 PM
THE INCODMAN	TION ON THIS EOD	MIC BUBLIC BECOR	D LINDED CHA	DTED CAO DOM:



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: SCOTT LINK			PHONE NUMI	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: sgl.in.stl@gmail.c	com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/29/20	DATE:)24 3:39 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.

I do not support attempts to prevent ranked choice voting.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED L	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: SHARON GEUEA	JONES		PHONE NUME 573-808-2	
REPRESENTING: MO VOTER PROT	ECTION COALITION		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 227 JEFFERSON S	ST		·	
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY	•		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: sharon.geuea.jon	es@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 12:00 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Missouri Voter Protection Coalition (MOVPC) submits this testimony in opposition to SJR 78, which proposes amending the constitution with unnecessary and confusing citizenship language. impede voters' ability to establish or vote on forms of election and open the door to less secure election tabulation. The provision proposes to amend Art. VIII Section 2 of the Missouri Constitution, which guarantees all citizens of Missouri the right to vote, to be replaced by "only" citizens. This is duplicative and unnecessary - given that only citizens are eligible to vote — and designed to confuse voters. Indeed it is ballot candy designed to stoke fears by Missourians that somehow non-citizens are eligible to vote. They are not. And the language could further undermine the Missouri constitution's protection of the right to vote, which "establish[es] with unmistakable clarity that the right to vote is fundamental to Missouri citizens." Weinschenk v. State, 203 S.W.3d 201, 212 (Mo. banc 2006). SJR 78 would further undermine the voices of Missourians by prohibiting their ability to consider alternative forms of voting such as ranked choice or approval voting, but limiting ranking votes or allowing a voter to cast more than one vote (something that is common in certain municipal or school board elections). We should not shut Missourians out of the process of determining voting practices that may be desirable to them in the future. The measure would also establish that only the person gaining the most votes in a political party primary election can be a party candidate, limiting options for Missouri's voters. SJR 78 would also open the door to less secure and less accurate tabulation by allowing the legislature to ban use of voting machines and not require any jurisdiction to use voting machines for purposes of tabulating votes. It is well known that hand counting ballots is more slow and error prone than machine tabulation. In truth, very few 1jurisdictions with more than 1,000 voters count votes by hand because it is so logistically challenging and results in significantly increased delay and error. The machines further allow a voter verify the accuracy of their choices before being tabulated. And importantly, many include functions allow voters with disabilities to vote privately and independently. SJR 78 is unnecessary, confusing and needlessly limits voters' voices and choices. Accordingly, we urge this committee to vote NO on SJR 78.



BILL NUMBER: DATE: 4/30/2024 **SJR 78** COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **SHERRY L BUCHANAN BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: ZIP: STATE: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 2:37 PM EMAIL: ATTENDANCE: sherrybuchanan66@gmail.com Written

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. Please do not forward SJR 78. The Legislature needs to focus on encouraging voter participation, not giving more reasons for citizens to think their votes do not count. And, no proposal should go to the voters with deceptive, misleading ballot language.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: STEVEN O'NEAL			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			•	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: soneal_89@hotma	ail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE: 124 8:36 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Ranked Choice Voting is the best way for voters to be able to express their will in elections. By allowing people to vote for the candidates that they truly believe in, Ranked Choice Voting gives voters a voice and can empower them to push for representation that reflects their values without having to worry about their vote being wasted. Banning Ranked Choice Voting is effectively silencing the vote of so many who want to be able to have their voice heard but can't with our current voting system. It is telling voters that their vote does not matter and the status quo is more important than the will of the people.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	\square FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: SUE EDWARD		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:		·	
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: bflosue2337@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/30/20	DATE:)24 4:45 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am a supporter of Ranked Choice Voting (RCV). This enables voters to vote for their preferred candidate, as well as acceptable alternate candidates, rather than being forced to vote for someone with the best chance of beating their most hated candidate, even if they don't actually support that person. It increases voter participation in our elections, and enables someone to vote their values without being accused of being a spoiler. I support RCV in all elections, whether non-partisan, partisan party primaries, and in general elections. Note that this is NOT what Fair Vote was petitioning for in 2022.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Of	ficials			
TESTIFYING:	SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO □ F	OR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: SUSAN GIBSON			PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:			TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Onesuegibson@protonm	ail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 4/27/20	DATE: 124 8:46 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.				

We've seen this attempt at trickery before.



vdub1229@gmail.com

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: DATE: **SJR 78** 4/30/2024 COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **VANESSA WESTERN BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:** TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP: SUBMIT DATE: 4/29/2024 4:29 PM EMAIL: ATTENDANCE:

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Written

Please vote no on this bill. I would like the opportunity to move to ranked choice voting and give more than just two parties the chance to legitimately participate in our government. I believe having more choices makes for a stronger democracy. Why would you try to put limits on this? Also, why include misleading language? Please act with integrity and vote no on this misleading bill that takes away options from Missouri voters.



BILL NUMBER: DATE: 4/30/2024 **SJR 78** COMMITTEE: **Elections and Elected Officials** ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ✓ IN OPPOSITION TO FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES **TESTIFYING: WITNESS NAME** INDIVIDUAL: WITNESS NAME: PHONE NUMBER: **WILLIAM JOHN NEKOLA** BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: TITLE: ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP: ATTENDANCE: Written SUBMIT DATE: 4/30/2024 10:42 AM EMAIL: wjnekola@gmail.com

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. SJR 78 is an unnecessary burden to the citizen's right to vote. Citizenship is already a prerequisite to voting and as a non-issue, should not be mentioned. It prohibits a voter's ability to choose voting options i.e. ranked choice. This bill should be eliminated.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024	
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elections	cted Officials				
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	▼ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSE	S
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: WINIFRED S. COL	WILL		PHONE NUME	BER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			<u> </u>		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: Colwillw@gmail.c	om	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT I 4/30/20	DATE: 024 10:53 AM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS EOD	M IS DUBLIC PECOP	D LINDED CHA	DTED 610 PSMo	

This bill would ban ranked voting or approval, preempting consideration of such measures. Missouri voters should have the option of considering and debating different types voting procedures. Please oppose SJR78. Thank you.



BILL NUMBER: SJR 78				DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elec	cted Officials			
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: YVONNE REEVES	CHONG		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: seedistheword@g	ımail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT E 4/30/20	DATE: 124 12:12 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD LINDER CHAPTER 610 RSMo				

I'm sick and tired of your games. You are so confident in that you are the rulers of the people in this state and not our servants. We will vote you out. Your arrogance has finally exposed you.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SJR 78			DATE: 4/30/2024
COMMITTEE: Elections and Elected Officials			
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: DAVID EDWARD ROLAND		PHONE NUI	MBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: libertyandjustice@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT 4/30/2	DATE: 2024 12:11 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

SJR78 and the Truth About the Effort to Promote Ranked Choice VotingApril 30, 2024by Daye RolandMy name is Dave Roland. I am an attorney who has devoted almost my entire career to educating people about constitutional principles and fighting in court to secure transparent, accountable, constitutionally-limited government. I started out working with groups such as the Freedom Forum's First Amendment Center, the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, the Institute for Justice, and the Show-Me Institute, before my wife and I founded our own non-profit, the Freedom Center of Missouri, in 2010. Even if some of the people in this room aren't familiar with my name or my face, I expect they will be familiar with my work. I fight for free speech, religious liberty, property rights, and government transparency. I drafted the original version of Amendment 5, which Missouri voters adopted in 2014 to bolster the right to keep and bear arms under the Missouri Constitution. I had a significant role in drafting Missouri's Second Amendment Preservation Act. I am one of the very few attorneys who in Franks v. Hubbard, 498 S.W.3d 862 (Mo. App. E.D. 2016), actually proved election fraud in a court of law, getting the result of the fraudulent election overturned and causing former Governor Jay Nixon to fire several members of the St. Louis City Board of Election Commissioners. I have also won landmark legal victories to bring transparency to the electoral process, including a unanimous Missouri Supreme Court decision in Roland v. St. Louis City Board of Election Commissioners, 590 S.W.3d 315 (Mo. banc 2019), which held that absentee ballot applications and envelopes are open public records subject to citizen review, and Schoeller v. Huddleston, in which a trial court held that cast vote records are open public records subject to citizen review. I have also won important victories in the field of election law—specifically, in cases in which people are trying to restrict voters' choices. For example, I won a Missouri Supreme Court case that prevented a state senator from having her opponent removed from the ballot. I won a Court of Appeals case that prevented then-Secretary of State Jason Kander from unilaterally removing a candidate from the Democratic primary election ballot. And two years ago I won a trial court judgment on behalf of a candidate that the Democratic party was attempting to remove from the ballot. I fight these cases pro bono because I believe that the genius of our republican system of government depends on the people being able to cast meaningful ballots for the candidates they think would best represent them. And I hold to that belief whether or not I'm confident that the person my fellow citizens might choose holds the same political opinions that I do. As the Founders envisioned our political system, it is our responsibility to persuade others to share our ideals and support the candidates we prefer, not to rig the system in a way that favors our preferred candidates—or their political parties. My frustration with the extent to which political insiders would go to rig the system against unconventional candidates dates back to my high school AP Government class, where I first learned about how gerrymandering allowed politicians to choose their constituents, rather than constituents choosing their politicians. But about a decade ago, not long after I won my first big election case, I came to the frustrating conclusion

that even if I kept winning cases in court, our current electoral system is so thoroughly skewed in favor of the two major political parties and the insiders who control them that it would take a systemic reform to improve the extent to which our elected officials reflect the will of the people. In light of this realization, I took two important steps. First, I withdrew from direct participation in electoral politics by terminating my voter registration—I felt that participating in the existing system made me complicit in its flaws and the best way to demonstrate my disapproval was to opt out entirely. And second, I started learning and thinking carefully about what kinds of reforms might bring us back closer to the (little "r") republican ideal of representative government. That study and contemplation is what led me to ranked choice voting, which—although not a perfect system for choosing political officials—I believe to be a dramatic improvement over the status quo. This brings me to the reason I am testifying for informational purposes today—to correct some of the outright lies that are being spread about this reform and who is promoting it here in the state of Missouri. It's true that in 2021 an initiative petition was filed that would have brought ranked choice voting to this state. I know because I filed that petition and I was instrumental in discussing and drafting its provisions. Certainly, there were progressives involved in that conversation—just as there were conservatives and libertarians involved. Because a lot of people across the political spectrum who care deeply about the well being and future of our state and our country recognize that voters are deeply frustrated with the political status quo. Ranked choice voting has been supported by the Cato Institute, a venerable libertarian think tank in Washington, DC, and the R Street Institute, another think tank that promotes free markets and constitutionally limited government. The Heritage Foundation have taken a public stand against this sort of reform, but when my friend Hans von Spakovsky first raised his concern about the "radical" proposal to bring ranked choice voting to Missouri at a meeting of conservative/libertarian attorneys we both attended, I engaged him in a lengthy, thoughtful conversation in which I explained that I was the one spearheading the initiative and I offered my reasons why. I didn't persuade Hans, but at least a dozen conservative attorneys—including John Eastman!—thanked me for the explanation and said they actually thought ranked choice voting was worth considering. So, to be clear, the narrative that ranked choice voting is some sinister, left-wing plot is simply not true. Whether or not any of you is persuaded that this sort of reform is good for Missouri, the question of whether it should be adopted should be—and, of course, ultimately will be—left to the voters themselves. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.