



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1215 K Street
Suite 1750
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.thepoliticallaw.group

Tracey Wigglesworth
(916) 712-8125
tracey@tpl.group

Nicholas Sanders
(530) 219-6692
nicholas@tpl.group

July 27, 2026

P.K. Runkles-Pearson
General Counsel
Portland City Auditor's Office
1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 310
Portland, OR 97204
via email only at: P.K.Runkles-Pearson@portlandoregon.gov

Robert Taylor
Portland City Attorney
1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 430
Portland, OR 97204
via email only at: robert.taylor@portlandoregon.gov

Re: Demand for Immediate Suspension of Signature Verification and Request for Independent State Oversight

Dear Ms. Runkles-Pearson and Mr. Taylor:

We are counsel to the Chief Petitioners for the 1PDX2026 initiative petition, and we write to address the City's conduct with respect to the 1PDX2026 petition. By this letter, we demand that the City suspend its verification of the 1PDX2026 petition, request and permit the Oregon Secretary of State to assume responsibility for a new verification process and produce and maintain the records necessary for an independent review of the City's current verification process. Details of the City's errors and violations are below, as is a specific process by which it can comply with the demands of both the law and our clients. We are as disappointed in the necessity of this letter as we are with the City's blatant disregard for its role in protecting the rights of its citizens. And yet it has become clear that the City is either unable or unwilling to do its job if we do not intercede now.

As you are now well aware, the integrity of the City's administration of the signature verification process has been materially compromised, placing at risk the constitutional rights of both the Chief Petitioners and the qualified Oregon electors who signed the petition. Every signature improperly excluded from the verification process disenfranchises an Oregon elector.

Since the petitions were submitted on July 6, 2026, the City and County have each acknowledged significant failures affecting different stages of the statutorily prescribed verification process. The City repeatedly changed their count of petition sheets and individual signature lines, they excluded **hundreds** of full petition sheets and **thousands** of individual signature lines during preprocessing without providing any real-time notice or explanation to the Chief Petitioners, and renumbered petition sheets destroying the audit trail and denying the Chief Petitioners any ability to review those extraordinary preprocessing decisions. The County then acknowledged that a material data-entry error invalidated the original statistical sample, obscuring the City's preprocessing determinations and, again, denying the Chief Petitioners a meaningful opportunity to review the irregularities before the verification process resumed.

These are not isolated administrative errors. They represent systemic failures affecting the foundation of Oregon’s statutory signature verification process. Taken together, they call into question the accuracy of the underlying petition universe, the transparency and traceability of the City’s preprocessing decisions, and the integrity of the verification process itself.

For the reasons set forth below, the Chief Petitioners respectfully demand that the City Auditor exercise her authority to immediately suspend the current verification process, request the assistance and participation of the Oregon Secretary of State’s Elections Division pursuant to ORS 190.110, and preserve the status quo until the petition universe has been fully reconciled and can be independently verified.

The City Has Not Reliably Defined the Petition Universe

Oregon law establishes a sequential process for verifying signatures on city initiative petitions. The City Elections Officer must first determine which petition sheets and signature lines are accepted for inclusion in the petition universe before statistical sampling may begin. (See ORS 250.315; OAR 165-014-0110.) The County then verifies signatures from that petition universe using the statistical sampling procedures prescribed by the Secretary of State. Every subsequent stage of the verification process depends upon the integrity of the petition universe established by the Filing Officer.

The City’s own records do not reliably identify the petition universe from which statistical sampling has been or is being conducted. Proofing reports, transfer memoranda, and related records reflect differing petition sheet and signature totals, and the mathematical calculations reflected in those records remain internally inconsistent.

The following chart summarizes the petition universe reflected in the City’s records:

Date	Petition Sheets	Petition Signatures
Monday, July 6	--	63,315
Wednesday, July 8	8806	--
Wednesday, July 16	8366	--
Monday, July 20	--	61,329
Tuesday, July 21	8309	--
Friday, July 24	--	55,837

The City’s own records reflect multiple, materially different petition universes over the course of the verification process. The Chief Petitioners have repeatedly requested an explanation and reconciliation of those discrepancies. To date, no complete reconciliation has been provided.

Until the petition universe has been reconciled and is capable of independent verification, neither the statistical sample drawn from it nor the resulting verification outcome can be treated as reliable.

The County’s Acknowledged Error Materially Prejudiced the Chief Petitioners

On July 23, 2026, Multnomah County acknowledged that a material data-entry error had affected the statistical sample and announced that it would discard the original sample, correct the error, and

generate a new random sample. The City likewise acknowledged that the error required the sampling process to begin again.

The consequences of that error extend beyond the statistical sample itself.

Before the error was disclosed, the Chief Petitioners understood that the City had reduced the petition universe through its ordinary eligibility review. They did not know – and could not reasonably have known – that the City had also excluded hundreds of petition sheets and thousands of individual signature lines before transmitting the petition universe to the County for statistical sampling. The inflated petition universe obscured the practical effect of those eligibility determinations.

After the County corrected the data-entry error, the petition universe transmitted for verification was reduced by approximately 5,500 signatures. Only then did it become apparent that the City's eligibility determinations had materially altered the petition universe before statistical sampling began. By that point, however, the County had already resumed signature verification using materially different records.

The Chief Petitioners therefore lost the opportunity to meaningfully review, analyze, and challenge those eligibility determinations before they became embedded in the ongoing verification process. That procedural prejudice has never been remedied.

The importance of that opportunity cannot be overstated. Before statistical sampling even began, the City excluded hundreds of petition sheets and thousands of individual signature lines from the petition universe. Every erroneous exclusion has the potential to disenfranchise a qualified Oregon elector. Where eligibility determinations affect thousands of signatures, meaningful review is not a procedural formality, it is an essential safeguard protecting the initiative rights Constitutionally reserved to the people of Oregon.

Under these circumstances, the verification process should not continue until the Chief Petitioners have been afforded a meaningful opportunity to evaluate eligibility determinations that may affect the voting rights of thousands of Oregon electors.

The City Has Not Provided Records Sufficient to Permit Independent Review

Independent review requires an accurate and complete audit trail. At present, the City has not provided records sufficient to permit the Chief Petitioners – or any independent reviewer – to trace the City's eligibility determinations from the petition sheets submitted by the Chief Petitioners to the petition universe ultimately transmitted to the County for statistical sampling.

During preprocessing, the City renumbered petition sheets without preserving a contemporaneous cross-reference to the original Bates numbers. As a result, the petition sheets submitted by the Chief Petitioners cannot presently be traced through the City's eligibility review to determine whether they were included in, or excluded from, the petition universe transmitted for statistical sampling. The City has advised that it is now attempting to reconstruct that cross-reference after the fact.

The City's records also do not permit meaningful review of the reasons underlying its eligibility determinations. During the parties' July 24 conference, the City acknowledged that petition sheets

and signature lines may have been excluded for multiple reasons even though its reports identify only a single basis for exclusion. As a result, even where the City has identified a reason for excluding a petition sheet or signature line, the Chief Petitioners cannot determine from the City's records whether additional eligibility determinations affected that same petition sheet or signature line.

The Chief Petitioners do not contend that every eligibility determination is incorrect. They contend that the City's records presently do not permit those determinations to be independently reconstructed or verified. Until the City produces records sufficient to trace and explain its eligibility determinations, independent review remains impossible.

The Verification Process Must Begin Anew Under Independent State Oversight

The City correctly suspended the verification process after the County identified the material data-entry error affecting the original statistical sample. That decision recognized an important principle: when the integrity of the verification process is materially compromised, accuracy must take precedence over speed.

The objective record demonstrates that the acknowledged sampling error was not an isolated mistake. The City has not reconciled the petition universe. The Chief Petitioners have never been afforded a meaningful opportunity to review the City's extraordinary preprocessing decisions. The City still has not produced records sufficient to permit independent verification of those decisions.

The City cannot restore confidence in this verification process by continuing it. The defects identified in this letter arose before statistical sampling began, and they affect the foundation upon which every subsequent stage of the verification process depends.

Under these circumstances, restarting the verification process under the same City and County procedures cannot restore public confidence in the outcome. Only an independent review beginning anew under the direct responsibility or oversight of the Oregon Secretary of State's Elections Division can do so.

Oregon law expressly authorizes state agencies and units of local government to cooperate in administering delegated governmental responsibilities. (ORS 190.110.) The circumstances presented here warrant precisely that type of intergovernmental cooperation. The Chief Petitioners do not seek special treatment or a predetermined outcome. They seek only a verification process that is accurate, transparent, independently verifiable, and worthy of the confidence of the more than 63,000 Portland electors who signed the petition.

Accordingly, the Chief Petitioners respectfully demand that the City Auditor:

- (1) Stop. Immediately suspend all further verification activity relating to the 1PDX2026 petition.
- (2) Enlist the Oregon Secretary of State and Start Over. Pursuant to ORS 190.110, immediately request that the Oregon Secretary of State's Elections Division assume responsibility for, or provide direct oversight of:
 - (a) A new preprocessing of the petitions submitted by the Chief Petitioners; and
 - (b) Then, a new statistical sampling and signature verification process using the newly established petition universe.

The preprocessing and signature verification process should be conducted in accordance with ORS 250.315 and OAR 165-014-0110 using lawful, transparent, and consistently applied standards – standards administered in a manner that protects the constitutional rights of qualified Oregon electors.

- (3) Produce all records. Separately, produce all records, whether held by the City or County, sufficient to permit independent review of the City's and/or County's original preprocessing and subsequent determinations and conduct, including all records identifying the basis for each exclusion, the chronology of those determinations, any subsequent revisions to those determinations, and all records necessary to determine whether petition sheets and signature lines were properly excluded from the original petition universe.
- (4) Preserve all records. Preserve all records, whether held by the City or County, relating to the intake, preprocessing, proofing, coding, renumbering, transfer, statistical sampling, and verification of the petition.

Attached is the Declaration of Christopher Gallaway, Managing Member of FieldWorks, describing the extensive quality-control procedures FieldWorks employed throughout the signature-gathering effort and explaining why, based upon FieldWorks' decades of experience, the circumstances surrounding this verification process are extraordinary.

We look forward to hearing on or before Tuesday at 5p.m. that the City will restart the process in a manner befitting the responsibilities required by law, and as outlined above.

The Chief Petitioners expressly reserve all rights and remedies available under the Oregon Constitution, Oregon statutes, and other applicable law, and will avail themselves of those rights if necessary.

Sincerely,



Tracey Frazier Wigglesworth

Enclosure (1)

cc: Dan Rayfield, Oregon Attorney General
Jenny M. Madkour, Multnomah County Counsel

DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER GALLAWAY

I, Christopher Gallaway, do hereby declare:

1. I am over the age of eighteen and am competent to testify to the matters set forth herein; and make this Declaration based on my personal knowledge.
2. I am one of the two co-owners (members) of FieldWorks, LLC, a District of Columbia limited liability company ("FieldWorks") and serve as managing member of the company.
3. FieldWorks' business is providing field services to nonprofit advocacy organizations, ballot measure committees, labor organizations, and political committees and organizations across the nation. The services offered by the company include political organizing, signature gathering, petition management, and canvassing for or against particular candidates, causes, initiatives and referenda.
4. FieldWorks was retained to collect signatures on the City of Portland ballot initiative 1PDX2026, the Portland Enhanced Community Safety Initiative.
5. FieldWorks has a national reputation for upholding the highest standards of quality control and ethical conduct in the gathering of voter signatures on candidate and ballot petitions – work it has performed very successfully for over a quarter century.
6. FieldWorks has qualified multiple ballot measures statewide in Oregon and in Multnomah County.

7. In my twenty years of managing petition drives across the United States, I have never encountered a situation in which (1) the original statistical sample had to be discarded because of an admitted data-entry error, (2) the petition universe continued to change after sampling began, and (3) substantial questions remained concerning the ability to independently reconcile the submitted petition sheets with the universe used for verification.

FIELDWORKS IMPLEMENTED GOLD STANDARD QUALITY CONTROL

8. The following practices and procedures, standard for FieldWorks, were meticulously implemented in the collection of signatures for 1PDX2026.
9. Petition circulators hired by FieldWorks are trained extensively on the requirements of the law and FieldWorks policies, both before they go out to begin collection and in the field. Training continues daily for every circulator. Circulators use an approved script in approaching and engaging with voters.
10. Using a proprietary application on mobile devices, circulators report each attempt at obtaining a signature from a voter; and for each completed signature, circulators take and upload an image of the petition page, which is transmitted to FieldWorks office managers together with the date and time each signature was collected, and where.
11. Each petition sheet is printed with a unique QR code allowing FieldWorks to track each sheet throughout the process. Only a circulator hired and authorized by FieldWorks has login credentials to access the application to upload the images of the petition sheet. Thus, each petition sheet is linked to a known circulator as signatures are being collected in real time. *Through that process FieldWorks can*

be absolutely certain that the sheets submitted by each individual circulator, back at the FieldWorks office at the end of each shift, were actually collected by that circulator, and no one else.

12. Each evening, each circulator completes a certification confirming the signatures collected by that circulator and attesting to compliance with all applicable laws and policies. And an office manager reconciles the digital data uploaded through the application with the physical petition sheets, confirming that FieldWorks has digitally recorded every sheet that has signatures on it.
13. Following that reconciliation, FieldWorks' quality control manager, a role completely separate from and not involved in signature collection, visually reviews each sheet and images them again; and identifies any issues with signatures and follow up with the managers of the circulators.
14. Then, every piece of data on each sheet is extracted and validation flags are created for each relevant type of data (field), to identify any signature lines where any required information is missing or illegible. **The individual signature lines are then matched to the voter file to determine if each individual who signed is in fact registered to vote. Thus every signature is validated to the extent possible** (without use of information, such as voter signatures, available only to the City government) **while the collection process is taking place.**
15. The database is used to identify potential duplicate signatures, and to identify any indicia of possible fraudulent signatures. Any such indicia are investigated immediately and acted upon.

16. Before petition sheets were turned in to the City, a senior team at FieldWorks reviewed every petition sheet, comparing the sheet to the digital image in the database. After verifying, a scanning system recorded the set of QR codes inserted into each folder of 200 sheets that was to be submitted.
17. Each folder was then numbered to ensure that the physical count of petition sheets matches the digital count. Each folder is then reviewed for duplicate signatures, which were struck out. Each QR code could then be associated with the number of the folder containing the sheet with that signature. Each folder was then inserted into a sequentially numbered box, each containing four folders (800), for submission to the City.

MORE THAN ENOUGH VALID SIGNATURES WERE TURNED IN

18. FieldWorks turned in 11 boxes with 8,805 petition sheets, containing 63,317 signatures. The City's initial review indicated that 3,682 signatures were crossed out (by FieldWorks or by voters), leaving 59,707 signatures for review by the City.
19. A validity rate of 67.8% would then be needed to meet the required number of 40,437 valid signatures. Based on the verification FieldWorks had already conducted, the actual validity rate would have been more than enough to qualify the required number of signatures.

THE CITY IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED HUNDREDS OF PETITION SHEETS

20. During preprocessing, the City excluded 498 petition sheets containing over 3,000 signatures—**effectively disenfranchising more than 3,000 voters.**

21. The vast majority of these sheets were excluded because the City claimed the circulator's signature did not match examples of signatures of the circulator that they had; or because the circulator corrected the date on which signatures were collected and didn't initial the correction. As to signature mismatches, the City is effectively claiming hundreds of sheets with the name and signature of a circulator were actually circulated by someone else.
22. **But FieldWorks knows for certain that that could not have happened and did not happen.** As explained above, only the circulator hired by FieldWorks, who signed the petition sheet, could have entered the image of each signature they collected on that sheet into FieldWorks' system. Each circulator was screened, subject to a background check, had their identity verified and was given unique login credentials.
23. As to the date corrections, only the circulator would have had access to the petition sheet before it was turned in to the FieldWorks office; and in some cases, the circulator originally put down the wrong date on which the signatures were collected and then corrected it; (just as many of us initially put the wrong date on a check and then correct it) and then simply forgot to initial the correction. Certainly that should not be a reason to disqualify the signatures of thousands of voters who had nothing to do with that process.

**THE CITY MISCOUNTED SIGNATURES AND MADE INDEPENDENT
VERIFICATION IMPOSSIBLE BY RENUMBERING PETITION
SHEETS**

24. The City issued a report on July 20, stating that 61,329 signatures had been accepted for verification. Four days later, on July 24, the City issued a revised report stating that only 55,837 signatures had been accepted for verification.
25. The City attributes this large discrepancy to a typographical error by the County, one of whose employees evidently recorded a single petition sheet containing over 5,000 signatures, when the maximum number of signers on a page is ten.
26. FieldWorks has been unable to verify which, if any, of these numbers is close to correct, because the City altered the unique ID numbers assigned to each petition sheet by FieldWorks prior to submission.
27. As noted above, the City threw out hundreds of petition sheets during pre-processing. Leaving aside the fact that this removal was entirely improper, when the City removed these sheets during their pre-processing review, the City replaced each removed sheet with a random sheet from the bottom of the pile of petition sheets submitted. The City then renumbered the sheet taken from the bottom with the number of the removed page it replaced.
28. That renumbering has made it impossible for FieldWorks to verify what signatures are on what renumbered pages. Even worse, the City did not log any of these replacement numbers. As a result, the City has been relegated to trying to re-create the history of these numbering changes by sending staff to the County to review the pages they already transmitted.

**THE CITY IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED THOUSANDS OF INDIVIDUAL
SIGNATURES**

29. In its initial review of the signature sample, the County has identified an additional 4.6% of signers of individual voters they are invalidating for non-matching signatures.
30. For context, if the current rates hold, the County will invalidate another 21,330 signatures.
31. As a result of the removal of the petition sheets and the exclusion of thousands of individual signatures, the validity rate is far below expectation based on FieldWorks' own review of signatures as they were being collected.
32. In our experience, signature matches comparing current petition forms to voter registration applications that were often signed years ago, are notoriously unreliable.
33. Based on FieldWorks' review, quality-control procedures, and experience, the results reported by the County are inconsistent with industry standards.
34. In our experience over 20 years, based on the validation conducted by FieldWorks during the signature collection, it would be statistically extraordinary for the validity rate resulting from the review by election authorities to be as low as it is.
35. The facts set forth above raise serious questions about the accuracy and credibility of the reviews conducted by the City and County.

I hereby declare that the above statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that I understand it is made for use as evidence in court and is subject to penalty for perjury.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Gallaway", is written over a horizontal line.

Christopher Gallaway