

# Oregon Republican Gubernatorial Primary

Statewide Poll Analysis — May 7–13, 2026

Predict Oregon | n = 656 Registered GOP Primary Voters | MoE ±3.83%

With four days remaining before the May 19 Republican primary, Predict Oregon's statewide poll shows the race for the gubernatorial nomination is a dead heat between Christine Drazan and Ed Diehl. Drazan's 3-point lead is inside the poll's ±3.83% margin of error. Other recent polls have placed Drazan well outside the margin of error and treated the race as effectively decided. This poll, conducted closer to election day, with a substantial share of respondents who have already voted — finds a much closer contest.

## 1. Decided Voters Only (n=507)

Candidate	Support	n
<b>Christine Drazan</b>	<b>41.0%</b>	208
<b>Ed Diehl</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	192
Chris Dudley	16.6%	84
David Medina	2.8%	14
Danielle Bethell	1.6%	8
Other	0.2%	1

Among the 507 respondents who named a specific candidate — either having already voted or stating a clear preference — Drazan leads Diehl by 3.1 points. The margin is inside the ±3.83% margin of error.

## 2. Leaners Only (n=31)

Candidate	Support	N
<b>Ed Diehl</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	10
<b>Christine Drazan</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	10
Chris Dudley	29.0%	9
Danielle Bethell	3.2%	1

This is a small sub-sample and is reported directionally. Among 31 voters who were initially undecided but named a lean when asked, Diehl and Drazan were tied at 10 each. Dudley pulled 9 leaners.

### 3. Combined: Decided + Leaners (n=538)

Candidate	Support	n
<b>Christine Drazan</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	218
<b>Ed Diehl</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	202
<b>Chris Dudley</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	93
David Medina	2.8%	15
Danielle Bethell	1.7%	9
Other	0.2%	1

Combining decided voters with leaners produces the most complete preference picture: Drazan 40.5%, Diehl 37.5%. The 3.0-point margin remains inside the  $\pm 3.83\%$  margin of error. Dudley holds steady at 17.3% — essentially identical to his share among decided voters alone.

### Primary Ballot Test

Combining all paths through the questionnaire — voters who have already cast a ballot, those with a current vote intention, and undecided voters who named a lean — the race breaks out as follows. The first numeric column reports the combined picture across all 656 respondents, including undecideds; the next two split the same data by whether the respondent had already voted at the time of interview.

Candidate	Combined	Already Voted (n=295†)	Not Yet Voted (n=243‡)
<b>Christine Drazan</b>	33%	40%	42%
<b>Ed Diehl</b>	31%	39%	36%
<b>Chris Dudley</b>	14%	17%	18%
<b>David Medina</b>	2%	2%	3%
<b>Danielle Bethell</b>	1%	2%	1%
<b>Undecided / no preference</b>	18%	—	22%§

† Of 339 already-voted respondents, 295 named a candidate. 43 chose “prefer not to say”; 1 refused.

‡ Of 313 not-yet-voted respondents, 243 named a candidate or leaner. The remaining 70 (22%) were still genuinely undecided at the time of interview.

§ Percentage of all not-yet-voted respondents who had not yet named a candidate or leaner.

### Candidate Favorability

Net favorability collapses the five-point scale into favorable (very + somewhat) and unfavorable (very + somewhat). “Name ID” is the share of respondents who registered an opinion at all — anything other than “no opinion” or refusal.

Candidate	Favorable	Unfavorable	No Opinion	Net	Name ID
Christine Drazan	63%	20%	17%	43%	82%
Ed Diehl	52%	8%	39%	44%	59%
Chris Dudley	48%	15%	38%	33%	61%
David Medina	20%	7%	74%	13%	25%
Danielle Bethell	17%	8%	75%	10%	24%

*Refused responses (2–4% per candidate) excluded from name ID denominator.*

## What This Poll Tells Us

### 1. Drazan-Diehl is a statistical dead heat — and tighter among already-voted ballots

Drazan leads Diehl by three points in the combined preference measure (40.5% to 37.6%). That gap sits inside the  $\pm 3.83\%$  margin of error. The picture tightens further on ballots already returned: among the 295 respondents who have already voted, Drazan and Diehl are within 0.7 points of each other (39.7% to 39.0%). Drazan's overall lead is being driven by voters who hold ballots they have not yet returned. The last five days of the race still have room to move the result.

### 2. The race in ballots already cast is essentially a tie. The lead opens up among voters yet to vote.

Among the 295 respondents who had already voted and named a candidate, Drazan leads Diehl 40% to 39% — a one-point gap inside any reasonable margin of error. Among voters who had not yet returned a ballot at the time of interview, Drazan's lead grows to 42% to 36%. This is consistent with a scenario in which Drazan's base voted early and Diehl's remaining supporters are still working through their decision — or with one in which the final wave of returns shifts further toward Drazan as the late-deciding electorate skews her direction. The poll cannot distinguish between these readings. What it shows is that the ballots in the box do not yet match the ballots still to come.

### 3. The crowd predicts Drazan more confidently than the ballot test does.

We asked every respondent, regardless of their personal preference, who they thought would win the primary. Of the 518 voters who named a candidate (79% of the sample), 55% picked Drazan and 27% picked Diehl. That gap (28 points) is more than three times wider than the ballot-test gap (2 points combined / 6 points among not-yet-voted).

The cross-tabulation is what makes this notable. Among Drazan's own supporters, 79% predict Drazan wins. Among Diehl's supporters, 61% predict Diehl wins — but 22% predict Drazan does. Among Dudley's supporters, 43% predict Dudley wins, and 35% predict Drazan does. Among voters who have already cast a ballot for Dudley, only 34% think their candidate wins; 38% think Drazan does. Roughly one in three Dudley voters in our sample dropped a ballot in the mail for a candidate they expected to lose.

Wisdom-of-crowd questions tend to capture something the ballot test cannot — a candidate's perceived momentum across the entire electorate, including from voters who aren't backing them. By that signal, Drazan is the consensus presumed winner, and notably so.

### 4. Dudley is the moderates' candidate. The lane is real, but it isn't very wide.

Dudley's overall share (14%) understates how clean the ideological story is. Among the 84 self-identified moderates who named a preference, Dudley wins 33% — essentially tied with Drazan (36%) and well ahead

of Diehl (26%). Among the 280 very-conservative voters who named a preference, Dudley's share drops to 14%, with Drazan and Diehl effectively tied at 41% each.

This is consistent with Dudley's 2010 general-election profile and his current positioning. The structural problem is that very-conservative voters outnumber moderates roughly 3-to-1 in the GOP primary electorate. Dudley is winning the lane he's targeting; the lane just doesn't deliver a plurality on its own.

### 5. Diehl converts intensity at a higher rate than Drazan, but he's working from a smaller pool.

Among the 209 voters who said they were "very favorable" toward Diehl, 79% picked him as their vote or lean. The comparable figure for Drazan is 73% (162 of 221). Diehl converts strong intensity slightly better than the frontrunner does. He has a name-ID problem (59% vs. Drazan's 82%), but among voters who do know him and like him, conversion is high and the unfavorability ratio is striking — 50% favorable, just 8% unfavorable.

This is Diehl's path: he doesn't need to convince voters they like him; he needs more of them to have heard of him. With four days remaining at the time of this analysis, that is a different campaign problem than Drazan or Dudley face.

### 6. Diehl's name-ID problem from April has substantially closed

Crosstabs/Hoffman's late-April poll flagged Diehl as the candidate with the highest conversion rate in the field — but with name ID as his only barrier. At that point, 48% of likely GOP primary voters had never heard of him. In this poll, 39.2% gave a "no opinion" rating on Diehl, with the remaining 60.8% holding a view of him. His net favorability (+44.0) is essentially identical to Drazan's (+42.8). Roughly six in ten primary voters now have an opinion of Ed Diehl, and that opinion is overwhelmingly favorable.

### 6. One in five respondents wouldn't predict a winner. That refusal pattern is itself a finding.

Q5 ("who do you *think* will win?") had a 21% refusal-or-no-response rate — substantially higher than any other substantive question in the survey. Refusal was concentrated among very-conservative voters (21% refused) and slightly lower among moderates (17%). Among voters with no candidate preference at all, 53% refused to predict.

Two readings of this are plausible. One: a portion of the electorate is genuinely uncertain about the outcome, and saying so is honest. Two: some voters declined the question because predicting Drazan felt like an unwelcome concession. Both can be true at once. What the refusal pattern is not, in our reading, is evidence of a hidden bloc for a non-frontrunner. The voters who refused to predict were not disproportionately preference-holders for Diehl or Dudley; they refused at roughly the same rate as everyone else.

---

## What Already-Cast Ballots Tell Us

Hoffman Research Group's late-April poll captured intentions before ballots had been returned. By the time fielding for this poll began on May 7, ballots had already started arriving in mailboxes. Of our 656 respondents, 339 (51%) reported having already returned a ballot. That subset offers something an earlier poll cannot: a sample of votes that are no longer theoretical.

Among the 295 already-voted respondents who named the candidate they had voted for:

Candidate	Already-Cast Share	Vote Intent (Not Yet Voted)	Difference
Christine Drazan	40%	42%	+2 pts
Ed Diehl	39%	36%	-3 pts

Candidate	Already-Cast Share	Vote Intent (Not Yet Voted)	Difference
Chris Dudley	17%	18%	+1 pt
Medina + Bethell	4%	4%	0 pts

The shifts are small and within the margin of error, so individual comparisons should be read with care. Two patterns are nonetheless worth noting. First, Diehl performs three points better in ballots already cast than in stated intent among voters yet to vote — modest but consistent with a campaign whose base voted early. Second, Drazan’s relative advantage is slightly larger among voters who have not yet returned a ballot — implying the late-returning electorate may close less favorably for Diehl than the early-returning one.

It bears repeating: these are within-MoE differences. We are not predicting that one of these scenarios will resolve the race. What we are observing is that the race in ballots already in the box looks marginally different from the race in ballots still to come, and the direction of the difference points in Drazan’s favor.

## Regional Signal

The regional picture below uses Hoffman’s county-grouping convention to allow comparison with their April field. Regions with fewer than 50 respondents are reported with caution; Multnomah (n=30) is included for completeness only and should not be read as a stable estimate.

Region	n	Drazan	Diehl	Dudley
Mid-Willamette	136	39%	43%	11%
Southern Oregon	129	47%	34%	13%
Eastern Oregon	60	37%	42%	15%
Washington County	54	41%	37%	22%
Clackamas County	46	37%	30%	30%
Central Oregon	42	43%	26%	29%
Coast	42	33%	43%	24%
Multnomah County	25	44%	36%	16%

*Shares are of respondents in each region who named a candidate or leaner. Excludes Medina, Bethell, and “other.”*

Three patterns stand out. Diehl’s strength is in Mid-Willamette, Eastern Oregon, and the Coast — a populist-leaning rural and small-city coalition. Drazan’s strongest region is Southern Oregon (47%), which is notable because Southern Oregon was Diehl’s best region in Hoffman’s late-April poll. Either the field has shifted there in the intervening three weeks, or methodological differences between the two polls are producing the divergence. Dudley’s regional pattern follows the ideological one: he runs strongest in Clackamas, Central Oregon, and Washington County — the suburban and metro-adjacent corridors where moderate Republicans cluster.

## Methodological Notes

- Poll conducted May 7–13, 2026 by Predict Oregon.
- Of 656 completed interviews, 647 (99%) were conducted live over the phone — a mix of Predict Oregon in-house volunteer interviewers and American Pulse as a contracted vendor. The remaining 9 respondents were unable to complete a live interview and were given a secure one-time access link to complete the survey online
- Sample drawn from the Oregon Secretary of State voter file, stratified across three likely-voter tiers: “likely” voted in 2 of the last 4 statewide primaries, “very likely” voted in 3-in-4 primaries, and “highly likely” voted in 4-in-4 primaries.
- Candidate options were rotated per respondent on every candidate question (Q2, Q2A, Q2B, Q3, Q4, Q5) and held constant across questions within the same interview to control for order bias.
- Mode: Primarily live phone interviews conducted by Predict Oregon volunteer interviewers and by an independent professional research firm under contract with Predict Oregon. A small portion (fewer than 20) of respondents unable to complete a live interview were offered a secure one-time access link to complete the survey online.
- Margin of error:  $\pm 3.83\%$  at 95% confidence.
- Weighted by gender to a 51.5% male / 48.5% female benchmark consistent with peer-pollster electorate composition. Age and ideology were tested for weighting; movement was under 0.2 points on every candidate, and toplines are reported unweighted on those dimension
- Geographic coverage: 34 of Oregon's 36 counties represented. Gilliam and Wheeler — the two smallest counties by Republican registration — are not represented.
- Demographics collected: age (decade brackets), gender, ZIP code, and self-reported ideology. Race and ethnicity were not collected.
- This poll was privately funded. This poll was conducted independently and was not paid for or sponsored by any candidate, campaign or committee.