

Submitter: Mary Chalkiopoulos
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure: SB166

I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB 166. These are just some of the issues I have with this bill:

1) Section 1 is completely unnecessary as our right to vote is already outlined in Article II of the Oregon Constitution.

2) Section 3 is an attempt to obscure election documentation. This would further erode trust in our elections. We have been assured that QR codes and markings made by the printing company cannot lead to identification of specific voters; therefore, all ballots, ballot images and cast vote records are anonymous. They become part of the public record of an election and are, therefore, available for audit or other public scrutiny.

The National Democratic Institute states: "Transparency is a key principle for credible elections. A transparent election process is one in which each step is open to scrutiny by stakeholders (political parties, election observers and voters alike), who are able to independently verify the process is conducted according to procedures and no irregularities have occurred. Providing transparency in an election helps establish trust and public confidence in the process, as voters have a means to verify the results are an accurate reflection of the will of the people."

3) Sections 4 & 5 are insulting to citizens who care enough about elections to actually volunteer their time to get involved in the process. The behaviors listed in Section 5(d) describe behaviors we have seen from Antifa – not from citizen observers. This section also makes election workers a "protected class" which is wholly unnecessary and fosters a two-tiered system of justice. All people, including election workers, observers, and the general public are already protected by current harassment and abuse laws. We are all covered by the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution – "equal protection under the laws".

4) Section 6 is laughable as, without chain of custody, any security plan is meaningless and only serves to obfuscate actual practices from the public.

5) Section 8 holds that signatures submitted on circulated petitions may only be verified by the office of the chief elections officer. That is far from a transparent process. Signature verification should be conducted and witnessed by persons from different parties who have received training in signature verification.

6) Section 12 is ludicrous and absolutely unacceptable. It gives the Secretary of State too much power to subjectively change language on election documents, allows no transparency on this process, and provides no recourse to challenge such changes. As we have seen, the judgment of the Secretary of State is not infallible.

7) Section 16 is a very wordy, confusing section that codifies a bureaucratic runaround for handling complaints of violations of election law brought forth by electors. It shuffles complaints from one place to another and never actually culminates in action.

8) Section 26, the word 'may' should be change to 'must' as follows.

(1) A county clerk **MUST** cancel the registration of an elector in all of the listed circumstances. To retain a person's registration even though the person has requested removal, died, registered to vote in another county or state, or responded to a notice described in ORS 247.563, is unethical, falsely bloats the voter rolls, and creates unnecessary vulnerabilities in our voter system.

9) This bill is not legitimate as it is not written at the 8th grade level – a critical issue that plagues most of the bills proposed this session. As though the 5-page initial document wasn't bad enough in content, the 35-page convoluted amendment brought forth in the House goes above and beyond in unacceptable content and in poorly written, complex composition. I challenge you to give this document to an eighth grader to read and fully comprehend.