

Submitter:

Jason Heim

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Rules

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB210

There are little-to-no details in these revised processes would either increase the reliability/security of votes or reduce the administrative costs of collecting and processing votes for elections. Instead, the primary effect of these changes to Oregon voting law would be newly created loopholes that appear to be intentionally designed to give the state administrators who are currently in power more opportunities to unethically manipulate which voters have their ballots successfully entered into the electoral system and which will have their ballots lost.

Just a few examples of these newly exploitable weaknesses in the proposed voting-system adjustments include:

- The revised voting laws, while permitting mail-in ballots to still be requested, require that the voter provide the reason they are unable to vote. There is no objective list of what reasons should be deemed acceptable or not, and no specified process that a denied voter may turn to for speedily appealing a rejection of their provided reason(s). There is also no requirement that enough administrative time/staff be made available to ensure that all of the mail-in ballot requests can be processed before the mandatory deadline (21 days before the election) has been reached.
- The revised voting laws, while permitting mail-in ballots to still be requested, state a mandatory deadline of 21 days before the election to do so. However, there is no mandatory start date anywhere in the revised language for accepting mail-in ballot requests. The time window for requesting a mail-in ballot could be arbitrarily set to just a few days, or even just a few hours long, and it wouldn't technically be illegal.
- The revised voting laws completely eliminate the objective minimum requirement for 1 voting booth per 20,000 voters, and instead make the number of voting booths in each county solely up to the Secretary of State's subjective and arbitrary discretion, with no oversight or transparency over their decision.