

Submitter: Connor King  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB210

To the committee regarding SB 210,

I strongly urge a NO vote, and am incensed that elected members would spuriously target one of Oregon's most well-loved and effective programs.

This bill, should it be enacted, will disproportionately restrict the most vulnerable Oregonians from voting in our elections. Setting aside the increased cost/administrative burden of maintaining new polling stations across the state, access to those polling stations will create a new hurdle for those with physical disabilities and inconsistent access to transportation. Many Oregonians use mobility aids like motorized wheelchairs, scooters, and other devices that require vehicles to be specially modified in order to transport them safely. Users of these devices will have a harder time accessing polling stations, especially in rural areas where Oregonians will have to travel much farther in order access a polling place. What paratransit services do exist often restrict passengers to medical or health related trips. Many of these would-be voters are elderly, and have fixed incomes that preclude them from using more expensive options like taxis and rideshare apps. Giving such voters a mail alternative is absolutely ridiculous when voting by mail is already the standard in Oregon. Oregon consistently has high-turnout low-cost elections precisely because of vote by mail.

Repealing vote-by-mail would raise costs, reduce access, and reduce participation.

Despite a government task force on the subject, no substantial voter fraud has been found in vote by mail programs. There is no real benefit to SB 210.

Given these harmful effects, and the bill's lack of merit, it is a transparent attack on Oregon elections. As others have no doubt pointed out, many of Oregon's rural conservative leaning counties would be disproportionately affected by this measure. So, we are left with a measure that benefits no-one except representatives wishing to score some political clout on the national stage to the detriment of their constituents.

Absolutely NO to SB 210.

Sincerely,  
Connor King