

Submitter:	Miriam Grayer
On Behalf Of:	Self
Committee:	Senate Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	SB210

This is my testimony opposing SB 210. I oppose this bill because it appears to be designed specifically to make it harder for Oregonians to vote. We have used mail-in voting for decades. It has increased voters' access to voting and there is no evidence that it has increased fraud, no evidence of any negative outcomes at all, unless of course you consider easier access to voting a negative outcome. This bill appears to have been written by such a person, who considers free access to voting to be undesirable.

The bill requires electors to present valid government-issued photo identification when voting in person. Where is the evidence that unlawful voting is taking place? What if you've changed your name but don't have new ID yet, say, a recent divorcee?

The bill removes language concerning the number of voting booth required in each county, based on population, and gives the Secretary of State, in consultation with county clerks, rulemaking authority to determine the minimum number of booths required. This bill will make voting access vulnerable to the whims of county clerks and potentially a secretary of state whose goal it may be to suppress voting. Most of Oregon is quite rural with very long commutes to get to any kind of population center. Oregon shifted to vote by mail for a reason and that reason is still valid—it provides EQUAL opportunity to vote to everyone, regardless of how far they live from a polling place and regardless of whether a particular official wants people to vote. This is not a fantasy worst case. It's happening in other states in the country already.

The bill requires voting booth designations to be open on the date of the election for at least eight hours, and until 8:00 pm. This means that voting booths could be open only from noon to 8 pm. What about people who work from noon to 8 pm? Nurses, for example, work long shifts that would not permit them to go to a voting booth during those hours.

The bill should require, not just allow, electors who are waiting in line to vote at 8:00 pm to be considered starting the voting process.

The bill allows an elector to request a ballot by mail, no later than 21 days before the election. What about someone who becomes ill or injured, or must travel unexpectedly within 21 days of an election?

The bill requires electors to present valid government-issued photo identification

when requesting a ballot to be returned by mail. How? Will this require an elector to request a mail ballot in person somewhere? This would limit the ability of housebound or rural people to get a mail in ballot. Will this require a person requesting a mail-in ballot to upload their sensitive ID to a portal? We've already seen how insecure this can be under the Trump administration with Trump giving wholesale access to private data to unvetted people without background checks and without a need to know.

The bill requires all ballots returned by mail to be received by the county clerk by 8:00 pm on the date of an election. Citizens can't control mail delivery times. This would allow a corrupt postal official to sway an election by cutting services and extending delivery times, as we saw Louis DeJoy try to do before the 2016 election. Current rules allow a reasonable and not unlimited time for ballots to arrive at the county clerk's office.

The bill repeals the requirement for the state to pay the postage for ballots returned by mail. This makes it harder for people to vote, which appears to be the primary purpose of this bill.

The bill repeals statutes related to voting-by-mail being the primary voting method during an election. Again this appears to be a bill designed to make it harder for people to vote. There is no documented downside to mail-in voting. Have any citizens requested this? Or is it only a bill forwarded by politicians who want to limit free access to voting?

Thank you.