

Greetings,

I am writing today to register my very strong opposition to SB554. As you know, SB 554 repeals Oregon's "pre-emption" statute which restricts the creation of gun laws to the state legislature. Under SB 554, any locality will be able to write whatever gun laws they like. Frankly, I'm quite surprised that the Oregon legislature is willing to relinquish that authority.

First off, SB554 could result in the creation of a vast hodge-podge of laws within Oregon such that a person who might be lawfully carrying a concealed firearm can unwittingly become a felon should they walk or drive another 10 feet into an area where an entirely new set of laws apply. This could be the case even if the firearm were not even removed from the holster.

Secondly, SB554 would place thousands of "public buildings" off-limits to licensed concealed-carry holders. This creates a mine field for an otherwise law-abiding citizen. How is the average citizen expected to know of every "public building" in the state? Of course, DMV offices are easily identifiable, but I know for a fact that PERS leases space in various office parks. How is someone expected to know where every state, county or city government entity leases space, potentially shared with non-government entities, that might classify that space as a "public building" ? If someone, who is otherwise a law-abiding citizen, who happens to be a legally authorized concealed-carry licensee and is concealed-carrying their firearm, has business to conduct with that neighboring non-government entity, should they potentially become a felon by merely passing nearby those leased government offices? Again, this could be the case even if the firearm were not even removed from the holster.

Oregonians need a consistent set of laws to follow in order to remain law-abiding citizens. That is why the pre-emption statute was established in the first place and that needs to remain the case for those who are legally authorized to carry a concealed firearm. Imagine, for example, if the laws governing driving a car were not similar statewide and a driver could be ticketed for a simple maneuver, such as a right-turn-on-red, in one city but not in the adjacent city. How could a person be expected to make any sense of such a situation and remain a law-abiding citizen?

Thank you for your time,
David Gaffney Jr
Hillsboro, OR