

Submitter: Sean Gordon
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

To normalize my feedback I'm going to include background info here in the hopes it's weighted. I'm a gun owner, but I'd like to think I can find the happy medium in issues.

I:

- voted yes on Measure 114
- am a gun owner
- am Democrat
- am Veteran
- have a BS in Criminal Justice
- voted for Representative Kropf
- am a parent
- am disgusted when mass shootings occur

TL;DR -

I am opposed to the fee increase, exemption list (deferral until 2028) and retroactive effect of > 10 round magazines proposed in HB 3075.

Measure 114 (BM 114) has reasonable restrictions in place, enough for this gun owner to have voted for it. Please don't 'pile on' restrictions/financial hurdles in HB 3075 that make reasonable gun owners not want to vote for this type of legislation in the future.

—Now with detail—

Permit Fee increases

This signals to all those gun owners that the government can't do cost projections, budgeting and is just interested in financially penalizing legal gun owners. The win of BM 114 is coming to fruition; make it something everyone, including gun owners, can live with. Make it something that is shaped around reasonable gun ownership and not punitive.

Magazine ownership, retroactive to BM 114 passing:

Magazines with capacities that are greater than 10 rounds have been sold in OR since BM 114 was placed on hold. It's actually hard to find 'capacity compliant' (<=10 round magazines) firearms of certain models and magazines in OR right now (2025). Even if not sought out there are entire firearm models that are not sold without a <= 10 round magazine. Please don't 'dunk' on these people and make their purchases criminal actions retroactively. Please consider the magazines illegal after the point

where they can be purchased.

The other area retroactive magazine ownership will go sideways is in enforcement. Asking law abiding citizens to produce receipts for magazines that they did not need to keep at the time of purchase is unreasonable. Asking law enforcement to enforce this will get reasonable push backs and flat out protest from the less reasonable, 'constitutional Sheriffs', of rural counties.

HB 3075 permit requirement exceptions are not consistent with the purpose of safety through training. This worries me from a few vectors as a gun owner that wants to see training requirements put in place around firearms:

1. HB 3075 defers permitting/training requirements of specific firearms based on types. This implies some firearms are more dangerous than others. Don't fight this fight. All firearms require some sort of safety training.
2. The 2028 delayed guns have a slower rate of fire and/or magazine change rate. This will be identified as what it is if you're singling out these types of firearms; a tax or financial hardship for some firearms and not a training/permitting focus. Don't fight that fight with the gun lobby; it's not productive. All firearms necessitate training.
3. This smacks of bills being written by people who do not know firearms. This is akin to bathroom bans; laws borne out of ignorance (in the strictest sense of the word) and ideology. As an example, semi-automatic firearms have benefits in sport shooting and hunting that are outside of rate of fire. Let our laws be well thought through, dispassionate measures. Let them stand proudly, supporting a goal of safety and not 'winning' vs the other side.

I am worried a little about BM 114.

Please make sure the training is accessible and productive. I'm now out of characters :(