

I am in FULL OPPOSITION of this proposed bill for a number of reasons.

Federal Firearms Licensees are already currently regulated and held to a high standard with regards to federal law. The establishment of a state license would be an undue burden on businesses both large and small that are already struggling in the current economy. This initiative would also require the allocation of tax dollars for an unnecessary study in the attempt to establish redundant regulations. The parameters and goal of the study has not been outlined, which leads me to believe that there either isn't one, or that the aim is to gauge public interest of those who have already proven to be supportive of such measures, yet ignorant of the facts regarding firearm sales, safety, and regulations. There is already plenty of data that shows a vast majority of firearms involved in crimes are not acquired through legal channels. They are either stolen or purchased illegally not from an FFL by the eventual offender prior to the commission of the crime. Imposing further regulations on the businesses that are not the cause of the problem will do nothing to reduce overall crime or crimes involving firearms. Criminals do not respect or follow laws, creating more laws will not change this very obvious reality.

Other costs that businesses would have to incur to be in compliance are absolutely outrageous. The data storage requirement to comply with the video surveillance portion of this bill is impossibly costly for large corporations, let alone small businesses. The requirements being:

“(A) The system must clearly record images and, for systems located inside the premises, audio, of the area under surveillance.

“(B) Each camera must be permanently mounted in a fixed location. Cameras must be placed in locations that allow the camera to clearly record activity occurring in all areas described in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph and reasonably produce recordings that allow for the clear identification of any person.

“(C) The areas recorded by the system must include all of the following:

“(i) Interior views of all entries or exits to the premises.

“(ii) All areas in which firearms are displayed.

“(iii) All points of sale, in a manner sufficient to identify the parties involved in the transaction.

“(D) The system shall continuously record 24 hours per day at a frame rate of no less than 15 frames per second.

“(E) The media or device on which recordings are stored shall be secured in a manner to protect the recording from tampering, unauthorized access or use or theft.

“(F) Recordings must be maintained for a minimum of **five years**.

“(G) Recorded images must clearly and accurately display the date and time.

To illustrate the financial impact of this requirement I give the following example:

If a business were to have 4 cameras with 1080p resolution, which would be enough to effectively surveil a very small space, 24/7 video with audio would need roughly 44.5GB per camera, per day, or about 178GB per day total. If they chose to create redundancy to not miss any recordings in the case of a failure in the main storage device, at 20-50% more. To store 5 years' worth of audio and video recordings with redundancy, you'd need 390-488TB of storage. This amount of storage would cost TEN'S OF THOUSANDS in equipment alone. Once you include

installation costs and maintenance to remain in compliance, it would be beyond what a vast majority of businesses could afford. This would cause irreparable harm to citizens and small business owners in Oregon, and would be highly unlikely to have a positive impact on crimes involving firearms. As I stated before, there is plenty of data from peer reviewed studies that shows a vast majority of firearms involved in crimes are not purchased legally by offenders from federally licensed dealers. This portion alone appears to be an obviously obstructive requirement with the goal of putting firearm dealers out of business. This is a net negative for Oregonians. It would lessen our ability to observe our right to self-defense, result in lower economic opportunities statewide, and would do little to nothing to reduce criminal gun violence in the state.

This brings me to the most troubling aspect of this bill is the reporting requirement that would be imposed on the licensees. The State requiring the licensees to report the personal and private information of customers, to include; serial numbers of firearms sold, the identity of purchasers, and details of the permit to purchase issued under ORS 166.505, runs afoul of the 4th Amendment of the US Constitution, as well as Article 1 Section 9 of the Oregon Bill of Rights. As citizens of this country and state “No law shall violate the right to the people to be secure in their person, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable search or seizure: and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause.” This bill very clearly violates this unalienable right. The State requiring a business to report the identity along with the serial numbers of legally purchased firearms without investigating a crime, having a search warrant, or probable cause is undoubtably unconstitutional. This data is only needed in the event that a crime is committed and being investigated. A vast majority of firearm owners keep personal records of their firearms because they are valued property. In the event of theft or loss due to some sort of disaster, this data can be, and is already required to be provided to the relevant entities. There is no just cause for The State to compile this data of law-abiding citizens.

These observations of this bill have left me with the following questions:

- What is the ACTUAL purpose for this redundancy? The BATFE have been tasked with the regulation of firearm dealers, and hold licensees to a high standard of compliance.
- Has anyone involved in the creation of this bill actually thought about the financial impacts of such a system not only for The State, but for those that would be most affected? It appears they either have not, or simply do not care. Neither of those answers are acceptable.
- Have the possible Constitutional conflicts of these proposals been examined? I’m not a legal expert by any means, but if there is even a question that any portions of this bill are unconstitutional, it will be argued in court. This means costly court proceedings paid for by tax dollars of the very people that this bill will put out of business.

Attempts to legislate based on the feelings surrounding gun violence and not using an honest data driven approach this bill will do nothing to address the root issue of firearm related crimes and gun violence all while greatly harming Oregonians and small business owners.

THIS BILL MUST BE OPPOSED IN ITS ENTIRETY.