

TO: Chair Sen Prozanski, Vice Chair Thatcher and Committee Members

FROM: Colonel Rick Coufal, US Army (Ret)  
Multnomah County Sheriff's Department Law Enforcement Sup (Ret)  
National Rifle Association Firearms Instructor  
National Rifle Association-Institute for Legislative Action, Frontlines  
Activist Leader (FAL) for Oregon

DATE: 26 MAR 2025

#### STATUS ON SB 243-1 – OPPOSED

This switch and stuff Amendment combines four legislative bills into one amendment. Please read my suggestions to make this amendment better, just don't dismiss it, because I am against it.

SB 429, Requires a 72 hr. wait by the gun dealer before he can release the purchased firearm to the buyer and then only if the buyer has a valid Permit to Purchase (PTP) requirement.

SB697 prohibits possession of handguns and semi-auto rifles, shotguns by anyone under 21 yrs of age, except under certain circumstances.

HB3693 Restrictions on Capitol Grounds, Courthouses, Commercial airports serving 1 million plus passengers annually (PDX) along with authorization to create more gun free zones in State, City and Municipality buildings and grounds surrounding or controlled by the government agency when posted.

SB 696 Prohibits possession, purchase, manufactures, sales or transfers Rapid Fire Actuators (RFA). i.e. Binary Trigger system, Bump Stock, Burst Trigger system, Hellfire trigger.

This Amendment is written in legal language that only a lawyer can understand! It exceeds the 8<sup>TH</sup> GRADE READING REQUIREMENT or even High School equivalency that is REQUIRED FOR ALL PROPOSED LEGISLATION, so that the people can read and understand the legislation and its intent. This Amendment is confusing and does not meet the basic written requirement and should be dropped.

## **DEALER PURCHASE AGE RESTRICTIONS**

Let's start with the "DEALER PURCHASE WAITING PERIOD" this section not only requires the buyer to pass a background check, then the dealer must wait an additional 72 hours after the purchase approval from the criminal background check has been finalized and a unique approval number has been issued. This would be bad enough to make the LEGAL and CLEARED firearm purchaser wait the additional 72 hours before they can take possession of the firearm, but a Permit To Purchase (PTP) requirement similar to that found in HB 3075 and Ballot Measure 114 (2022) adds additional requirements that HAVE NOT BEEN PUT IN PLACE AS OF THIS HEARING and probably will not be in place when/if this bill becomes law 91 days after the 83<sup>rd</sup> Legislative Assembly Adjourns sine die. This just adds additional burdens to the gun dealer and the gun buyer without really making the community safer. I am against this measure!

## **RAPID FIRE ACTIVATORS (RFA)**

The next section of SB 243-1 deals with Rapid Fire Activators (RFA), making it a crime of unlawful possession, purchase or receive an RFA. It will also be unlawful to transport, or transfer and RFA. Yet there is no grandfather clause for those who have legally purchased them unless you are a class V Firearms license to own machineguns. All four trigger types of Binary Trigger system, Bump Stock, Burst Trigger system and Hellfire trigger are currently legal to buy, trigger cranks, switches, auto sears are also banned by this amendment. This restriction also has no off ramp for legal firearm owners that have purchased RFA's for their own enjoyment and training. Without a full cost buyback option from the State, why should anyone destroy their RFA or turn it in, of course by turning it in they demonstrate they are guilty of possession and transfer of an RFA. I am against this section of the amendment!

## **FIREARM AGE RESTRICTIONS**

This section of SB 243-1 prohibits possession of certain firearms if under 21 years of age with exceptions. This amendment basically eliminates firearm enthusiasts under 21 years of age from owning, using many lawfully owned firearms by citizens under 21 years of age, without any grandfather or exception clause for current ownership. They are automatically criminals if caught with any of the banned firearms that they were legally given or purchased. Yes, there are

exceptions if the parent or guardian gives the youth (under 21 years of age) the firearm to use. But nothing about the temporary transfer of a firearm to a young adult (under 21 years of age) for the purpose of youth shooting sports where the parent or guardian is not present. This will impact the National Rifle Association Junior's Program, ODFW Hunters Education and many other shotgun, rifle and pistol clubs that are currently open to or focused on the youth shooting sports with semi-automatic firearms. Yes, I saw the exceptions listed on page 11, lines 14 through 20. As well as the list of authorized firearms found on page 12, "who is at least 18 years of age but under 21 years of age and who is not otherwise prohibited under subsection (1) (c) (B) to (H) of this section from possessing: Lines 1 through 15 on page 12. This prohibits anyone under 18 from possessing, using, and owning any firearm. This will cripple the NRA Junior's Program and the ODFW Hunters Education programs for our youths. This seems to be focused on making all Oregon youths that own or shoot firearms guilty of sometime in the future of being an active shooter. The need to reduce gun violence is a State and Federal priority but should not be done at the expense of the law-abiding public.

Banning firearm ownership or possession for individuals under 21 disproportionately impact young adults who rely on firearms for lawful purposes, such as hunting, competitive shooting sports, or self-defense in rural areas. Age-based restrictions overlook the fact that many individuals under 21 are responsible young adults and are trained in firearm safety, often through family traditions or formal programs.

Additionally, age restrictions infringe on our constitutional rights, particularly the Second Amendment, by imposing blanket limitations without considering individual circumstances. 18-21 yr olds in Oregon, are old enough to vote or enlist in any of the military services, also 16-year-olds are automatically registered to vote with "motor voter," two years before they can legally vote! I am against this section as well.

## **PUBLIC AREA RESTRICTIONS**

This section comes out of HB 3693 and talks about locations where CHL holders and non-CHL holders can and cannot carry, with of course some exceptions. It seems like a double standard for CHL holders not to be able to carry in the capitol building complex with the heavy OSP presence, or other state buildings with security. It appears that CHL holders who, traditionally do not have a history of mass shootings/active shooters, cannot be trusted in the capitol complex but are trusted enough to carry concealed in public, except at Hospitals, PDX, Court

houses, school grounds and other county, city and municipalities as posted in Oregon. If someone has a concealed carry permit (CHL) then it is better to have them armed and able to assist in stopping an active shooter or any active felony crime occurring. I am more concerned about what was left out of HB 3693, regarding concealed carry and not incorporated into this amendment. Section 5, page 4 and 5 lines 21 through 9. Basically, changes the current concealed handgun license training requirements. As an NRA firearms instructor (13 years) and a Law Enforcement Firearms Instructor (15 years) I am very familiar with the need for good firearm training for anyone who owns or wants to carry a firearm. Training is critical to safe firearm handling, but our problem in Oregon and the United States is mental health identification, extended treatment and continuous monitoring. Not firearms restrictions, there are too many registered and unregistered to remove firearms from the public, that is not the answer, it is to educate the public starting at an early age with the NRA Eddie Eagle program and to identify, treat and prevent those that should not have access to firearms from firearm ownership or possession. If we are going to do this, let's do it right, which means spending state general fund money on mental health and mental health treatment facilities that we do not currently have. Let's fix this the right way, not as punishment to the legal owners of firearms but to prevent those that should not have access from having access to firearms. Again, I am against this section as written.