

Testimony – SB 243 (CHL & “Adjacent Grounds”)

Chair, members of the committee—thank you. My name is Greg Fishback, I am the owner of the Defensive Arts Center and a certified Defensive Tactics instructor for both DPSST officers and responsible civilians.

So many things are wrong with this bill and how it was presented, but I’m here today to focus on **one** critical issue: This amendment removes the ability of Licensed CHL holders to rely on their legal **affirmative defense under ORS 166.370**—not just inside public buildings, but also on what it now vaguely calls “**adjacent grounds**.”

That could mean sidewalks, courtyards, lawns, shared parking lots—places with **no clear boundaries**.

There’s no way for a CHL holder—or any of the thousands of **licensed public safety professionals** who work in armed security roles throughout the state—to know exactly where they would become a felon.

There is no carve-out for DPSST-certified armed security officers.

That means a licensed, on-duty guard could walk off their post to grab lunch and accidentally break the law just by passing city property.

This bill:

- **Creates legal traps** by criminalizing people not for intent, but for standing in the wrong place—sometimes just feet from a lawful zone. A CHL holder could be perfectly legal on one side of a sidewalk, and a criminal on the other.
- **Builds a very confusing patchwork** by letting various entities create their own rules. What’s legal on Monday in one town could be illegal on Tuesday in the next—without citizens or professionals to be able to track it all.
- **Targets everyday public spaces** like sidewalks outside libraries, bus stops at city hall, or trails that cross a campus.
- **Undermines the CHL program**—punishing vetted, licensed Oregonians who’ve followed every rule
- And sets up **arbitrary enforcement** based on invisible lines and unclear policies

Let’s be honest: this is a **hidden expansion of gun-free zones**, buried in amendment language difficult for the average person to find and completely disconnected from the original bill’s intent.

If you want to create new restrictions, **do it in the open. Write it clearly. Pass it with public and professional input.**

Don’t sneak it through under the label of “adjacent grounds.” hidden in a bill introduced to “**study background checks for gun transfers**”.

At a minimum, this bill needs serious fixing. And please—I implore you to invite subject matter experts to help craft the many changes this bill clearly needs. I’m available.

Thank you.