

Submitter: Andrew Hall
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB696

Honorable Senators and Representatives,

Thank you for allowing me to testify against Senate Bill 696, which creates new crimes for "rapid fire activators." While its intent may be safety, I oppose it because it will cost Oregon dearly while making us less safe. Here's why.

1. High Financial Costs

SB 696 defines two crimes: unlawful transport, manufacture, or transfer of a rapid fire activator (Class B felony, up to 10 years/\$250,000 fine) and unlawful possession (Class A misdemeanor, up to 364 days/\$6,250 fine). Enforcing this will strain Oregon's budget.

Enforcement and Courts: Police will need training to identify these devices, and the vague definition—any device increasing fire rate—will spark lawsuits, clogging courts. Judicial costs will rise with prosecutions and defenses.

Incarceration: Housing an inmate costs ~\$50,000/year. Just 100 felony convictions could cost \$5 million annually, plus jail costs for misdemeanors. These funds could better support schools or mental health.

Economic Loss: The law may hurt Oregon's firearms and outdoor industries, cutting jobs and tax revenue.

2. Reduced Safety

SB 696 won't enhance safety—it'll weaken it.

Resource Drain: Police will focus on this instead of violent crime, like homicides or assaults, which are rising. Chasing technical violations leaves real threats unchecked.

Criminalizing Citizens: Lawful gun owners—hunters, sport shooters—could face felony charges for devices legal under federal law. This erodes trust in law enforcement, key to safety.

Ineffectiveness: Criminals won't obey this law. Federal rules already limit these devices; SB 696 adds little but burdens law-abiding Oregonians.

3. A Better Way

Instead of SB 696, fund mental health, community policing, or illegal gun trafficking enforcement. These address root causes without wasting money or alienating people.

Conclusion

SB 696 will cost millions in enforcement, incarceration, and lost revenue while

diverting focus from real dangers. I urge a "No" vote for a safer, fiscally sound Oregon.

Thank you,

Andrew Hall

Salem, OR