

## **Testimony - SB 698 (CHL & "Adjacent Grounds")**

Chair and members of the committee-thank you. My name is Greg Fishback, and I am the owner of the Defensive Arts Center. I'm a certified Defensive Tactics instructor for both DPSST-licensed professionals and law-abiding civilian students.

This bill raises serious concerns-especially how it impacts responsible CHL holders and licensed armed professionals. I want to focus on a central issue:

SB 698 removes the ability of Licensed CHL holders to rely on their legal affirmative defense under ORS 166.370-not just inside buildings, but on vaguely defined "adjacent grounds."

That term is dangerously unclear. It could mean:

- Sidewalks
- Lawns
- Parking lots
- Courtyards
- Transit stops near city property

There's no clear way to know where legal carry ends and criminal liability begins. No signage, no boundaries-just risk.

Even something as simple as turning around in a public parking lot after missing a turn while driving could result in a criminal offense. That's not hypothetical-it's the kind of everyday situation thousands of Oregonians encounter.

While there has been talk of reducing the severity of the penalties under this bill, those changes have not yet been enacted, and the exposure to criminal charges remains.

Critically, there's no exemption for DPSST-certified armed security officers. That means an on-duty, licensed guard could be charged simply for stepping across unclear boundaries while performing routine tasks like grabbing lunch or returning to a work site.

SB 698 does the following:

- Creates legal traps by criminalizing location, not intent
- Breaks continuity for law enforcement and private security professionals working statewide
- Applies inconsistently-with different entities making rules CHL holders can't realistically track
- Targets ordinary public spaces like library sidewalks, park paths, or shared parking lots
- Undermines the CHL framework and punishes Oregonians who followed every rule
- Encourages arbitrary enforcement based on invisible, undefined boundaries

Let's be honest: this is a broad expansion of restricted zones, hidden inside amendment language that doesn't reflect the original bill's stated purpose.

If the intent is to restrict carry in more places, that debate should happen openly-with clarity, transparency, and public input. Not through vague language like "adjacent grounds" buried in a bill about background check studies.

At a minimum, this bill needs serious revision. I urge the committee to bring in subject matter experts before moving this forward. I'm available and willing to help.

Thank you for your time.

*-Greg Fishback*

*Defensive Arts Center, LLC*

