

Submitter: Jessica Davidson  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1015

Opposition Statement to SB 1015  
Oregon Community Violence Reduction Grant Program Proposal

Chair Senator Floyd Prozanski, Vice-Chair Senator Kim Thatcher and committee members:  
Senator Anthony Broadman, Senator Sara Gelser Blouin, Senator James Manning Jr. and Senator Mike McLane:

While the intention behind this legislation—to reduce community violence—is admirable, I oppose this measure for several key reasons.

1. Exclusion of Law Enforcement Undermines Public Safety Collaboration

The bill specifically prohibits law enforcement entities from receiving grants or participating directly in the program. This exclusion is counterproductive. Law enforcement plays a critical role in addressing and preventing violence, and excluding them from funding opportunities limits the potential for comprehensive, coordinated community safety strategies. Community-based efforts should complement, not replace, law enforcement.

2. Lack of Accountability and Oversight

There are no clear guidelines in the bill regarding how grant recipients will be held accountable for measurable outcomes. Without robust oversight, public funds could be misused, wasted, or funneled into ineffective programs. Oregon taxpayers deserve transparency and assurance that these grants will yield tangible reductions in violence.

3. Vague Definition of “Community Violence”

The bill defines community violence narrowly—only interpersonal firearm violence in public by non-family members. This definition excludes other significant forms of violence, such as domestic violence, gang-related activities that may not involve firearms, or private incidents with public impacts. Such a limited scope could render the initiative ineffective in truly addressing the broader spectrum of violence affecting communities.

4. Potential for Ideologically Driven Allocation of Funds

Because the bill gives preference to organizations outside of the law enforcement structure, it may disproportionately fund groups based on ideological alignment rather than demonstrated effectiveness. Without strict performance-based metrics, this

could lead to politicization of public safety efforts.

In summary, while reducing community violence must remain a top priority, this bill in its current form lacks the balance, accountability, and strategic clarity needed to ensure its success. I urge each of to reconsider this approach and instead pursue solutions that incorporate law enforcement, emphasize results-driven funding, and expand the definition of violence to reflect real-world conditions.

Thank you,  
Jessica Davidson

::I stand in support of the 2nd Ammendment::