

Re: SB 796

To the Senate Judiciary Committee:

I understand the concern about untrained people carrying guns, but there is nothing to indicate that there is a training deficiency. Just because the state is not requiring a shooting test does not mean concealed carriers are not working on improving their overall proficiency, seeking additional training, and regularly practicing. More than just a lack of need, such a requirement is going to seriously disenfranchise people simply due to lack of facilities.

I live in one of the more populated counties in Oregon, Washington County. Despite our large population, the nearest, and effectively only, ranges are Yamhill County Sportsmen's Association and Tri-County Gun Club. Both of which are nearly an hour each way from my home. At present, CHL training is available in classroom settings at numerous locations throughout the county, and there is ample access to public land in the Tillamook State Forest where people can practice their live fire. Both of the previously mentioned ranges are at their membership capacity and are seeing record usage; meanwhile CHL classes are also experiencing record enrollment. With that in mind, it is not hard to see how restricting people's training to just these two facilities is going to act as a major bottleneck. This is going to stop individuals from getting the training they need to be an effective and proactive participant in their safety. This represents not only a serious disenfranchisement of people's rights, but it is a completely unnecessary one at that.

This concern could be rectified with the creation of public ranges in underserved areas. There are even Federal funds, from the Pittman-Robertson Act, available for various hunting and conservation related projects, one of which can be the construction of public shooting ranges. Though given the lack of a training problem, therefore the lack of necessity for this bill, the creation of public ranges would also be unnecessary. Fortunately too because this then leaves the Department of Fish and Wildlife's current allocation for Pittman-Robertson funds unaltered and that is preferable.

Another concern I've heard voiced is over webpage training courses without a live instructor. This strikes me as a much more valid concern than the non-existent deficiency in training. It would also be much more straightforward to rectify this issue directly; requiring training to be taught by a live person but permitting the use of technology such as Skype or other teleconferencing tools. This increases accessibility, in particular to the handicapped, and ultimately everyone too.

In conclusion, there's no demonstrated need for a shooting test and such a test would deprive countless members of our communities of the training they need to be an effective participant, not only in their own security but also that of our society as a whole. On the other hand there are ways in which we can redirect the possible misapplication of technology in the form of webpage based classes and instead better utilize technology in the form of teleconferencing tools to more effectively include a wider range of people.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Chris Janik

Forest, Grove, OR