

April 21, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I am not opposed to firearm buyer background checks but I do object to the requirements of Senate Bill 941. My understanding of the bill is that it will mandate that the seller and buyer go to a FFL gun dealer and obtain a criminal background check on the buyer, except for gun show transactions between private parties as mentioned below. The requirement to perform a background check through a FFL gun dealer is totally unnecessary to obtain a background check and adds the additional cost of the gun dealer's fee.

I do not have a FFL dealer license but have sold a firearm privately in the past and have obtained a background check on the buyer prior to the transfer. The process was and still is as follows:

- 1) Download a State of Oregon Firearms Transfer Record form from the Oregon State Police website.
- 2) Buyer and seller complete the form.
- 3) The seller calls the Oregon State Police and requests a background check on the buyer.
- 4) The seller receives a response of "Approved", "Denied", or "Pending/Delayed" from the State Police.
- 5) Assuming the transfer is approved, the seller receives a transaction approval number.
- 6) The seller pays the State Police the background check fee which was \$10 at the time.
- 7) The seller signs the form and completes the transfer.
- 8) The seller keeps the Transfer Record form for 5 years.

The above process is exactly what is required of non-FFL seller and buyer at gun shows, no FFL gun dealer is involved. The goal of the process is to have a background check done on the buyer, the Oregon State Police has a detailed record of the transaction and the seller keeps the Transfer Record form for 5 years. The goal of SB 941 is met, the FFL dealer adds no value to the transaction. I believe the above process should be extended to all private transfers.

I am 100% against getting a FFL gun dealer involved when it is totally unnecessary. If the seller and buyer don't know how to perform the background check and want the help of a FFL gun dealer that is fine and the service should be available, however it should not be mandatory that a dealer be involved. Also there should be a limit placed on what a FFL dealer can charge for their service.

I do have a Federal Firearms Curio and Relics license issued by BATFE. This is not a dealer's license, it is a license that allows me to purchase certain firearms that are 50 or more years old without involving a FFL dealer. I strongly urge that SB 941 be amended to state that C&R holders are not required to have a FFL dealer involved when purchasing a firearm that meets the BATFE requirements. C&R holders have already gone through a BATFE background check as have FFL dealers.

Sincerely,

Richard Sundstrom
Forest Grove, OR