

Submitter: James McHughes

On Behalf
Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary and Ballot Measure 110
Implementation

Measure: SB1510

Dear Senate Committee,

I am writing you today with mixed reactions to SB1510.

I whole heartedly support requiring officers to advise citizens of their right to refuse a consent search.

But I DO NOT support banning or dropping lighting violations down to secondary infractions

Back in 2019 I noticed a driver leaving a local bar in Clackamas County. I dialed 911 and reported him as a suspect drunk driver. As I followed him the driver was able to stay in his lane and was not speeding.. but his left brake light was out. An Officer stopped him and later that night I got a phone call that he was arrested for DUII with a blood alcohol of 0.18...over 2 times the legal limit and his license had been suspended previously due to a past DUII.

Incidents like this occur everyday and cannot be discounted or ignored when pushing for reforms.

There is a reason MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving) have opposed legislation like this in other states. Although noble it will have unintended consequences of hindering the important work of Law Enforcement.

Looking back at HB2002 from last year the outcry from the public was large, and merely browsing the public testimony page and the list of witnesses signed up to testify would show you that a large portion of the citizens and police organizations were against HB2002.

Reform is important but if reform makes it harder to catch real criminals than it's more of a hindrance than a benefit.

James McHughes
Clackamas, OR