

Submitter: Gianna Simon
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Dear Members of the House Judiciary Committee, I am writing to express my opposition to House Bill 3075, which modifies the firearm permit provisions of Ballot Measure 114 (2022).

As a public school employee especially, I recognize the goal of improving public safety. However, I believe this bill places undue burdens on law-abiding citizens, erodes constitutional protections, and misses the mark on addressing gun violence effectively. First, HB3075 extends the permit issuance timeline from 30 to 60 days and raises application fees. These changes disproportionately impact rural Oregonians with limited access to permit agents and low-income individuals who may find the increased costs a barrier to exercising their Second Amendment rights. Disabled gun owners will face additional burdens because guns they legally own and safely operate could require expensive retrofitting. Law-abiding citizens should not face additional obstacles to their constitutional freedoms.

Additionally, I am deeply concerned about the magazine capacity restrictions upheld through Ballot Measure 114 and reinforced by HB3075. Limiting magazines to 10 rounds undermines self-defense capabilities for law-abiding gun owners, particularly in rural areas where law enforcement response times can be delayed. Standard-capacity magazines—often exceeding 10 rounds—are commonly used for lawful purposes, and there's little evidence that such restrictions reduce crime, as criminals routinely ignore these laws. My own two handguns are 10-round and 19-round magazines. Handguns aren't typically the weapon of choice for mass shooting events.

Furthermore, the bill's expansion of permit requirements and exemptions—delaying full implementation until 2026 or 2028 for certain transfers—creates a confusing patchwork of rules. This risks inconsistent enforcement and could penalize responsible gun owners for unintentional violations. It puts implicit and explicit bias on the part of the LEO front and center in their decision making. Clear, fair, and consistent laws would better serve Oregonians.