

**Date:** February 2, 2026

**To:** House Committee on Judiciary  
Oregon State Legislature

**From:** Michael Findlay, Director of Government Relations  
National Shooting Sports Foundation

**Subject: Opposition to HB 4145 (2026 Session)**

---

Chair Kropf and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Michael Findlay, and I am the Director of Government Relations for the National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF), representing the firearms industry, including manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and ranges that operate lawfully and responsibly in Oregon.

**NSSF respectfully oppose House Bill 4145.**

At a high level, HB 4145 attempts to revise and repackage Ballot Measure 114. In practice, it reinforces the same structural problems that have already proven unworkable, while expanding discretionary authority, increasing costs, and creating new compliance risks for lawful businesses and citizens who are already following the law .

**First, the permit-to-purchase system remains fundamentally broken.**

HB 4145 extends processing timelines, raises fees, and expands data collection, but it does not resolve the core issue: the system itself is administratively fragile and resource-intensive. Extending the decision window from 30 to 60 days does not improve performance. It simply codifies delay.

For lawful purchasers, that delay is a real and tangible burden. For retailers, it means canceled transactions, stranded inventory, and customer frustration that they cannot control. None of this enhances public safety.

**Second, the bill expands vague and subjective denial standards that undermine due process.**

HB 4145 allows permits to be denied based on a permit agent's determination that an applicant "may be a danger" based on past behavior or perceived mental or psychological state. That standard is undefined, subjective, and untethered from clear evidentiary thresholds.

From an industry perspective, this creates an unpredictable system where similarly situated applicants can receive different outcomes, not because of disqualifying conduct, but because of discretionary interpretation. That lack of clarity invites inconsistent application, erodes confidence in the system, and increases the likelihood of legal challenges.

**Third, the bill increases costs without demonstrating a corresponding public safety benefit.**

Raising permit and renewal fees may appear modest, but these costs are imposed on individuals who are already complying with the law and successfully passing background checks. The firearms industry already operates under a comprehensive federal and state regulatory framework. There is no evidence that higher fees and longer timelines reduce criminal activity.

What they do increase are barriers to lawful participation and administrative strain on the system itself.

**Fourth, the large-capacity magazine provisions continue to create uncertainty for regulated businesses.**

While HB 4145 attempts to address enforcement timing during periods of injunction, it still leaves manufacturers and dealers operating in a shifting legal environment with criminal penalties attached. Businesses are required to make long-term decisions on inventory, contracts, and manufacturing based on laws that remain subject to abrupt change.

That uncertainty discourages investment, disrupts supply chains, and places Oregon-based businesses at a competitive disadvantage.

**Finally, HB 4145 prioritizes process over outcomes.**

The firearms industry supports policies that focus on violent criminals and unlawful misuse. What we oppose are laws that add layers of paperwork, delay, and discretion while failing to address criminal behavior.

HB 4145 makes compliance harder for lawful actors, increases risk for businesses, and does not meaningfully improve public safety.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the committee to oppose HB 4145.



Michael Findlay  
Director of Government Relations  
National Shooting Sports Foundation