

Submitter: Angelita Sanchez
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4145
Chair, Members of the Committee,

My name is Angelita Sanchez. I am a lifelong rural Oregonian, a CDL driver, and Sweet Home City Councilor.

I want to be very clear: this testimony is not about whether people want safe communities. We all do.

This is about how this bill attempts to implement that goal in a way that places the burden, the cost, and the delay squarely on the backs of lawful, rural Oregonians who are already following the law.

HB 4145 doesn't simply "clean up" Measure 114.
It operationalizes it in a way that expands government control, extends timelines, increases fees, and creates real-world barriers for people who are not the problem.

In my part of Oregon:

- The sheriff's office is already understaffed.
- Appointments are weeks out.
- People drive an hour or more just to access basic services.

Now we are proposing a system where:

- The government has more time to delay a lawful purchase,
- Citizens must pay more for permission to exercise a constitutional right,
- And rural law enforcement is handed an administrative burden they do not have the staffing to carry.

That is not public safety.

That is a paperwork bottleneck that will fall hardest on the people furthest from government.

This bill assumes a level of access to agencies that simply does not exist outside Portland and Eugene.

And when government creates delays, backlogs, and costs around a right, the effect is the same as a restriction — even if that wasn't the stated intent.

That's what concerns me.

Because criminals do not stand in line for permits.
Criminals do not attend safety classes.
Criminals do not wait 60 days for approval.

Law-abiding citizens do.
And they are the only ones this bill will impact.

Last session, I testified against HB 3075 because it attempted to centralize legal authority in one courthouse, ignoring the realities of rural Oregon and equal access to constitutional protections. The same principle leads me here today: when legislation — even under the guise of public safety — creates burdens and barriers that fall hardest on law-abiding citizens simply because of where they live, it functionally infringes on the very rights it claims to protect.

If this body truly wants effective policy, it must start with a simple question:

Will this stop a criminal — or will this frustrate a citizen?

HB 4145 clearly does the latter.

Rural Oregonians are not asking for special treatment.
We are asking for laws that recognize the reality of how we live, how far we travel for services, and how limited our local agencies already are.

Public safety cannot come at the cost of making constitutional rights dependent on proximity to government infrastructure.