

Written Testimony in Opposition to HB 4145  
Submitted by: Michael Saindon  
Tillamook, Oregon

Chair and Members of the Committee,

I am writing in opposition to HB 4145.

This bill significantly expands and modifies the already controversial framework created under Ballot Measure 114 by adding new layers of cost, delay, bureaucracy, and legal complexity to the firearm purchase and transfer process in Oregon.

HB 4145 does not simply “clarify” Measure 114. It materially changes it in ways that will have serious consequences for law-abiding citizens while doing little to address criminal misuse of firearms.

First, the bill extends the permit issuance timeline from 30 days to 60 days. In many rural counties, sheriff and police staffing levels already struggle to meet existing demands. Doubling the processing time effectively creates a de facto waiting period measured in months, not days, for citizens who are legally eligible to purchase a firearm.

Second, the bill increases fees for permits up to \$150 initially and \$110 for renewal, plus additional background check costs. This creates a financial barrier to exercising a constitutional right, disproportionately affecting lower-income Oregonians.

Third, HB 4145 requires fingerprinting, photographing, extensive documentation, and places all permit holders into a statewide electronic database that is explicitly exempt from public records law. This level of data collection and secrecy raises serious privacy and civil liberties concerns for lawful citizens.

Fourth, the bill expands the authority of permit agents to deny permits based on subjective determinations of whether a person may be a “danger to self or others” based on past behavior patterns, a standard that is vague, highly discretionary, and prone to inconsistent application.

Fifth, HB 4145 restricts where legal challenges to the law may be filed, requiring them to be brought only in Marion County Circuit Court. This limits access to justice for residents across the state and appears designed to discourage lawful legal challenges.

Finally, the bill alters enforcement language related to large capacity magazines in a way that creates confusion about what is lawful during periods of court injunctions and after appellate rulings, adding further legal uncertainty for citizens and businesses attempting to comply with the law.

This bill adds complexity, cost, delay, and legal risk for law-abiding Oregonians while offering little evidence that it will reduce criminal activity. Criminals do not apply for permits, attend safety classes, or comply with magazine restrictions. These burdens fall almost entirely on responsible citizens.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge a NO vote on HB 4145.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Michael Saindon