

From: [Alex Horn](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP 17 Explanatory Statement
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 2:32:45 AM

Good evening Senator.

I wish to email you regarding the explanatory statement of IP17 and state that the explanatory statement that has been published is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure, which is not a speculation. Working knowledge of firearms would allow you to realize that not all types of ammunition are the same and mini shells would also have to be banned, or directly discussed, allowing for an exception. Whether the specific rounds be in a tubular fed or magazine fed, these rounds are shorter and allow for more rounds to be loaded into the firearm at a time.

The searchable database that is to be maintained by law enforcement agencies should not be implemented, period. If the federal government is barred from maintaining a searchable database, then the local governments should be barred as well. There is no reason that a right should be regulated as such. Cars can be regulated because it is a privilege, not a right. The constitution is very clear on this matter and all laws contradicting the text are null and void.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure. Many law enforcement agencies have come forward saying that they do not have the funding to provide these services to the public and there is no statement that allows funding for these services to create these services so that the people of Oregon can obtain this training that you seek to require. There is no funding for this measure or others that are similar and looks to clarify mandates after the enactment of the law without further input from civilians.

In light of the recent Breun decision that was released by the supreme court as well as other past rulings such as Heller, I would say that this bill is unconstitutional as is the same with other legislation that has been put forth. I object to the legislation as a whole and voters should not be misled by the wording and "bullet points" that has been provided for the legislation.

--

Alexander Horn
Newberg Resident

From: [Terra Kloepfer](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Objection to Ballot Measure 114
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 4:05:17 AM

Dear Secretary Fagan

My name is Terra Kloepfer. I'm a resident of the state of Oregon in the city of Portland, Multnomah County. I am a leftist transwoman who has lived in the state of Oregon for the past four years.

I am also a gun owner.

I'm reaching out to your office regarding ballot measure 114, which is a proposed measure for the ballad that would enact strict gun control laws in the state of Oregon. Has the owner of three firearms, I am part of the population that would be affected by this ballot measure should it pass. In the wake of the mass shooting such as an Uvaldi Texas and Buffalo New York, it is more clear than ever that the United States has massive issues with firearms, and those who use them. I personally understand the response coming from the heart regarding such a ballot measure. I have a seven-year-old son who is the same age as the victims in Uvalde Texas. Anything had happened to him in the event of a mass shooting, I would be devastated and I would be very much reacting out of emotion.

However, I also do not believe that we should rush into judgment and pass overreaching, draconian laws that are damn near unenforceable and do not solve the problem at its core.

To be upfront, I do not object to everything in the ballot measure itself. I'm a firm believer in that gown owners should take safety courses as part of their gun ownership. They should be aware of how to use their firearms responsibly. What I object to is the fact that ballot measure 114 does not provide any wording or action as to how these trainings will be taught. It also does not state how they will be funded, nor does it provide any form of provision that would enable gun owners from lower socioeconomic classes to be able to obtain "buyers permits" or even pay for the safety courses they would be required to take.

My biggest objection, however, stems from the fact that ballot measure 114 wishes to give the Oregon state police, local law-enforcement agencies, and county level sheriffs offices final say and sole arbitration as to who gets buyers permits and who doesn't. Given that over the last five years there have been multiple shootings involving police officers killing innocent civilians, primarily people of color and those who are having mental health crises. People from marginalized communities, such as the black, Hispanic, indigenous, Asian, LGBTQ plus, etc., Will be much less likely to approach law-enforcement and entrusted them to have their best interest at heart when it has been demonstrably demonstrated, especially during 2020 and the Portland protest, that the people do not trust or have any faith in law-enforcement agencies. The Portland police bureau is going through a staffing shortage crisis, as it is unable to fill the rules needed to just maintain simple policing in the city. To add onto this work load by having them also keep track of every single individual large capacity magazine, firearm, and the owners and their addresses and their licensing, is absurd bordering on mind boggling.

The third point in which to make is that one of these things that people who advocate for stricter gun control and gun laws is that it will reduce crime. However, as it has been

demonstrated over the past two years, that is not the case. There is more money than ever going into law enforcement, especially in the city of Portland. However, despite that, shootings are on the rise. Crime is on the rise. What is being overlooked is the fact that we as a country have undergone the massive trauma of a global pandemic that has killed over 1 million Americans. People who are traumatized lash out and act out in irrational ways, and seek means of control. I myself suffer from immense trauma as a result of sexual assault, rape, police brutality, right-wing violence, and nearly dying from medical causes. There have been more than enough people in Portland Oregon alone who have been murdered by police while they are having a mental health crisis.

Additionally, the United States of America is coming apart at the seams. We are more divided than ever, and in times of crisis, opportunists arise. This ballot measure will not impact criminals. It will only be detrimental to legal gun owner such as myself.

As a final note, I want to remind you and those in your office and under you and at the legislative capital building in Salem, that this ballot measure, should it go on to be put on there, will galvanize the far right and the Republicans. We have just barely gotten out of living under a fascist president, and I myself have lived in fear for the past four years that I will be a victim of a violent right wing attack. If the Democrat party of Oregon wants to maintain its power, it needs to understand that overbearing gun control is not the way. There is a better way to do this. We have to be willing to not act out of emotion, but out of logic and ethic. As a responsible, leftist, and Queer gun owner, I want to be able to have the means to defend myself from the violence that I am very much afraid is right around the corner. To disarm disenfranchised in marginalized groups and leave them to the wolves that is the fascist Republican party is turning your back on the people that you claim to represent. I really hope that you consider what will happen in seven years rather than what will happen at the end of this one.

Thank you for your time

Terra Kloepper

From: [T. M.](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Re: Firearms Measure IP17--Upcoming Voter's Guide
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 5:20:18 AM

Dear Committee Members:

This letter is a follow-up to the ***Explanatory Statement*** recently adopted by the committee.

The explanatory statement is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

The statement falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. That must not be allowed to remain in the statement.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure.

The statement fails to clarify many mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input.

The whole statement is totally unacceptable and I strongly urge you to reconsider adopting it in its current form.

Sincerely,

Todd Miller
Portland, OR

From: T. M.
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 8:09 AM
To: elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov <elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>
Subject: Firearms Measure IP17--Upcoming Voter's Guide

Dear Committee Members:

In the interest of fairness and full disclosure to Oregon voters, I would ask you to include the following facts in any statement about your firearms

measure IP17 to be published in the upcoming voter's guide. It is vital that the voters know the substantive content of any measure that appears on the ballot.

The measure outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit. Most shotguns which have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 “mini shells” making them illegal to purchase. This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon.

The measure requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training.

The measure only allows those approved by police to provide the required “training” to apply for a permit. Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed. There is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or manpower to provide classes. Police in urban areas are already not responding to most violent crimes.

There are no exceptions for the required permit for Federally licensed dealers or law enforcement.

The Oregon State Sheriff’s Association has estimated that if a person somehow could complete the required training, the permitting process would cost sheriffs almost \$40,000,000.00 annually. There is nothing in the measure that provides any funding and the fees included would not come close to covering the costs. There is no estimate on the cost or impact on small local police departments.

While the measure caps the cost for a permit, there are no caps on the costs for the required training, which is unlikely to be available anyway. This will mostly affect low income communities.

The measure requires that the required class (taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers) include training on

state and federal law, transfers and storage, and the “impact of suicide on the country as a whole.” There is no indication of who would be qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved.

The measure requires that a sheriff or local police department issue a permit within 30 days after an approved background check has been completed by the State Police. But there is NO limit on how long the State Police can take to complete the background check and NO penalties if they do not complete it. There are no estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police.

The measure requires a public list of persons who attempt to purchase firearms.

The measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets.

The measure requires a permit from local police (which may be impossible to get) just to apply for permission from the Oregon State Police simply to buy a firearm. But it also removes the one safeguard that protects gun buyers if the State Police do not complete their background check.

State and Federal law allow the transfer of a firearm if the State Police don't complete a background check in 3 business days. This measure removes that safeguard. So a single mom with threats against her and her children could literally wait forever to get permission to get a home defense firearm.

Thank you.

Very Sincerely,

Todd Miller
Portland, OR

From: [Torsten Kamrath](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP17
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 9:38:25 AM

Concerned citizen and payer of your wages

The explanatory statement is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that ^{der} most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

The statement falsely claims that the ~~examples from public discipline that must~~ not be allowed to remain in the statement.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure. The statement fails to clarify many

^e mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input. Agreeing on falsehoods and disrespecting and violating the Oregon and US constitution is not what you are being paid for.

Sincerely

Torsten Kamrath



OREGON HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

Protecting Oregon's Wildlife, Habitat and Hunting Heritage

P.O. Box 1706, Medford, OR 97501 • (541) 772-7313
oha@oregonhunters.org • oregonhunters.org

July 29, 2022

Secretary of State Fagan
Elections Division
Salem, OR 97310

Subject: Comments on Explanatory Statement for IP 17

The Oregon Hunters Association, with 24 chapters statewide, has reviewed the draft Explanatory Statement for IP17 and finds that it is woefully inadequate to describe the real impact of this measure. Even worse, it is misleading. We are an Association of law abiding citizens, hunters and hunting families that enjoy the freedom of the outdoors and our right to hunt and bear arms for self defense and recreational shooting.

The Explanatory Statement must make clear that IP17 is really two measures in one. Sections 3-10 create a new "permit to purchase" system that is placed on the backs of Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs to carry out. Section 11 is completely separate and bans magazines over 10 rounds. If a voter wants to "ban" large capacity magazines, but doesn't support a new permit system they have no choice but to accept a permit system with a "yes" vote even if they only support a magazine limit. Or support a permit system even if they oppose magazine limits. These two distinct effects must be pointed out clearly as separate. Voters must know they are voting on two different things. There is **no** connection between a "permit to purchase" system and a limit on magazine capacity.

The major effect of IP17, in our view, is the creation of duplicative and overly burdensome "permit to purchase" system. The current Explanation Statement states: "No permit required to obtain firearms". That is misleading and false, since all firearm sales require OSP to conduct thorough gun background checks under Oregon law (ORS 166.412). IP17 really creates a **second** "permit" background check which is a complete duplication and then some. The new "permit" requires additional things such as classes and live fire proficiency and an extra \$65 fee in addition to any classroom fees, fingerprinting fees, photo fees, range fees, etc that a local Sheriff or Chief may deem necessary. It is in effect a "super background check" before you can get a second one. The extra red tape is an attempt to prohibit law abiding citizens from exercising their 2nd Amendment Right.

The Explanatory Statement needs to point out this redundancy in clear terms.

IP17 contemplates a permit system run by Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police. But there is nothing in IP17 that **compels** law enforcement to engage in offering "permits to purchase". Section 4 creates the permit process, putting the burden on Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police to develop and implement the permits. However, there is nothing in IP17 that compels a Sheriff or Chief to create an application system for permits, or to issue ANY permits if they choose not to, **or are directed not to issue permits by local politicians, especially in the case of Chiefs.**

Currently, Sheriffs and Police Chiefs are overwhelmed and understaffed to deal with anything other than major crimes. They lack the funding and staffing to provide basic public safety. The permit process created by IP17 requires the creation of new labor intensive programs, fingerprinting, photographs, classes, databases, live fire, certification of trainers, etc. IP17 provides no funding other than a \$65 permit fee, which is unlikely to cover the cost of these permits. If Sheriffs and Chiefs can't or won't set up a permit process, or it takes months or years of waiting for a permit, IP17 effectively bars gun purchases by Oregon residents in Oregon.

A right delayed is a right denied.

If a Sheriff or Chief chooses not to, or is forbidden from accepting applications for a permit, they will never "deny" a permit to trigger the appeal process in Section 5. This will effectively take away the Second Amendment Rights of law abiding citizens to keep and bear arms.

Nothing in IP17 prohibits Sheriffs or Chiefs from requiring classes provided by third party vendors and those vendors can charge whatever they want. This places an additional cost burden on low income, racial and ethnic minorities.

Sheriffs budgets are controlled by County Commissioners, and Chiefs are hired by and report to Mayors and City Councils. If local politicians forbid Chiefs to issue ANY permits, a potential applicant is out of luck, since they can only obtain the permit from a chief or sheriff with "jurisdiction over the residence of the person" -Section 4(1)(a). Likewise, if a Sheriff refuses to create a permit program due to lack of resources or budget restrictions, a citizen has no way to obtain a permit, and effectively their Second Amendment rights are denied. They can't travel to a different Oregon jurisdiction to obtain a permit.

This scenario is likely to play out in major metropolitan areas such as Portland, Salem and Eugene as well as others which have substantial ethnic and racial minorities and liberal political leaders who are opposed to gun rights.

While affluent residents can choose to drive or fly to Washington, Idaho or California to purchase a firearm without a "permit to purchase", low income residents and minorities

that lack the mobility to go out of state will lose the ability to legally acquire a firearm. And if they do manage to travel out of state they will have to pay more due to sales taxes that Oregon doesn't impose.

This puts a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minorities. The current impact statement fails to address the fact that obtaining a permit will hit these residents the hardest. If obtaining a legal "permit to purchase" proves impossible or cost prohibitive, it will drive otherwise law abiding citizens to resort to illegal firearm purchases. This circumvents the existing background check system, and will put these citizens at risk of arrest, fines and possible imprisonment for violations.

Another major effect of IP17 will be to deprive the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife of federal revenue. The draft statement overlooks this entirely. Excise Tax Funds from the sale of firearms and ammunition go into the Federal Pittman-Robertson Fund, which is distributed to states based on sales within a state. Many hunters and other potential gun owners will bypass this onerous permit system by shopping online and picking up their firearm by driving to WA, ID, CA or other states. Those states will reap the extra federal funding, and ODFW will be a loser to the detriment of wildlife programs. Oregon received \$14.3 M in 2020 from firearms and related sporting equipment sales which will be at risk as in-state sales drop significantly.

Another impact of IP17 will be to diminish hunter participation. OHA works with youths, women and other communities to promote hunting as a healthy family activity. IP17's permit system will create a barrier to participation. Hunter Safety Education is already required for youth and new hunters. It covers gun safety and live fire, but doesn't teach about suicide (not appropriate in a hunter ed class) so these courses would not qualify as firearms training even though they have been taught successfully for generations.

A further impact from IP17 will be the destruction of fund raising by non-profit conservation groups including OHA, Ducks Unlimited, Rocky Mt. Elk Foundation and others who hold numerous banquets and various raffles/auctions of firearms to raise money for wildlife habitat and conservation efforts statewide. If the "winner" of a raffle or auction for a firearm doesn't happen to possess a "permit to purchase" they will be prohibited from obtaining a background check to claim their firearm. This will effectively end this means of fundraising for all these groups.

Sections 3-10 of IP17 will effectively place enough "speed bumps" in front of law abiding citizens that will either preclude them from obtaining a permit, or simply make Oregonians go out of state to purchase a firearm, or purchase illegally on the streets.

Section 11 of IP17 is controversial amongst some of our members. While most hunters agree that a magazine of over 10 rounds isn't necessary for most hunting situations, there are hunters who enjoy the freedom to use larger magazines for varmint hunting or sport shooting. The 10 round limit will also make shotgun buyers into criminals since several types of tubular feed shotguns are capable of accepting more than 10 rounds of "mini-shotshells".

Section 11 is a major second part of IP17, but the Explanation should give voters the perspective that the US Supreme Court has recently ruled that restrictions such as this are likely unconstitutional under the Second Amendment, which does not limit the capacity of firearms. It should be noted in the Explanatory Statement.

To summarize, IP17 is not what it appears to be and the draft Explanatory Statement fails to clearly disclose the major impacts and unintended (or perhaps hidden) consequences of the measure. The so called "permit to purchase" is a major unnecessary burden to legal firearm ownership. It can, and most likely will be used to bar ownership by persons who would otherwise pass the current background check. It is extra duplicative. **This is really two measures in one.**

The voters of Oregon deserve an **honest explanation** of the real impacts of IP17.

Sincerely,

Paul Donheffner
OHA Legislative Chairman

From: [copper 4413](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Cc: [Ty Rae Risewick](#)
Subject: Explanatory statement for IP-17
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 10:55:43 AM

Dear sirs,

I'm a competitive target shooter, and the explanatory statement, as released by the committees is seriously flawed.

It's restrictions on firearms is so vague that it will effectively outlaw the shotgun and other firearms that we use in our sport if Cowboy Action Shooting.

1.The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

2.The statement falsely claims that the database of **gun** permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. That must not be allowed to remain in the statement.

3.The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

4.The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

5.The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure.

6.The statement fails to clarify many mandates that will be created later by the **Oregon** State Police without public input.

The proposed explanatory statement must be revisited and corrected.

Sincerely,
Ty Rae Risewick
Newport Oregon

From: [Shawn Jones](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP 17 Objections
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 12:29:04 PM

Dear Elections.Sos team,

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter of IP17. The text that is being used to describe the ballot is misleading.

The State Police publishing of permit records doesn't state whether or not it is available to the public. We can see a similar situation to Californias data leak exposing to criminals where they can find and steal firearms.

For the "hands on" training requirement for first time buyers, will they be provided a firearm for training or will they need thier own? It is not explained by the text.

The magazine capacity law does not disclose how shotguns will be treated since they can hold more than 10 shots with shorter rounds. This could effectively ban most modern shotguns and different models of lever action rifles. This should be noted also.

Further, when possessing magazines larger than 10 rounds it doesn't specify if the citizen or the state must submit proof that those magazines were purchased before the measure. So the possibility to be charged for possession can occur multiple times.

What is the cost for the taxpayer on this new initiative? It does not mention what funds will be used or new taxes that will need to fund the bureaucracy to implement the many different provisions in the initiative. One being training facilities and trainers assigned to those facilities. Second, the data base of applicants and permit holders.

What about all of the other changes the State and local Law Enforce will need to make to begin compliance with the new law, those details must be disclosed to the voter. Especially since it doesn't mention any changes will have public input.

Again, your attention and time is appreciated, thank you for listening.

Best Regards,

Shawn M Jones

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [FLHSTEVE](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP 17
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 2:14:12 PM

Permit to purchase a hunting rifle.

If I don't already own a gun and desire to purchase a bolt action hunting rifle, how am I going to do a live fire demonstration with a gun? It is a Catch 22. Can't get a hunting rifle without a permit but need a rifle for live fire demonstration.

Steve Burock
McMinnville

From: [Mickey Walker](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Measure 114
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 3:13:57 PM

Hello,

Measure 114 is a very bad piece of legislation created to victimize the poor and people of color and vicariously, all Oregonians. This is pretty clear and straightforward. A piece of history that everyone should already know.

<https://www.dailysignal.com/2022/06/16/after-the-guns-were-removed-the-killing-fields-began/>

Thank you,
Mick

From: [Wade Kearn](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure 114
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 3:36:45 PM

Dear Secretary of State,

I object to the explanatory statement for the voters guide for Ballot Measure 114 for the following reasons:

The explanatory statement is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

The statement falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. That must not be allowed to remain in the statement.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure.

The statement fails to clarify many mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input.

Sincerely,
Wade Kearn
Hillsboro Oregon

From: [larry lyman](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot measure 114
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 5:08:48 PM

I am a citizen of Oregon, I am 72 years old, I strongly object to ballot measure 114 we do not need this period!

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Mikerascan A.D.C.](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure 114 Explanatory Statement
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 5:12:41 PM

Greetings,

I am writing regarding the recently adopted language in support of ballot measure 114 that is fundamentally flawed and misleading at best.

The statement completely ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide that training. Essentially, we would be in a position of a product being sold but was not available for purchase.

The statement, as currently worded, does not acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure.

The statement also falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. This is the most blatant misrepresentation in the text and must be removed. Even if it were not the case, there is very little public trust of this type of information not being leaked as seen recently in California.

The statement misleads voters about any of the live fire requirements.

The statement completely ignores the lack of funding for the implementation of this expensive measure.

Finally, due to a lack of clarity, the statement will result in many mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input. This bypasses the people and leads to potential administrative abuses by unelected individuals.

Because of the above, I strongly urge that this statement be returned for review and reconsideration. As I see it, to do otherwise, seriously damages the credibility of those who drafted and supported it.

Thank you.

M. Steffen
Tigard, OR