

From: cskarren@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:21:36 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Craig Karren

From: feemerson@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 3:11:43 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Frayne Emerson

From: benkg741@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:56:35 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Bennett Knutson

From: ascook@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:18:43 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Augustus Cook

From: ted.leach@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 7:02:51 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Ted Leach

From: wells-kirby@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 7:02:52 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Kirby Wells

From: Moroost@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 7:02:55 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Rooster Potter

From: eric.hammers@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 7:46:35 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Eric Hammers

From: [Craig Hawks](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP17 / Ballot measure 14
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:11:30 AM

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.

Also, It is patently unconstitutional to have to "pay" to exercise a constitutional right as in this case of having to buy a permit before one can "keep and bear arms" The State needs to address real problems other than punishing law abiding citizens of this state.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: dougrob@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:19:32 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Douglas Robinson

From: dougrob@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:19:32 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Douglas Robinson

From: tjwilson@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:30:33 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Tim Wilson

From: Rob.dinneen@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:52:41 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required

timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Robert Dinneen

From: kc7@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:03:39 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Gary Bell

From: Randy.Padgett@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:14:31 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Randy Padgett

From: Racerfan_48@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:14:36 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Trish Evenson

From: burgiei39@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:25:32 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, James Burghardt

From: [Stuart Haas](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP # 17, Ballot Measure 114
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:36:09 AM

Aside from misleading information regarding the functionality of firearms, a lever action rifle and a pump action shotgun have to be fully cycled to chamber a cartridge/shell , fire/ discharge said cartridge/ shell, eject said cartridge/shell in order to chamber the next round (cartridge/shell).

The actions of these two firearms are also entirely different from each other as they are also different from a bolt action or breech action firearms.

Your office, Secretary of State, elections is looking anything but impartial by allowing information that is misleading verging on blatant deception regarding information by the proponents of IP 17 / B M 114.

This is a fraudulent attempt to redefine long rifles as semi automatic. Shame on you!

Additionally, there are two (2) separate issues contemplated in BM 114:

- 1). Registration /permitting
- 2). Limitations to personal property

With both of these items you are attempting to make a criminal out of law abiding citizens

Respectfully ,
Stuart Haas

Sent from my iPhone

From: brettpdx71@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 9:47:36 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Brett Williams

From: [Marcus](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Explanatory Statement for Ballot Measure 114
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:01:03 AM

To whom it may concern,

The draft Explanatory Statement is mediocre at best. It contains at least one outright falsehood.

The statement says that the State Police electronic database is exempt from public disclosure, but the actual text of the measure requires the State Police to publish this data annually.

Concerning the ban on magazines holding more than 10 rounds, it fails to inform the public that concealed carry firearms will be limited to 10 rounds by this measure.

Thank you,

Marcus Mathews
West Linn

From: soxsgrey@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:20:31 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Mike Washburne

From: blakewood81@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:31:46 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Blake Wood

From: [Rick Ropp](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Measure 114 is seriously flawed
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:32:25 AM

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.

Lastly the only thing the ballot measure 114 will achieve is infringe on the rights of law abiding citizens. It seems nobody can give an intelligent answer on how anything in the measure will detour criminals from obtaining and doing what they intend to do regardless. Please do not let this bill move any further than it has. It is a waste of resources and it will fail. Maybe look at a real problem we have like crime running out of control in this state. / Legalizing hard drugs and putting magic mushrooms on a ballot. Drugs are killing and destroying more lives in this state than anything. Drugs = crime not only petty crime but violent crime as well. Please get it together...

Respectfully,

From: john@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:04:43 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, John Hughes

From: [Jw Gardner](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure 114
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:06:15 AM

Reduction of gun violence? Let's get real. More laws and restrictions will do nothing to stop the lawless actions of criminals who, by the very definition of what they are called, do not obey the law. Ask the family of Japan's former prime minister Shinzo Abe. In a country with the strictest gun laws where citizens are not permitted to own a gun, he was shot twice and killed with a homemade, double barrel shotgun weapon made out of two pipes, wood, tape, and a small battery for the firing mechanism. ***You gonna' outlaw hardware stores too?***

Ballot Measure 114 is an attempt to trample on the Constitutional rights of every lawful and free citizen of this state. If it is your intention that only lawbreaking criminals should possess firearms then you are on the right track. Stop the effort to deceive the voting citizens of this state. Print the truth about what this measure will require. Ballot Measure 114 is an unconstitutional, anti-gun initiative package that includes a state-run government registry of gun owners' personal information and firearms, requires a permit to purchase a firearm, imposes an indefinite delay on background checks, and bans any magazine with over a 10-round capacity.

Voting citizens of Oregon,
JW & Gloria Gardner
Central Point, OR

From: stewartcole@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:15:36 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Stewart Cole

From: janetellis0712@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:15:38 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Janet Ellis

From: daveb0404@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:37:30 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, David Baker

From: irishviking7@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:59:33 AM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Javan Ireland

From: [Sardar Khalsa](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP 17
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:28:28 PM

Please stop punishing law-abiding citizens every time there is a shooting. We have tens of thousands of gun control laws on the books now. Adding this is just virtue signaling to the radical left. This law is unenforceable and will cost a fortune to put into effect. You took an oath to support the 2nd Amendment and this proposed law violates the 2nd Amendment. This law is just a back door scam to outlaw guns to the public. Criminals don't follow the thousands of gun control laws on the books now and they won't follow this one. Please rethink this needless law.

Sardar Khalsa

From: [Eli Kaspari](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure Public Comment IP17
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:48:34 PM

Dear Elizabeth McKanna, Margaret Olney, Leonard Williamson, HK Kahng, Lynn Nakamoto,

Thank you for your hard work for the State of Oregon! Legislating seems like a difficult job, and I am grateful for your expertise and willingness to serve. As a State of Oregon employee, I am glad that we can all work together to make Oregon a better place for everyone.

Since you will be holding a public comment meeting soon, I have some public comments that I would like to add regarding IP17/Measure 114. This is the well-intentioned but somewhat misguided legislation that is designed to reduce gun violence in our state.

Unfortunately, IP17/Measure 114 will not reduce gun deaths or violence in Oregon. It will only affect law-abiding citizens and waste valuable law enforcement resources.

One problem with the measure is that the ammunition magazine restriction to ten rounds will not reduce gun deaths in the state, but will severely impact responsible Oregonians. While I think that some sort of capacity restriction could be beneficial, the number 10 is an arbitrarily chosen number with no data or research to back it up. I've spent a decent amount of time online searching for some data or research to back up that quantity, but no such data is available. I currently own a Sig Sauer P365X, which is a handgun that uses 12-round magazines. Is a 12-round magazine so much more lethal than a ten round magazine that it needs to be banned? Or perhaps a Glock 19, which uses a 15-round magazine? This restriction would also make almost every pump-action shotgun illegal because the fixed tube magazine usually holds more than 10 mini-shells. This would have a drastic impact on shotgun sports, such as sporting clays, skeet, trap, and hunting. Also, those that aim to do harm to innocent Oregonians are not afraid of laws, so they will simply acquire whatever ammunition magazines they choose. They only fear an armed and responsible Oregonian. We can't put our armed and responsible Oregonians at risk by limiting them to ten rounds when a criminal can choose any number they want.

Another issue with the measure is that the permitting system does not add any concrete value to the firearm purchasing process. The process to receive a permit to purchase a firearm is very similar to the process to purchase a firearm using the standard federal form. This makes the permit a redundant step that will have no added benefits. Why would someone need to have a background check to receive a permit when they will need a background check every time they use the permit? This will only inconvenience law enforcement and responsible Oregonians. One of the only differences is that the applicant will be photographed, but a photograph is already available from the DMV. Another difference is the requirement to take a firearm safety course. The course can be beneficial to a new gun owner, but will not prevent suicides or murders, as the applicant will likely disregard firearms safety to achieve their goals. A better way to benefit new gun owners would be to require a pamphlet in the box that lays out the four rules of firearms safety created by Col. Jeff Cooper.

The requirement for Oregonians to demonstrate to law enforcement that they can use a firearm has some issues as well. Oregon law enforcement is very busy addressing criminal activity, and currently lacks the resources to check to make sure people know how to operate a firearm. Also, this would incur unreasonable expenses for the law enforcement agencies. Gun ranges would need to be rented or built, and guns and ammunition would need to be provided, which are both expenses that would be a burden on our already busy law enforcement agencies. Also, the gun use demonstration may not even be relevant to the gun that the applicant wishes to purchase. If an applicant proves to the law enforcement officer that they can operate a semi-automatic handgun, that will not prove that they can safely operate a rifle, shotgun, or revolver. The demonstration will simply be a waste of time and resources for the applicant and law enforcement agency. It would be much cheaper for the Oregon State Police to create how-to videos on YouTube to instruct safe firearm use. To make these

materials easier to access, a pamphlet with QR codes or links could be included with firearm purchases.

Oregon is a wonderful state that already has strong and effective gun laws. We have universal background checks to prevent unlawful gun purchases, a safe storage law to prevent gun suicides, and a red flag law to remove guns from the hands of dangerous people. These laws work in concert to make Oregon a safe place while allowing Oregonians to exercise their Second Amendment rights. Passing this measure would drain law enforcement resources and place arbitrary restrictions on responsible Oregonians without doing anything to prevent criminal use of firearms.

--

Eli Kaspari
(503) 385-3920

From: grantaa1967@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:27:34 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Grant Anderson

From: leprovencher@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:38:33 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Louis Provencher

From: lpmetzger@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 2:00:36 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Lindsay Metzger

From: [Merrilee Alexander](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP 17
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 3:54:20 PM

To whom it may concern,

After reviewing the committees first meeting in regards to IP 17 & learning of the measure I felt compelled to contact you. From what I understand you're putting together the information for and against this ballot measure in the upcoming voters pamphlet. I'm just urging you to be straightforward when you put the voters pamphlet out in regards to exactly what this bill will look like for the ordinary Oregonian. Exactly how it will infringe on our second amendment rights.

After reviewing the meeting I see there are no caps on the cost for the required training and in my opinion will affect the low income. What is a person (say a woman) to do when she needs to protect her children when she is being threatened in her home? With the passage of this bill it will be impassible for her to buy a gun for protection. Something that got my attention is only law enforcement 'trainers' can teach and yet there's no indication of who is qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved. I do see the Measure will have to issue a permit within 30 days after approved background check has been completed by the state police but there's no limit on how long the state police can take to complete the background check and no repercussions for them if they do not complete it. Plus no estimate on the cost. As citizen of the US & a native to Oregon to read where you want to require having a public list of any person that attempts to purchase firearms in my opinion is simply egregious. This would create an entirely new category of victimless crimes when right now the police are underfunded and real criminals are released within minutes. Along with the above now you want to require a permit from local police just to apply for the permission from the Oregon state police simply to buy a firearm. You want to add this on to what they already do? They can't keep up with regular every day crimes as it is. And who pays for this? I pay for this. You pay for this. The taxpayer pays for this. Another measure that's once again egregious. After reviewing this further this measure would outright ban any new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit. I could go on with the particulars but you know doing this would make them illegal to purchase. This would have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon which many people enjoy and have been doing it for generations. Just one more thing to take away from our young people. It's sport and is enjoyed and it keeps them busy. Plus this bill requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm? There are virtually no facilities that will be able will be available for this training. As you know the measure only allows those approved by police to provide the required training to apply for a permit. Our police are under funded and understaffed. From what I understand there is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or man power to provide classes. Police in urban areas are ready not responding to most violent crimes and you know this. If this measure would pass the estimate of what it would cost is \$40 million annually and that is provided by the Oregon State sheriffs Association. 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.

I do not support this measure in the slightest.

Kindly,

Merrilee Alexander

From: [Merrilee Alexander](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP 17
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 3:54:20 PM

To whom it may concern,

After reviewing the committees first meeting in regards to IP 17 & learning of the measure I felt compelled to contact you. From what I understand you're putting together the information for and against this ballot measure in the upcoming voters pamphlet. I'm just urging you to be straightforward when you put the voters pamphlet out in regards to exactly what this bill will look like for the ordinary Oregonian. Exactly how it will infringe on our second amendment rights.

After reviewing the meeting I see there are no caps on the cost for the required training and in my opinion will affect the low income. What is a person (say a woman) to do when she needs to protect her children when she is being threatened in her home? With the passage of this bill it will be impassible for her to buy a gun for protection. Something that got my attention is only law enforcement 'trainers' can teach and yet there's no indication of who is qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved. I do see the Measure will have to issue a permit within 30 days after approved background check has been completed by the state police but there's no limit on how long the state police can take to complete the background check and no repercussions for them if they do not complete it.Plus no estimate on the cost. As citizen of the US & a native to Oregon to read where you want to require having a public list of any person that attempts to purchase firearms in my opinion is simply egregious. This would create an entirely new category of victimless crimes when right now the police are underfunded and real criminals are released within minutes. Along with the above now you want to require a permit from local police just to apply for the permission from the Oregon state police police simply to buy a firearm. You want to add this on to what they already do? They can't keep up with regular every day crimes as it is. And who pays for this? I pay for this. You pay for this. The taxpayer pays for this. Another measure that's once again egregious. After reviewing this further this measure would outright ban any new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit. I could go on with the particulars but you know doing this would make them illegal to purchase. This would have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon which many people enjoy and have been doing it for generations. Just one more thing to take away from our young people. It's sport and is enjoyed and it keeps them busy. Plus this bill requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm? There are virtually no facilities that will be able will be available for this training. As you know the measure only allows those approved by police to provide the required training to apply for a permit. Our police are under funded and understaffed. From what I understand there is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or man power to provide classes. Police in urban areas are ready not responding to most violent crimes and you know this. If this measure would pass the estimate of what it would cost is \$40 million annually and that is provided by the Oregon State sheriffs Association. 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.

I do not support this measure in the slightest.

Kindly,

Merrilee Alexander

From: rjpilcher1873@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 4:23:33 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Randall Pilcher

From: psispoidis@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 4:45:34 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Panagiotis Sispoidis

From: secretary@linngop.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP17 Misleading Language
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:02:40 PM

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.

From: johnbyers10@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:40:37 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, John Byers

From: [Sue Christensen](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure 114 harms the poor and low income unfairly and creates financial hardship
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:51:11 PM

The proposed fees associated with permits will put a harsh financial burden on the poor and low income folks who depend on emergency cash using their guns as pawn collateral.

They already pay \$10.00 per OSP back ground check on pawned gun pickups, even through the person has a 10 year history of pawning the same gun over and over for emergency cash.

New Costs of Continuing Gun Ownership:

Permit to Purchase?	\$?	No Plan
Firearm Safety Course?	\$?	No Plan
Firearm Safety Instructor	\$?	No Plan
Submit Fingerprints and Application?	\$ 65.00	
Criminal Background Check	\$ 10.00	

There will be significant costs associated with these new gun restricting laws.

These are the people who hunt game to fill their freezers. Adding to their financial burden is not what we need. They are upstanding, hardworking, honest gun owners you are harming.

Sincerely,

Sue Christensen

From: Gmcniel23@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 5:51:39 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Grant Mcniel

From: m.anslinger@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:15:26 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, mike Anslinger

From: occiabc@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:35:30 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Greg Ostrom

From: badbiskitnodog@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 7:30:38 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Mark Montgomery

From: rick.coufal@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 7:42:00 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Richard Coufal

From: whitehdman@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:25:33 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, Bobby White

From: West-c@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:47:34 PM

Dear Secretary of State, Shemia Fagan and Explanatory Statement Committee: I do not support the draft Explanatory Statement; it is factually flawed and misleading to voters. The bullet point list is confusing and does not provide voters with an understandable statement explaining the effects of IP 17 to voters. The explanatory statement should instead be just that; a statement in sentence form, like the form that Legislative Counsel drafted. In the draft statement released for public comment, current law fails to mention the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, as protected by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This needs to be included in the statement because IP 17 is in clear violation of these fundamental guaranteed rights. The statement fails to mention that most modern shotguns will be banned under IP 17. Whether a “pump action” or a “semiautomatic”, shotguns with barrels over 21 inches have the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds. These are not exempted by the fixed magazine “lever action” exemption because “pump action” and “semiautomatic” are NOT “lever action” firearms. A searchable database is not sufficient to notify voters that IP 17 will create a government registry of firearm owners’ personal information and firearms. The searchable database should be called what it is under IP 17, a government registry. The statement should also include what information IP 17 requires law enforcement to collect and store in the registry: applicant’s legal name, current address and telephone number, date and place of birth, physical description, applicant’s signature, applicant’s photograph, applicant’s fingerprints, and any additional information determined necessary by department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to tell voters that law enforcement has the unfettered discretion to ask for ANYTHING they may determine “necessary” for issuance of a permit. Law enforcement may determine what is necessary without any input from the public through their own internal department rules. The Explanatory Statement needs to inform voters that government registry information may be released to the public, because IP 17 requires "on or before January 31 of each year, beginning in 2024, the department shall annually publish a report indicating for each county the number of applications made to any permit agent, the number of permits-to-purchase issued and the number of permits-to-purchase denied and the reasons for denial. The department may, by rule, include any additional information that it determines would be helpful to ensuring the permit-to-purchase process is being administered in a consistent and equitable manner." This gives the departments discretion to release ANY information contained in the application that may be “helpful” to ensure consistency and equitableness. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform the voters that, while a permit is required to acquire a firearm, nothing in IP 17 requires law enforcement to administer the training programs. Law enforcement is already under-staffed and underfunded in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that there is no funding for law enforcement to conduct these trainings. From January 1, to May 31, 2022, 166,251 NICS background checks have been performed. In 2021, 454,133 NICS firearm background checks were performed. Law enforcement does not have the funding or staffing capacity to handle this volume of permit applications for review and training. The Explanatory statement fails to inform voters that Concealed Handgun Licenses and hunter safety certifications are not acceptable as permits under IP 17. The Explanatory Statement fails to inform voters that the training requirements include live-fire and classroom training. It also fails to inform voters that while the permit application cost is capped to \$65 to apply and \$50 to renew, there is no cap on how much law enforcement may charge for the training. It also fails to disclose that applicants must pay and

re-take this training every 5 years. Public shooting ranges are already scarce in Oregon and the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that there is a lack of training facilities in the state to conduct the required training for permit issuance and that there is no guideline or required timeline for law enforcement to develop the training program or locate adequate facilities for the required permit training. The introductory statement of the Explanatory Statement is misleading by stating IP 17 requires safety training, as mentioned above, it does not tell voters that safety training requires classroom and live-fire training. The introductory statement is misleading because background checks are already required by law to purchase a firearm, instead what IP 17 does is create a possibility for an indefinite delay of firearm transfers and voters should be informed of this. The Explanatory Statement does not notify current owners of magazines over 10 rounds that they are not grandfathered-in for possession; instead, they are limited to use on private property, at shooting ranges and while hunting. Finally, the Explanatory Statement fails to mention that a permit would not be available to anyone prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law, including those who lawfully use marijuana under Oregon law. Federal law preempts state law and marijuana is a Schedule 1 controlled substance according to federal law. Controlled substance users and addicts are prohibited from owning firearms. The measure would require federal law enforcement to be notified of marijuana users attempting to acquire a permit. For these reasons, the draft statement needs to be revised to properly inform voters of the effects of IP 17 in an impartial, simple and understandable statement. Sincerely, James West