

Comments Received to IP 17, Saturday, July 23, 2022

From: Kevin Gregg <kevinmgregg3@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 7:42 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: we the people just ask to be treated fary this will not help under funder no one to help the police stop this thank you kevin gregg

From: James Wilson <jswilson@hevanet.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 6:41 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: Comments about IP 17

Hi,

About IP 17:

It's fairly clear that given recent SCOTUS rulings, the IP 17 won't pass constitutional muster. Further, I doubt that it would pass a fair reading of Oregon's constitution.

The technical definitions contained in the bill are vague or simply unworkable at best.

The facilities for "live fire" training, simply do NOT exist.

The funding for the "life fire" and other instruction are NOT provided for.

As far as I can tell, the mechanisms for qualifying and hire instructors in the required numbers have not been identified.

The same can be said for any testing regime that would be established.

Finally, IP 17 does NOT address the major sources of gun violence in Oregon: gang violence, inadequate policing, and effective criminal rehabilitation.

Sincerely,

Jim Wilson

Newport, OR 97365

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Barr <7pappa@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 6:38 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP17

IP 17 100% against my right as person. I don't need people telling me what I can have to protect my self and my family. Don't need people telling me I need a permit for a firearm and class to own a firearms.

This should not even be on the ballot or discussion.

Shall not be infringed mean don't touch it...

Sent from my iPhone

From: oldnuc@comcast.net <oldnuc@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 7:40 PM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP 17 comments

I am very concerned this initiative is a violation of my 2nd Amendment rights. California tried to pass a similar bill and was struck down for being unconstitutional.

Restricting law abiding citizens rights to purchase firearms is unconstitutional! Permits are a restriction and unnecessary. This will not stop gun violence. Criminals and evil people will not abide by any laws that are passed. Adding another burden on the Sheriffs departments for issuance of permits in an unreasonable request and no where in the initiative is there any administrative guidelines or any time line when requesting permits. The current process is already too restrictive on law abiding citizens.

Restricting magazine size is also unconstitutional as California found when reviewed by the Supreme Court. Many other issues in the initiative were not thought through. The People that developed the petition and the initiative appear to not care about the average citizen, but only about a few individuals that probably have never served in the armed forces or have been hunting. The magazine restriction will prevent purchasing nearly all shotguns and semi-automatic guns in general. This is unconstitutional.

Please do not allow this initiative to be put to the voters. Allow the police to enforce the current laws on the books.

By the way there can be no law that will prevent bad people from doing bad things. Following up on people that have been identified as suspect is the key. Because the legislators and many district attorneys are afraid to enforce the law and hold the criminal responsible for their actions.

This initiative has been presented only in a few cities and counties and is not the sentiment of the law abiding gun owners in Oregon. Please do not restrict the ability for law abiding citizens to purchase guns.

Thank you,
Dennis S. Bullock

4784 Columbus ST SE
Albany, OR 97322

From: velvet Brick <velvetbrick931@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 9:58 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP 17

hello & thank u for your time please do not vote in favor of this measure us 🙏 MX

From: brett amdor <baamdor@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 8:35 AM
To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>
Subject: Ballot measure comments and requests

Dear Committee,

Please include the following statements or some likeness thereof in the ballot measure explanation. Thank you.

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

The measure requires live fire training before a person can *apply* for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training. For first time gun buyers this could well require that you have a gun before you can get a permit to buy a gun.

There are no exceptions for the permit to purchase requirement for police or Federally licensed gun dealers.

The “permitting agent” can demand “any additional information” to issue the permit opening up endless opportunities for abuses.

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

The Oregon State Sheriff’s Association has estimated that if a person somehow *could* complete the required training, the permitting process would cost sheriffs almost \$40,000,000.00 annually. There is nothing in the measure that provides any funding and the fees included would

not come close to covering the costs. There is no estimate on the cost or impact on small local police departments.

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

The measure requires that the required class (taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers) include training on state and federal law, transfers and storage, and the “impact of suicide on the country as a whole.” There is no indication of who would be qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved.

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

The measure requires a *public list* of persons who attempt to purchase firearms. This creates safety and privacy concerns for all gun purchasers, For example - Victims of domestic violence and other susceptible groups will be at risk for all their private information being made public along with their efforts to purchase a firearm for self-defense.

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

The measure requires a permit from local police (which may be impossible to get) just to *apply* for permission from the Oregon State Police simply to *buy* a firearm. But it also removes the one safeguard that protects gun buyers if the State Police do not complete their background check. State and Federal law allow the transfer of a firearm if the state police don't complete a background check in 3 business days. This measure removes that safeguard. So, a single

mom with threats against her and her children (or any other qualified buyer) may not be able to get a home defense firearm in a timely manner.

The proposed legislation will undoubtedly prompt extensive costly litigation regarding the constitutionality of the restrictions on the right to bear arms.

Thank you,

From: Joe Wilson <setptn@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 5:41 PM
To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>
Subject: IP 17 Explanatory statement

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Since the Oregon Supreme Court certified the Ballot Title for IP 17 on 11/2021 there has been some Supreme Court of the United States rulings that effect the constitutionality of IP 17. The voters of Oregon should be made aware of these new rulings and thus the now unconstitutionality of IP 17.

On June 23, 2022 the Supreme Court of the United States ruled;

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/20-843_7j80.pdf

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

2 NEW YORK STATE RIFLE & PISTOL ASSN., INC. v. BRUEN Syllabus . Held: New York's proper-cause requirement violates the Fourteenth Amendment by preventing law-abiding citizens with ordinary self-de

www.supremecourt.gov

This Supreme Court of the United States ruling cited that;

"In this case, petitioners and respondents agree that ordinary, law-abiding citizens have a similar right to carry handguns publicly for their self-defense. We too agree, and now hold, consistent with Heller and McDonald, that the Second and Fourteenth Amendments protect an individual's right to carry a handgun for self-defense outside the home,"

Therefore IP 17 will now be found unconstitutional due to violations of the Second and Fourteenth Amendments whereas due to the lack of equity concerning low-income individuals without the where with all to be able to afford IP 17 permit fees and yet to be established training costs for said individuals.

Individuals who live in high crime areas are the most in need of individual self-defense however such individuals tend to be the least able to afford such fees known and unknown within IP17. As stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn, INC vs Bruen case; "As we stated in Heller and repeated in McDonald, 'individual self-defense is 'the central component' of the Second Amendment right,'" whereas not only would the central component of the second amendment be potentially denied by IP 17 to low income individuals however these low income individual's Fourteenth Amendment rights of Equal Protection would be also denied. IP 17 would unduly punish and bring hardship to low-income individuals. The voters of Oregon should be made aware of this fact in the explanatory statement.

Another component of IP 17 is the prohibition of large capacity magazines. On June 23, 2022 the Supreme Court of the United States has remanded back to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeal the case of Duncan v. Bonta due to the recent ruling of the New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn, INC vs Bruen case ;

https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=4540467538923292545&q=Duncan+v.+Bonta&hl=en&as_sdt=40006&as_vis=1

Duncan v Bonta had three issues concerning magazine bans;

1.) It is a law prohibiting law-abiding citizens from possessing magazines "in common use" a violation of the 2nd amendment.

2.) Does confiscating legally obtained magazines violate the 5th Amendment "taking clause"?

3.) Is the "two-step" approach of the 9th Circuit unconstitutional under the 2nd amendment?

In anticipation of the magazine ban now being found unconstitutional in this remanded case whereas the LA Police department has stopped enforcing the magazine ban that is current law in California.

The voters of Oregon in the explanatory statement for IP 17 should also be made aware that due to the recent ruling by the Supreme Court of the United States which held in their Bruen decision whereas magazine bans will be held unconstitutional.

It is critical that IP 17 explanatory statement be as truthful as possible.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Joe Wilson

33019 Hillside Acres Rd.

PO Box 1365

Gold Beach, OR 97444

541-425-5548

setptn@outlook.com

From: sidejack <sidejack@protonmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 3:38 PM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP 17 is not constitutional

And anybody with common sense can see that.

Furthermore, IP 17 does NOTHING to reduce crime -- the bad guys won't care; it only punishes the law-abiding citizens

AND, finally, it's a lie!

It will do nothing to curb violence

AND everyone knows it.

Jack Fassel

Oregon City

From: Josh Bruce <joshua1982too@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 9:34 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP17 comments

I urge you to think about letting the public know about the impact this would have on the sheriff and police departments. They are under staffed and funded. The streets current condition are clear indication of disarray financially for our state. There's not enough funding packed into the bill to facilitate its rules, warehousing the lists with tracking and would mostly impact low-income communities where people who mostly need this type of protection, would be hit the hardest. It also violates the belief systems of many fellow oregonians and would create more division in a Time where we need more law-abiding citizens to come together for a real solution to our Mental Health and drug epidemic crisis.

From: STEPHEN DYER <stephendyer5@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 9:23 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP 17 commennt

Dear Legislators,

I would like to comment on ballot measure IP17:

The requirement that local law enforcement agencies become involved in a citizen obtaining a 'license to purchase' a firearm is completely unrealistic. Ever since the collapse of the timber industry with the resulting loss in state revenues, law enforcement agencies in Oregon have been barely able to keep up with the primary job of fighting crime. To add to their responsibilities in any way, particularly by the measures included in this bill, would be crippling to their primary mission.

Sincerely,

Stephen Dyer
Eugene

From: john kaufman <jkaufman357@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 6:01 AM
To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>
Subject: IP 17

I'm asking that the following facts be included in any statement published about this Initiative in the voter's guide:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The measure requires that the required class (taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers) include training on state and federal law, transfers and storage, and the “impact of suicide on the country as a whole.” There is no indication of who would be qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved.

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

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

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

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

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

From: Ted W <tedwegener@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 4:12 AM

To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>

Subject: IP 17 Committee

The measure requires a permit from local police to apply for permission from the Oregon State Police to buy a firearm. This should certainly be included in any statement published in the voters guide. There should also be a statement of the estimated costs to the taxpayers.

Ted Wegener

Oregon registered voter.