

From: gejohnson57@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 3:56:31 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, Gary Johnson

From: [Pat Mundy](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Measure 114
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:36:56 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to express my dissatisfaction with, and aversion to, the explanatory statement proposed for Measure 114. It is misleading and factually dubious and will lead many voters to false conclusions. While the measure in its entirety is odious enough for many reasons (not the least of which are the omissions and elisions made by the authors), the explanatory statement is a repugnant example of the nonsense that permeates political speech today.

Sincerely,

Pat Mundy

Pat Mundy
Vice President Sales/Marketing
800.285.3701 ext. 1015
patm@nosler.com

NOSLER[®]



ISO 9001:2015
CERTIFIED

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and proprietary information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient(s), please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Susan@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 8:42:30 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, Susan Allen

From: toddohalloran@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:37:39 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, Todd O'Halloran



JAKE MCGUIGAN

Managing Director, Gov't Relations - State Affairs

jmcguigan@nssf.org | 203-426-1320 x238 | nssf.org

400 N. Capitol Street NW, Suite 475, Washington, D.C. 20001

August 2, 2022

Oregon Elections Division
255 Capitol St., NE
Suite 501
Salem, OR 97310

SENT VIA EMAIL

Re: Objections Relating to Initiative Petition 17, Ballot Measure 114

To Whom It May Concern:

As the trade association for America's firearms, ammunition, hunting, and shooting sports industry, the National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the issues with Initiative Petition 17 ("IP 17"), which changes Oregon law relating to firearms by requiring safety training and completed background checks to obtain a permit to purchase firearms; and limiting the use, manufacture, sale and purchase of "large capacity" ammunition magazines.

The proposed initiative, IP 17, seeks to implement a permit to purchase scheme consisting of costly training while also banning the possession and transfer of certain ammunition feeding devices. The voting public should be given all the facts of the proposed initiative when voting on such a proposal, rather than being misled by made-up terms in order to ban certain products that are overwhelmingly used for lawful purposes.

IP 17 wording includes the term "large capacity magazines," which the term itself is a misleading description. Again, this is a very deceptive term as many of the ammunition feeding devices that would be prohibited under IP 17 as capable of accepting more than 10 rounds, are in fact, "standard" in most cases. Depending on the make and model of the firearm, magazines provided by manufacturers as standard equipment for handguns and rifles often accommodate 15 to 30 rounds of ammunition. These magazines offer recreational and competitive shooters, as well as those citizens exercising their right to carry a firearm or keep one at home for self-defense, the choice of magazine - a choice that should be theirs to make.

The measure as currently written would create an outright ban on most modern shotguns including pump action turkey hunting shotguns. Tubular magazines on most shotguns are capable of holding more than 10 rounds of certain ammunition. Unfortunately, throughout the discussions, proponents continue to express that shotguns are not impacted by the proposal, but without taking input or comments from those within the industry this is the end result.

The second part of IP 17 will create a permit to purchase scheme that will make The Second Amendment, a fundamental right, unattainable for many. Oregon will demand licensees take a costly firearms training safety course along with possible demonstrative testing to be eligible for a permit. Even after these bureaucratic steps are completed, it could still take months to receive approval. The practice of charging mandatory fees to exercise a fundamental right has

discriminatory roots. The practice of poll taxation in some states was a deliberate means to keep certain marginalized Americans from voting in federal elections.

Permits to Purchase do not only tax the individual, they also burden the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). NICS is the background check system all Federal Firearms License (FFL) holders contact for authorization before selling a firearm. This is the same system that is used to verify if a person can obtain a Permit to Purchase and complete a firearm transfer at the point of sale. This double verification is redundant and burdens an already strained system, which routinely handles

Permit to Purchase regulations have no measurable impact on reducing violent crime or restricting access to firearms by prohibited persons. The federally required background check is already completed before the point of sale by an FFL. An evaluation conducted by the RAND Corporation proves that Permits to Purchase are ineffective: through the analysis of seven qualifying studies examining the effects of Permit to Purchase laws on total and firearm homicides, they drew this conclusion: "Considering this evidence and an evaluation of the studies' strengths, we find inconclusive evidence for the effect of licensing and permitting requirements on total homicides and firearm homicides."

Ultimately, what Permit to Purchase requirements do is deter current and future firearm owners from exercising their Second Amendment rights and participate in the longstanding tradition of hunting and shooting sports.

In closing, the National Shooting Sports Foundation would object to the language contained in Initiative Petition 17. The title and text are misleading and will cause extreme confusion amongst voters and does not explain the full impact of the initiative being voted on. The missing information is imperative for voters to be able to make informed decisions when voting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jake McGuigan", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jake McGuigan

From: lynn.schreiner@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:59:35 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, Lynn Schreiner

From: jlpadberg@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:16:31 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, John Padberg

From: jimk@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:27:38 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, James Kababick

From: [Sue Christensen](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: UNFAIR! BALLOT MEASURE WAS A STACKED COMMITTEE OF DEMOCRATS.
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:40:04 AM

What arrogance! Just like the Democrats to stack a committee.

Extend the comments since the proposal was written in the most vague, illegal, outright deceptive, incorrect, false, misleading and impossible to comply rule.

There are too many falsehoods to address here. We need an extended period of time to offer counters and undo the language completely.

Sue Christensen

From: Shawn Laird
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Gun "safety" ballot measure
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:10:25 PM

“A right is something that cannot be legally denied, such as the rights to free speech, press, religion, and raising a family. A privilege is something that can be given and taken away and is considered to be a special advantage or opportunity that is available only to certain people.”

“Rights are legal, social, or ethical principles of freedom or entitlement; that is, rights are the fundamental normative rules about what is allowed of people or owed to people according to some legal system, social convention, or ethical theory.”

The above definitions were taken from the internet and, keeping them in mind, the ballot measure, as written, has inherent flaws, ignores important considerations, and allows for ambiguity only destined to cause confusion and legal entanglements.

I would like to begin with the hypocrisy of the ballot measure, as written, with a glaring omission that shows the true nature of the naïveté, or ignorance, of the drafters. As a member of the NRA, I am sure my views here would not be well received because I am not “all in” on no gun control but these are my views. This hypocrisy is described under the “Safety” paragraph.

PREAMBLE: The preamble of the ballot measure, is naturally written to incite reaction in an emotional manner while omitting key facts. The ballot measure is a knee jerk reaction to current events. What is the average age of these mass shooters? What is the average age of a drive-by shooter? They are young and a majority of them are playing violent video games. They are desensitized to violence through these games. THIS is where Oregonians should first place their sights. What came first? The chicken or the egg? What came first? Being exposed and desensitized to violence or initiating violence.

Those of us who have guns for sport, hunting, or self defense have them for recreation and, sometimes, out of fear. The fear comes from the violence growing from the desensitizing of others and what may come with current world events. Perhaps the focus should be on the root of the problem.

SAFETY: Safety is the theme of the ballot measure and the impetus behind any gun control, as it should be, and yet the mandating of manual EXTERNAL safeties on firearms is not even considered. As an older generation gun owner, I want a manual safety on all my weapons. I want this to prevent accidental discharge and, also, to mandate that extra second of thought should I feel I have to use my weapon. Younger weapon owners HATE manual safeties and say they take time away from defending themselves and yet all military weapons have to have a manual safety. Just look at the military version of the Sig P320 (the M17 and M18). They have manual safeties yet the P320 does not even offer it as an option. The truth is there are many handgun manufacturers who do not even make handguns with manual safeties.

I also read that this ballot measure was intended to reduce suicides. Guns will be able to be obtained but the true reduction in suicides would come in that extra second of the act of consciously having to move a lever from safe to “armed”. It is too easy to pick up a gun and simply pull the trigger but having to take pause, manipulate an external safety, and think would make more difference than any of these proposed restrictions. I challenge you to look a how FEW handguns are offered with manual safeties. Additionally the demand is so skewed that the price is LOWER for the same handgun with a manual safety versus one without.

I challenge someone to tell me how the magazine capacity is going to affect the suicide rate. I have yet to hear of a suicide where someone shot themselves ten, or more, times. If the goal is genuinely to increase safety then start with the manual safety and do not use safety as an excuse to restrict rights.

FEES: Driving, hunting and fishing are privileges. Conceal carry is a privilege (though some would argue otherwise). Associating fees for those privileges is reasonable. There should be absolutely no fee associated with a right. Having to pay for a right turns it into a privilege only available to those who can afford it. The price is guns themselves are bad enough.

If the state wants to mandate these restrictions, then it needs to pay for them to include any mandated training.

TRAINING: After 23 years in the military, I have had HOURS of weapons training. This training is even annotated by my marksmanship rating on my DD Form 214. There should be an exemption for veterans for training at the very least. Prior law enforcement should also be exempt. The cost of the training should be on the state if the state is going to mandate it to exercise a right. (Not a privilege.).

Mandating training for conceal carry is reasonable since it is a privilege but not the simple ownership of a gun.

MAGAZINE CAPACITY: As written the ten round capacity limit does not include if you already own higher capacity magazines yet, I have heard but cannot find in writing, puts restrictions on how these are kept even in ones homes. This is unreasonable. If I want to keep more then ten rounds in my gun at home for home protection, I should be allowed to under no risk of penalty if I have to use the gun. Additionally, this restriction should not apply to those of us who conceal carry. There is absolutely no mention nor consideration in the ballot measure for those who conceal carry.

The ballot measure ignores the ability to reload in 3 seconds. A crazed person carrying two 20 round magazines will retain the ability to cause the same amount casualties and one carrying 4 10 round magazines. The weapons abilities and capacities are not the problem.

SHOTGUNS: Though it is stressed that sporting shotguns are not a target, this is not at all clear as written and the ambiguity is open to problems and future legal issues. The advent of the “shorty” shotgun shell increases the capacity of pump shotguns yet has no affect in semi-automatic shotguns. The authors of this ballot measure purposely used vague and unclear terminology to create these problems. As written, this ballot measure is not ready for intent is as stated.

REGISTRATION: The registration of already owned guns that fall under this ballot measure is a RED FLAG for future confiscation. This age old fear will turn law abiding citizens into non-law abiding citizens simply out of fear the government will take the weapons in the future. There are very few exceptions to countries that have demanded weapon registration not confiscating the weapons upon future legal legislation.

INSURANCE: Another omission in the ballot measure, again due to naïveté, is the lack of mandating insurance for those who own guns. There is even conceal carry insurance and mandating this would be prudent even if it contradicts my previous feelings regarding fees.

Responsible gun owners should not have their rights restricted by the actions of irresponsible individuals.

INCREDIBLE IRONY: The result of this ballot measure is going to be the same as it has been in every other state. Until the law goes into affect, there is going to be a race to purchase anything that will not be able to be purchased after the ballot measure. People like me, who have a wish list, will rush to purchase while they can. When Washington recently passed their law, companies selling guns and magazines that fell under the law delayed shipping to all other customers to fill orders to Washington customers so they received items before the law passed. The result? An INCREASE in the number of guns. No small irony.

CONCLUSION: Common sense is lacking in almost every regard and the lack of focus on manual safeties clearly shows safety is not the primary motivation. As mentioned previously, video games; a society desensitized to violence; politicians who incite divisions among citizens; and fringe hate groups are the problem and should be the focus. It is not with the conscientious, law abiding citizens who will be affected by this measure but others.

World events make this a terrible time for Oregon to reduce the readiness of its law abiding citizens.

Years ago I swore to defend the Constitution of the United States. I renewed that oath with every reenlistment. I swore to defend it against enemies foreign and domestic. Never did I think I would see the day that my home state was trying to take away the rights I swore to defend.

It is the state of Oregon's position that the restriction of the rights of law abiding gun owners is a higher priority than resolving the real source of the problem? This is the easy way out that will have no affect on the people responsible for the enacting of the ballot measure. Mental health and the desensitizing of violence, combined with the lack of value of human life is the problem. Morality cannot be controlled through legislation.

I have no problem with reasonable, clear, logical, and sound legislation on gun control but this ballot measure needs more thorough vetting, clearer language, reasonable exemptions and consideration for veterans and those who conceal carry. Additionally, I wish there were more focus on the root of the problem versus the instrument used as a result.

Shawn W. Laird
503-720-5374

From: [Jason Taylor](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Concerns over IP17
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 7:35:53 PM

Hello

I have read the full text of IP17 and I want to share my concerns with you.

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.

Please take these talking points into consideration.

Thank you

v/r

Jason Taylor

Sent from my iPhone

From: president.ossa.org
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#); president.ossa.org
Subject: Ballot Measure 114/IP17 Explanatory Statement/Financial comments Input Kerry Spurgin, President, Oregon State Shooting Association.
Date: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 5:53:02 AM

The proposed statement for Ballot measure 114/IP17 has clear and known omissions that results in the statement MISLEADING Oregon Voters.

Through the committee process valid input and expert detail was brought to the committee, but disregarded.

These are the Key Issues with the Statement:

- Voters need to know that Measure 114 effectively blocks a person at risk for suicide from transferring his/her firearm to a friend or storage facility for safe keeping during their crisis.
- Voters need to know that the proposed magazine ban includes nearly 2/3rds of all shotguns (fed by tube magazines) and lever action rifles other than 22lr. These rifles and shotguns have been designed and build this way for over 100 years.
- Voters need to know that the proposed permit process does not require the officials to complete the process and therefore block the purchase a firearm.
- Voters need to know that the facilities required to complete the training requirement are not funded and will therefore block the ability to purchase a firearm. The Oregon State Sheriffs Association estimated the annual cost of maintenance at \$40,000,000. The Oregon State Shooting Association estimated the cost of the facilities construction at \$200,000,000. Without providing the facilities to complete the training safely, the required training is unable to be completed, the permit process is blocked, and therefore purchasing a firearm is blocked.
- Voters need to know that citizens not comfortable with interacting with government agencies (minorities, women, LGBT,...) will be disproportionately affected by this measure and will be restricted from purchasing a firearm.

The Oregon State Shooting Association (OSSA) (www.ossa.org) is committed to promoting and practicing SAFETY and WELLNESS in the shooting sports and our communities of Oregon. SAFETY and WELLNESS starts with basic firearms safety handling procedures and safety while enjoying shooting sports, but it also includes safety in secure storage with an emphasis on safety within our families and community, especially with our children. OSSA is leading the way in suicide prevention to help those with crises or mental challenges affecting their lives. (www.ossa.org)

The Oregon State Shooting Association (OSSA) drives for and supports legislation that directly addresses the persons at risk of committing these horrendous actions in our community. For example, legislation requiring use our current background systems by law enforcement, courts, certified medical professionals, and family members. The NICS system is already enabled to note and block purchases by persons who have demonstrated to law enforcement, certified medical professionals, and family members when owning a firearm would be a danger to themselves or others. Also, update and clarification of existing transfer laws to enable persons of risk of suicide to feel comfortable in storing their firearms with others or in a facility until the crisis or risk has passed. Lastly, update and clarification of 'Red Flag' laws with due process requirements to enable both parties to be considered in a decision to remove one's rights to keep their firearms.

Kerry Spurgin

President

Oregon State Shooting Association.

From: president ossa.org

Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 6:51 PM

To: elections.sos@sos.oregon.gov

Cc: president ossa.org <president@ossa.org>

Subject: IP17 Input and Issues. Kerry Spurgin, President, Oregon State Shooting Association.

The key issues with IP17 are:

- The Magazine ban is poorly defined and includes most shotguns with a tube magazine. This most means old and new tube fed shotguns will be illegal. This will devastate our new high school trap and skeet programs. The petition demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of firearms types and configurations. (ex. Shotguns vs. lever actions).
- The cost of this measure has not been estimated for the Oregon citizens. As I am also the secretary of the Oregon Association of Shooting Ranges (OASR), we have discussed the cost of ranges/facilities to be very high. The facilities required for the training do not currently exist. To build them could be as high, or higher than, \$200,000,000.00 (\$200million!) Operating them has been estimated at \$40,000,000.00 annually. The effect of this will be that that required training and range time will not be available and will then prevent firearms purchases.
- Each of the items below will make the permit unattainable, therefore purchases not possible and thus a violation of the 2nd amendment.
 - The training infrastructure does not exist and is not funded by the measure.
 - Key requirements for the permit are not defined, leaving the definition up to interpretation to local law enforcement.
 - Time requirements on the background checks are not defined, therefore permits will not be completed in timely fashion.
- The petition is required to produce a public list of the people who apply for permits. This is a violation of privacy and must not be allowed.

Unfortunately, NO involvement of firearms experts was solicited during the process of the IP as well as only token membership allowed in the current committee process. As demonstrated by the meetings held to date the input from opponents is not considered.

Kerry Spurgin

President, Oregon State Shooting Association

Secretary, Oregon Association of Shooting Ranges.

From: pndowen@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:44:31 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, Patrick Owen

From: [Esbon Griffin](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IP17 : Objections
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:52:25 PM

Dear Explanatory Statement Committee,

The "explanatory statement" for IP17 is seriously defective:

- The measure *outright bans most modern shotguns*. Period. Tubular magazines on most shotguns are capable of holding more than 10 rounds of certain ammunition. Therefore they will be banned. The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.
- Proponents argue that shotguns were exempted because of the exception for "lever action firearms." And no matter how much the opponents attempted to clarify that "lever action" is not the same as "pump action" the proponents insisted that was simply "argument" or "speculation." And clearly it is not. "Pump action" and "lever action" are each entirely different configurations.
- Tubular fed semi-automatic shotguns were not even discussed. To comply with the "large" capacity magazine regulation, disassembly of the shotgun would be required before transporting outside the home. There is no simple "magazine release" button.
- The measure allows retention of magazines already owned, if they don't leave your property, but you can be charged with a crime if you cannot prove you owned them before the ban. Under the measure, it becomes *the owner's* responsibility to prove their innocence. And, of course, nothing prevents them from being charged again and again for the same magazines since conventional magazines contain no identifying marks.
- The statement falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants **is exempt from public disclosure**.
- The statement says: "*Requires State Police to maintain electronically searchable database of permits, information is exempt from public disclosure.*" The language of the measure clearly states that the police must publish an annual report that is not exempt from public disclosure.
- 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 misleads voters by suggesting that the live fire requirement in the mandated classes for the "permit to purchase" can be completed with "hands on demonstration of basic firearms handling" *by the instructor*, when in fact, the student will need to be firing the gun. And of course, since you would need a gun to demonstrate that you could load, unload, and fire it, and you can't buy a gun without the required permit, first time buyers will have an almost impossible hurdle to overcome.
- 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Esbon Griffin
Hubbard, Oregon

Measure 114 (IP 17)

Once again, a proposed law that seeks to put a band aid on a social problem. Lawlessness and violence are rampant on our streets and instead of getting to the root causes, this measure attacks *lawful* gun owners and their Constitutional freedoms. Department of Justice statistics from 2019 show that less than 2% of all prisoners had obtained their weapons *lawfully*. This is all an attempt to divert the public's attention from their lack of leadership and lack of consequences for the actual criminals and their criminal behavior. This measure isn't going to solve any problems, because it doesn't address the real issues.

Problems with this measure:

- Puts a heavy burden on already under-funded and under-staffed police agencies. The estimate for implementation of this law is at least \$50 million for the first year and \$45-50 million a year to maintain. The fees they are proposing don't even come close to covering these costs.
- Puts low income people at a disadvantage in trying to protect themselves (think stalking and domestic violence victims).
- Will require diverting funds from many community social programs along with raising current taxes and the creation of new taxes to fund the requirements of the measure.
- Publicizing names of gun owners/permit holders violates basic right to privacy and will allow criminals to know which houses to target for robbery and which houses don't have weapons to defend themselves.
- Blatantly disregards the 2nd Amendment. It will be overturned for its unconstitutionality and then all that money spent for set-up will have been wasted.
- Punishes law abiding citizens and legal gun owners. The people using guns illegally to commit crimes of violence are criminals who aren't going to follow these new laws anymore than they follow current laws and why should they? There are no consequences for their criminal behavior.
- Identifications are already verified and background checks are already performed. Very little, if any new info would be found.
- Money/resources would be better spent on safety training, providing more device locks and safes, and mental health programs.

Please think about the consequences of this measure and adequately inform the voting public to avoid an economic catastrophe.

Thank you,

Rodney & Stephanie Davis

Warrenton, OR

From: [Merrilee](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot measure 114
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:12:51 PM

As a native Oregonian I oppose the 'changes to gun ownership and purchase requirements initiative'. After thoroughly reviewing all I could read, watch and listen to this bill would end the legal sale of firearms in the state. There is not one aspect of this bill that is reasonable. With the rare exception the majority of gun owners in Oregon own guns legally, following the law, obtaining a cc permit, etc. Under this measure a permit would be required to obtain any firearm and magazine's capable of holding more than ten rounds would be outlawed. Commonly used pump shotguns would be banned simply because they exceed the ten round limit. State police would be required to maintained a searchable database of all permit applications. This is an out and out infringement on our rights. In regards to getting a permit: the applicant has to show up w a firearm to show he has the ability to load, fire, unload and store the firearm. This is nonsense because under your proposed law you can't get the firearm w/o a permit. Under Oregon's highly restrictive gun storage laws, no one can legally loan a firearm to another. In other words it creates an impossible barrier. It's catch 22. The permit & training programs also create an unfounded mandate with zero enforcement measures. There is no requirements as to who does the training. What is their background? Who decides this? This is too ambiguous and the way it's written leaves it wide open. As well as the measure does not estimate the cost or analyze it's impact on small local law enforcement. Once you break it down, realistically it would cost tens of millions of dollars annually. Yet you have nothing in the measure that provides any funding. Plus the fees included wouldn't come close to covering the costs. Many police departments have agreed that complying with this measure will do one of two things, it will be exorbitantly expensive or next to impossible to obtain. Next is the unfettered authority granted to the OSP to inquire into any and all matter of personal information of the applicant & the power to deny the applicant the permit for any reason whatsoever. We have a constitution and bill of rights with a second amendment that is the law of the land of which I abide and will continue.

You can make more and more laws but in the end it will not stop criminals from getting weapons. All this does is penalize all when it's a minute % that commit gun related crimes.

My last concern is your explanation of this bill in the voters pamphlet. I expect as a taxpayer that it's honest & forthright pro and con.

~ Merrilee

From: [Michelle Reagan](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot measure public comment
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 7:42:45 PM

To: Explanatory IP 17 Committee members

RE: Problems with the explanatory statement for IP 17

The explanation that has been drafted for the voter's pamphlet has several misleading sections that I would like to have addressed and changed.

- The Title paragraph *“Requires permit to acquire firearms; police maintain permit/firearm database; criminally prohibits certain ammunition magazines”*

This is too vague and should explain more clearly to the voter what the “certain ammunition magazines” encompasses. **The wording should be changed toCriminally prohibits tubular and detachable magazines in excess of 10 rounds.** This would make it much clearer that this measure will also apply to the thousands of shotguns which were purchased as home defense firearms.

- The first paragraph under “Explanation” reads: *“This measure changes Oregon law relating to firearms by (1) requiring safety training and completed background checks.....”*

This implies that background checks are not currently required to purchase a firearm, and is therefore misleading to the voter. Background checks are currently required every time a firearm is purchased. **This paragraph should have “and completed background checks” struck from the wording.**

- The third bullet point under “Currently” reads *“State Police tracks background checks; no requirement for searchable database.....”*

Since the focus of this measure is not the State Police it should read as follows: **“Background checks completed by State Police; no requirement for searchable database.....”**

- Fourth bullet point under “Currently:” would better read as “Safety training required for concealed handgun license and hunting license for youth. If this wording is kept the “or” should be changed to “and” in “...concealed handgun license ~~or~~ **AND** hunting license for youth.”
- Sixth bullet point under “Currently:” now is written “Sheriff can deny concealed handgun license....” This needs to be changed to “Sheriff will deny concealed handgun license....” This statement is misleading because a sheriff does not have an option to grant a license if a background check is failed.
- Seventh bullet point under “Currently:” “Firearms can be sold/transferred without complete background check after three days.” This statement is misleading because it is a half truth and omits the fact that if the background check comes back as failed the firearm must be recovered by the seller, therefore, transferring a firearm after three days without a completed background check is not a standard practice for anyone selling firearms.
- A point of information that is missing from the explanatory statement is that, if passed, this ballot would make most pump action shotguns illegal. In recent years many first time firearm owners purchased shotguns for home defense, after all this was the firearm recommended by our current president, Joe Biden. These firearms would now be illegal since they can hold over 10 rounds of certain types of ammunition. These shotguns would not be exempt from this ballot measure because just like the name states, they are a PUMP action firearm and NOT a LEVER action firearm.

Thank you for your consideration in amending the explanatory statement for IP 17 to make it clearer so that our voters can make an informed decision.

Michelle Reagan

To: Explanatory IP 17 Committee members

RE: Problems with the explanatory statement for IP 17

The explanation that has been drafted for the voter's pamphlet has several misleading sections that I would like to have addressed and changed.

- The Title paragraph *"Requires permit to acquire firearms; police maintain permit/firearm database; criminally prohibits certain ammunition magazines"*

This is too vague and should explain more clearly to the voter what the "certain ammunition magazines" encompasses. **The wording should be changed toCriminally prohibits tubular and detachable magazines in excess of 10 rounds.** This would make it much clearer that this measure will also apply to the thousands of shotguns which were purchased as home defense firearms.

- The first paragraph under "Explanation" reads: *"This measure changes Oregon law relating to firearms by (1) requiring safety training and completed background checks....."*

This implies that background checks are not currently required to purchase a firearm, and is therefore misleading to the voter. Background checks are currently required every time a firearm is purchased. **This paragraph should have "and completed background checks" struck from the wording.**

- The third bullet point under "Currently" reads *"State Police tracks background checks; no requirement for searchable database....."*

Since the focus of this measure is not the State Police it should read as follows: **"Background checks completed by State Police; no requirement for searchable database....."**

- Fourth bullet point under "Currently:" would better read as "Safety training required for concealed handgun license and hunting license for youth. If this wording is kept the "or" should be changed to "and" in "...concealed handgun license ~~or~~ **AND** hunting license for youth."
- Sixth bullet point under "Currently:" now is written "Sheriff can deny concealed handgun license...." This needs to be changed to "Sheriff will deny concealed handgun license...." This statement is misleading because a sheriff does not have an option to grant a license if a background check is failed.

- Seventh bullet point under “Currently:” “Firearms can be sold/transferred without complete background check after three days.” This statement is misleading because it is a half truth and omits the fact that if the background check comes back as failed the firearm must be recovered by the seller, therefore, transferring a firearm after three days without a completed background check is not a standard practice for anyone selling firearms.
- A point of information that is missing from the explanatory statement is that, if passed, this ballot would make most pump action shotguns illegal. In recent years many first time firearm owners purchased shotguns for home defense, after all this was the firearm recommended by our current president, Joe Biden. These firearms would now be illegal since they can hold over 10 rounds of certain types of ammunition. These shotguns would not be exempt from this ballot measure because just like the name states, they are a PUMP action firearm and NOT a LEVER action firearm.

Thank you for your consideration in amending the explanatory statement for IP 17 to make it clearer so that our voters can make an informed decision.

Michelle Reagan

From: [Vickie M. Westbrook](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Gun Ballot Measure IP 17 Hearing
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 2:50:47 PM

Dear Sir / Maam's:

There is simply NO reason for this Ballot Measure. The good God Fearing Citizen's of Oregon do not kill people with guns. But the criminals do. This bill won't stop the criminals. It won't stop the meth heads or the any of the crazy people who can buy guns on the black market and kill all the people they want.

In recent school shootings or public shootings it has been the deranged person with a gun that has killed people. NOT a law abiding citizen.

Your ballot is damaging in and will cause grossly cost the law abiding citizen's thousands of dollar's. Here are some things that infuriate me!

- **Police in urban areas are already not responding to most 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 penalties if they do not complete it.**

YOU need to stop this non-sense! You are not looking out for the good people of Oregon.

In God We Trust!

Vickie M. Westbrook
931 Sellwood Drive
Eagle Point, Oregon 97524
541-601-8175

NO Vax 4 Kids

Precinct Committee Person (PCP), Republican Party, Precinct 8
Never give up your rights and freedom.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: gmadison812@grassrootsmessages.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: The Explanatory Statement for IP 17 is Flawed & Misleading
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 3:18:28 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, Gary Madison

From: jimcjagger@aol.com
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Explanatory Statement Response to Measure 114
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 3:30:49 PM

Dear Committee members:

I was a practicing attorney in Oregon before retirement for 48 years. I have reviewed the Explanatory Statement for Measure 114. It accurately outlines the contents of Measure 114 fairly and honestly. It should be approved. It will save lives and I support its passage. Thank you.

Jim Jagger 541-913-5194
3457 Whisper Lane
Eugene, Oregon 97401

From: [Merrilee Alexander](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: (IP) 17.... ballot measure 114
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 3:49:51 PM

LIP 17 is yet another anti-gun ballot initiative that seeks to further erode Second Amendment rights for Oregonians. Initiative 17 does nothing to reduce gun violence and blatantly disregards our constitutional rights. This ballot measure is dangerous to Oregon's law abiding gun owners, sportsman and women, and Second Amendment supporters. 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. The measure requires the following:

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 and there is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities nor the manpower power to provide classes. Police and urban areas are already not responding to most violent crimes.

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.

I know recently there was an explanatory statement committee that met to draft an explanatory statement for the voters pamphlet, explaining to voters effects of ballot measure 114. Proponent's brought in their own deceptive, bullet point format of a "statement", disregarding the legislative councils draft they were provided to work with. They falsely argued with the opponents that "their experts" said, "pump action" and "lever action" fire arms are the same, and expressed other erroneous claims. This deceptive draft statement was released for public comment despite the efforts of opponents on the committee. Your actions are criminal to say the very least. Oregon has a over abundance of gun laws that don't work now. Criminals will always get guns and weapons. From what I understand the voters pamphlet will not be truthful and correct in regards to the impact of this unconstitutional law. Oregonians need to know the black and the white, the up and the down, the in and out, and every aspect of this bill you're trying to push on law abiding Oregonians.

Merrilee Alexander

From: [Michael C Galloway](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure 114 proposed "Explanatory Statement"
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 4:41:57 PM

Dear Committee Members:

After reading the "Explanatory Statement" regarding Ballot Measure 114, we would ask you to please clarify/add the following to it before the final version is submitted to the Voters' Pamphlet:

- * Where will the funds come from for all these additional requirements? Law enforcement agencies are currently short staffed and underfunded. Measure requires instructors are to be certified by a law enforcement agency; searchable database is to be provided by police departments.
- * How will equity issues regarding fees for the permits and required training (fee unknown) for low income and minorities be provided? Where will the money come from?
- * How can the database be truly exempt from public disclosure as evidenced from California's recent breach?
- * Clarify "State Police annually reports permit data"; reports what to whom? Risk of public disclosure?
- * How is applying for a concealed handgun license different from this ballot measure's permit requirements? To obtain a concealed handgun license one must take a gun safety course and pass a background check.

Please note that current law requires a background check prior to purchasing a firearm.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Michael C Galloway and Carol A Galloway