

## Comments Received to IP 17, Tuesday, July 26, 2022

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

From: Danielle Kelly <[rivernymph80@yahoo.com](mailto:rivernymph80@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:12 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: IP 17

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to express concerns regarding the Gun Ban Measure IP 17.

I understand that this measure is meant to keep the general public safe, and that you all are tasked with reviewing this measure.

I feel confident that you're looking at this measure through the lens of what you all think is best for our citizens out of a genuine concern for our wellbeing.

I'm seeing some issues that may not be appropriately considered for the long term effects that this measure, as it stands, is not addressing.

I've learned that the Oregon State Sheriff's Association will be responsible for the processing of permits that citizens will be required to have in order to purchase a gun if this measure passes.

I understand that the expense of processing these permits could be upwards of \$40,000,000.00 annually.

I ask you to consider the following:

Where will these funds come from?

How would this funding be ensured?

What is the actual benefit vs. risk of having this measure in place vs. not having this measure in place?

How many law abiding, registered gun owners have committed a heinous crime vs. criminals that aren't registered gun owners.

Is that number annual? Consistent?

Have those numbers changed during the Covid Pandemic?

Does this committee, which is a representation of the general population of Oregon, truly believe that this measure would change that number if the measure passes?

Could it be possible that our great state might benefit from \$40,000,000.00 budget to address mental health programs instead? Or homelessness... or both?

I hope I have added some valid considerations that this committee will listen to and take to heart, as this is a very important topic that should not be passed without much deep and honest reflection on the impacts of this measure to our Oregonian citizens.

Thank you for your time and your genuine consideration.

Sincerely,

Danielle Kelly  
Cottage Grove, OR

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

From: Mike Smith <[mk.smith79@comcast.net](mailto:mk.smith79@comcast.net)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:31 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: IP 17

IP17 is unworkable and adversely affects marginalized people.

The petition requires extensive training to obtain authorization to purchase a firearm. As a certified firearm instructor, I know that this will impose a significant cost and availability hurdle, that particularly impacts the poor. Many ranges, that host training, are not easily accessible to urban residents using public transportation.

Further, the initiative imposes requirements, for all Oregonians, without providing any plan for implementation. The police must provide the training, or certify others as instructors. There is no method to execute this. There is no budget to support it. It just won't work.

Finally, the bill clearly won't stand up to judicial scrutiny. IP17 will delay Oregonians exercising rights that the US Supreme court has sustained and waste taxpayer dollars futilely defending a law that the court has clearly indicated that it will not support.

IP17 hurts the poor. It's not a complete plan. It will waste taxpayer dollars.

Mike

--

So act that the use of thy freedom may not circumscribe the freedom of any other.

- Kant

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

From: Rocky <[ytsilver@yahoo.com](mailto:ytsilver@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:04 PM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: Racial and ethnic impacts of IP 17

To whom it may concern:

Oregon's State police force is the governor's police force, under the direction of the governor and with a superintendent appointed by the governor. This situation significantly insulates the force from the democratic process and influence of the people they serve. To be reliant upon such an insulated institution in order to exercise an individual right facilities

systemic racism. Given our current superintendent and governor the concern may not be great but we should insure that the laws we put in place may not be tools for abuse by those with political power in the future.

The urban community is underserved with access to areas with which to conduct live fire shooting instruction and practice. Given the live fire qualification requirement of IP 17 residents of our urban communities, typically more ethnically diverse than Oregon's rural communities, will be disadvantaged in their ability to meet the proposed requirement to purchase a firearm.

Additional encumbrance to legal firearm ownership has historically resulted in people seeking illicit means in order to acquire firearms for protection. Given the racial and ethnic disparities proposed by this law it is reasonable to believe that those people illicitly owning firearms for self defense will be over represented by ethnic minorities. This situation will contribute to the over representation of incarcerated minorities.

Thank you for your time,

Robert Hardesty, Oregonian

Sent from my iPhone

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

From: [mrbill6752@charter.net](mailto:mrbill6752@charter.net) <[mrbill6752@charter.net](mailto:mrbill6752@charter.net)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 6:38 PM

To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP 17

Measure IP 17 requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

The existing racial statement covers none of these issues.

Sincerely,  
Bill S. May  
1719 SE Giles St.  
Roseburg, OR 97470

**From:** Alexander Fine <[alexander.m.fine@gmail.com](mailto:alexander.m.fine@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:10 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17 Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement

Hello,

My name is Alexander Fine and I am a resident of Portland, Oregon. I am a licensed Oregon CPA. Thank you for considering the public's opinion regarding the Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement of Initiative Petition 17. My opinion on the matter is written below.

This measure will massively impact those who are most vulnerable in our communities. While the idea of promoting firearms education and safety classes is not a bad concept, in execution this bill does nothing more than give the government enormous discretionary authority in the permitting system, and imposes no limits on time and cost for the law abiding citizen to be able to procure a firearm. This effectively gives the government total control in deciding who has the right to defend themselves. This measure would grant the government discretionary power to investigate individuals for an unlimited amount of time before deciding to issue a permit, which has enormous potential for abuse. This will massively impact individuals from low income communities, who will spend crippling amounts of time and money trying to make it through this non-transparent and costly permitting process. Furthermore we must recognize the real, tangible harm that this will cause. Individuals from low income and minority communities are more likely to experience real danger in their life, and in turn, have a higher chance of needing to defend themselves whether or not they actually discharge a firearm while defending themselves (in most self defense uses of a firearm, the firearm is never fired, simply owning a gun is enough to save your life from an attacker). In light of this circumstance, it can be seen that this measure abandons people from low income communities who may not have the extra time and extra money to dedicate to this permitting process. For example, maybe someone asking the government for a permit is a single mother working around the clock, and they want to carry a gun in their purse so they can feel safe at night. This measure would condemn such a person who may not have extra resources and time to get through the permitting process. It condemns them to live a life in fear, unable to defend themselves if/wen they need to. Self defense is a natural right and we must be extremely careful how we restrict this right. Restricting this right always comes at a significant cost to liberty and justice.

Furthermore, the Oregon Firearms Federation has mentioned these two points below which I find quite relevant:

1. The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.
2. There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Thank you for considering my opinion in this matter.

Alexander Fine, CPA

**From:** Joe Rosa <[joerosa11@gmail.com](mailto:joerosa11@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 6:14 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17 Gun and Magazine initiative

To whom it may concern,

After reading the IP 17 initiative find that I have many questions and concerns with the language used in the crafting of this

Initiative. I find that as it stands it will be difficult for the voters of this state to fully understand the content and make an informed

Decision come election day.

Furthermore it seems evident to me the rural parts of the state and the low income and minority families will be adversely effected and find

It much more difficult to meet the requirements listed in your initiative.

Listed below are some bullet points ( no pun intended) of the items I find of concern.

- The measure outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit. Most shotguns which have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 "mini shells" making them illegal to purchase. This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon.
- The measure requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are no facilities that will be available for this training.
- For first time gun buyers this could well require that you have a gun before you can get a permit to buy a gun. There are no exceptions for the permit to purchase requirement for police or Federally licensed gun dealers.
- The "permitting agent" can demand "any additional information" to issue the permit opening endless opportunities for abuses.
- The measure only allows those approved by police to provide the required "training" to apply for a permit. Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed. There is no plan in place to physically provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or workforce to provide classes.
- 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.
- There are no estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police. The measure requires a public list of persons who attempt to purchase firearms. Victims of domestic violence will be at risk for all their confidential information being made public along with their efforts to purchase a firearm for self-defense.
- The measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets. The measure requires a permit from local police (which may be impossible to get) just to apply for permission from the Oregon State Police simply to buy

a firearm. But it also removes the one safeguard that protects gun buyers if the State Police do not complete their background check.

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

I respectfully request that the committee address these issues in there explanatory statement.

Thank you

Joe A Rosa

2790 Brookdale Dr.

Central Point Or. 97502

Joerosa11@gmail.com

**From:** Jake Layer <[jake@layerdental.com](mailto:jake@layerdental.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 5:33 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17 racial and ethnic impact

Dear Committee –

Here are some points to consider with respect to the racial and ethnic impact of IP17.

Thank you for your consideration:

-Dr. Jake Layer

Medford, OR

- The measure requires a “class” before a person can apply for a “permit” to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.
- The required “class” must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.
- The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a “permit.” This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.
- There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

**From:** Pete Steen <[4petesteen@gmail.com](mailto:4petesteen@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:55 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP17

This proposed action will assure that only affluent people will be able to afford the cost of the required training. Low income people, including minorities and other marginalized people will not be able defend their homes from the predators and gangs that terrorize our neighborhoods today.

Pete Steen  
503.312.4216 cell  
[4petesteen@gmail.com](mailto:4petesteen@gmail.com)

**From:** Guy McMahan <[gcmcmahan16@gmail.com](mailto:gcmcmahan16@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:28 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Content of IP 17 gun ballot measure.

To Whom It May Concern:

The general terms of the ballot measure IP 17 are discriminatory and racist towards lawful citizens that would otherwise have a lawful right to carry arms for protection and recreation as can now be applied for currently. Specifics and Clarifications need to be addressed by the proponents BEFORE this is placed on the ballot.

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban and minority residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous

potential for abuse. These powers can be applied selectively and with impunity.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required.

At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for my concerns.

These issues are certain to impact low income and minority communities disproportionately.

My concerns are not addressed in General or Specifically.

How can you see your way through placing this flawed proposal on the ballot?

Cordially

GRM

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

From: Philip Fleury <[philipfleury1@me.com](mailto:philipfleury1@me.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:17 PM

To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP 17 impact on minorities

I believe that if IP 17 is passed into law, one of the primary effects of the new legislation would be to dramatically and disproportionately affect, in a negative manner, minorities in the community. It would have a huge impact on senior minority members living on a fixed income, who, in all likelihood, would not be able to pay for the classes and fees needed to even apply to purchase a firearm, much less the firearm itself. The measure contains no plan to offer the required classes locally, thus impacting elders, especially if they are frail physically, requiring them to travel to an unknown location where the class is being offered. The result of this measure would be to make minority members more vulnerable and less able to defend themselves from the increasing violence in Portland.

Philip A. Fleury  
Sent from my iPad

**From:** Roadrunner <[roadrunner\\_1@embarqmail.com](mailto:roadrunner_1@embarqmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:05 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17



Please consider these points in IP17 and how they would impact minorities and low income families.

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Thank You

Dan Drayton

Lincoln City, OR

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

From: Andrew Stephens <[spookdaddy73@yahoo.com](mailto:spookdaddy73@yahoo.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:40 PM

To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP 17

To whom it may concern,

This bill violates our citizens 2nd Amendment rights. Period full stop. You have no right to push this bill through. We don't have a gun problem in Oregon or America! We have a leadership problem. We have a mental health crisis problem, and sadly the left side of our political system is leading the mental health crisis problem. If you have Pfizer money in your back ground we will find out. We will hold you accountable. We will ruin you in the future. This isn't China, it's America! And we won't be bullied by weak, spineless, political criminals! Have you ever heard the term " They won't be able to walk down the street " ? We're talking about bad politicians, and we have our fair share here in Oregon as displayed by your hideous bills and medical hypocrisy. Don't do this, end this bill before it can start!

Sincerely yours,  
Every patriot in Oregon

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

From: Jim Welsh <[jimwelsh69@yahoo.com](mailto:jimwelsh69@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:36 PM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: IP 17, or the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act'

I believe that IP 17, the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act' violates the Single-subject rule of the initiative process in Oregon as there are several different items in this initiative petition.

Also IP 17 will require a 'permit to buy' a firearm., which is akin to a Firearm Owners Identification Card which was ruled unconstitutional under the second amendment to the United States Constitution in one state. This would be no different the IP 17 'permit to buy' scheme, which reduces a right to that of a privilege.

IP 17 the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act' should struck from the 2022 ballot as being more than a single subject and confusing in its nature and terminology.

Thank you,

Jim Welsh  
[jimwelsh69@yahoo.com](mailto:jimwelsh69@yahoo.com)

**From:** Brian Girsberger <[bcgirsbe@teleport.com](mailto:bcgirsbe@teleport.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:23 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17 Racial & Ethnic Impact

This measure states a "Class" must be taken before a person can apply for a "Permit" to buy a firearm. This class will require live fire. Low income, urban residents will have the most difficult time finding an approved class. This class is required!

This required class must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in these Low income urban areas can't provide the class, those residents will be required to find a class far from their home at their cost. This could become cost preventative for them.

This measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "Permit". This has a huge potential for abuse and can be given selectively.

There is no time limits on the multiple background checks that will be required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. Even the sponsors of this measure have admitted they have no idea what to do on the answers for these concerns. All of these issues WILL impact low income and urban type communities disproportionately.

This has no business being on the ballot cause no thought was put into where the money was coming from to finance these programs plus the inequality of the whole thing. Needs to be scrapped and started over.

Sincerely,

Brian Girsberger

"A Country without history, is a Country without a future." – Winston Churchill

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:20:07 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17. I understand that this measure **outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit.**

**Most shotguns which have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 "mini shells" making them illegal to purchase.**

**This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon's 30 high school teams featuring over 600 student athletes.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Anne Larson

Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:20:46 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17. I understand that this measure **requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training.**

**Many areas in Oregon, including my own, have limited or no facilities available to pursue effective live fire training. When available, high expense is yet another limiting factor.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in

Committee.  
Sincerely,  
Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:40:17 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.  
I understand that this measure **requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training. Many areas in Oregon, including my own, have limited or no facilities available to pursue effective live fire training. When available, high expense is yet another limiting factor.**  
I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.  
Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:40:56 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.  
I understand that this measure **only allows those approved by police to provide the required "training" to apply for a permit. Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed. There is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or manpower to provide classes. Police in urban areas are already not responding to most violent crimes.**  
I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.  
Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:41:30 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.  
I understand that this measure **does not provide exceptions for the required permit for Federally licensed dealers or law enforcement.**  
I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.  
Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:42:28 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.  
I understand that the **Oregon State Sheriff's Association has estimated that if a person somehow could complete the required training, the permitting process would cost Oregon 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.**  
I urge you to consider and include these facts in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.  
Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17

**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:43:08 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **though this measure caps the cost for a permit, there are no caps on the costs for the required training.**

**This type of training is unlikely to be available.**

**This burden will mostly affect low income communities.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson

Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17

**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:43:50 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure requires that the required class—taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers—includes 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 urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson

Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17

**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:44:24 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure requires that a sheriff or local police department issue a permit within 30 days after an approved background check has been completed by the State Police.**

**But there is NO limit on how long the State Police can take to complete the background check and NO penalties if they do not complete it.**

**And there are NO estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson

Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17

**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:45:07 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure requires a public list of persons who attempt to purchase firearms.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson

Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17

**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:45:40 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at a time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets without accountability.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:46:19 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

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

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson  
Beaverton, Oregon

**From:** Anne Larson  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS  
**Subject:** IP17  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:47:58 PM

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **current State and Federal law allows the transfer of a firearm if the State Police don't complete a background check in 3 business days.**

**This measure removes that safeguard, a concern for anyone awaiting a home defense firearm.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Anne Larson,  
Beaverton, Oregon

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

From: Harry Wallace <[harrywallace1@comcast.net](mailto:harrywallace1@comcast.net)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:18 PM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Cc: [harrywallace1@comcast.net](mailto:harrywallace1@comcast.net)  
Subject: IP 17

To whom it should Concern:

Placing a cost premium on legal firearms purchases disproportionately affects ethnic minorities, lower middle classes and the poor. The very people in most need of self defensive tools, as they inhabit less than ideal neighborhoods due to economic necessity. There are no gated communities with security guards for them. Especially in these times of defunded and demoralized law enforcement these more vulnerable citizens are harder pressed with the exponential increase in crime and homicides. The progressive policies of late have nearly reduced our society to chaos where only self preservation stands between the individual and oblivion. Eroding our 2nd Amendment rights through more and more absurd restrictions is unconscionable.

Do the responsible thing, the humanitarian thing, send IP 17 into the round file.

Regards,

Harry W Wallace  
Reg. Independent

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

From: Leith <[leithal@leithal.org](mailto:leithal@leithal.org)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:52 PM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: Comments on IP17

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Front Sight Patron  
NRA Patron Member

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

From: Harry Wallace <[harrywallace1@comcast.net](mailto:harrywallace1@comcast.net)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:17 PM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: IP 17

To whom it should Concern:

Placing a cost premium on legal firearms purchases disproportionately affects ethnic minorities, lower middle classes and the poor. The very people in most need of self defensive tools, as they inhabit less than ideal neighborhoods due to economic necessity. There are no gated communities with security guards for them. Especially in these times of defunded and demoralized law enforcement these more vulnerable citizens are harder pressed with the exponential increase in crime and homicides. The progressive policies of late have nearly reduced our society to chaos where only self preservation stands between the individual and oblivion. Eroding our 2nd Amendment rights through more and more absurd restrictions is unconscionable.

Do the responsible thing, the humanitarian thing, send IP 17 into the round file.

Regards,

Harry W Wallace  
Reg. Independent

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

From: Roy Pierce <[rmpierce056@gmail.com](mailto:rmpierce056@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:31 PM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: IP 17

No provisions or strategy has been addressed pertaining to lower income persons who would be burdened by these requirements. Undue strain would be exerted on this class of persons and the unaddressed time periods for approval would allow the use of class standing to open up potential discriminatory denials of rights.

The potential added financial burden due to understaffed law enforcement agencies not being able to screen or test would cause already strained individuals great financial harm. In essence a discrimination based on class and socioeconomic standing would harm those individuals at the greatest risk as they live and work in the highest crime areas.

I urge that thought be carefully given to the unneeded establishment of these problems. Law enforcement is already stretched to thin and unable to keep up.

**From:** foudad mohiadeen <[fmvolume86@gmail.com](mailto:fmvolume86@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:36 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17

Good afternoon,

I'm deeply troubled to learn that Oregon would like to pass a measure that would open up to racism, prejudice and racial biases.

As a middle eastern American and United States Veteran I truly find this troubling. Giving control to another person to decide whether you could or should own a firearm is just asinine. How can this not be abused.

This bill needs to address how unconstitutional it is in the first place and the impact on the tax payers in this state that will have to shell out on the lawsuits that will be LOST due to supreme court Bruen case which laid it out clear.

This goes beyond gentrification, now this state not only has gentrified most of the state now it wants the people in those gentrified areas unable to pursue firearms for protection in a city riddled with crime the state refuses to go after.

There are no plans in place to have training done, no plan in place no how the police with being understaffed to conduct all this "certified training" and of course it will only open up racial discrimination, age, and gender discrimination. There is no guarantee that another human being won't abuse this and the state would be now infringing on the rights of its citizens.

I believe this Bill goes against the Oregon Constitution as well.

**From:** Rod Rancik <[kicnar@yahoo.com](mailto:kicnar@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:17 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17, the Gun, and Magazine Ban Initiative

Besides the cost impact to police departments and the State of Oregon, the availability of personnel meeting the instructor requirements is unattainable. The police do not have adequate personnel to handle the increased workload for these applications. The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class. The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense. The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively. There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of



the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately

**From:** Tim Stewart <[scubapilot48@gmail.com](mailto:scubapilot48@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:14 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17

I am concerned that IP 17 does not provide funding for most of the requirements it proposes. I believe that the 'Explanatory Statement' should point out that no funding will be provided by IP 17 to police departments for such things as shooting ranges, (indoor or outdoor), or to provide rental firearms for those without one, funds for training those who will provide this firearms class, funds for the time and effort the police will put into administration of the rule or even compensation for those who teach this class.

Without this information included in the Explanatory Statement, it seems that most people will not be able to make an informed decision about whether IP 17 should become law.

Tim Stewart

Phoenix, Oregon

[www.scubapilot2.com](http://www.scubapilot2.com)

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

**From:** Fred Kenpo <[fredkenpo@gmail.com](mailto:fredkenpo@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:59 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Impact on Minorities of Prop 17.

July 28, 2022

Oregon Criminal Justice Commission

Re: Impact of Prop 17 on minorities

Dear sirs/madams:

Thank you for your concern about the effects of Proposition 17 on non-whites. I can't predict the future, but it will be disproportionate to the effects on Whites. The proposition does cap license fees at \$65.00 which is in line with other fees for the exercise of Second Amendment rights. It requires training which currently is not available; however, a police chief or a sheriff mindful of his duties to uphold the Constitution might farm the training out the way it currently is.

However, such training and fees will amount to about \$165, possibly more. Let's look at the stats for states that have required fees of that magnitude.

"Race and concealed handgun permits

Here are a few states with high fees to get permits Texas 2012 permit fee \$140 Black share of population 12.2%  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48000.html>

Black share of permits issued 7.2%

[http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/RSD/CHL/Reports/2012Fiscal/byRace\\_Sex/1LicenseApplicationsIssued.pdf](http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/RSD/CHL/Reports/2012Fiscal/byRace_Sex/1LicenseApplicationsIssued.pdf)

Louisiana 2009 permit fee \$100

Black share of population 32.4%

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/22000.html>

Black share of permits issued 12%

<http://www.lsp.org/pdf/chAnnualReport09.pdf>

Oklahoma 2011 permit fee \$125

Black share of population 7.7%

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/40000.html>

Black share of permits issued 2.8% <https://osbi.ok.gov/> [i][ii]

Other states have used licensing to restrict Black gun ownership. Consider the following:

“In the 1990s, "gun control" laws continue to be enacted so as to have a racist effect if not intent:

Police-issued license and permit laws, unless drafted to require issuance to those not prohibited by law from owning guns, are routinely used to prevent lawful gun ownership among ‘unpopular’ populations. Public housing residents, approximately 3 million Americans, are singled out for gun bans.

‘Gun sweeps’ by police in ‘high crime neighborhoods’ whereby vehicles and ‘pedestrians who meet a specific profile that might indicate they are carrying a weapon’ are searched are becoming popular, and are being studied by the U.S. Department of Justice as ‘Operation Ceasefire.’” [iii]

The origins of this go way back. And they weren’t, especially in the North (what we now call the Blue States), they were also aimed at Union organizers, who needed protection against the goons called in by large corporations.

According to Stefan B Tahassebi,

The first gun control laws were enacted in the ante-bellum South forbidding blacks, whether free or slave, to possess arms, in order to maintain blacks in their servile status. After the Civil War, the South continued to pass restrictive firearms laws in order to deprive the newly freed blacks from exercising their rights of citizenship. During the later part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century, gun control laws were passed in the South in order to disarm agrarian reformers and in the North to disarm union organizers. In the North, a strong xenophobic reaction to recent waves of immigrants added further fuel for gun control laws which were used to disarm such persons. Other firearms ownership restrictions were adopted in order to repress the incipient black civil rights movement. [iv]

Tahassebi goes on to say,

The historical purpose of gun control laws in America has been one of discrimination and disenfranchisement of blacks, immigrants, and other minorities. American gun control laws have been enacted to disarm and facilitate repressive actions against union organizers, [Page 69] workers, the foreign-born and racial minorities. [2] Bans on particular types of firearms and firearms registration schemes have been enacted in many American jurisdictions for the alleged purpose of controlling crime. Often, however, the purpose or actual effect of such laws or regulations was to disarm and exert better control over the above-noted groups. [3] As Justice Buford of the Florida Supreme Court noted in his concurring opinion narrowly construing a Florida gun control statute [v]

So the effect, if not the intent of gun control laws, is to disarm Blacks and other groups (e.g., immigrants and Union organizers), and any disarmament will put the disarmed at risk.

This still persists today.

Even today firearms regulations target minorities or other unpopular groups. For instance, present Massachusetts law still makes possession of guns by aliens a criminal offense.[57] Present federal statutes make it a felony for one dishonorably discharged, or having renounced American citizenship to purchase or possess a firearm.[58] This federal statute is surely a punitive measure against those who have trespassed certain norms of acceptable behavior even though there is no indication of violent criminal tendencies.

The worst abuses at present occur under the mantel of racially neutral laws that are, however, enforced in a discriminatory manner. [Page 81]

In many jurisdictions which require a discretionary gun permit, police departments have wide discretion in issuing a permit, and those departments unfavorable to gun ownership, or to the race, politics, or appearance of a particular applicant frequently maximize obstructions to such persons while favored individuals and groups experience no difficulty in the granting of a permit.[59] In St. Louis[vi]

But proposition 17 doesn't allow discretion in the issuance of a permit. Well, no, but most police forces can't afford to train people. True, some sheriffs might farm it out to the present trainers, but the cost will hurt minorities. And others might simply require people to wait until the police will train. And will the police fairly train minorities? Heh. I think you know the answer to that.

But what of it? Blacks and minorities don't need to protect themselves. I think you know the answer to that.

Whites will be inconvenienced by Proposition 17. They will get the training, if training is necessary. They will present their current license which, hey, presto! will be good enough. For Blacks and other minorities, they might be a little more critical.

We can't tell how much the adverse effects of Proposition 17 will be on minorities, but there will be some and it will be disproportionate to the effect on White populations. This should be mentioned in the description of the law.

Thank you for listening.

Dr. Fred Young

---

[i] [i][i][i][i][i][i] <https://johnrlott.blogspot.com/2013/03/race-and-concealed-handgun-permits.html>

[ii]The Racist Origins of US Gun Control - The Truth About Guns <https://cdn0.thetruthaboutguns.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/the-racist-origins-of-us-gun-control-2.pdf>

[iii]

[iv] George Mason University Civil Rights Law Journal Vol. 2 (1991): 67, p. 1

[v] Ibid, p. 3

[vi] Ibid, p. 11

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

From: D. Qotsaisaw <[biskinik@gmx.us](mailto:biskinik@gmx.us)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:49 AM

To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP 17 Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement Comments

RE: IP 17 Racial and Ethnic Impact statement,

The current Racial and Ethnic Impact statement does not address these issues:

\* The measure requires a “class” before a person can apply for a “permit” to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

\* The required “class” must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

\* The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a “permit.” This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

\* There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Thank you,  
David Qotsaisaw  
Talent, OR

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

From: Michael C Galloway <[mcgalloway@comcast.net](mailto:mcgalloway@comcast.net)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:47 AM

To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: Racial impact of IP 17

To The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission:

IP 17 requires a “class” before a person can apply for a “permit” to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required “class” must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a “permit.” This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Michael Galloway

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

**From:** [hoss@gorge.net](mailto:hoss@gorge.net) <[hoss@gorge.net](mailto:hoss@gorge.net)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:03 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** comments on IP 17

To whom it may concern-

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportional.

I don't understand how the legislature can consider this unconstitutional bill. The class, the permit, along with the 'unlimited time' for the background check will undoubtedly create an undue burden for citizens. This (unconstitutional) law may cause the death of someone needing a gun for self protection.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Mitch Hosford

**From:** dave neil <[scorpion23572020@outlook.com](mailto:scorpion23572020@outlook.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:58 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** class to get a permit to buy

It could be said we gun owners are in the minority. If we can't afford classes or permits then what? Just out of luck I guess. Just try to get an

explanation of what the measure is and how it can or can't be upheld fairly across the board.

**From:** Laura Hurst <[lauhurst@gmail.com](mailto:lauhurst@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:28 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement for IP 17

Regarding racial and ethnic impact for the IP 17, the Gun Ban Ballot Measure, the following needs to be considered first, before this measure is accepted and passed:

The measure requires a “class” before a person can apply for a “permit” to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class. The required “class” must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense. The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a “permit.” This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively. There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately. The existing racial statement covers none of these issues.

Sincerely,

Laura Hurst

Rogue River, Oregon

**From:** Julie Madsen <[jmadsen618@aol.com](mailto:jmadsen618@aol.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:51 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17

Hello.

This proposal requires a “class” before a person can apply for a “permit” to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

This “class” must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

Why should we give police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a “permit.” This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively. As we have seen, low-income communities could be targeted.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

These concerns are valid and deserve your consideration.

With goodwill...Julie Madsen

**From:** Paul Marshall <[paulmarshall@bendcable.com](mailto:paulmarshall@bendcable.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:49 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17 comments

The measure requires a class before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required class must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a permit. This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

**From:** Christopher Czarnecki <[chrisjczar@gmail.com](mailto:chrisjczar@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:23 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE IP 17

The measure requires a “class” before a person can apply for a “permit” to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required “class” must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a “permit.” This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

**Christopher Czarnecki**

*Chef/Owner, The Joel Palmer House Restaurant, Inc.*

503.864.2995 | 503.550.8680 | [chris@joelpalmerhouse.com](mailto:chris@joelpalmerhouse.com) |

[www.joelpalmerhouse.com](http://www.joelpalmerhouse.com)

**From:** Kevin Starrett <[k\\_starrett@oregonfirearms.org](mailto:k_starrett@oregonfirearms.org)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:52 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement Comments

To whom it may concern,

While addressing the Racial and Ethnic Impact of IP 17, (now ballot measure 114) please consider the following comment from the [Statistical Transparency of Policing Report](#) "Dated 12.1.2017 and revised April 15 2022. (Attached)

*"Based on the criteria described above, it is recommended that Oregon State Police be examined in greater detail by STOP Program researchers and receive technical assistance from DPSST. Oregon State Police was indicated as having a disparity in the Predicted Disposition analysis with regard to its citations of Black, Latinx, Asian/PI, Middle Eastern, and Native individuals; with regard to searches for Latinx and Native individuals; and with regard to arrests of Native individuals. In addition, the KPT Hit-Rate analysis identified a disparity with regard to searches of Middle Eastern individuals."*

IP 17 allows the Oregon State Police, in the background check mandated by the measure, to request of the applicant "any additional information determined necessary by the department rules."

It's not unreasonable to conclude that an open ended mandate of that type could be used to discriminate against persons of color. If the check includes the race of the permit seeker (as the current form for the purchase of a firearm, Form 4473 does) it would be an easy matter for law enforcement to single out persons of color for additional scrutiny in the background check process.

I ask you to also consider the added burdens placed on many persons of color who often live in urban areas which will be furthest from already sparse shooting facilities. Most life fire shooting facilities are located in rural or, at best, suburban areas far from inner cities and not served, or only marginally served, by mass transit.

This could easily place a disproportionate burden on low income minorities.

**From:** Jay P <[coldest0@hotmail.com](mailto:coldest0@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:57 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Ip17 ethnic and racial impact



The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**From:** Rog <[rohoduck@aol.com](mailto:rohoduck@aol.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:34 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Gun bill opposition

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the

"class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

**From:** SCOTT MCHARNES <[scottmch23@comcast.net](mailto:scottmch23@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:10 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17 VOTER'S GUIDE EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

I would like to see the following facts in the statement.....

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

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

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

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

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

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

The measure requires that the required class (taught only by "law enforcement approved" trainers) include training on state and federal law, transfers and storage, and the "impact of suicide on the

country as a whole.” There is no indication of who would be qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Scott McHarness

1116 Risdin Pl

Eugene OR 97404

**From:** Jake Layer <[jake@layerdental.com](mailto:jake@layerdental.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:52 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** input regarding IP17

OR CJC –

Here are some of my thoughts regarding IP 17. My comments may seem substantially similar to others who have commented. I assure you that my comments are well thought out and authentic. I hope that my comments help you to provide an honest, complete, and accurate assessment of what is actually in the measure and, more importantly, what the measure does. Thank you for your attention.

-Jake Layer

Medford, OR

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

2. The measure requires live fire training before a person can *apply* for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training. For first time gun buyers this could well require that you have a gun before you can get a permit to buy a gun.
3. There are no exceptions for the permit to purchase requirement for police or Federally licensed gun dealers.
4. The “permitting agent” can demand “any additional information” to issue the permit opening up endless opportunities for abuses.
5. The measure only allows those *approved by police* to provide the required “training” to apply for a permit. Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed. There is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or manpower to provide classes. Police in urban areas are already *not responding to most violent crimes*.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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. There are no estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police.
10. The measure requires a *public list* of persons who attempt to purchase firearms. Victims of domestic violence will be at risk for all their private information being made public along with their efforts to purchase a firearm for self-defense.
11. The measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets.
12. The measure requires a permit from local police (which may be impossible to get) just to *apply* for permission from the Oregon State Police simply to *buy* a firearm. But it also removes the one safeguard that protects gun buyers if the State Police do not complete their background check.
13. State and Federal law allow the transfer of a firearm if the state police don’t complete a background check in 3 business days. This measure removes that safeguard. So a single

mom with threats against her and her children could literally wait forever to get permission to get a home defense firearm.

From: Nathan Charpentier <nathan.charpentier@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:41 AM

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

Subject: Comments on ORS 137.685 Initiative 17

To whom it may concern,

Let us not forget some simple, common sense concepts when it comes to any gun control measures that are intended for safety.

Firstly, and most importantly, guns save a vast majority more lives than they harm. This is directly from CDC reporting showing the overwhelming majority of gun use is for self defense. Creating more hurdles to accessing guns for self defense is directly risking more deaths from avoiding access to firearms and concealed carry permits.

Secondly, gun control doesn't do what it intends to do, as most measures that are only based on "common sense" good intentions, versus empirical hard scientific evidence. The latest and largest meta-analysis to date, published by RAND, overwhelmingly concluded gun bans and ammunition bans and other non-evidenced measures provide no benefit to public safety. Here is link: [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2088-1.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2088-1.html). Follow up with more work only supporting this via expert interviews: <https://reason.com/video/2022/03/31/do-studies-show-gun-control-works-no/>.

Thirdly, criminals DO NOT FOLLOW GUN LAWS. You do not create more safety by targeting law abiding citizens and commonly owned firearms and magazine capacity handguns. You are likely doing the opposite, creating black markets, making illegal gun sales more lucrative, and empowering criminals.

In direct regards to ORS 137.685 Initiative 17 and how it relates to racial equity, or whatever politically correct rhetoric is proper to use today:

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding approved classes and possibly affording ammunition.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit". This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Additionally, let's not forget the first three major points mentioned that work against the safety of all citizens in the state of Oregon, including especially minority and low income individuals, in their ability to defend themselves from criminals with violent intent. Maybe you could focus more on root causes of violence in general, seeing as how any inanimate object can become a violent weapon with the intent to do harm. Instilling fear in law abiding citizens versus the criminals with violent intent is a good strategy how? If you want to brag about budget surpluses, put them into context with actual outcomes, property crime, violent crime, drug overdoses, and other types of major preventable deaths that take overwhelmingly significant amounts of life years from our communities are the vital components that show failure. Hold yourselves accountable for your policies and actually source quality science and empirical evidence instead of your good intentions or common sense idealisms. The "common sense good intentions" without quantifiable and defined metrics to hold the policies accountable is a dead giveaway these policies are geared otherwise.

God bless

Regards,

Nathan Charpentier

The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send this communication to the sender and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system.

**From:** Walther, Jad <[jad.walther@tektronix.com](mailto:jad.walther@tektronix.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:35 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Comments in Regards to IP 17

Hello,

I wanted to share some thoughts concerning the summary that is being developed for the voter's handbook for IP 17. First and foremost, I just ask that the committee truly provides an unbiased summary of the proposal. That means that both sides, for and against IP 17 are fairly represented. The summary should include facts about the proposed measure. I humbly ask you to consider these points when writing the final summary.

- The measure outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit. Most shotguns which have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 “mini shells” making them illegal to purchase. This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon.
- The measure requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training.
- The measure only allows those approved by police to provide the required “training” to apply for a permit. Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed. There is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or manpower to provide classes. Police in urban areas are already not responding to most violent crimes.
- The Oregon State Sheriff's Association has estimated that if a person somehow could complete the required training, the permitting process would cost sheriffs almost \$40,000,000.00 annually. There is nothing in the measure that provides any funding and the fees included would not come close to covering the costs. There is no estimate on the cost or impact on small local police departments.
- While the measure caps the cost for a permit, there are no caps on the costs for the required training, which is unlikely to be available anyway. This will mostly affect low income communities.
- The measure requires that the required class (taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers) include training on state and federal law, transfers and storage, and the “impact of suicide on the country as a whole.” There is no indication of who would be qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved.
- The measure requires that a sheriff or local police department issue a permit within 30 days after an approved background check has been completed by the State Police. But there is NO limit on how long the State Police can take to complete the background check and NO penalties if they do not complete it. There are no estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police.
- The measure requires a public list of persons who attempt to purchase firearms.
- The measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets.
- The measure requires a permit from local police (which may be impossible to get) just to *apply* for permission from the Oregon State Police simply *to buy* a firearm. But it also removes the one safeguard that protects gun buyers if the State Police do not complete their background check.

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

I appreciate your time reading and taking my thoughts into consideration.

Sincerely,

Jad Walther

Bend, OR

---

*Please be advised that this email may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us by email by replying to the sender and delete this message.*

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

From: Wade Mckee <[wade.mckee@ymail.com](mailto:wade.mckee@ymail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:40 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: Effects on black and brown community are bad

These measures are without merit hurting black and brown community s access to protection and safety by making costs excessive and too many steps to go through. Background checks are successful. Making racially driven only requirements blocking my Hispanic, asian, black, islander and lgbtq friends access more is negatively impacting them.

This will hurt black and brown people the most as they are most financially oppressed.

Thank you

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

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

From: Marcus <[marcusmathews24@gmail.com](mailto:marcusmathews24@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:52 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: Comments concerning Racial impact statement on IP17

To whom it may concern,

This measure, if it becomes law, would effectively discriminate against minorities in Oregon seeking to legally purchase a firearm. Here's how: It creates an undue financial burden on those experiencing poverty to receive the necessary training and apply for the permit. Since poverty disproportionately affects certain minority communities in Oregon, this law is essentially making it more difficult for people in those communities to legally purchase a firearm than it is for people in more financially stable communities.

Marcus Mathews

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

From: Sue Volz <[avzfan7@hotmail.com](mailto:avzfan7@hotmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:02 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>



Subject: IP17

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

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

Many areas in Oregon, including my own, have limited or no facilities available to pursue effective live fire training. When available, high expense is yet another limiting factor.

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sue Volz

**From:** Vince Hamblin <[vince.hamblin@icloud.com](mailto:vince.hamblin@icloud.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:33 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Cc:** Vincent Hamblin <[vince.hamblin@icloud.com](mailto:vince.hamblin@icloud.com)>

**Subject:** Comments on IP17

To Whom it May Concern;

Through avenues available to me as an actively voting constituent, I've learned of an initiative that has received approval to go to ballot.

The gun and magazine ban initiative (IP17), will have, among many concerning aspects of the measure, a grossly negative impact on and create disproportionately difficult access to law abiding lower income constituents seeking self defense firearms. The measure seeks to impede lawful and rightful access to firearms for citizens that have no previous issues with the laws. Access issues are not considered, nor are privacy concern addressed.

It is evident that this initiative and, thereafter, measure was hastily created without concern to these or any other impacts. It is readily apparent that the measure has been moved too quickly to committee and the ballot in an effort to capitalize on a public concerned with gun violence that has been further sensitized by recent events.

Below, I provide several of my itemized concerns.

1. The measure creates a requirement for a "class", but does not provide definition, curriculum guidance nor, most importantly, a range for the amount that can be charged for such a "class". This is very concerning given that many firearm 'classes' taken by citizens range wildly and can reach costs well over \$2,000. For many that might want, or even need, a self defense firearm, this cost alone represents as much as 6.5% of their before-tax annual income. This creates a disproportionate barrier of participation for those that are working and living within lower income lifestyles. It is patently unfair of a public governing body to marginalize a group of people based on income. This measure, and those that would support a description that does not detail this concern, is 'income-prejudiced'.
2. The measure will require "live fire" training prior to the application process commencing. The 'live fire' aspect of this measure creates yet another income disparaging point of concern. Given that no curriculum guidance has been provided in this measure, no limit to the amount of 'live fire' required is outlined or implied. Ammunition in today's economy commands an extremely high dollar amount for acquisition. Often times ammunition is altogether unavailable. A 'live fire' class will impose an additional cost to an already monetarily-strained constituent. Such a class, given the lack of confining definition in this measure could cost that person in excess of \$500, or more than 1.6% of their gross annual income.
3. An even greater burden will be placed on already financially-beleaguered sheriff's offices throughout the state. This may exceed \$40,000,000 in additional costs without any indication from the measure on how that will be funded. If left to underfunded offices, these 'permits' will likely go unprocessed or have, at best, an extremely

slow approval rate thereby creating extremely limited access to a potentially life-saving self defense firearm. The measure's description must address this concern and lay bare to the voting public this shortcoming.

4. This measure creates a list of applicants for a firearm. This list is then made public. The right to privacy is in complete disregard with such a list. Those that would intend to do harm, specifically domestic abusers, to others may use this information as a catalyst for felonious and life-threatening action. Any description of this measure made to the public must include these points and outline the breach in privacy of those that would intend to purchase a firearm for self defense against an estranged domestic abuser. Anything less would be purposely misleading.

It must also be stated that this additional law will, in no way, impede an already determined criminal from committing the crime that person was intending to commit. This measure will only create unnecessary restrictions on those that would otherwise purchase a firearm for use in a lawful manner. One such manner would be to defend oneself against the very criminal intent on disregarding ALL laws and doing harm to an individual.

You are ONLY hurting and impeding law-abiding citizens and constituents.

I request this committee seek true non-partisan transparency in their determination of the impact statement associated with this measure as it goes to ballot.

I welcome a response and further discourse on this matter. I also offer my services, free of charge, in collaborating on the definition to be associated with this measure.

I can be directly reached at my mobile phone number or email address, listed below.

Regards,  
Vincent Hamblin  
503-320-8268

[Vince.hamblin@icloud.com](mailto:Vince.hamblin@icloud.com)

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:17 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

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

**Many areas in Oregon, including my own, have limited or no facilities available to pursue effective live fire training. When available, high expense is yet another limiting factor.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** Greg Daiker <[daikersachers@gmail.com](mailto:daikersachers@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:31 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:**

Greg Daiker

Molalla, OR 97038

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

**From:** Vince Hamblin <[vince.hamblin@icloud.com](mailto:vince.hamblin@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:31 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Input on IP17

To Whom it May Concern;

Through avenues available to me as an actively voting constituent, I've learned of an initiative that has received approval to go to ballot.

The gun and magazine ban initiative (IP17), will have, among many concerning aspects of the measure, a grossly negative impact on and create disproportionately difficult access to law abiding lower income constituents seeking self defense firearms. The measure seeks to impede lawful and rightful access to firearms for citizens that have no previous issues with the laws. Access issues are not considered, nor are privacy concern addressed.

It is evident that this initiative and, thereafter, measure was hastily created without concern to these or any other impacts. It is readily apparent that the measure has been moved too quickly to committee and the ballot in an effort to capitalize on a public concerned with gun violence that has been further sensitized by recent events.

Below, I provide several of my itemized concerns.

1. The measure creates a requirement for a "class", but does not provide definition, curriculum guidance nor, most importantly, a range for the amount that can be charged for such a "class". This is very concerning given that many firearm 'classes' taken by citizens range wildly and can reach costs well over \$2,000. For many that might want, or even need, a self defense firearm, this cost alone represents as much as 6.5% of their before-tax annual income. This creates a disproportionate barrier of participation for those that are working and living within lower income lifestyles. It is patently unfair of a public governing body to marginalize a group of people based on income. This measure, and those that would support a description that does not detail this concern, is 'income-prejudiced'.
2. The measure will require "live fire" training prior to the application process commencing. The 'live fire' aspect of this measure creates yet another income disparaging point of concern. Given that no curriculum guidance has been provided in this measure, no limit to the amount of 'live fire' required is outlined or implied. Ammunition in today's economy commands an extremely high dollar amount for acquisition. Often times ammunition is altogether unavailable. A 'live fire' class will impose an additional cost to an already monetarily-strained constituent. Such a class, given the lack of confining definition in this measure could cost that person in excess of \$500, or more than 1.6% of their gross annual income.
3. An even greater burden will be placed on already financially-beleaguered sheriff's offices throughout the state. This may exceed \$40,000,000 in additional costs without any indication from the measure on how that will be funded. If left to underfunded offices, these 'permits' will likely go unprocessed or have, at best, an extremely slow approval rate thereby creating extremely limited access to a potentially life-saving self defense firearm. The measure's description must address this concern and lay bare to the voting public this shortcoming.
4. This measure creates a list of applicants for a firearm. This list is then made public. The right to privacy is in complete disregard with such a list. Those that would intend to do harm, specifically domestic abusers, to others may use this information as a catalyst for felonious and life-threatening action. Any description of this measure made to the public must include these points and outline the breach in privacy of those that would intend to purchase a firearm for self defense against an estranged domestic abuser. Anything less would be purposely misleading.

It must also be stated that this additional law will, in no way, impede an already determined criminal from committing the crime that person was intending to commit. This measure will only create unnecessary restrictions on those that would otherwise purchase a firearm for use in a lawful manner. One such manner would be to defend oneself against the very criminal intent on disregarding ALL laws and doing harm to an individual.

You are ONLY hurting and impeding law-abiding citizens and constituents.

I request this committee seek true non-partisan transparency in their determination of the impact statement associated with this measure as it goes to ballot.

I welcome a response and further discourse on this matter. I also offer my services, free of charge, in collaborating on the definition to be associated with this measure.

I can be directly reached at my mobile phone number or email address, listed below.

Regards,  
Vince Hamblin

503-320-8268 (cell) [Vince.hamblin@icloud.com](mailto:Vince.hamblin@icloud.com)

**From:** Candy Yow <[yowhunter2@gmail.com](mailto:yowhunter2@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:27 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17

Please consider some of the concerns I have regarding IP 17, I believe there are so many unanswered questions, Thank you for your time, Candy

- **The measure outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit. Most shotguns that have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 “mini shells” making them illegal to purchase. This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon.**
- **The measure requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training.**
- **The measure only allows those approved by police to provide the required “training” to apply for a permit. Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed. There is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or manpower to provide classes. Police in urban areas is already not responding to most violent crimes.**
- **There are no exceptions for the required permit for Federally licensed dealers or law enforcement.**
- **The Oregon State Sheriff’s Association has estimated that if a person somehow could complete the required training, the permitting process would cost sheriffs almost \$40,000,000.00 annually. There is nothing in the measure that provides any funding and the fees included would come close to covering the costs. There is no estimate on the cost or impact on small local police departments.**
- **While the measure caps the cost for a permit, there are no caps on the costs for the required training, which is unlikely to be available anyway. This will mostly affect low-income communities.**
- **The measure requires that the required class (taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers) include training on state and federal law, transfers and storage, and the “impact of suicide on the country as a whole.” There is no indication of who would be qualified to instruct on these issues or how they become approved.**
- **The measure requires that a sheriff or local police department issue a permit within 30 days after an approved background check has been completed by the State Police. But there is NO limit on how long the State Police can take to complete the background check and NO penalties if they do not complete it. There are no estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police.**
- **The measure requires a public list of persons who attempt to purchase firearms.**
- **The measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at a time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets.**
- **The measure requires a permit from the local police (which may be impossible to get) just to apply for permission from the Oregon State Police simply to buy a firearm. But it also removes the one safeguard that protects gun buyers if the State Police do not complete their background check.**
- **State and Federal law allow the transfer of a firearm if the State Police don’t complete a background check in 3 business days. This measure removes that safeguard. So a single mom with threats against her and her children could literally wait forever to get permission to get a home defense firearm.**

*Candy Yow*

*Co-Host Extreme Desire TV*

*Cabela's Pro-Staff*

*Ladies Hunting Camp*

*Oregon Access & Habitat Board*

**Oregon Representative DC Project**

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:22 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **current State and Federal law allows the transfer of a firearm if the State Police don't complete a background check in 3 business days.**

**This measure removes that safeguard.**

**So a single mom with threats against her and her children could literally wait forever to get permission to get a home defense firearm.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

---

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:22 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure creates a whole new category of victimless crimes at a time when the police are grossly underfunded and real criminals are being released onto our streets without accountability.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:21 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure requires a public list of persons who attempt to purchase firearms.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:20 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure requires that a sheriff or local police department issue a permit within 30 days after an approved background check has been completed by the State Police.**

**But there is NO limit on how long the State Police can take to complete the background check and NO penalties if they do not complete it.**

**And there are NO estimates of the cost of these checks to the State Police.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:20 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **this measure requires that the required class—taught only by “law enforcement approved” trainers—includes 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 urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:20 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that **though this measure caps the cost for a permit, there are no caps on the costs for the required training.**

**This type of training is unlikely to be available.**

**This burden will mostly affect low income communities.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:19 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that the **Oregon State Sheriff's Association has estimated that if a person somehow could complete the required training, the permitting process would cost Oregon 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.**

I urge you to consider and include these facts in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.  
Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:19 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that this measure **does not provide exceptions for the required permit for Federally licensed dealers or law enforcement.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.



Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:18 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that this measure **only allows those approved by police to provide the required “training” to apply for a permit.**

- **Police in Oregon are underfunded and understaffed.**
- **There is no plan in place to actually provide any training and virtually no rural police have the facilities or manpower to provide classes.**
- **Police in urban areas are already not responding to most violent crimes.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter’s Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

**From:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com) <[wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:15 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Cc:** [wjcoon@frontier.com](mailto:wjcoon@frontier.com)  
**Subject:** Concerns with Measure IP17

Greetings,

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that this measure **outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit.**

**Most shotguns which have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 “mini shells” making them illegal to purchase.**

**This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon’s 30 high school teams featuring over 600 student athletes.**

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter’s Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Wallace & Kimberlie Coon

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

**From:** Suzanne Volz <[sue.volz@me.com](mailto:sue.volz@me.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:54 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP17

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17. I understand that this measure requires live fire training before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. There are virtually no facilities that will be available for this training. Many areas in Oregon, including my own, have limited or no facilities available to pursue effective live fire training. When available, high expense is yet another limiting factor. I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter's Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,  
Sue Volz

**From:** [drompa@comcast.net](mailto:drompa@comcast.net) <[drompa@comcast.net](mailto:drompa@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:54 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17

IP 17 if approved and passed will have a devastating and extremely restrictive impact on Oregon's low-income and racial minority individuals and families. Many of these people rely on shotguns for hunting, varmint control and home protection. They cannot afford other expensive weapon alternatives. IP 17 will make it impossible to legally purchase a pump shotgun, for example.

What Oregon needs is "crime control" and not "gun control." Continually releasing dangerous criminals out onto the streets with limited or no bail is directly related to our high and rising crime rates. IP 17 will not stop this trend.

The Sherriff in my county has already stated that he does not have the resources to implement IP 17 if it is passed and he would not be able to enforce the law anyway. So, what's the point in passing a law no reasonable people want?

Bill Rompa  
Albany, OR

**From:** James Homolka <[james@legend21.net](mailto:james@legend21.net)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:53 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Public comments on IP 17

Good morning,

I wanted to send in my comments as a concerned citizen of Marion County and Oregon, regarding the upcoming ballot measure IP 17. I believe this is a dangerous and unconstitutional proposed measure that will greatly impact law abiding citizens in Oregon, especially minority communities.

Speaking specifically to the issue of the impact on minorities. The new proposed measure gives law enforcement an unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a citizen for a permit. This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively, especially to minority communities.

The new proposed measure requires a training class before someone could apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. Since this training requires live action fire, many if not all low income, urban residents would have an undue hardship trying finding a local approved training class.

The training class is required to be led by law enforcement or an instructor(s) approved by law enforcement. If the police departments in minority areas choose to prioritize this training and not provide a class, then minority residents would be required to find a training class far from their home with an extended strain on their time and finances.

Finally, there are no time limits set in place within this measure, in regards to the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the required training class. In recent days even the key sponsors of the proposed measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns that I have listed.

These issues, and many others related to this measure, are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately and in a place an extra hardship on them.

Thank you for your time and service.

James Homolka

Keizer, OR

**From:** [jsedwards25@hotmail.com](mailto:jsedwards25@hotmail.com) <[jsedwards25@hotmail.com](mailto:jsedwards25@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:53 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Explanatory Statement Committee (IP17) - Diverse Community Impact Assessment

Good morning,

I am submitting this feedback for publication to the record regarding the projected impacts to various racial communities within Oregon state, focused solely on BIPOC/communities of color and diverse ethnicity. I will highlight the title of each section, high level description of section, whether there is an impact to marginalized communities and provide narrative to expand understanding of impact. There is no intent to highlight areas of this initiative that are at significant risk due to the findings and clarifications of NY v. Bruen, nor to challenge the Secretary of State's assessment of the Constitutionality overall of this initiative.

The below is solely focused on impact to our marginalized communities. Thank you in advance.

### **Section 1: Permit to purchase process.**

**Description:** A new process requiring all citizens to submit for fingerprints, photographs, standard FBI background check, in-person demonstration of firearm handling, and establishment of a state database maintained by state law enforcement of all card holders.

**Impact to marginalized communities:** Significant/Negative

**Narrative:** Two key impacts which increase the burden on BIPOC communities over Euro/Caucasian communities in Oregon: cost and safety.

**Cost** – the number of approved training facilities is expected to be low and likely co-located with existing ranges in Oregon, almost exclusively located in rural or suburban communities. The cost and ability to travel to these locations will create travel hardships for BIPOC members who may be dependent on public transit or impacted by high costs of fuel. Further, while there is a cap on the cost of the license itself, there is no cap on training as these are provided as private services. Comparatively, a concealed pistol license course may run over \$100; trainers will need to implement new processes and services (fingerprints, photos, background check) which will raise the costs higher. A \$50 license requiring \$200-300 in licensing training costs will have significant financial impact to marginalized community members over traditional Euro/Caucasian communities.

**Safety** – In the United States, with Oregon as no exception, trust between marginalized communities and law enforcement has never been lower. Since George Floyd, the microscope has become hyper focused on disparity in policing comparing Caucasian and BIPOC communities. The potential physical and absolute psychological impact of forcing members of diverse communities to now register themselves with law enforcement will be seen as a net negative for those communities and discourage responsible/legal ownership. The psychological impact will further prevent members in these communities from being able to protect themselves. The dichotomy of reduced police presence in urban areas (see: Portland staffing challenges and response times) further elevates the risk/danger in these communities.

**Section 2: Permit-to-purchase due process appeal**

**Description:** An explanation of the legal rights and steps an individual may take if they are denied a permit/have a permit seized from them.

**Impact to marginalized communities:** Significant/Negative

**Narrative:** The process for appeal does not specify any differences for communities of color vs. not; the reason this triggers a Significant/Negative assessment is due to the following attributes of the appeal process:

**Subjectiveness** – “Reasonable grounds” is frequently referenced as a possible bar for denial/revocation. In addition to the aforementioned lack of trust between the marginalized communities and law enforcement, it is prudent to observe Oregon’s storied history of racial discrimination. When “reasonable grounds” includes observation of a petitioner’s mental and psychological state – without requiring empirical data supporting a concern – without clearly articulated quantitative requirements, the ability to discriminate unfairly against BIPOC communities remains high. More work needs to be done on how this is properly assessed.

**Cost** – if a person is denied a license, fairly or unfairly, the burden of cost and proof falls to the person choosing to appeal. Court costs, legal fees, and access to attorneys willing to engage in this process are unknown but a reasonable person can expect them to be significant given known court costs for common items like appeals, divorces, and the like. While the costs themselves will likely be the same for all communities, this will create statistically a much higher burden on marginalized communities.

**Section 3: Costs and permits for dealers**

**Description:** The process for dealers to become certified in Oregon to remain in business

**Impact to marginalized communities:** Minimal/Neutral

**Narrative:** The only actual impact of these requirements may see a decline in available firearm dealers and trainers. This may move from neutral to negative if the net effect is a decline in dealers serving communities of color and forcing community members to travel outside said communities to find access to tools of defense.

#### **Section 4: Permits for private transfers**

**Description:** Adds the requirement of having a firearm license card (**Section 1**) for any transfers done in state.

**Impact to marginalized communities:** Significant/Negative

**Narrative:** Oregon state already requires all transfers except in the case for family inheritance to be done through a licensed FFL. All the reasons this negatively impacts communities of color in **Section 1** applies. Further, this erases the ability for family members to exercise firearm inheritance as recognized and protected in case law at the Federal level. This is an additional burden and tax forced on BIPOC community members.

#### **Section 5: Permits for transfers at gun shows**

**Description:** Formalizing that all gun shows should be following Oregon-mandated practice for firearm transfers.

**Impact to marginalized communities:** Minimal/Neutral

**Narrative:** Oregon law requires FFL transfers for all but family inheritance today, which covers gun shows within the state. This does not add additional burden to communities of color.

#### **Section 6: Prohibitions/exceptions to 'large capacity' magazines**

**Description:** Restricting the sale of magazines over 10 rounds in Oregon, giving exception to active duty military and law enforcement.

**Impact to marginalized communities:** Moderate/Negative

**Narrative:** Referencing the chasm of trust between law enforcement and marginalized communities in our state, this portion in effect allowed increased capacity for harm by law enforcement while reducing capacity of defense for citizens of the BIPOC community. Optically, when the state recognizes that law enforcement has significant work to do in order to earn trust but giving them a tilted field and putting BIPOC members at a numerical disadvantage, it sends a strong message that those community members are not on the same level of trust as law enforcement. This is Moderate over Significant because the purchasing applies to all ethnicities.

**Summary:** Many provisions of this initiative create a larger disparity between communities of color and Caucasian communities, as well as communities of color and law enforcement, particularly where the most trust needs to be rebuilt. The psychological and financial impact to these communities cannot be overstated, and this initiative will create significant hardships on the overwhelmingly law-abiding citizens of these communities.

Thank you,  
Jonathan Edwards

Tigard

**From:** D Wilson <[wilsondh59@gmail.com](mailto:wilsondh59@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 7:28 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Hearing to receive testimony on the the racial and ethnic impact statement for IP 17

Comments about the explanatory statement associated with ballot measure IP 17.

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Thank you.

Douglas Wilson

**From:** David Williams <[williamsplanet@outlook.com](mailto:williamsplanet@outlook.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 6:40 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Racial & Ethnic Impact Statement for IP17

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

**From:** jim valli <[45bart54@gmail.com](mailto:45bart54@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 5:33 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Gun Control

Vote no on any Gun Control bills that you See.

**From:** Ahmed Badran <[ahmed.badran@gmail.com](mailto:ahmed.badran@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:35 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Regarding the racial and ethnic impact of IP 17

Hi,

As a person who is eligible to vote in OR, I would like to comment on the some of the potential racial and ethnic impacts of IP 17.

Throughout this email I will be citing statistics from the document "Overlooked & Undercounted 2021 - Struggling to Make Ends Meet in Oregon", this is an official document that can be retrieved from:  
<https://www.oregon.gov/workforceboard/data-and-reports/Documents/Overlooked-Undercounted-2021.pdf>

Now to the potential racial and ethnic impacts of IP 17.

1. According to the document cited, Black (African Americans), Latinx, and other multiracial communities have the highest income inadequacy rates of all racial/ethnic groups in OR. IP 17 will require a person to take a class before applying for a permit to purchase firearms. Given that these classes will require live fire, will be taught by police or those approved by police, it is reasonable to assume that the cost for these classes will be non-trivial. Adding to that the cost for the permit itself, this will leave communities of color, who are already struggling with income inadequacy, now having to choose between spending money on basic life necessities or on a class and a permit in order to be able to

legally purchase a firearm. The end result will be that communities of color and lower income households may see the cost for the class and the permit as obstacles that deter them from even trying to purchase a firearm. Thus putting them at a disadvantage if they seek to own a firearm for self-defense purposes or for leisure purposes.

2. It is safe to assume that these classes will not be easily available for urban residents, low income urban residents will have to factor in the cost of transportation when looking around for a class in order to be able to apply for a permit. Again, a very likely hinderance that will sway lower income groups from the idea of purchasing a firearm if they have to take on all these expenses.

3. IP 17 does not account for potential invisible biases and stereotypes against particular racial and ethnic groups. These can cause someone from a particular racial or ethnic group to be unable to legally purchase a firearm because of some widespread stereotypes and biases and due to no fault of his or her own. Again, potentially discriminating against particular racial and ethnic groups.

4. The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively, again leaving people from particular racial and ethnic groups either unable to legally purchase a firearm or potentially having to provide far more information than they would be comfortable sharing.

Regards,

Ahmed

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

From: Gary Weis <[gary298@charter.net](mailto:gary298@charter.net)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 1:32 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: explanatory statement for IP 17

Hopefully the explanation for this petition when written in the voters pamphlet will reflect the following:

1. the petition will change the Oregon Constitution's "shall have the right to bear arms" statutorily to a "may have the right to bear arms", 2. Requires the people to get a permit to purchase, but " does not require law enforcement to provide an agent, approved trainers, or staff to take applications, and process them. 3. If this is a mandate it does not provide funding for these agencies to provide staff.

Thanks,

Gary Weis  
1401 W Ellendale Ave  
Dallas, Oregon 97338

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

From: Gary Weis <[gary298@charter.net](mailto:gary298@charter.net)>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:51 AM  
To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: IP 17 racial discrimination comments

Three well heeled and privileged white people have put forth a clearly racist and discriminatory initiative petition regarding a "permit to purchase" firearms . If it weren't so then they would have provided funds to compensate low income BIPOC and Q people for the costs they will incur to receive a permit to purchase. Petitioners are intelligent people who knew exactly what they were doing. The discrimination is intentional and systematic.

The State of Oregon offers low income rent assistance. Why wasn't this type of assistance provided for here? Clearly, to obstruct low income people of color from exercising there Constitutional right to self defense. This is simply another form of "Poll Tax".



This Initiative is also discriminatory because it requires people to take time off work to get fingerprinted and interviewed by an agent, which poor people cannot afford to do. Higher income people can afford to take time off work with little effect on their finances.

What does the following mean:

"Section 4....

C) Does not present reasonable grounds for a permit agent to conclude that the applicant has been or is reasonably likely to be a danger to self or others, or to the community at large, as a result of the applicant's mental or psychological state....."

Is it "reasonable grounds... to conclude" that an uppity black woman with attitude or a disheveled Latino is a danger?

This part of the initiative is clearly vague and open to discrimination. And intentionally so.

Low income people many of whom are BIPOC and Q people live in high crime areas because that is all they can afford. The requirements of this initiative are an insurmountable barrier to them and will deny them a Constitutionally protected right of self defense which they need more than most.

Thanks,

Gary Weis

1401 W Ellendale Ave unit 73

Dallas, Oregon 97338

971-322-6465

**From:** Bob Wampler <[wambo6911@hotmail.com](mailto:wambo6911@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:38 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the

measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Bob Wampler

**From:** Jeremey Freid <[jeremey.freid@gmail.com](mailto:jeremey.freid@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:04 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

**From:** Aaron Johnston <[aaron@aaronjohnston.com](mailto:aaron@aaronjohnston.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2022 9:50 PM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17 hurts low income families

To whom it may concern,

This measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

-Aaron Johnston

**From:** TERRY <[HOMER1991@msn.com](mailto:HOMER1991@msn.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2022 9:15 PM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** racial and ethnic impact statement for IP 17

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Terry Kane

7530 S.E. Salmon St.

Portland Oregon 97215

**From:** hello <[hello@sean-harvey.info](mailto:hello@sean-harvey.info)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 6:23 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Racial Impact Statement IP17

I believe IP17 would have negative racial impacts if passed.

The measure requires a class before a person can apply for a permit to purchase a firearm. The class would require live-fire which requires a proper firing range. If you look around Portland there's not very many facilities that could facilitate this. Supply and demand - range time to complete the class would be expensive and negatively impact low-income folks who are disproportionately people of color.

Since the police are responsible for issuing permits IP17 would set up a situation where people of color could be discriminated against. [PPB's own report for 2021](#) shows Latino and Black community members are disproportionately stopped by police. If IP17 is passed we'll likely see people of color disproportionately denied a permit to purchase a firearm. We can't trust the police to be impartial when it comes to traffic stops why would we expect them to be impartial when issuing firearm permits?

Thanks for your consideration,

Sean

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

**From:** Patrick Havens <[patrickhavens@gmail.com](mailto:patrickhavens@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 7:56 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17

Vote no on IP 17 as it is written. Currently there is insufficient funding, resources and it is also tainted with privacy conflicts. It needs a close review and honest revision.

Thank you

Patrick Havens

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Doug Hall <[dhall8587@yahoo.com](mailto:dhall8587@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:00 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** IP 17 Comments

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income and urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class. There is no limit on the amount of ammunition required to complete the course and could run several hundred dollars for each application or renewal.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, low income and minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home, and possibly requiring multiple trips, at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively. This information can be financial, racial, or even protected medical information.

There are no required time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately. This duplicates the existing background checks required to purchase firearms in the first place.

Because this "permit" relies upon the discretion of individuals for an approval, it is highly prone to racial profiling and the taking of bribes which benefit those with financial means but penalizes minorities and lower income individuals.

Donald Hall

**From:** David Kennell <[dlkennell@msn.com](mailto:dlkennell@msn.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:09 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17

Oregon Criminal Justice Commission;

Greetings,

I believe that IP 17, the gun ban measure will effect low income urban residents the hardest. The costs of purchasing a permit, firearm, ammunition, fuel to drive to a class and the cost of the class will effect them negatively, financially. And that's even if they can find a firearms class as there are no financial provisions to provide law enforcement with funds to teach these classes. With the limited number of law enforcement officers in Oregon numerous agencies say they can't even teach the required firearms classes. This again has a negative effect on low income families and persons of color.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Kennell

PO Box 13

Prineville, OR 97754

Email: [dlkennell@msn.com](mailto:dlkennell@msn.com)

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

**From:** Jim Welsh <[jimwelsh69@yahoo.com](mailto:jimwelsh69@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:10 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP 17, the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act'

IP 17, or the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act' as it is being called, violates Article 1, Section 27 of the State Constitution for starters in that 'The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power'

I feel that IP 17 violates the 2nd, 4th, 5th, and the 14th amendments of the Constitution, as well as 18 U.S. Code § 241 - Conspiracy against rights, 18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law.

I feel that IP 17 violates the 1939 United States v. Miller ruling, item #8 the part that says 'And further, that ordinarily when called for service these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time. The AR style platform semi-automatic is the most common in use rifle in America today.

I feel that IP 17 violates the Firearms Owners' Protection Act of 1986.

I feel that IP 17, the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act' violates the 2008 District of Columbia v. Heller ruling in that 'that the Second Amendment guarantees an individual right to possess firearms independent of service in a state militia and to use firearms for traditionally lawful purposes, including self-defense.'

IP 17 also violates some aspects of the recent NYSRPA v. Bruen ruling IP 17, the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act' singles out the law abiding gun owner, and potential new law abiding gun owners, by heaping onerous and punitive rules and restrictions upon them for wanting to nothing more than to exercise their God given 2nd amendment rights. IP 17 would also make it easier for criminals to practice their trade with impunity since they would know that the people of Oregon have been effectively disarmed because of this bill.

I would also like to say that when seconds count, law enforcement is minutes away, and that you are your own first responder.

Finally, I believe that IP 17, the 'Reduction of Gun Violence Act' violates the Single-subject rule of the initiative process in Oregon.

Thank you

Jim Welsh

[jimwelsh69@yahoo.com](mailto:jimwelsh69@yahoo.com)

**From:** Ted Martino <[tmartinojr@hotmail.com](mailto:tmartinojr@hotmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:25 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Racial and ethnic impact statement for IP 17 .

The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

Cordially,

-ted

--

Ted Martino Jr.

[tmartinojr@hotmail.com](mailto:tmartinojr@hotmail.com)

**From:** sidejack <[sidejack@protonmail.com](mailto:sidejack@protonmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:33 AM  
**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** IP 17 comments

This measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" (a requirement that may be unconstitutional) to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class. Currently, such a class does not exist anywhere in Oregon.

The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively and contradicts the recent Supreme Court decision.

There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the "class" that is required. At this time even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities and all residents of Oregon.

Finally, the sponsors of this measure clearly have no experience or knowledge of current firearms, nor their purchase, nor the non-effect on crime.

Jack Fassel

Oregon City

**From:** Erik Colville <[colvillee@gmail.com](mailto:colvillee@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:39 AM

**To:** SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

**Subject:** Comments related to the racial and ethnic impact statement for Initiative Petition 17

Comments related to the racial and ethnic impact statement for Initiative Petition 17 that is related to crime and likely to have an effect on the criminal justice system. Offered by Erik Colville of Salem, Oregon.

- The history of gun control in America is undeniably racist and discriminatory. More recent gun control laws are less overtly discriminatory, but they certainly have a disproportional impact on the poor and minorities. The justification for this state of affairs should be that the societal benefits of gun control clearly outweigh the social costs to the poor, but there is no consensus of research and facts to support this position. Intentionally or not, the poor and minorities eventually became the primary targets of gun control discrimination. Even recent measures proposed and taken in the name of public safety, have a disproportional impact on those of a lower socioeconomic background with almost no persuasive, certainly not definitive, evidence suggesting that these laws will reduce crime. In some instances gun bans are even accompanied by an increase in gun violence. To implement further unproven measures that are inherently biased toward certain people would be irresponsible. Many attempts to control guns result in a disproportionate burden on the poorest and most vulnerable people in our society with no proven benefit to the surrounding community. (Babat, David, "The Discriminatory History of Gun Control" (2009))

- There are reasons to believe that strategies to reduce overall population rates of gun violence may not be effective in addressing the disproportionately high firearm-related homicide rates among minorities and the poor, especially in urban areas. The lack of attention to urban violence is also reflected in firearm research itself. While many studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of various firearm laws in reducing overall population homicide rates, the vast majority of these studies do not distinguish between victims of different races/ethnicities. In failing to do so, these studies assume that state-level firearm laws produce homogeneous effects, even while minority and poor communities continue to bear the undue burden of firearm violence. (Michael Siegel, "Gun Control, Another Place Where Race Matters")

- The measure requires a "class" before a person can apply for a "permit" to purchase a firearm. Since this class requires live fire, low income, urban residents will have the hardest time finding an approved class.

- The required "class" must be taught by police or those approved by police. If the police in minority areas choose to simply not provide the class, minority residents will be required to find a class far from their home at unlimited expense.

- The measure gives police unlimited ability to require any information they want when approving a person for a "permit." This discretion has enormous potential for abuse and can be applied selectively.



- There are no time limits on the multiple background checks required for a permit and there are no limits on the cost for the “class” that is required. At this time, even the sponsors of the measure have admitted they have no answers for these concerns. These issues are certain to impact low income communities disproportionately.

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

From: Suzanne Volz <[sue.volz@me.com](mailto:sue.volz@me.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 8:49 AM

To: SOS Elections \* SOS <[Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov](mailto:Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov)>

Subject: IP17

I am writing today as a responsible Oregon gun owner, to express my concerns over IP17.

I understand that this measure outright bans the new purchase of most sporting shotguns because of the magazine capacity limit.

Most shotguns which have tubular magazines can hold more than 10 “mini shells” making them illegal to purchase.

This will have a profound effect on youth trap and skeet shooting in Oregon’s 30 high school teams featuring over 600 student athletes.

I urge you to consider and include this fact in your description of IP17 for the Voter’s Guide in Committee.

Sincerely,

Sue Volz