

ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE RESTRICTING OPENLY CARRYING  
LOADED FIREARMS IN PUBLIC PLACES**

Annotated to show ~~deletions~~ and additions to the code sections being modified. Deletions are **~~lined through~~** and additions are **underlined**.

**WHEREAS**, Article 2. Section 1 of the Ashland City Charter provides:

Powers of the City. The City shall have all powers which the constitutions, statutes, and common law of the United States and of this State expressly or impliedly grant or allow municipalities, as fully as though this Charter specifically enumerated each of those powers, as well as all powers not inconsistent with the foregoing; and, in addition thereto, shall possess all powers hereinafter specifically granted. All the authority thereof shall have perpetual succession.

**WHEREAS**, ORS 166.173 expressly authorizes Oregon local jurisdictions to enact ordinances to regulate, restrict or prohibit persons from possessing loaded firearms in public places, except for persons expressly exempted by statute;

**WHEREAS**, the City has determined, on the basis of past and recent instances of firearms-related violence in the City, the State, and the Nation, that public safety is compromised by persons without firearms permits carrying loaded firearms in public places;

**WHEREAS**, the Oregon Supreme Court recently has held that Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution does not preclude enactment of a provision regulating "the manner, possession, and the use of constitutionally protected arms," and permits "wide legislative latitude" to enact specific regulations restricting the possession and use of weapons to the extent such regulation of arms is necessary to promoting the public safety and does not unduly frustrate the individual right to bear arms for the purpose of self-defense;

**WHEREAS**, the United States Supreme Court recently opined that the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution does not preclude laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive public places;

**WHEREAS**, the Oregon Supreme Court recently has upheld a City of Portland ordinance provision restricting possession of loaded firearms in public places against the claim that the provision violated Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution and the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; and

**WHEREAS**, in order to promote public safety the City wishes to enact a municipal code provision which restricts the carrying of loaded firearms in public places under certain conditions

and which is identical to the City of Portland restriction already upheld by the Oregon Supreme Court.

**THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF ASHLAND DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

**SECTION 1. Definitions.**

**The following definitions govern the construction this Chapter:**

- A. "Firearm" means a weapon, by whatever name known, which is designed to expel a projectile by the action of powder.**
- B. "Public place" means a place to which the general public has access and includes, but is not limited to, hallways, lobbies and other parts of apartment houses and hotels not constituting rooms or apartments designed for actual residence, and highways, streets, schools, places of amusement, parks, playgrounds, and premises used in connection with public passenger transportation.**

**SECTION 2. Possession of a Loaded Firearm in a Public Place.**

**It is unlawful for any person to knowingly possess or carry a firearm, in or upon a public place, including while in a vehicle in a public place, recklessly having failed to remove all ammunition from the firearm.**

**SECTION 3. Exceptions.**

**Section 2 does not apply to or affect the following persons:**

- A. A law enforcement officer in the performance of official duty.**
- B. A member of the military in performance of official duty.**
- C. A person licensed to carry a concealed handgun.**
- D. A person authorized to possess a loaded firearm while in or upon a public building or court facility under ORS 166.370.**
- E. An employee of the United States Department of Agriculture, acting within the scope of employment, who possesses a loaded firearm in the course of a lawful taking wildlife.**
- F. A government employee authorized or required by his or her employment or office to carry firearms.**
- G. A person conducting an athletic contest to fires blank ammunition in a plug firearm toward the sky.**
- H. A person authorized by permit of the chief of police to discharge blank ammunition or a weapon for a lawful purpose.**
- I. A person traveling to and from and discharging a firearm or weapon on a licensed public or private shooting range, shooting gallery or other approved area designed or built for the purpose of target shooting, when such person is a member or guest of said range or area.**

**SECTION 4. Penalties.**

**Violation of this Chapter is a Class A misdemeanor.**

**SECTION 5. Severability.** The sections, subsections, paragraphs and clauses of this ordinance are severable. The invalidity of one section, subsection, paragraph, or clause shall not affect the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, paragraphs and clauses.

**SECTION 6. Codification.** Provisions of this Ordinance shall be incorporated in the City Code, and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "code", "article", "section", or another word, and the sections of this Ordinance may be renumbered or re-lettered, provided however, that any Whereas clauses and boilerplate provisions (*i.e.*, Sections Nos. 5-6) need not be codified, and the City Recorder is authorized to correct any cross-references and any typographical errors.

The foregoing ordinance was first read by title only in accordance with Article X, Section 2(C) of the City Charter on the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014, and duly PASSED and ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara M. Christensen, City Recorder

SIGNED and APPROVED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Stromberg, Mayor

Reviewed as to form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
David H. Lohman, City Attorney

G:\legal\COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS - Drafts\2014 Council Items\February 18, 2014\021814 Proposed Open Carry.Ord.docx

## REALISTIC OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL ACTION ON FIREARMS RESTRICTIONS

ACTION OPTIONS	QUESTIONS
<b>A. Ordinances</b>	
1. Ban loaded, open carry, with exceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> </ul>
2. Restrict minors' access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> <li>• Preemption/litigation/costs?</li> </ul>
<b>B. Resolutions</b>	
1. Admonition to Legislature on re-writing preemption re ammo and minors' access to clearly allow local ordinances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> <li>• Prolonged?</li> </ul>
2. Declaration that Ashland does not welcome persons carrying weapons in public places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> </ul>
<b>C. Referrals</b>	
1. Refer ordinance banning loaded open carry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> <li>• Dispassionate?</li> </ul>
2. Refer ordinance on minors' access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> <li>• Dispassionate?</li> <li>• Preemption/litigation/costs?</li> </ul>
3. Refer advisory question on banning loaded open carry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispassionate?</li> <li>• Prolonged?</li> </ul>
4. Refer advisory question on minors' access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispassionate?</li> <li>• Preemption/litigation/costs?</li> <li>• Prolonged?</li> </ul>
5. Refer admonition to Legislature on re-writing preemption re ammo and/or minors' access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> <li>• Dispassionate?</li> <li>• Prolonged?</li> </ul>
6. Refer declaration that Ashland does not welcome persons carrying weapons in public places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective?</li> <li>• Dispassionate?</li> </ul>
<b>D. No Action</b>	
1. Object to consideration of the matter (not debatable; 2/3 vote)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsive?</li> </ul>
2. Move to postpone indefinitely (debatable; majority vote)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsive?</li> </ul>
3. Vote against motion to approve ordinance, resolution, or referral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsive?</li> </ul>

# Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

*How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?*

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of March 12, 2014, 1:43 PM



*As with any public comment process, participation in Open City Hall is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.*

# Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

*How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?*

## Introduction

The City Council requested the City Attorney draft what he believes to be a legally defensible ordinance prohibiting person from carrying a loaded firearm in public places. The ordinance would, under certain conditions, make it a class A misdemeanor to knowingly carry a firearm, in or upon a public place, including while in a vehicle in a public place, or recklessly having failed to remove all the ammunition from the firearm or from that firearm's clip or magazine.

The open carry ordinance is similar to ordinances adopted by Beaverton, Portland, Salem, Oregon City, Newport, Astoria and others. The draft ordinance contains language that has been upheld by the Oregon Supreme Court.

In addition, Legal staff prepared two other documents for Council consideration. One is a list of practical considerations both for and against adopting such an ordinance(s). It is not intended to advocate for one position or another, but to provide a single, non-judgmental list of options. The other is a list of action the Council might take. These actions include: the adoption of an ordinance(s), adoption of a resolution encouraging Oregon legislative action or simply stating Ashland's position on carrying guns in public places; referring an ordinance, advisory measure or resolution to the voters; or taking no action.

# Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

*How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?*

As of March 12, 2014, 1:43 PM, this forum had:

Attendees:	323
On Forum Statements:	58
All Statements:	103
Hours of Public Comment:	5.2

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

L K Casteel inside Ashland

March 12, 2014, 5:43 AM

Irrational: not using ration, contrary to logical thinking. Therefore, an "Irrational Fear" is a fear of something that has no real foundation, a fear that goes against logic, or a fear founded on falsehood: fear of dogs, man's best friend, a pet most of us grew up with or around without any negative consequence; fear of heights by people who have never fallen from a distance greater than the thickness of their shoes' heels; fear of the dark, the time that brings most people peace and rest, or a time of watching an awe inspiring sky; fear of religion, a belief that gives people hope of a better present and future, that brings peace and joy into people lives and heals hurt and anger in their hearts; And fear of guns. Every year in this country we hear little or nothing of the thousands of ordinary people who use guns to protect themselves, their businesses, their families, and even strangers. Thousands more people use guns, often just the sight of their gun, to ward off violent and bad intentioned people from committing crimes. Then there are millions of folks who use guns to put food on the table for their families and the families of others. Last, there are millions of men, women, and children who use their guns for simple shooting pleasure. And the percentage of people who are hurt in all of these activities is miniscule. Yet there is an irrational fear of guns by some people. Why?

The answer, I believe, is quite simply is a greedy press. Yes, there is a power hungry, politically motivated group of politicians who love to promote any controversy in order to get their name before the peoples, but it is the press who stirs that controversy and puts that name out there. It doesn't matter whether it is the written, visual, or audible press, the goal is the same; money. These heartless people prey on the bleeding hearts, tender hearts, and even the broken hearted in order to line their pockets. But, before we condemn them, let's remember that the press only does this because it sells. It is the buyers, us, the general public who buy their product.

When a really bad, evil person goes on a killing spree, the press is all over it for several days or weeks. If a mentally unstable and often known to be dangerous person illegally obtains a firearm and goes on a shooting rampage, we hear about it for weeks or months. We hear from the politically motivated, the ignorant, the greedy, and the publicity seekers hour after hour about how bad guns are, and sometimes it is mentioned in passing that the gun was obtained illegally, that the person was known to be mentally unstable and dangerous by family, friends, social services, law enforcement, and often educational and other public agencies, all of whom did nothing to prevent the killings. The gun is no more to blame for its misuse than the tennis racket or golf club or machete that is misused for the same purpose. It seems that people are more interested in blaming that (those) which (who) is (are) least capable of defending itself (themselves) rather than dealing with the truth, which may be more difficult. After all, blame guns and take them away; its much easier than blaming ourselves for not taking care of the mentally ill and unstable who committed these horrendous acts. Every major shooting in the last several years has been committed under the conditions mentioned above. The many laws on the books, which could help, are often ignored and unenforced, so politicians, who want people to think they can solve all of their problems, propose more laws instead of proposing that we more effectively enforce the laws we have. Some politicians go so far as to create imaginary problems that need to be solved, or maybe just capitalize on the irrational fears of a few in order to get their name before the voters.

Portland, Oregon has a small gun problem. The people there have taken steps to deal with their problem. (Sadly, they are trying all of the things other cities have proven to be ineffective.) Ashland has not had a gun problem. What Ashland has is a few people with an irrational fear of firearms, a fear which might be better dealt with through education and counseling, just like those who fear dogs, the dark, heights, and other similar things. Focusing on factual reality instead of sensationalized press coverings would help a lot of folks live more peaceably. The proposed ordinance restricts honest people from being able to safely defend themselves and

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

others and does nothing to create a safer town or safer people, and it deals with a nonexistent problem.

A note:

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Oregon was .9 people

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Portland was 2.5 people

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Oregon was 0 people

These numbers include suicide by firearm.

---

Amy Haptonstall inside Ashland

March 11, 2014, 5:46 PM

Overlooked portions of the gun proposal that need to be addressed: One, they take away 2A rights to a portion of our population that deserve their freedom more than anyone-our soldiers. A person can not get a CWP until they are 21, our soldiers are probably the most trained and won't have the freedom to protect themselves in Ashland as they may wish to. Two, public places are not just the downtown Ashland area, this includes your front porch, walkway, driveway, and your car, and I assume Greenway bike path-one of the most dangerous areas, and other public trails where I myself feel the most vulnerable due to strangers and at times bears and cougars. Yes, sipping wine on your porch is illegal according to the definition of public place. Three, we still have a brutal unsolved murder in our town and we have a high rate of sexual assault. Whether people want to protect themselves from these people is their business, but don't take away the right for those of us who wish to. Four, only way it is to be a preventable measure is our 4A rights are greatly infringed by searching without cause, including our own homes.

Again, these are only portions I feel are being overlooked there are many more obvious reason this is a bad idea, such as cost of enforcement and lawsuits. Liberty definition: the state of being free within society from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's way of life, behavior, or political views. Don't chisel away our liberty.

---

Richard Baize inside Ashland

March 11, 2014, 2:35 PM

This is clearly a poorly thought out solution to a problem that does not exist. If any person intends to do harm to another with a firearm, does anyone really think an "Ordinance" will prevent it? What WILL prevent it is the very real possibility that some of the intended "Victims" might be legally armed, trained civilians. I've had a Concealed Handgun License for a quarter of a century, and when you've seen me in public during that time, I've been armed. Having said that, some might think I don't have a dog in this hunt, but the fact is that I do; we all do. In my opinion, persons who go legally armed in a society are Citizens, while those who do not are Subjects. I belong to several gun rights organizations, including Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership. One of the mottos I've heard there is "Never Again." I will never allow anyone to take away any of my rights as a citizen. Never.

---

James Dykstra inside Ashland

March 10, 2014, 7:34 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I am against both proposals. If the city council believes this is a big issue, put it to a vote of the people. Not that it matters we have been supporting and living in Ashland since 1989.

---

Sandra Holstein inside Ashland

March 6, 2014, 9:40 PM

Since the two objections to this ordinance are that it is a constitutional "right" and that it will incur expensive lawsuits, it would seem that the courts' rulings upholding this law in Astoria, Newport, Portland, Beaverton, Tigard, Oregon City, Salem, Independence, and Multnomah County would preclude both arguments by setting a legal precedent..

What about the rights of people not to feel menaced or to fear accidents when approached by people carrying loaded guns? Some years ago, a professor at SOU was harassed by a stalker with loaded guns. I have seen angry people around Ashland; I do not want to worry that they are carrying guns.

One of the most frightening things I heard in Ashland was when I moved here from Asia and my five-year-old told me that his friends at school played with their fathers' guns. We know the percentage of accidental shootings by children in this country, and we know the domestic abuse rates.. Why do we allow some people's "rights" to take precedence over others'?

---

Olivia Doty inside Ashland

March 5, 2014, 3:03 PM

I don't like the sound of this at all!

---

Erin Muck inside Ashland

March 3, 2014, 9:18 PM

I am in favor of both ordinances.

My primary concern is the safety of our children. I understand the arguments about our constitutional rights, and how heated this topic is. But for me, bottom line, anything we can do to make our town safer for our kids, whether they are walking in downtown Ashland, or in our wonderful schools, then I support it.

---

Dave Helmich inside Ashland

March 3, 2014, 3:35 PM

I am very much in favor of both ordinances.

There is no reason to have guns in town in the first place and certainly not in view. To many it would be a menacing and threatening view. If a citizen is chronically afraid, moving is an option. If there are not enough cops, vote for more.

Cowards need guns. Well balanced individuals have enough self-confidence without them. The more cowards that leave town, the better.

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I've heard there is an argument that Ashland would have to defend this in court. If Ashland does and it may, then many other cities in the state will as well. The shared cost of a legal defense would be trivial for the added safety.

Vote for the ordinances! Vote for civility and safety!

---

loren deffenbaugh inside Ashland

March 2, 2014, 11:55 AM

I have worked for the city as a police officer for 15 years. During those years I could count on one hand the number of times I saw someone open carry a firearm in Ashland. I look at this and wonder "why"? It is often said we are a community of "diversity" and "tolerance". However persons with a special interest seem to be able to believe that those are one way streets. People who live within the law are punished because someone is offended by someone carrying a gun. I am offended that we cannot sing Christmas songs that mention God in Schools. That we cannot have a Christmas tree at a government building (has to be called Holiday).

There is no basis for enacting such a law other than ignorance. Why would anyone wish to deny the rights given by the Constitution of the United States? I would think all the elected councilors took an oath to uphold that document, how sorry if you didn't.

If you seek to create a utopian society, good luck, if 15 years of police work taught me anything it is there will always be those who take advantage of others. There will always be violence, bombs, knives, hammers, bats, the list goes on.

If you vote this through thinking it will help your wrong. All you do is create a false sense of safety. Someone mentioned in an opinion that open carry was about bolstering one's manhood. Perhaps it is more about personal safety should one need it.

Open carry is legal under the Constitution, it is a personal choice. Let's leave it that way and deal with real issues.

The storage of firearms reaches into the Fourth Amendment. It could only be enforced after the fact of a terrible accident, unless you feel the Fourth Amendment needs to be tossed aside as well. There are laws in place that deal with such acts of carelessness. It would be like enacting a law to require non-slip bath mats to prevent falls in tubs. Are you going to allow the police/city officials to come knock and check if you have a bath mat?

Thank You

---

Steve Eadie inside Ashland

March 2, 2014, 9:12 AM

My wife and I have lived in Ashland for 16 years. We are raising our 8yo twins here by choice. We are the definition of concerned and caring parents. In all of the time we have lived here we have never witnessed or heard of any violent act by a person legally carrying a firearm.

If there is ever a person who commits a violent felony around our children it is our true hope that someone legally carrying a firearm is there to stop them. I can absolutely guarantee a police officer will not be there when the act is committed.

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

If this proposed regulation goes into effect you are choosing to eliminate the one chance my family may have against a violent felon, an honest concerned citizen.

---

Larry Graves inside Ashland

February 27, 2014, 11:18 PM

I have read all the related documents, and all the written statements made on this issue, and have attended the public meetings. I've seen the young man carrying multiple weapons into the "study session" on banning guns and I've seen hundreds of instances of open carry in the town of Ashland in all my years living here. Every time I've ever seen a police officer in Ashland, I've seen open carry. Never gave it another thought. Why is it that when bad people do bad things, we call the good guys with their guns to save us? When seconds count, the police are only minutes away. I want everyone to think about this: WHO OWNS YOU? The answer must always be, YOU DO. Only you. No one else. Your thoughts, your personality, your love and your life energy -- they are yours, and yours alone. They are God-given and they are unique. They are inherent characteristics of who you are, and so is the right to protect yourself and your life from those who might one day try to take it for themselves. No one can ever predict when a bad person will attempt to steal your life or your liberty from you, but I know that none of us has the right to keep you from protecting yourself from evil. Your right to self-defense is an inherent characteristic of who you are, and it does not come from outside of you -- it does not come from a Constitution or a code of revised statutes or a city ordinance or a Presidential Executive Order -- it is an inextricable part of who you are. We have nothing to fear from law abiding people no matter how many weapons they might carry. We have only to fear the lawless individuals who WILL carry firearms, whether it is legal or illegal, lawful or unlawful. We can call out to the police in black with their big, scary, open-carry guns for help that will arrive too late, or we can immediately protect ourselves as is our inherent right. This Ordinance is a bad proposal. It solves NO problem. It is based in irrationality and fear. Even if you disagree with the philosophically correct argument above, think about this: the City of Ashland will ultimately be forced to spend hundreds of thousands of YOUR dollars in a losing legal battle to defend an indefensible position, just as has already happened with the \$400,000 Mt Ashland Ski Resort verdict. Carol Voisin says Ashland has never shied away from a legal fight just because the City Council adopts a losing cause. That's very easy for her to say, since she will be paying the bill with YOUR money, not hers.

~Larry Graves

---

Donald Stone inside Ashland

February 27, 2014, 4:14 PM

Ashland has little history of the massive threats and violence that would justify carrying around loaded firearms to "protect life and property" or "Mom, apple pie and the American way. Those that seem to feel justified in "displaying their manhood" by packing heat, loaded or unloaded, would seem to have little confidence in their "manhood" or they wouldn't have the need to display it. They all need to grow up. The only thing that needs shooting in Ashland are the deer.

---

April Rosenthal inside Ashland

February 26, 2014, 5:45 PM

In a civilized society it's hard to understand why the idea of allowing loaded firearms in public places is even

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

discussed. I live in Ashland for many reasons but mainly because of it's philosophy of peace and harmony, it's non-violent demonstrations, it's intellectual approaches to solving issues. I see no place for firearms in our community except in the hands of law enforcement. The public display of loaded (or unloaded weapons) in the Ashland community should not be tolerated as it is not tolerated in so many other communities in Oregon. We must protect our community and not be afraid to stand up to organizations such as the NRA whose purpose is to increase profits of gun makers by playing on the public's fears for safety. I do not want to worry when I go to an Ashland theatre that someone carrying a loaded firearm could kill another. I think the City of Ashland should consider that the proposal to prohibit carrying loaded firearms in public places would also encourage tourism here by promoting public safety. This should be considered especially in light of the recent incidents of gun violence against innocent citizens throughout our nation.

---

Larry Rogers inside Ashland

February 25, 2014, 9:07 AM

We do not need more gun control laws. We need to better enforce the laws we already have, better background checks etc.

The city needs to focus its time and energy in areas where there are real problems like the homeless issue, property taxes, infrastructure, etc.

---

Anne Batzer outside Ashland

February 24, 2014, 1:25 PM

As I look over the list of those who have signed the petition for gun safety measures in Ashland, I see others who, like me, have had a close family member murdered by a stranger. In my case, it was right here in the Rogue Valley. There have been at least three incidents where there was illegal gun use, or threatened illegal gun use, in Ashland since your first study session. This issue is not an abstraction. We watch in frustration as our federal government does nothing. Cities are limited in what we can do---but does that mean we do nothing? The committee---mostly parents of young children---who has brought these ordinances forward has kept their means congruent with their goal. They have not belittled or berated. They have not threatened or resorted to psychological violence. Rather they have modeled what they hope to achieve: a culture that is a little safer, a little more respectful and a little more civilized. It's right that you researched the legal liabilities of these ordinances. Your research reveals that the chances of lawsuits against these ordinances are slim. (No legislation is 100 percent free from the threat of litigation.) You have the opportunity to nudge our culture toward the direction of a more thoughtful maturity. Please pass both of these ordinances.

---

Noel Chatroux inside Ashland

February 23, 2014, 9:43 PM

I guess I have an unusual perspective because I am French and go back to visit my family of origin at least yearly. They shake their head in disbelief when I tell them of our laws protecting the possession of firearms and the reasons for these laws. To them it's clear that more firearms in homes doesn't make society safer, and that the reasons for violence, armed and otherwise lie elsewhere than in the lack of guns in the hands of regular people. Guns are dangerous and should be left to law enforcement people to use in their line of duty. The further in that direction we can go without exposing our city to ruinous law suits, the better.

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I also work with children and families as a mental health therapist. Seeing an adult carrying an assault weapon in a public place is shocking and potentially traumatizing. These sights belong on the battle field, not in our streets or stores.

Thank you for your effort to legislate civility into this antiquated american notion that we must be allowed to arm ourselves so that we can protect our families and assets.

---

cat gould inside Ashland

February 23, 2014, 1:23 PM

<http://youtu.be/8R8UOjMy-5k>

---

Sarah DeLong inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 6:23 PM

We're entering our 3rd year as Ashland residents. We love living and raising our kids here. This community is so focused on taking care of, and supporting each other in myriad ways. This very modest, common-sense gun regulation proposal seems like an extension of that characteristic. It's not trying to take anything away from anyone, it's merely trying to care for the community by keeping us safer. I definitely support both proposed ordinances.

---

Bruce Borgerson inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 6:18 PM

I strongly support this ordinance. I think all Ashland councilors need to be fully aware that opposition to any ordinance essentially similar to ordinances in Portland and other Oregon communities that have withstood court challenge will have one certain result:

That councilor will not be returned to the council following his or her next election day.

I'm an Ashland resident and voter.

---

ANNE ROBISON inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 5:49 PM

This is an excellent proposal to promote Ashland as a safe and civilized place to live, do business, raise kids, and visit. Do we need to feel bullied by a small handful of folks with questionable judgment who attend city council meetings with automatic weapons? This is a reasonable, common sense law well within our rights as a city to pass. For those that say "Ashland doesn't have a problem" - great, let's keep it that way. Or would we rather wait until a tragedy occurs? If this law prevents even one accidental or intentional death in this city in the next fifty years, it is worth it. It seems so easy. And where else can we begin but locally? Can we not provide example for other small towns, cities, and states? The data is so clear. Reduce guns, reduce deaths by gun. That would not have happened otherwise. Period. (Harvard School of Public Health Study: <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/hicrc/firearms-research/guns-and-death>)

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I think it is only reasonable to assume that fewer loaded guns will be statistically similar, though to a lesser degree. And anyway, folks with a concealed weapons permit get to keep their gun loaded.

But I must say, I firmly reject this notion of "Good Guys with guns." Guns are dangerous and can kill hundreds of people in just a few minutes. No matter the intention. Let's hedge our bets and ask people to keep them unloaded in public places.

---

Andrew Kubik inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 11:58 AM

I would support the 'open carry' provision because it makes sense and based on Portland's experience, would pass legal muster. No developed nation, except for the USA, allows this sort of nonsense. I would actually support a complete open carry ban nationwide. I understand the 'home storage' provision, but I feel it does not have legal viability and would likely nix the entire effort. Besides, parents of minors are liable when said minors commit crimes, cause car wrecks, etc. There should be ample provision in existing statute to cover this form of parental negligence. If not, then it needs to be legislated statewide.

---

Erik Larsen inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 4:42 AM

This seems like it could be a legal minefield for the city, and it's not clear that safety would be improved. If a person intends to do harm, I don't think this ordinance will stop them. Though I've never seen anyone with an open carry for its own sake here in Ashland, perhaps this is more about getting guns out of open view as an aesthetic? If so, I couldn't agree that the regulation is appropriate, because then where is the line drawn? Thank you.

---

jonathan seidler inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 1:01 PM

Update on March 7:

I feel a need to respond again today. First it has been said that the precedent for this ordinance has been set in other Oregon localities and this is not true. This proposal is of a different slant and language. Thus a court case would view it from a origin standpoint.

Second, A comment that cowards fits the description of anyone carrying or using a firearm and that all cowards should leave Ashland. I suggest that the author of that statement put forth a petition for a ordinance addendum to rule that all cowards be banned from Ashland, stipulating conditions for the removal of said persons with a time frame in place and a rule on jail time and fines pertaining for the culprit guilty of breaking the rule of said ordinance.

I, myself, am currently wording a document proposal for a petition to cite and ban persons using wireless devises while driving in Ashland. The evidence is overwhelming how the Ashland general public completely ignores the laws pertaining to cellphone use and the dangers associated with the activity while driving. An exclusion of these digital junkies from our local society will create a safer locality in general and will provide a huge boost for tourism and local economy.

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Original statement posted Feb 21:

Gun ownership is a right that is availed by the constitution. It is a rare commodity that is taken for granted by all. It is rare in that most other first and third world nations regulate, by criminal law, the ownership of arms. However if you are swayed by modern arguments on this "issue" and how strongly you feel about it, you still have to accept what is the "rule" of our land and it is a rule made by the people for the people. It has stood the test of time and resolve. It represents an acknowledgment of corruption in government from the beginning of this country and throughout history till today. Dictatorships were partially founded on arms confiscation and enforcement of those laws. Nazi Germany is a perfect example and there are living people today who can attest to the function of those gun control laws in Nazi Germany. Yes, some young people feel very strongly about parading their right to open carry and it does make some people nervous and rightly so. You always have the right to call police who will always investigate that occurrence. If you would talk to people who open carry they usually are very happy to discuss why they do with you. Ashland is part of Oregon and part of the USA. Ordinances like this petition proposal are not an answer to any problem here that is a council related issue. Surely if one feels that living in Ashland is dangerous then they can decide to move but where will you go? The States are united by the constitution and the right to bear arms is uniform. Move to NYC, or L.A. or Chicago where gun ownership is most regulated per ordinances and will you then be safer? Ashland WILL face a lawsuit because of a petition signed by 175 people out of a population of 20,000. How about real consensus and put it to a vote? For me, it is sad how people want Ashland to be groovier for the fact of how regulated it is, be it by ordinances or taxes. For your own information ask a Ashland Police Officer what they think of the proposal for gun control in Ashland. You might be surprised.

---

Greg Jost inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 11:50 AM

I agree with the intent of the ordinance, but provisions should be made for individuals that may have acute need of a concealed carry permit that would be annually approved by a sitting judge.

Also, I feel that the "state" should require gun owners to maintain required liability insurance, purchased in the open market, to provide liability coverage for all rifles, pistols, and weapons that is comparable to automobile liability insurance. This mechanism would allow the market place and courts to economically regulate irresponsible gun owners, who do not safely monitor their weapons, improperly utilize them in public situations, or participate in illegal criminal activities.

---

LINDA ADAMS inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 10:14 AM

I agree with limiting gun toting in public. I wish there was a legal possibility to limit gun ownership entirely. Portland has a no carry law, Ashland should, too.

---

k latham inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 10:01 AM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Stop trying to take away our rights as legal gun owners, out of fear and misinformation. Here in Ashland, more young people have died or been harmed by skateboard and bicycle use and heroin/drug overdoses in the past few years than any problems with guns.

We don't need people moving here, then attempting to change Ashland into wherever they came from. Move to Portland if you want to live in a "safer" community with this "law".

I live in Ashland, was born and raised here. My family has lived here for over 100 years.

---

Diane Paulson inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 9:23 AM

I agree with this effort to prohibit people from carrying loaded firearms in public places such as a school, city offices, SOU campus. The young man who shows up with several loaded firearms at the City Council meetings and at the Plaza in Ashland and in downtown Medford is a menacing and aggressive person as shown by his actions. I do not understand why he was allowed to come into a City Council meeting with such armament even though he has permits?! It is very aggressive and confrontative, intimidating and threatening behavior which can cause extreme fear in others. Why was he allowed access when his behavior is so very hostile and potentially dangerous???

---

Tom Burnham inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 10:31 PM

NO GUNS PERIOD

---

Michael Clark inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 9:05 PM

Are we having a problem with people carrying guns in town? Keep this "feel good" proposal going and we will—just so gun rights advocates can make a point that they have the right. They do have the right. I'm as appalled as anyone by the gun violence we so often hear about. Will banning the carrying of loaded guns in our public places prevent that? That's a rhetorical question.

---

Lee Fox inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 6:45 PM

I see absolutely no need for this regulation. Will someone please articulate the problem statement? The supporters "forgot" this since there is none. Do they really believe that government can protect us from all evil and that only government employees should be armed?? Its a dream to believe that felons will be dissuaded by a potential misdemeanor charge. Please focus on the criminals not the law abiding citizens!

---

J, D. inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 6:22 PM

I have lived in Ashland for 6 years and I have never seen anyone carrying a handgun in the open. I have never seen it as a problem. I am against any measure that would impede on my rights. I agree that people shouldn't

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

parade around town with a rifle slung across their back but what it all boils down to is common sense. People shouldn't worry that because someone is carrying a gun they are a potential criminal. Someone made a comment something to the effect that carrying a gun may cause criminal activity so guns should not be allowed in public on the streets of Ashland. Let's carry that same thought pattern over to alcohol and drunk driving. Should they prohibit any place to sell alcohol because someone that is drinking could get drunk and go on a rampage in their car and injure or kill people? That is making assumptions about things that might happen. Prohibiting open carry will only stop law abiding citizens from carrying. The criminals will still carry guns. Proof of that is that murder is illegal and there are all kinds of laws stating that it is illegal but people are still murdered everyday.

---

Larry Pearson inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 5:32 PM

I prefer that people do not carry loaded firearms in public places; however, I have not seen anyone doing so in Ashland [with the exception of those with concealed weapon permits], so I don't see the need for the Council to spend time on the issue. Except for the non-productive use of time, I am not opposed to the proposed prohibition of carrying loaded firearms in public places.

---

Sally McKirgan inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 5:14 PM

People need to be allowed to own guns but please let's not walk down the street with them slung over our shoulders. Guns are alarming things to see. Violence is abhorrent and so is seeing an AK47 or Rifle walking down the street or standing on the corner.  
Sally & Carl McKirgan

---

Shawn Kampmann inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:53 PM

If there ever comes a time where armed militias are roaming the streets of Ashland menacing the public, then maybe I would be more in favor of restrictions if state and federal law permitted it. But since I first moved to Ashland in 1973, I have not seen anyone with a firearm threatening people. In this current proposal about prohibiting loaded firearms in public, I am guessing that it is only going to encourage the pro-NRA lunatic fringe to take up parading around town brandishing iron to make a statement. It will end up being a "call to arms" for gun fanatics to take a stand and will only end up creating discontent and conflict where there is none now. C'mon folks, calm down and quit making "much ado about nothing!" The biggest reason to drop this misguided effort is that as taxpayers, we are all tired of the City wasting money on non-issues such as this, especially when it is likely to involve a very expensive legal defense if challenged (as has been already threatened by some NRA types). Ashland has little likelihood of winning this battle and we have so many other actual current financial needs (AFN, sewer treatment plant, parks, citizen services, etc.). If you don't want to see people with guns parading around town, then don't threaten to ban them and call them out because you are not likely see it otherwise. A ban would be unenforceable according to APD and "bad guys" aren't going to obey the law anyway so what's the real point here? As my parents used to say, "learn to pick your battles...."

---

Ronna Smith-Hileman inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:50 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Private citizens have no need and no business to carry loaded firearms in the city of Ashland.

---

Corren Hileman inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:41 PM

There is no reason for a private citizen to carry a loaded firearm of any kind in the city of Ashland.

---

Diana Trygg inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:41 PM

I strongly support this prohibition. We need to take a more rational approach to firearms based on our current history rather than the distant past.

---

cynda howell inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:21 PM

I agree with the requested ban on loaded guns in public. Also, whenever any gun is observed, police should verify that it is properly licensed and not loaded. Guns should be confiscated if either condition is not met. The right to public safety can never be over ridden by the right to bare arms. Responsible gun own owners are in favor of background checks and licensing. Only a nut case would carry a loaded gun around in their homes while mowing the lawn, watching TV, or making lunch.. So, why would they carry a gun attending a play, a walk in the park, or in the grocery check out line? Guns should be used for activities such as hunting or target practice by those who are licensed and have received proper training.

---

Don Paul inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:03 PM

I personally have a carry permit. No one knows because I do not display my pistol or tell folks. I feel this is just another attempt by liberals to disarm law abiding citizens. We all know that those from the criminal element will not follow the law. This puts the rest of us at a disadvantage by not having someone with a firearm available to defend the innocent in a crime situation. I do not support any change in the law at this time. Thanks.

---

Becky Snow inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:42 PM

I am persuaded by the experience of other communities, states and countries where sensible gun restrictions reduce accidental and intentional deaths by gunshot. Prohibiting loaded weapons on Ashland streets may be the only step this community can take by itself, without statewide legislation, but it should at least take this step.

---

STEPHANIE BARTLETT inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:35 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Just because we haven't had a gunfire rampage in Ashland doesn't mean it couldn't happen. Why make it easier/more possible? I'm in favor of prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms in public places in the city of Ashland. As for our second amendment rights, why is it that people opposed to gun control always leave out the prepositional phrase, "in a well-ordered militia?"

---

Scott Calamar inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:34 PM

I personally believe in controlling arms. HOWEVER, once again the city is wasting time and resources on a non-issue—philosophical meanderings repeatedly supersede the practical workings of council and staff. For instance, the TAP water thing has been going on for how long and you've once again managed to sidestep putting something out for \*bids\*. So I am AGAINST a proposal that does not address an active issue in this town.

---

Penny Naumoff inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:20 PM

I totally support this proposal. Seems like common sense to me.

---

Daisy Hering inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:18 PM

I am surprised this issue is being treated as controversial when even the NRA recommends keeping guns unloaded until just before use. Ashland is not immune from illegal gun use. According to the city and the newspaper, in just the last month, the police received a tip that a student was threatening to bring a gun to the high school, a man with a gun menaced a woman in the parking lot of an Ashland shopping center, and a gas station was robbed by a man with a gun. Guns are everywhere in this country and Ashland is not an exception. Common sense and scientific studies show that the greater the presence of loaded guns, the greater the risk of accidents and criminal gun use. Let's keep Ashland sensible and keep loaded, openly-carried guns out of public places.

---

mark kelly inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:09 PM

Ban loaded weapons. Simple.

---

Ron Parenteau outside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:02 PM

Thought there was laws to that issue already

---

Jerry Spears inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:52 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

All laws are a lessening of freedom, some are worth the price, but why would anyone lessen freedom with no benefit?

How many people have been killed or injured with a gun downtown in Ashland in the last 50 years? Now how much trouble, property damage and violence have "homeless" people caused in Ashland in that same time period?

We have many problems in Ashland... this is not one of them. It distracts people from actually doing anything. People need food, homes, mental health help, etc. Will this do anything to help solve these problems? If you want to help go buy someone a sandwich, but don't try and slowly take our freedoms away!

Do we really want to move onto the slippery slope of new unnecessary laws?

Anyone remember the 2%"temporary" food tax to help pay for the flood damage. Almost instantly it was raised to 5% and now it is permanent and has nothing to do with the flood.....

I have always believed that in a democracy laws were for the greater good of all not just for a few people did not like something?

I remember in the 70's being pulled over by a police officer (somewhere in this valley) and being told that the "boy"(30 year old black man) driving the car I was riding in needed to get off the road and go back home if he didn't want any trouble. Seemed there was a sundowner law because some people did not like black people out after dark. Thankfully most of those laws are gone because what some people did not like was not worth the freedom it took from others.

---

Deborah Gordon outside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:14 PM

As an Ashland business person (not a resident), I think safety lies on the side of prohibiting loaded firearms in public places. As a health professional, I am well aware of the incredible history and opportunity for mishaps when loaded guns are around. Please prohibit loaded firearms in public places.

---

Samantha Hammell inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:12 PM

Ashland bans nudity in public places. Have we really come to the point where a nude woman on a bicycle is more of a threat to public safety and health than a loaded gun? Let's keep Ashland a reasonable place to live-- a place with laws that are the result of rationality. Loaded guns carry inherent danger and those who own guns need to respect the rights of those around them when they are out in public by unloading their weapons. Clothes mandatory, but loaded guns optional? C'mon, let's have some mature thinking and avoid this absurd result!

---

Bruce Hanson outside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:04 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Carrying firearms in public is a really BAD IDEA.  
This isn't the wild West.

---

John Williams inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:46 PM

Research and data are indisputably clear on this question: the more guns in public places, the more accidental and intentional gun injuries and deaths occur. Despite the facts, many gun lovers will inexplicably say virtually anything to justify their disdain for any gun controls. The facts say having more guns does not reduce crime, but does increase gun accidents, gun suicides, and gun crime. There is absolutely no downside to prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms in public places...only benefits.

---

John Johnson inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:44 PM

I agree that we're discussing a non-problem here in Ashland. I do believe that gun violence is a serious problem in our country. I wish people would stop making excuses for guns.

---

David Runkel inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:32 PM

This is a no-brainer. Of course, such a prohibition should be in place.

David and Deedie Ruknel

---

Matt Warshawsky inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:17 PM

I agree with Mark Decker's comment. It addresses a problem that doesn't really exist, and is derived largely from fear. It is more likely to divide our community than of bring us together. The council has enough work already and should be focusing on our real problems.

---

Mark Decker inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 10:37 AM

Since the ordinance only applies to open carry of \*loaded\* firearms (open carry of unloaded guns, and concealed carry of loaded guns with CHL are OK), it seems like a reasonable safety measure to help prevent accidental shootings, and does not significantly impair gun rights. However, it solves a problem that doesn't seem to exist, and would be hard to enforce. If we want to make a political statement to express the views of the community, an actual ordinance is overkill. A resolution that open carry is unwelcome in Ashland would be sufficient. Responsible gun owners should voluntarily respect the resolution for safety reasons and out of consideration for their neighbors' concerns. A real ordinance might backfire by angering strong supporters of gun rights to the point where they start parading around with unloaded weapons just to make a statement, needlessly scaring children and tourists. Let Ashland be a stage for real theater, not political theater.

---

Darrell Boldt inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 9:04 AM

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of March 12, 2014, 1:43 PM

<http://peakdemocracy.com/1736>

Page 18 of 19

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I think that carrying loaded firearms in public places should be banned unless the carrier has a concealed weapons permit.

Darrell Boldt

---

rob raby inside Ashland

February 19, 2014, 9:57 PM

This isn't portland and we don't have there problems. Why are some folk's trying to make Ashland a copy of a problem city.

Is there some crime wave i'm not aware of that is being used to justify the trampling of our civil rights.

---

Donald Politis inside Ashland

February 19, 2014, 6:49 PM

While I don't advocate open carry it is our right and just as the little kids might see an open carry person so will they see a police gun when the Mother is stopped for a driving offense...same scary gun I expect.

Don't spend your time on solutions to problems that don't exist

---

# Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

*How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?*

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of March 14, 2014, 10:39 AM



*As with any public comment process, participation in Open City Hall is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.*

# Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

*How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?*

## Introduction

The City Council requested the City Attorney draft what he believes to be a legally defensible ordinance prohibiting person from carrying a loaded firearm in public places. The ordinance would, under certain conditions, make it a class A misdemeanor to knowingly carry a firearm, in or upon a public place, including while in a vehicle in a public place, or recklessly having failed to remove all the ammunition from the firearm or from that firearm's clip or magazine.

The open carry ordinance is similar to ordinances adopted by Beaverton, Portland, Salem, Oregon City, Newport, Astoria and others. The draft ordinance contains language that has been upheld by the Oregon Supreme Court.

In addition, Legal staff prepared two other documents for Council consideration. One is a list of practical considerations both for and against adopting such an ordinance(s). It is not intended to advocate for one position or another, but to provide a single, non-judgmental list of options. The other is a list of action the Council might take. These actions include: the adoption of an ordinance(s), adoption of a resolution encouraging Oregon legislative action or simply stating Ashland's position on carrying guns in public places; referring an ordinance, advisory measure or resolution to the voters; or taking no action.

# Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

*How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?*

As of March 14, 2014, 10:39 AM, this forum had:

Attendees:	347
On Forum Statements:	73
All Statements:	125
Hours of Public Comment:	6.3

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Victor Chang inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 11:31 PM

I strongly support both proposed ordinances (though it seems that the council has dropped consideration of the safe storage ordinance). I will address my comments to the open-carry of loaded guns ordinance. To me, this is not necessarily about directly reducing violent crime. Rather, it is a way to limit the community disruption when a gun owner feels the need to flaunt their gun in public. I mistrust the conscious or unconscious need to be that provocative and brazen. As other gun owners have pointed out, we never know who the more responsible gun owners who carry in public are because they have their concealed weapons permit and don't feel a need to show people they're packing. I respect their right and need to carry a gun and do so in a more private way.

Gun ownership is indeed a right that is not going away soon. However, it sure seems that like other rights the courts have long ago decided it's not an unlimited right. We have the right to free speech and yet it is limited (think- not yelling "fire" in a crowded theater). Just because we can do something doesn't mean we should. I can't see how allowing people to openly carry guns (loaded or unloaded) in public contributes one iota to the quality of life in this town. This ordinance is not trying to take away your guns. It is, however, saying Ashland is not the Wild West.

Lastly, to a previous commenter's falsely cited statistics (copied below):

A note:

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Oregon was .9 people

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Portland was 2.5 people

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Oregon was 0 people

These numbers include suicide by firearm.

These numbers are inaccurate. From the 2011 Oregon Violent Death Reporting System, the death rate by gunshot in 2011 was 10.9 per 100,000 (421 deaths) with 81% of those being suicides and 15% homicides.

Source here:

<https://public.health.oregon.gov/DiseasesConditions/InjuryFatalityData/Documents/NVDRS/AnnualDataReport.pdf>

---

Matthew Sniffen inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 11:07 PM

On behalf of myself, my wife, and my two daughters I strongly support these proposals and I urge the council members to approve the ordinances, or at the very least put them on a ballot for the residents of Ashland to decide.

I have read the full text of both proposals and attended the council's study session, and I feel that these are reasonable, common sense proposals. They in no way restrict anyone's right to own firearms, and even contain reasonable exceptions for those who have obtained a permit or who require a firearm for the execution of their duties. The language has even been updated to follow the language used in the Portland statutes, which has already stood up to judicial scrutiny.

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Many comments on this forum have questioned the need/benefit of these proposals. In my mind the benefit is clear. I think these proposals will help to promote a culture in which guns are not treated casually. I don't want to raise my children in an environment surrounded by guns, and I think these proposals send a clear message that guns are important but potentially dangerous tools, and their presence in our public spaces should be limited to those people who have a legitimate need for them.

Also, let's remember that one of the proposals has to do with safe gun storage in the home. Passage of this ordinance will encourage people to make the extra effort to properly secure the guns they have in their home, and if even one accidental gun death is prevented as a result, it will be well worth it in my mind.

Please pass these two proposals.

---

Arianna Van Heusen inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 9:12 PM

Gun safety is a growing concern and as a resident of Ashland I strongly support prohibiting the carrying of a loaded firearm in public places. Studies indicate that stronger laws around access to guns can lead to less gun related violence and deaths and I would like to see Ashland be proactive about protecting public safety.

---

Peter Canning inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 7:54 PM

Yes to both proposals!

As a local ER doctor who too frequently takes care of the victims of gun violence, both accidental and otherwise, I am a strong advocate for these proposals to tighten gun control. Fewer guns, fewer gun-related crimes, fewer accidents and fewer deaths.

---

Rocky Wardle outside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 6:34 PM

Council members::

The constitution gives people the right to bare arms, an unloaded gun is not an arm. You have no right to restrict my rights as you please. You have the duty to uphold the constitution, no matter how you feel on the subject , as you, I am assuming are a United States Citizen and should have the loyalty to the constitution of the United States Of America. Think, really think about what you are being asked to do. Betray constitutional rights or follow the bleeding hearts . Thank you for your time. A visitor to Ashland,,,,,,,,, Rocky Wardle

---

Nancy Mead outside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 5:34 PM

I visit Ashland frequently and believe I am safer when people are not walking around the streets with loaded guns. In fact I consciously feel much safer in places where I know firearms are prohibited, such as court houses. Also, I acknowledge that the vast majority of gun owners keep their weapons securely stored, but

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

some don't. Gun owners must be held responsible when their weapons are used in unintentional shootings, suicides, or murders. I am a gun owner. I do not carry my gun in public (it hasn't left my house in years), and I store it safely.

Dave Hering inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 4:26 PM

I fully support the proposed open-carry ordinance, and I also would support a child access prevention ordinance, if the council was willing to consider one. I have read the comments on this forum, and I'm pleased the city council is taking a serious approach to gathering public opinion on this issue. From the comments recorded here, however, it is evident that many people posting to the forum misunderstand the scope of the current Ashland proposal.

After paying close attention at the two council study sessions and giving considerable thought to this issue, I have come to the following conclusions:

1. Ashland is clearly and unambiguously authorized to regulate possession of loaded firearms in public places by ORS 166.173. Many other Oregon cities have passed laws limiting loaded open-carry in public, and the authority to do so has been upheld by the Oregon Supreme Court.
2. The proposed loaded open-carry limit would not apply to people who hold a concealed handgun license (CHL), and therefore, it would not prevent most people from carrying guns for self-defense or any other purpose. Rather, it would set a clear and objective community standard for gun use in our public spaces. In effect, the city would be asking anyone who wishes to carry a loaded gun in public to first go through the process to obtain a CHL. This requirement is not onerous. By law, the sheriff's department "shall issue" a CHL to any citizen, age 21 or older, who passes a criminal background check, takes a minimal gun safety course or equivalent, and pays a small fee. The Oregonian newspaper recently reported that one out of sixteen adults in Oregon already has a CHL. The CHL requirement is a reasonable, minimum standard that is appropriate for Ashland.
3. Gun violence has not been a problem recently in Ashland, but it is naïve to imagine that it could never occur. Gun crimes do happen here, including an armed robbery of a downtown gas station last month. No rational person thinks that the proposed gun ordinance will prevent all gun violence, but it will add a tool to the "tool box" that our police can use to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. Violence has been a problem regionally and nationally. Local actions such as this one are an attainable first step to address the larger-scale issue.

Guns are tools, and like many other tools, they can be dangerous. The ordinance proposed for Ashland would act to mitigate the inherent risk of gun use by requiring users to go through the minimal training and background-check process necessary to obtain a CHL before carrying loaded guns in public. In my view, this pragmatic effect supersedes the emotional rhetoric on both sides of the gun issue and justifies passage of the proposed ordinance.

Lastly, I want to remind the city council to review the many thoughtful comments posted by local residents on the change.org petition about this issue: (<https://www.change.org/petitions/the-city-council-of-ashland-oregon-adopt-moderate-practical-gun-safety-ordinances-2>). Those opinions, though not recorded here, should not be

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

discounted by the council.

Dave Hering, Ashland

---

Ramie Streng outside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 4:20 PM

I hope the proposal that prohibits loaded firearms in public places is implemented. Thank you.

---

Baldr Odinson inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 4:13 PM

Mandated safe storage of guns in homes with children, or "Child Access Protection" laws, are a commonsense solution that has been demonstrated to reduce accidental shootings and suicides of children, teens, and adults as well. It just makes common sense. In 12 states where CAP laws had been in effect for at least one year, unintentional firearm deaths fell by 23% from 1990-94 among children under 15 years old, and CAP laws are correlated with reducing gun suicides among those aged 14 through 17 by 10.8%. For more statistics, see here: <http://kidshootings.blogspot.com/p/child-access-prevention-laws-save-lives.html>

And as for open carry of guns, it hasn't been shown to reduce crime in any way whatsoever. What it does, however, is openly intimidate anyone around the carrier. Further, having a conceal carry permit in Oregon doesn't require the firing of a single bullet, much less training for shootout situations (unlike police). In Oregon, you need only sit in a class for a few hours, take a quick test, pay some money, and pass a background check. You can even do it online, no experience required. This is a dangerous practice that only instills fear in citizens and turns our community into the mythical "Wild West." Oppose! A related page: <http://newtrajectory.blogspot.com/2013/11/open-carry-intimidation.html>

---

Paul Fishman outside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 3:47 PM

My wife and I have visited Ashland since the 1970's, primarily to attend the OSF. I also have worked as a consultant to the City for Goal 5 and flood restoration projects. We visit Ashland at least twice every year now. We both support passing legislation that would prohibit carrying loaded firearms in public places, and also to assign liability to gun owners if a minor gets ahold of their gun without permission. There are many thousands of deaths and injuries by guns in the United States every year, and every level of government needs to help end this epidemic. Thank you for considering this comment. Paul and Sherry Fishman Portland, Oregon

---

Diane M Schaffer inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 2:15 PM

I urge every member of our community to read the study of mass shootings by Stanford's Geospatial Center. [See 40 [http://alumni.stanford.edu/get/page/magazine/article/?article\\_id=68845](http://alumni.stanford.edu/get/page/magazine/article/?article_id=68845). See related data on mental health spending at <http://massshootingsamerica.wix.com/massshootings#!maps/c16gl>]

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Comparison of incident frequency in 1973, 1993, and 2013 clearly demonstrates that the frequency of mass shootings has dramatically increased. Furthermore, "...the data confirm that shootings at schools and colleges account for the largest number of fatalities..." (p. 34, [http://alumni.stanford.edu/get/page/magazine/article/?article\\_id=68845](http://alumni.stanford.edu/get/page/magazine/article/?article_id=68845))

Yes, Ashland seems to be a relatively safe place to live, but it only takes one careless gun owner to provide a disturbed child or adult with the opportunity to rob many children of their lives. The two ordinances proposed to our City Council regarding gun safety are modest, common-sense precautions which are consistent with ordinances already upheld by the Oregon Supreme Court. We should not hesitate to take every action legally available to us to protect our children.

---

Priscilla Hunter inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 1:25 PM

1. I am enchanted by the sweet, timid, and polite tone of the proposed question (and actual city ordinance?) to Ashland voters. I don't know what to think about the legal or psychological effectiveness of this language, but I think it's very Ashland and, if this language and tone work in legal terms in other instances, I'm all for the present wording of the issue on the ballot measure.

2. You've presented several scenarios of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of ordinances on the open carry of (loaded) firearms and minors' access to firearms in Ashland. I am in favor of having such ordinances on the city's books and publicized as well as on display throughout the city. My support of the new ordinances is not for philosophical reasons. I am more concerned with the practical value of being safe in Ashland and decreasing the likelihood of danger to everyone when guns, loaded or unloaded, are present.

I believe that city ordinances like these state an assumption and set a tone of non-violence and cooperation that I find essential to my sense of well being and trust in my city. A city's language is important. Ordinances like the ones presently proposed serve to heighten the awareness of gun-safety and the neighborliness of neighbors caring for neighbors in peaceful and considerate ways. A desire for peace and safety is not philosophical, either among the gun-owning or the non-gun-owning public. I speak as a person who has studied and fired firearms a little myself.

Part of the effectiveness of such ordinances as you propose comes from an increase of public confidence in the safety of our streets and the effectiveness of our own police. This confidence itself lessens the likely incidence of gun violence that can threaten innocent lives. Another part of a city's ordinances on the use and care of guns comes from their effectiveness in promoting the greater care that would be practiced by those who cherish a right to bear arms and who would be made aware or reminded, with the community's help, that their guns, particularly if loaded and displayed in a public place, would cause undue alarm to many or could cause (not reduce, as many gun owners claim) danger or injury from the use of firearms. Guns affect everyone around them and if guns are present, whether loaded or not (who can tell from just a quick look at them), they set up possibilities of unintended and irrevocable harm that can without justification come to others.

So I would rather have the city adopt ordinances against open or, if they don't already exist, against concealed carry of firearms in public, period. But I support even the open-carry ordinance you are proposing and I am fully in favor of the proposed ordinance you've designed to protect minors by placing or promoting prohibitions on

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

their access (intentional or unintentional) to firearms.

---

Ellen Wright inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 12:33 PM

The evidence seems so clear – countries that limit access to firearms have fewer gun related deaths and injuries than countries that allow more access to guns. Consider what happened in Australia when, in 1996 in response to an horrific mass shooting, they made gun laws stronger and uniform across Australia: (<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/dec/14/america-mass-murder-australia-gun-control-saves-lives>)

"Australia didn't ban guns. Hunting and shooting are still thriving. But by adopting laws that give priority to public safety, we have saved thousands of lives."

I was very upset to see the fellow at the study session who thought it would be a good idea to attend armed to the teeth. This incident persuaded me that we do indeed need this ordinance in Ashland. Ashland should join other brave communities in proving that the American people are better than this. We do not need to be armed – it does not make us safer.

"We identified and analyzed 62 (mass shootings), and one striking pattern in the data is this: In not a single case was the killing stopped by a civilian using a gun. And in other recent (but less lethal) rampages in which armed civilians attempted to intervene, those civilians not only failed to stop the shooter but also were gravely wounded or killed. Moreover, we found that the rate of mass shootings has increased in recent years—at a time when America has been flooded with millions of additional firearms and a barrage of new laws has made it easier than ever to carry them in public places, including bars, parks, and schools."

(<http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/09/mass-shootings-investigation>)

The Second Amendment was meant to allow arms only for members of a well regulated militia, not an entire armed population. The term "regulated" means "disciplined" or "trained", it does not mean any untrained citizen: see footnote 158 here:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second\\_Amendment\\_to\\_the\\_United\\_States\\_Constitution#cite\\_note-Merkel361-158](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution#cite_note-Merkel361-158)

According to the Washington Post Fact Checker, there is no link between right-to-carry laws and changes in crime.

" In 2004, a committee of the National Research Council of the National Academies devoted a chapter in a report titled "Firearms and Violence: A Critical Review" examining Lott's research. The report concluded: No link between right-to-carry laws and changes in crime is apparent in the raw data, even in the initial sample; it is only once numerous covariates are included that the negative results in the early data emerge. While the trend models show a reduction in the crime growth rate following the adoption of right-to-carry laws, these trend reductions occur long after law adoption, casting serious doubt on the proposition that the trend models estimated in the literature reflect effects of the law change. Finally, some of the point estimates are imprecise. Thus, the committee concludes that with the current evidence it is not possible to determine that there is a causal link between the passage of right-to-carry laws and crime rates."

The Brady Reports are an interesting read on the subject of gun control (<http://www.bradycampaign.org/programs/legal-action-project/brady-reports>), especially on the NRA's role in

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

distorting the truth about guns and crime. I would recommend that the members of the council at it to their reading list when researching this issue.

I urge the City Council to pass the gun safety ordinance. For our children.

---

mitzi miles inside Ashland

March 13, 2014, 11:53 AM

This proposal is a waste of the city's time and money. Firearms that are a problem will be in the hands of the irresponsible or the criminal regardless of regulation. My point is illustrated by the extreme gun violence that plagues cities with the most stringent gun control laws: Oakland, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, DC, to name a few. It is not just a slogan that when we outlaw guns, only outlaws will have guns. A criminal element can easily and willfully prey upon a sitting-duck populous. I don't in any way advocate violence as an antidote to violence; I'm just saying law-abiding citizens make themselves victims by making sure the "gun culture" is forced underground.

I went to the concealed carry class at Ashland Gun Club, and I have my permit. My main interest in doing both was to educate myself about safe firearms handling and the permit process. I was shocked to find out how wrong I was about so many things--in particular the quality of the people who are AGC members. These are respectable, caring, careful people who understand that gun ownership is a right AND a responsibility. Safety for everyone lies in education, not legislation, and the citizenry of Ashland should not get this backwards. Want to be safe from guns? LEARN!

To think guns will disappear in America is to live in an oblivious dream world. The genie is out of that bottle, and I intend to be part of the community dedicated to seeing that it stays out. We should be more concerned with keeping our options open than with frivolous, unwieldy proposals such as this one. No one will be made safer. Enforcement will just be made more costly and complicated.

---

Kerensa Ritchie inside Ashland

March 12, 2014, 4:24 PM

Laws are in place to protect people. If people have gone through the process to get a concealed carry permit and have gone through the process to purchase a gun, which both require background checks, then the city has no right to make a law prohibiting law abiding citizens from carrying loaded firearms in public. If you do the research it is very clear that cities and states who ban legally abiding citizens from carrying guns have higher rates of violence. Law abiding citizens are never the problem. Please just let this go. Spend time on current problems and issues not on hypothetical situations.

---

L K Casteel inside Ashland

March 12, 2014, 5:43 AM

Irrational: not using ration, contrary to logical thinking. Therefore, an "Irrational Fear" is a fear of something that has no real foundation, a fear that goes against logic, or a fear founded on falsehood: fear of dogs, man's best friend, a pet most of us grew up with or around without any negative consequence; fear of heights by people

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

who have never fallen from a distance greater than the thickness of their shoes' heels; fear of the dark, the time that brings most people peace and rest, or a time of watching an awe inspiring sky; fear of religion, a belief that gives people hope of a better present and future, that brings peace and joy into people lives and heals hurt and anger in their hearts; And fear of guns. Every year in this country we hear little or nothing of the thousands of ordinary people who use guns to protect themselves, their businesses, their families, and even strangers. Thousands more people use guns, often just the sight of their gun, to ward off violent and bad intentioned people from committing crimes. Then there are millions of folks who use guns to put food on the table for their families and the families of others. Last, there are millions of men, women, and children who use their guns for simple shooting pleasure. And the percentage of people who are hurt in all of these activities is miniscule. Yet there is an irrational fear of guns by some people. Why?

The answer, I believe, is quite simply is a greedy press. Yes, there is a power hungry, politically motivated group of politicians who love to promote any controversy in order to get their name before the peoples, but it is the press who stirs that controversy and puts that name out there. It doesn't matter whether it is the written, visual, or audible press, the goal is the same; money. These heartless people prey on the bleeding hearts, tender hearts, and even the broken hearted in order to line their pockets. But, before we condemn them, let's remember that the press only does this because it sells. It is the buyers, us, the general public who buy their product.

When a really bad, evil person goes on a killing spree, the press is all over it for several days or weeks. If a mentally unstable and often known to be dangerous person illegally obtains a firearm and goes on a shooting rampage, we hear about it for weeks or months. We hear from the politically motivated, the ignorant, the greedy, and the publicity seekers hour after hour about how bad guns are, and sometimes it is mentioned in passing that the gun was obtained illegally, that the person was known to be mentally unstable and dangerous by family, friends, social services, law enforcement, and often educational and other public agencies, all of whom did nothing to prevent the killings. The gun is no more to blame for its misuse than the tennis racket or golf club or machete that is misused for the same purpose. It seems that people are more interested in blaming that (those) which (who) is (are) least capable of defending itself (themselves) rather than dealing with the truth, which may be more difficult. After all, blame guns and take them away; its much easier than blaming ourselves for not taking care of the mentally ill and unstable who committed these horrendous acts. Every major shooting in the last several years has been committed under the conditions mentioned above. The many laws on the books, which could help, are often ignored and unenforced, so politicians, who want people to think they can solve all of their problems, propose more laws instead of proposing that we more effectively enforce the laws we have. Some politicians go so far as to create imaginary problems that need to be solved, or maybe just capitalize on the irrational fears of a few in order to get their name before the voters.

Portland, Oregon has a small gun problem. The people there have taken steps to deal with their problem. (Sadly, they are trying all of the things other cities have proven to be ineffective.) Ashland has not had a gun problem. What Ashland has is a few people with an irrational fear of firearms, a fear which might be better dealt with through education and counseling, just like those who fear dogs, the dark, heights, and other similar things. Focusing on factual reality instead of sensationalized press coverings would help a lot of folks live more peaceably. The proposed ordinance restricts honest people from being able to safely defend themselves and others and does nothing to create a safer town or safer people, and it deals with a nonexistent problem.

A note:

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Oregon was .9 people

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Portland was 2.5 people

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

In 2010, the Murder rate by firearm per 100,000 in Oregon was 0 people  
These numbers include suicide by firearm.

---

Amy Haptonstall inside Ashland

March 11, 2014, 5:46 PM

Overlooked portions of the gun proposal that need to be addressed: One, they take away 2A rights to a portion of our population that deserve their freedom more than anyone-our soldiers. A person can not get a CWP until they are 21, our soldiers are probably the most trained and won't have the freedom to protect themselves in Ashland as they may wish to. Two, public places are not just the downtown Ashland area, this includes your front porch, walkway, driveway, and your car, and I assume Greenway bike path-one of the most dangerous areas, and other public trails where I myself feel the most vulnerable due to strangers and at times bears and cougars. Yes, sipping wine on your porch is illegal according to the definition of public place. Three, we still have a brutal unsolved murder in our town and we have a high rate of sexual assault. Whether people want to protect themselves from these people is their business, but don't take away the right for those of us who wish to. Four, only way it is to be a preventable measure is our 4A rights are greatly infringed by searching without cause, including our own homes.

Again, these are only portions I feel are being overlooked there are many more obvious reason this is a bad idea, such as cost of enforcement and lawsuits. Liberty definition: the state of being free within society from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's way of life, behavior, or political views. Don't chisel away our liberty.

---

Richard Baize inside Ashland

March 11, 2014, 2:35 PM

This is clearly a poorly thought out solution to a problem that does not exist. If any person intends to do harm to another with a firearm, does anyone really think an "Ordinance" will prevent it? What WILL prevent it is the very real possibility that some of the intended "Victims" might be legally armed, trained civilians. I've had a Concealed Handgun License for a quarter of a century, and when you've seen me in public during that time, I've been armed. Having said that, some might think I don't have a dog in this hunt, but the fact is that I do; we all do. In my opinion, persons who go legally armed in a society are Citizens, while those who do not are Subjects. I belong to several gun rights organizations, including Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership. One of the mottos I've heard there is "Never Again." I will never allow anyone to take away any of my rights as a citizen. Never.

---

James Dykstra inside Ashland

March 10, 2014, 7:34 PM

I am against both proposals. If the city council believes this is a big issue, put it to a vote of the people. Not that it matters we have been supporting and living in Ashland since 1989.

---

Sandra Holstein inside Ashland

March 6, 2014, 9:40 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Since the two objections to this ordinance are that it is a constitutional "right" and that it will incur expensive lawsuits, it would seem that the courts' rulings upholding this law in Astoria, Newport, Portland, Beaverton, Tigard, Oregon City, Salem, Independence, and Multnomah County would preclude both arguments by setting a legal precedent..

What about the rights of people not to feel menaced or to fear accidents when approached by people carrying loaded guns? Some years ago, a professor at SOU was harassed by a stalker with loaded guns. I have seen angry people around Ashland; I do not want to worry that they are carrying guns.

One of the most frightening things I heard in Ashland was when I moved here from Asia and my five-year-old told me that his friends at school played with their fathers' guns. We know the percentage of accidental shootings by children in this country, and we know the domestic abuse rates.. Why do we allow some people's "rights" to take precedence over others'?

---

Olivia Doty inside Ashland

March 5, 2014, 3:03 PM

I don't like the sound of this at all!

---

Erin Muck inside Ashland

March 3, 2014, 9:18 PM

I am in favor of both ordinances.

My primary concern is the safety of our children. I understand the arguments about our constitutional rights, and how heated this topic is. But for me, bottom line, anything we can do to make our town safer for our kids, whether they are walking in downtown Ashland, or in our wonderful schools, then I support it.

---

Dave Helmich inside Ashland

March 3, 2014, 3:35 PM

I am very much in favor of both ordinances.

There is no reason to have guns in town in the first place and certainly not in view. To many it would be a menacing and threatening view. If a citizen is chronically afraid, moving is an option. If there are not enough cops, vote for more.

Cowards need guns. Well balanced individuals have enough self-confidence without them. The more cowards that leave town, the better.

I've heard there is an argument that Ashland would have to defend this in court. If Ashland does and it may, then many other cities in the state will as well. The shared cost of a legal defense would be trivial for the added safety.

Vote for the ordinances! Vote for civility and safety!

---

loren deffenbaugh inside Ashland

March 2, 2014, 11:55 AM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I have worked for the city as a police officer for 15 years. During those years I could count on one hand the number of times I saw someone open carry a firearm in Ashland. I look at this and wonder "why"? It is often said we are a community of "diversity" and "tolerance". However persons with a special interest seem to be able to believe that those are one way streets. People who live within the law are punished because someone is offended by someone carrying a gun. I am offended that we cannot sing Christmas songs that mention God in Schools. That we cannot have a Christmas tree at a government building (has to be called Holiday). There is no basis for enacting such a law other than ignorance. Why would anyone wish to deny the rights given by the Constitution of the United States? I would think all the elected councilors took an oath to uphold that document, how sorry if you didn't.

If you seek to create a utopian society, good luck, if 15 years of police work taught me anything it is there will always be those who take advantage of others. There will always be violence, bombs, knives, hammers, bats, the list goes on.

If you vote this through thinking it will help your wrong. All you do is create a false sense of safety. Someone mentioned in an opinion that open carry was about bolstering one's manhood. Perhaps it is more about personal safety should one need it.

Open carry is legal under the Constitution, it is a personal choice. Let's leave it that way and deal with real issues.

The storage of firearms reaches into the Fourth Amendment. It could only be enforced after the fact of a terrible accident, unless you feel the Fourth Amendment needs to be tossed aside as well. There are laws in place that deal with such acts of carelessness. It would be like enacting a law to require non-slip bath mats to prevent falls in tubs. Are you going to allow the police/city officials to come knock and check if you have a bath mat?

Thank You

---

Steve Eadie inside Ashland

March 2, 2014, 9:12 AM

My wife and I have lived in Ashland for 16 years. We are raising our 8yo twins here by choice. We are the definition of concerned and caring parents. In all of the time we have lived here we have never witnessed or heard of any violent act by a person legally carrying a firearm.

If there is ever a person who commits a violent felony around our children it is our true hope that someone legally carrying a firearm is there to stop them. I can absolutely guaranty a police officer will not be there when the act is committed.

If this proposed regulation goes into effect you are choosing to eliminate the one chance my family may have against a violent felon, an honest concerned citizen.

---

Larry Graves inside Ashland

February 27, 2014, 11:18 PM

I have read all the related documents, and all the written statements made on this issue, and have attended the public meetings. I've seen the young man carrying multiple weapons into the "study session" on banning guns and I've seen hundreds of instances of open carry in the town of Ashland in all my years living here. Every time

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I've ever seen a police officer in Ashland, I've seen open carry. Never gave it another thought. Why is it that when bad people do bad things, we call the good guys with their guns to save us? When seconds count, the police are only minutes away. I want everyone to think about this: WHO OWNS YOU? The answer must always be, YOU DO. Only you. No one else. Your thoughts, your personality, your love and your life energy -- they are yours, and yours alone. They are God-given and they are unique. They are inherent characteristics of who you are, and so is the right to protect yourself and your life from those who might one day try to take it for themselves. No one can ever predict when a bad person will attempt to steal your life or your liberty from you, but I know that none of us has the right to keep you from protecting yourself from evil. Your right to self-defense is an inherent characteristic of who you are, and it does not come from outside of you -- it does not come from a Constitution or a code of revised statutes or a city ordinance or a Presidential Executive Order -- it is an inextricable part of who you are. We have nothing to fear from law abiding people no matter how many weapons they might carry. We have only to fear the lawless individuals who WILL carry firearms, whether it is legal or illegal, lawful or unlawful. We can call out to the police in black with their big, scary, open-carry guns for help that will arrive too late, or we can immediately protect ourselves as is our inherent right. This Ordinance is a bad proposal. It solves NO problem. It is based in irrationality and fear. Even if you disagree with the philosophically correct argument above, think about this: the City of Ashland will ultimately be forced to spend hundreds of thousands of YOUR dollars in a losing legal battle to defend an indefensible position, just as has already happened with the \$400,000 Mt Ashland Ski Resort verdict. Carol Voisin says Ashland has never shied away from a legal fight just because the City Council adopts a losing cause. That's very easy for her to say, since she will be paying the bill with YOUR money, not hers.

~Larry Graves

---

Donald Stone inside Ashland

February 27, 2014, 4:14 PM

Ashland has little history of the massive threats and violence that would justify carrying around loaded firearms to "protect life and property" or "Mom, apple pie and the American way. Those that seem to feel justified in "displaying their manhood" by packing heat, loaded or unloaded, would seem to have little confidence in their "manhood" or they wouldn't have the need to display it. They all need to grow up. The only thing that needs shooting in Ashland are the deer.

---

April Rosenthal inside Ashland

February 26, 2014, 5:45 PM

In a civilized society it's hard to understand why the idea of allowing loaded firearms in public places is even discussed. I live in Ashland for many reasons but mainly because of it's philosophy of peace and harmony, it's non-violent demonstrations, it's intellectual approaches to solving issues. I see no place for firearms in our community except in the hands of law enforcement. The public display of loaded (or unloaded weapons) in the Ashland community should not be tolerated as it is not tolerated in so many other communities in Oregon. We must protect our community and not be afraid to stand up to organizations such as the NRA whose purpose is to increase profits of gun makers by playing on the public's fears for safety. I do not want to worry when I go to an Ashland theatre that someone carrying a loaded firearm could kill another. I think the City of Ashland should consider that the proposal to prohibit carrying loaded firearms in public places would also encourage tourism here by promoting public safety. This should be considered especially in light of the recent incidents of gun violence against innocent citizens throughout our nation.

---

Larry Rogers inside Ashland

February 25, 2014, 9:07 AM

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of March 14, 2014, 10:39 AM

<http://peakdemocracy.com/1736>

Page 15 of 26

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

We do not need more gun control laws. We need to better enforce the laws we already have, better background checks etc.

The city needs to focus its time and energy in areas where there are real problems like the homeless issue, property taxes, infrastructure, etc.

---

Anne Batzer outside Ashland

February 24, 2014, 1:25 PM

As I look over the list of those who have signed the petition for gun safety measures in Ashland, I see others who, like me, have had a close family member murdered by a stranger. In my case, it was right here in the Rogue Valley. There have been at least three incidents where there was illegal gun use, or threatened illegal gun use, in Ashland since your first study session. This issue is not an abstraction. We watch in frustration as our federal government does nothing. Cities are limited in what we can do---but does that mean we do nothing? The committee---mostly parents of young children---who has brought these ordinances forward has kept their means congruent with their goal. They have not belittled or berated. They have not threatened or resorted to psychological violence. Rather they have modeled what they hope to achieve: a culture that is a little safer, a little more respectful and a little more civilized. It's right that you researched the legal liabilities of these ordinances. Your research reveals that the chances of lawsuits against these ordinances are slim. (No legislation is 100 percent free from the threat of litigation.) You have the opportunity to nudge our culture toward the direction of a more thoughtful maturity. Please pass both of these ordinances.

---

Noel Chatroux inside Ashland

February 23, 2014, 9:43 PM

I guess I have an unusual perspective because I am French and go back to visit my family of origin at least yearly. They shake their head in disbelief when I tell them of our laws protecting the possession of firearms and the reasons for these laws. To them it's clear that more firearms in homes doesn't make society safer, and that the reasons for violence, armed and otherwise lie elsewhere than in the lack of guns in the hands of regular people. Guns are dangerous and should be left to law enforcement people to use in their line of duty. The further in that direction we can go without exposing our city to ruinous law suits, the better.

I also work with children and families as a mental health therapist. Seeing an adult carrying an assault weapon in a public place is shocking and potentially traumatizing. These sights belong on the battle field, not in our streets or stores.

Thank you for your effort to legislate civility into this antiquated American notion that we must be allowed to arm ourselves so that we can protect our families and assets.

---

cat gould inside Ashland

February 23, 2014, 1:23 PM

<http://youtu.be/8R8UOjMy-5k>

---

Sarah DeLong inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 6:23 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

We're entering our 3rd year as Ashland residents. We love living and raising our kids here. This community is so focused on taking care of, and supporting each other in myriad ways. This very modest, common-sense gun regulation proposal seems like an extension of that characteristic. It's not trying to take anything away from anyone, it's merely trying to care for the community by keeping us safer. I definitely support both proposed ordinances.

---

Bruce Borgerson inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 6:18 PM

I strongly support this ordinance. I think all Ashland councilors need to be fully aware that opposition to any ordinance essentially similar to ordinances in Portland and other Oregon communities that have withstood court challenge will have one certain result:

That councilor will not be returned to the council following his or her next election day.

I'm an Ashland resident and voter.

---

ANNE ROBISON inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 5:49 PM

This is an excellent proposal to promote Ashland as a safe and civilized place to live, do business, raise kids, and visit. Do we need to feel bullied by a small handful of folks with questionable judgment who attend city council meetings with automatic weapons? This is a reasonable, common sense law well within our rights as a city to pass. For those that say "Ashland doesn't have a problem" - great, let's keep it that way. Or would we rather wait until a tragedy occurs? If this law prevents even one accidental or intentional death in this city in the next fifty years, it is worth it. It seems so easy. And where else can we begin but locally? Can we not provide example for other small towns, cities, and states? The data is so clear. Reduce guns, reduce deaths by gun. That would not have happened otherwise. Period. (Harvard School of Public Health Study: <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/hicrc/firearms-research/guns-and-death>)

I think it is only reasonable to assume that fewer loaded guns will be statistically similar, though to a lesser degree. And anyway, folks with a concealed weapons permit get to keep their gun loaded.

But I must say, I firmly reject this notion of "Good Guys with guns." Guns are dangerous and can kill hundreds of people in just a few minutes. No matter the intention. Let's hedge our bets and ask people to keep them unloaded in public places.

---

Andrew Kubik inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 11:58 AM

I would support the 'open carry' provision because it makes sense and based on Portland's experience, would pass legal muster. No developed nation, except for the USA, allows this sort of nonsense. I would actually support a complete open carry ban nationwide. I understand the 'home storage' provision, but I feel it does not have legal viability and would likely nix the entire effort. Besides, parents of minors are liable when said minors commit crimes, cause car wrecks, etc. There should be ample provision in existing statute to cover this form of parental negligence. If not, then it needs to be legislated statewide.

---

Erik Larsen inside Ashland

February 22, 2014, 4:42 AM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

This seems like it could be a legal minefield for the city, and it's not clear that safety would be improved. If a person intends to do harm, I don't think this ordinance will stop them. Though I've never seen anyone with an open carry for its own sake here in Ashland, perhaps this is more about getting guns out of open view as an aesthetic? If so, I couldn't agree that the regulation is appropriate, because then where is the line drawn? Thank you.

jonathan seidler inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 1:01 PM

Update on March 7:

I feel a need to respond again today. First it has been said that the precedent for this ordinance has been set in other Oregon localities and this is not true. This proposal is of a different slant and language. Thus a court case would view it from a origin standpoint.

Second, A comment that cowards fits the description of anyone carrying or using a firearm and that all cowards should leave Ashland. I suggest that the author of that statement put forth a petition for a ordinance addendum to rule that all cowards be banned from Ashland, stipulating conditions for the removal of said persons with a time frame in place and a rule on jail time and fines pertaining for the culprit guilty of breaking the rule of said ordinance.

I, myself, am currently wording a document proposal for a petition to cite and ban persons using wireless devises while driving in Ashland. The evidence is overwhelming how the Ashland general public completely ignores the laws pertaining to cellphone use and the dangers associated with the activity while driving. An exclusion of these digital junkies from our local society will create a safer locality in general and will provide a huge boost for tourism and local economy.

Original statement posted Feb 21:

Gun ownership is a right that is availed by the constitution. It is a rare commodity that is taken for granted by all. It is rare in that most other first and third world nations regulate, by criminal law, the ownership of arms. However if you are swayed by modern arguments on this "issue" and how strongly you feel about it, you still have to accept what is the "rule" of our land and it is a rule made by the people for the people. It has stood the test of time and resolve. It represents an acknowledgment of corruption in government from the beginning of this country and throughout history till today. Dictatorships were partially founded on arms confiscation and enforcement of those laws. Nazi Germany is a perfect example and there are living people today who can attest to the function of those gun control laws in Nazi Germany. Yes, some young people feel very strongly about parading their right to open carry and it does make some people nervous and rightly so. You always have the right to call police who will always investigate that occurrence. If you would talk to people who open carry they usually are very happy to discuss why they do with you. Ashland is part of Oregon and part of the USA. Ordinances like this petition proposal are not an answer to any problem here that is a council related issue. Surely if one feels that living in Ashland is dangerous then they can decide to move but where will you go? The States are united by the constitution and the right to bear arms is uniform. Move to NYC, or L.A. or Chicago where gun ownership is most regulated per ordinances and will you then be safer? Ashland WILL face a lawsuit because of a petition signed by 175 people out of a population of 20,000. How about real consensus and put it to a vote? For me, it is sad how people want Ashland to be groovier for the fact of how regulated it is, be it by ordinances or taxes. For your own information ask a Ashland Police Officer what they think of the

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

proposal for gun control in Ashland. You might be surprised.

---

Greg Jost inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 11:50 AM

I agree with the intent of the ordinance, but provisions should be made for individuals that may have acute need of a concealed carry permit that would be annually approved by a sitting judge.

Also, I feel that the "state" should require gun owners to maintain required liability insurance, purchased in the open market, to provide liability coverage for all rifles, pistols, and weapons that is comparable to automobile liability insurance. This mechanism would allow the market place and courts to economically regulate irresponsible gun owners, who do not safely monitor their weapons, improperly utilize them in public situations, or participate in illegal criminal activities.

---

LINDA ADAMS inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 10:14 AM

I agree with limiting gun toting in public. I wish there was a legal possibility to limit gun ownership entirely. Portland has a no carry law, Ashland should, too.

---

k latham inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 10:01 AM

Stop trying to take away our rights as legal gun owners, out of fear and misinformation. Here in Ashland, more young people have died or been harmed by skateboard and bicycle use and heroin/drug overdoses in the past few years than any problems with guns. We don't need people moving here, then attempting to change Ashland into wherever they came from. Move to Portland if you want to live in a "safer" community with this "law". I live in Ashland, was born and raised here. My family has lived here for over 100 years.

---

Diane Paulson inside Ashland

February 21, 2014, 9:23 AM

I agree with this effort to prohibit people from carrying loaded firearms in public places such as a school, city offices, SOU campus. The young man who shows up with several loaded firearms at the City Council meetings and at the Plaza in Ashland and in downtown Medford is a menacing and aggressive person as shown by his actions. I do not understand why he was allowed to come into a City Council meeting with such armament even though he has permits?! It is very aggressive and confrontative, intimidating and threatening behavior which can cause extreme fear in others. Why was he allowed access when his behavior is so very hostile and potentially dangerous???

---

Tom Burnham inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 10:31 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

NO GUNS PERIOD

---

Michael Clark inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 9:05 PM

Are we having a problem with people carrying guns in town? Keep this "feel good" proposal going and we will—just so gun rights advocates can make a point that they have the right. They do have the right. I'm as appalled as anyone by the gun violence we so often hear about. Will banning the carrying of loaded guns in our public places prevent that? That's a rhetorical question.

---

Lee Fox inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 6:45 PM

I see absolutely no need for this regulation. Will someone please articulate the problem statement? The supporters "forgot" this since there is none. Do they really believe that government can protect us from all evil and that only government employees should be armed?? Its a dream to believe that felons will be dissuaded by a potential misdemeanor charge. Please focus on the criminals not the law abiding citizens!

---

J, D. inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 6:22 PM

I have lived in Ashland for 6 years and I have never seen anyone carrying a handgun in the open. I have never seen it as a problem. I am against any measure that would impede on my rights. I agree that people shouldn't parade around town with a rifle slung across their back but what it all boils down to is common sense. People shouldn't worry that because someone is carrying a gun they are a potential criminal. Someone made a comment something to the effect that carrying a gun may cause criminal activity so guns should not be allowed in public on the streets of Ashland. Let's carry that same thought pattern over to alcohol and drunk driving. Should they prohibit any place to sell alcohol because someone that is drinking could get drunk and go on a rampage in their car and injure or kill people? That is making assumptions about things that might happen. Prohibiting open carry will only stop law abiding citizens from carrying. The criminals will still carry guns. Proof of that is that murder is illegal and there are all kinds of laws stating that it is illegal but people are still murdered everyday.

---

Larry Pearson inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 5:32 PM

I prefer that people do not carry loaded firearms in public places; however, I have not seen anyone doing so in Ashland [with the exception of those with concealed weapon permits], so I don't see the need for the Council to spend time on the issue. Except for the non-productive use of time, I am not opposed to the proposed prohibition of carrying loaded firearms in public places.

---

Sally McKirgan inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 5:14 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

People need to be allowed to own guns but please let's not walk down the street with them slung over our shoulders. Guns are alarming things to see. Violence is abhorrent and so is seeing an AK47 or Rifle walking down the street or standing on the corner.

Sally & Carl McKirgan

---

Shawn Kampmann inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:53 PM

If there ever comes a time where armed militias are roaming the streets of Ashland menacing the public, then maybe I would be more in favor of restrictions if state and federal law permitted it. But since I first moved to Ashland in 1973, I have not seen anyone with a firearm threatening people. In this current proposal about prohibiting loaded firearms in public, I am guessing that it is only going to encourage the pro-NRA lunatic fringe to take up parading around town brandishing iron to make a statement. It will end up being a "call to arms" for gun fanatics to take a stand and will only end up creating discontent and conflict where there is none now. C'mon folks, calm down and quit making "much ado about nothing!" The biggest reason to drop this misguided effort is that as taxpayers, we are all tired of the City wasting money on non-issues such as this, especially when it is likely to involve a very expensive legal defense if challenged (as has been already threatened by some NRA types). Ashland has little likelihood of winning this battle and we have so many other actual current financial needs (AFN, sewer treatment plant, parks, citizen services, etc.). If you don't want to see people with guns parading around town, then don't threaten to ban them and call them out because you are not likely see it otherwise. A ban would be unenforceable according to APD and "bad guys" aren't going to obey the law anyway so whats the real point here? As my parents used to say, "learn to pick your battles...."

---

Ronna Smith-Hileman inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:50 PM

Private citizens have no need and no business to carry loaded firearms in the city of Ashland.

---

Corren Hileman inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:41 PM

There is no reason for a private citizen to carry a loaded firearm of any kind in the city of Ashland.

---

Diana Trygg inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:41 PM

I strongly support this prohibition. We need to take a more rational approach to firearms based on our current history rather than the distant past.

---

cynda howell inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:21 PM

I agree with the requested ban on loaded guns in public. Also, whenever any gun is observed, police should verify that it is properly licensed and not loaded. Guns should be confiscated if either condition is not met. The

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

right to public safety can never be over ridden by the right to bare arms. Responsible gun own owners are in favor of background checks and licensing. Only a nut case would carry a loaded gun around in their homes while mowing the lawn, watching TV, or making lunch.. So, why would they carry a gun attending a play, a walk in the park, or in the grocery check out line? Guns should be used for activities such as hunting or target practice by those who are licensed and have received proper training.

---

Don Paul inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 4:03 PM

I personally have a carry permit. No one knows because I do not display my pistol or tell folks. I feel this is just another attempt by liberals to disarm law abiding citizens. We all know that those from the criminal element will not follow the law. This puts the rest of us at a disadvantage by not having someone with a firearm available to defend the innocent in a crime situation. I do not support any change in the law at this time. Thanks.

---

Becky Snow inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:42 PM

I am persuaded by the experience of other communities, states and countries where sensible gun restrictions reduce accidental and intentional deaths by gunshot. Prohibiting loaded weapons on Ashland streets may be the only step this community can take by itself, without statewide legislation, but it should at least take this step.

---

STEPHANIE BARTLETT inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:35 PM

Just because we haven't had a gunfire rampage in Ashland doesn't mean it couldn't happen. Why make it easier/more possible? I'm in favor of prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms in public places in the city of Ashland. As for our second amendment rights, why is it that people opposed to gun control always leave out the prepositional phrase, "in a well-ordered militia?"

---

Scott Calamar inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:34 PM

I personally believe in controlling arms. HOWEVER, once again the city is wasting time and resources on a non-issue—philosophical meanderings repeatedly supersede the practical workings of council and staff. For instance, the TAP water thing has been going on for how long and you've once again managed to sidestep putting something out for \*bids\*. So I am AGAINST a proposal that does not address an active issue in this town.

---

Penny Naumoff inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:20 PM

I totally support this proposal. Seems like common sense to me.

---

Daisy Hering inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:18 PM

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of March 14, 2014, 10:39 AM

<http://peakdemocracy.com/1736>

Page 22 of 26

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

I am surprised this issue is being treated as controversial when even the NRA recommends keeping guns unloaded until just before use. Ashland is not immune from illegal gun use. According to the city and the newspaper, in just the last month, the police received a tip that a student was threatening to bring a gun to the high school, a man with a gun menaced a woman in the parking lot of an Ashland shopping center, and a gas station was robbed by a man with a gun. Guns are everywhere in this country and Ashland is not an exception. Common sense and scientific studies show that the greater the presence of loaded guns, the greater the risk of accidents and criminal gun use. Let's keep Ashland sensible and keep loaded, openly-carried guns out of public places.

---

mark kelly inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:09 PM

Ban loaded weapons. Simple.

---

Ron Parenteau outside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 3:02 PM

Thought there was laws to that issue already

---

Jerry Spears inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:52 PM

All laws are a lessening of freedom, some are worth the price, but why would anyone lessen freedom with no benefit?

How many people have been killed or injured with a gun downtown in Ashland in the last 50 years? Now how much trouble, property damage and violence have "homeless" people caused in Ashland in that same time period?

We have many problems in Ashland... this is not one of them. It distracts people from actually doing anything. People need food, homes, mental health help, etc. Will this do anything to help solve these problems? If you want to help go buy someone a sandwich, but don't try and slowly take our freedoms away!

Do we really want to move onto the slippery slope of new unnecessary laws?

Anyone remember the 2% "temporary" food tax to help pay for the flood damage. Almost instantly it was raised to 5% and now it is permanent and has nothing to do with the flood.....

I have always believed that in a democracy laws were for the greater good of all not just for a few people did not like something?

I remember in the 70's being pulled over by a police officer (somewhere in this valley) and being told that the "boy" (30 year old black man) driving the car I was riding in needed to get off the road and go back home if he didn't want any trouble. Seemed there was a sundowner law because some people did not like black people out after dark. Thankfully most of those laws are gone because what some people did not like was not worth the

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

freedom it took from others.

---

Deborah Gordon outside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:14 PM

As an Ashland business person (not a resident), I think safety lies on the side of prohibiting loaded firearms in public places. As a health professional, I am well aware of the incredible history and opportunity for mishaps when loaded guns are around. Please prohibit loaded firearms in public places.

---

Samantha Hammell inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:12 PM

Ashland bans nudity in public places. Have we really come to the point where a nude woman on a bicycle is more of a threat to public safety and health than a loaded gun? Let's keep Ashland a reasonable place to live-- a place with laws that are the result of rationality. Loaded guns carry inherent danger and those who own guns need to respect the rights of those around them when they are out in public by unloading their weapons. Clothes mandatory, but loaded guns optional? C'mon, let's have some mature thinking and avoid this absurd result!

---

Bruce Hanson outside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 2:04 PM

Carrying firearms in public is a really BAD IDEA.  
This isn't the wild West.

---

John Williams inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:46 PM

Research and data are indisputably clear on this question: the more guns in public places, the more accidental and intentional gun injuries and deaths occur. Despite the facts, many gun lovers will inexplicably say virtually anything to justify their disdain for any gun controls. The facts say having more guns does not reduce crime, but does increase gun accidents, gun suicides, and gun crime. There is absolutely no downside to prohibiting the carrying of loaded firearms in public places...only benefits.

---

John Johnson inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:44 PM

I agree that we're discussing a non-problem here in Ashland. I do believe that gun violence is a serious problem in our country. I wish people would stop making excuses for guns.

---

David Runkel inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:32 PM

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

This is a no-brainer. Of course, such a prohibition should be in place.

David and Deedie Ruknkel

---

Matt Warshawsky inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 1:17 PM

I agree with Mark Decker's comment. It addresses a problem that doesn't really exist, and is derived largely from fear. It is more likely to divide our community than of bring us together. The council has enough work already and should be focusing on our real problems.

---

Mark Decker inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 10:37 AM

Since the ordinance only applies to open carry of \*loaded\* firearms (open carry of unloaded guns, and concealed carry of loaded guns with CHL are OK), it seems like a reasonable safety measure to help prevent accidental shootings, and does not significantly impair gun rights. However, it solves a problem that doesn't seem to exist, and would be hard to enforce. If we want to make a political statement to express the views of the community, an actual ordinance is overkill. A resolution that open carry is unwelcome in Ashland would be sufficient. Responsible gun owners should voluntarily respect the resolution for safety reasons and out of consideration for their neighbors' concerns. A real ordinance might backfire by angering strong supporters of gun rights to the point where they start parading around with unloaded weapons just to make a statement, needlessly scaring children and tourists. Let Ashland be a stage for real theater, not political theater.

---

Darrell Boldt inside Ashland

February 20, 2014, 9:04 AM

I think that carrying loaded firearms in public places should be banned unless the carrier has a concealed weapons permit.

Darrell Boldt

---

rob raby inside Ashland

February 19, 2014, 9:57 PM

This isn't portland and we don't have there problems.Why are some folk's trying to make Ashland a copy of a problem city. Is there some crime wave i'm not aware of that is being used to justify the trampling of our civil rights.

---

Donald Politis inside Ashland

February 19, 2014, 6:49 PM

While I don't advocate open carry it is our right and just as the little kids might see an open carry person so will they see a police gun when the Mother is stopped for a driving offense...same scary gun I expect.

## Carrying Loaded Firearms in Public Places

How does the Ashland community feel about a proposal that prohibits carrying loaded firearms in public places?

Don't spend your time on solutions to problems that don't exist

---

# PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

(as distinguished from philosophical and legal arguments)

## FOR AND AGAINST ADOPTING NEW ORDINANCES CONCERNING OPEN CARRY OF LOADED FIREARMS AND MINORS' ACCESS TO FIREARMS

1. EFFECTIVE? Might (a) enhance safety in public places by reducing the likelihood of unintentional gun-related violence OR (b) reduce safety by suggesting that criminal activity in Ashland public places will not likely be met by citizens' armed resistance.
2. EFFECTIVE? Might have no discernible impact on public safety given that gun-related crimes and accidents in Ashland are rare. (That is, in light of the rarity of gun-related crime and accidents in Ashland public places, any benefit from restricting open carry of loaded guns AND any benefit from the possibility of having armed citizens in public places at opportune times to deter or defend against serious crimes might both be negligible.)
3. EFFECTIVE? Might (a) have no real impact on open carry of loaded guns given that inspection to determine loaded or unloaded status of openly carried gun may not be possible, thereby limiting enforcement OR (b) enhance safety in public places and homes as a result of voluntary compliance, even if actual enforcement occurs rarely.
4. EFFECTIVE? Might (a) decrease the likelihood of minors in Ashland getting possession of guns without permission OR (b) have no discernible impact because the incidence of minors in Ashland getting unpermitted access to guns is rare even without a special prohibition.
5. EFFECTIVE? Might (a) be effective, regardless of enforceability, as an expression of the views of a majority of Ashland citizens on an issue under legislative consideration in the State Legislature and Congress OR (b) be regarded as merely unenforceable political statements, which might, in turn, cause other ordinances to be taken less seriously.
6. LITIGATION? Might (a) result in lengthy legal battles so costly as to have an appreciable impact on City budgets and services OR (b) result in no lawsuits, as has been the case in 10 of the 11 Oregon jurisdictions that currently ban loaded weapons in public places.
7. FAIR? Might (a) alienate law-abiding citizens who are unlikely to misuse firearms even without the new ordinances OR (b) cause law-abiding gun owners to be more aware of many citizens' apprehensions about guns in public places.
8. VISITOR IMPACT? Might (a) result in fewer visitors to Ashland OR (b) attract new visitors to Ashland.