

Regarding the Oregon 2020 Safe Storage bill HB4005; these proposed laws would not have saved Cindy Yuille and Steve Forsyth from the Clackamas Town Center killer.

According to the Clackamas County Sheriff's Office active shooter investigation TIMELINE OF EVENTS (Linked and attached below). The murderer who had seen the rifle he used several months prior, stole it on December 11, 2012 between 5 a.m. and noon while sleeping over at the owners home.

The owner did not wake up until 4 p.m. on December 11, to find his rifle and murderer gone. This was over half an hour after the shooting.

The owner called 911 from payphone at approximately 7 p.m. to report the rifle stolen to Portland Police, well within the 24 hour required by the proposed laws.

Back on December 8 and 9, 2012 the murderer purchased several 30 round AR-15 magazines and .223 ammo from a local gun shop, a sporting goods store and a local big-box retailer. If the rifle were secured as required by the proposed law, then the murderer could have also purchased tools to defeat a lock earlier.

Note that only 17 rounds total were fired. A "high capacity" magazine ban would NOT have affected the outcome.

While not minimizing the two deceased and one wounded, it must be pointed out that the murderer could have inflicted more death and injury simply by running over shoppers in the mall parking lot with his legally owned car. Should we also mandate the "Safe Storage" of motor vehicles and hold a victim of automobile theft liable for the actions the criminal who stole from them?

Theft was not his only option. The murderer was 22 years old with NO criminal history, NO history of violence and NO history of diagnosed mental

illness. Unless he had walked into the local gun shop or sporting goods store smelling of Marijuana he could have passed the NICS background check by lying about his drug use on the Form 4473 and purchased an AR-15 or a hunting rifle which fires a more powerful cartridge by himself.

Finally, I along with other responsible gun owners, believe that young children and prohibited persons should not have access to loaded firearms, however this bill which places a blanket restriction on all gun owners is unnecessary. For example, a law requiring caregivers of children under 9 to use approved baby carriers or booster seats in automobiles is reasonable, while a law requiring that all vehicle owners have a carseat installed whether they have a young child or not is unreasonable.

Please keep the above facts in mind as you discuss HB4005 and remember, you can always tell that a bill is bad when the "Whereas" at the top are lies.

Steven Pelles

Pendleton, Oregon

<https://dochub.clackamas.us/documents/drupal/03ed9911-ccaf-4197-8b1e-918fc7b4b685>