

Exhibit 30

(Testimony of Police Chief J. Thomas Manger)

**Statement of J. Thomas Manger,
President, Major Cities Chiefs Association
Chief of Police, Montgomery County, Maryland**

before the
**Committee of the Judiciary
of the
United States Senate**

December 6, 2017

HEARING:

Firearm Accessory Regulation and Enforcing Federal and State Reporting to the
National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS)

Chairman Grassley, Ranking Member Feinstein, distinguished Members of the Committee, I am Tom Manger, Chief of the Montgomery County (Maryland) Police Department and President of the Major Cities Chiefs Association, representing the largest police agencies in America and the ten largest in Canada. As the officials responsible for public safety in every major urban area, we know first-hand about gun violence. As the sole representative of local law enforcement today, I speak for the men and women who run toward the gunfire and not away from it. I speak for those protect the victims of gun violence, and I speak for officers who have died by gun violence.

We commend Chairman Grassley for holding this hearing because we recognize that political sensitivities and controversy can be difficult at times like this. But recent tragedies show that this is a time for leadership and courage, and the Chairman has responded. For American law enforcement, we truly thank Chairman Grassley for ordering the hearing today.

Ranking Member Feinstein we applaud your unwavering support for victims of gun crimes and your relentless pursuit of measures to curb gun violence in America. Today I will describe how we strongly support your proposed legislation.

On behalf of American law enforcement, let me say It is our greatest hope that Democrats and Republicans can come together and adopt measures to protect the public from harm – because public safety should not be a partisan issue. Perhaps today will be a step in the direction of strong bipartisan leadership.

National Trends:

Gun violence continues to be the number one threat for homicides in the major cities I represent. Worse yet, our nation has witnessed a number of devastating mass murders such as the shooting in Sutherland Springs, Texas by a mentally disturbed subject; the massacre of more than a thousand shots fired on the public in Las Vegas, Nevada; and not long ago, the tragedy in Charleston, South Carolina by a white supremacist who should not have had access to guns. Before these mass murders, previous cases from Arizona and Virginia serve as bloody reminders that the current system is just not working.

We need to come together to protect the public. A device that results in a military attack, equivalent to full automatic firing – must be stopped. Bump stocks and similar devices have no legitimate sporting or hunting purpose. Likewise, the screening process for individuals looking to purchase a firearm or ammunition has had many loopholes for far too long and NICS must be strengthened.

Bump Stock Accessory Devices

Las Vegas, NV

On October 1, 2017, attendees of a music festival in Las Vegas, Nevada experienced a horrific hail of gunfire - 1,100 rounds in a matter of minutes. The worst mass murder in the history of our Nation – and it was attributable the devastating number of rounds fired. Stephen Paddock fired more than a thousand rounds because of a device that you must prohibit – the Bump Stock.

Paddock was able to stockpile twenty-three firearms, ammunition, and a variety of high-capacity magazines with the ability of holding 100 rounds each in his suite at the hotel. The firearms found in his room were four DDM4 rifles, three FN-15 rifles, one AR-15 rifle with forward front grip, one .308-caliber AR-10 rifle, one AK-47 rifle, at least one custom made LMT rifle, and a handgun.

Twelve of those guns were outfitted with the Bump Stock accessory that you are considering today. Paddock was able to fire approximately 90 rounds every 10 seconds into the crowd below. This deadly device has only one purpose – it enables a gunman to fire rounds at a speed equivalent to that of an automatic firearm without removing their finger from the trigger. While it is illegal for private citizens to possess fully automatic firearms, Bump Stocks are legal under current federal law.

The sole and pointless purpose of the Bump Stock is to accelerate the rate of fire to equal fully automatic firepower - exactly what Congress attempted to stop with previous legislation that bars fully automatic weapons. To prevent such horrific mass murders in the future, Major Cities Chiefs strongly support Senator Feinstein's proposal to ban Bump Stocks and similar devices. We appeal to Senators from both parties to join with Senator Feinstein and make S. 1916 a bipartisan effort to prevent another tragedy like the massacre in Las Vegas.

How can this device be justified for sporting or hunting? The assailant in Las Vegas left 58 dead and over 546 injured within a ten-minute time frame. Major Cities Chiefs are calling upon Congress to act now and give to ATF the authority to stop the carnage which results from a military rate of fire.

Appeals from Houston and Las Vegas

At our recent meeting in Philadelphia, the Acting Director of ATF who has testified today advised all the Chiefs that ATF does not now have the authority under Federal law to bar this device and new legislation is required to do so. I have submitted for the record a letter from Houston Chief Art Acevedo who supports S 1916 and notes that bump stock legislation is "common sense" legislation to protect the public.

Today I am also entering into the record a letter from Sheriff Joe Lombardo of Las Vegas, in which he likewise calls for action by Congress to give ATF authority to take action against the Bump Stock device and prevent further tragedies. In the aftermath of the worst mass homicide in our history, Sheriff Lombardo has appealed to Congress to empower ATF to protect the public. Surely the Committee can find a bipartisan way forward to protect the public from another tragedy of this magnitude.

National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS)

Sutherland Springs, Texas Case Study-November 2017:

The tragedy in Texas exemplifies a broad systemic weakness in NICS. On November 5, 2017, 26-year-old gunman Devin Patrick Kelley entered the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas. There he murdered 26 individuals and injured 20 others. Like the Las Vegas shooter, Kelley also died at his own hand after a self-inflicted head shot. This shooting is the deadliest mass shooting by one person in the state of Texas, and the fifth-deadliest mass shooting in the United States to date.

Kelley entered the church wearing tactical gear and carrying an AR-15 pattern Ruger AR-556 semi-automatic rifle. He walked up and down the aisles of the church firing in the pews. Law enforcement later reported for evidence they found 15 empty AR-15 rifle magazines capable of holding 30 rounds each at the scene. Two additional firearms were later found in Kelley's vehicle; a Glock 9 mm and a Ruger .22-caliber.

As this hearing has demonstrated, Kelley should have been barred from the purchase of firearms or ammunition because of his mental health history and prior criminal convictions. He was charged with assaulting his wife and with fracturing his toddler skull. Kelley openly made death threats against the superior officers who charged him and was caught sneaking various firearms onto the Air Force base where he worked. When he was dismissed from the Air Force with a bad conduct discharge, the Air Force failed to record this conviction in the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database which is used by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) database. Surely a textbook example of a prohibited person – but NICS failed more than just a record of conviction.

Mental Health and Domestic Violence

This case raises a broader question for the Committee – Does the current NICS law adequately cover mental health and domestic violence? Kelley was admitted to a mental healthcare facility in New Mexico after his threats against others and himself. He escaped from that facility, and was apprehended and brought back until being taken for court-martial. It was later found that he used computers at the facility to order numerous weapons and tactical gear.

Testimony today has explained the loopholes and failures in NICS, allowing a prohibited person to purchase multiple weapons. Despite his military courts-martial and discharge, and despite his documented history of mental illness, Kelley was able to purchase four guns at licensed gun dealers in Colorado between 2014 and 2017.

That's why we strongly support Senator Cornyn's proposal to strengthen NICS. The "Fix NICS Act of 2017" is a major step to strengthen communications between the FBI's background check system and reporting Federal and State agencies regarding both criminal and mental health records. We support comprehensive efforts to ensure that Federal agencies and States will produce NICS implementation plans and correct current deficiencies that result in persons being cleared who should not be allowed to purchase firearms.

Today we thank Senator Cornyn because this measure represents the beginning of a process to strengthen NICS, not the end of it. Much more can be done to strengthen the criminal and mental health provisions of NICS to ensure that every State reports comprehensive and consistent information. Recent tragedies should help to inform Congress on how to strengthen procedures, reporting, and also the definitions that were intended to protect the public from those who perpetrated recent mass shootings.

Support from Houston and Las Vegas

Houston Chief Art Acevedo strongly supports the measure introduced by his Senator from Texas. Chief Acevedo goes further to call on Congress to expand background checks. Sheriff Joe Lombardo of Las Vegas also calls on Congress to swiftly adopt this long overdue measure to strengthen NICS. These and other law enforcement executives join me in calling for swift passage of the legislation.

Ongoing Priority to Strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS):

But the incidents that gave rise to the hearing today were only the most recent reminders of what was already known – we can and should do much more to stop these mass murders.

Charleston, SC

In June of 2015, white supremacist Dylann Roof murdered nine parishioners. The Charleston shooting exemplifies yet another loophole in NICS. In this case, the arrest and conviction were not properly recorded and interpreted by the FBI. When he testified before Congress, former FBI Director Comey stated that Roof should have been barred from a gun purchase but failures in NICS allowed the shooter to slip through the bureaucracy and acquire the guns he ultimately used to kill nine innocent persons.

The shooter was able to purchase the gun for the massacre because of the “default proceed” provision in NICS which allows the sale to go through after 72-hours even if something insufficient or inconclusive comes back on a background record check. FBI data shows that the default proceed provision has resulted in gun sales to more than 15,000 prohibited individuals in a five-year period.

Tucson, AZ

Former Congresswoman Gabby Giffords was the victim of a deranged shooter in Tucson, Jared Lee Loughner. In 2011, Loughner murdered six people and injured another thirteen. Like the recent Texas shooter, when purchasing the firearm, Loughner’s background check came up as satisfactory. But he had a documented background of mental instability and the state of Arizona prohibits the possession of firearms by anyone found to be a danger to themselves or to others. Loughner had been also been suspended from his community college for “mental problems” and they would not allow him to return to the school until he obtained a clearance of his indicated issues by a mental healthcare professional.

Congresswoman Giffords thankfully survived the incident and still speaks about gun violence today, including the issues now pending before Congress.

Blacksburg, VA

The 2016 shooting at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia is yet another example of a mentally ill person who slipped through the process. Shooter Seung Hui Cho was declared a danger to himself and was directed into psychiatric care. While a student at Virginia Tech, he submitted numerous pieces of writing with references to violence to an extent that concerned both his classmates and his professors. With such a background, Cho was still able to then purchase two firearms necessary for his shooting of 32 people on the Virginia Tech campus because his name did not appear within the NICS database.

Universal Background Check

Today the Committee has focused on cases where NICS should have barred a gun purchase from a licensed dealer – but the Committee surely recognizes that this is incomplete and only part of the problem.

Morgantown, WV

In 2014, Jody Lee Hunt was able to buy a gun and murder four people. He had previously been convicted of a felony kidnapping and sentenced to ten years in prison for abducting a former girlfriend. This should have prevented him from being able to purchase firearms or ammunition as a background check would have been flagged with his felony conviction status, but he was able to find a 9-mm handgun for purchase through the use of a Facebook advertisement. He used the weapon to murder a business associate he disliked, a former girlfriend and her current boyfriend, his own cousin, and later himself.

As Chiefs of Police, we must ask why does Congress require background checks for only some gun purchases, but not all of them? You should not consider strengthening NICS without also considering how background checks may be expanded to cover all gun purchases. In the letter submitted by Houston Chief Acevedo regarding the recent Texas shooting, he notes that even if the killer had been barred from buying through a licensed gun dealer, he could have simply purchased the weapons elsewhere.

This is not a controversy for the majority of Americans. A 2013 Gallop Poll showed that 91% would vote for a measure requiring criminal background checks for all gun sales.

Bipartisan Leadership

I would like to close as I began – with a call for a bipartisan coalition to curb gun violence. The cases examined today represent lessons learned, but the real tragedy is that we had already learned those lessons from previous, horrible incidents. Now is a time for long overdue action and we look to you for leadership to prevent future mass murders.

Whether a rookie or a seasoned police executive, we have taken a solemn oath to protect the public for harm. Members of Congress share that duty with every officer on the street.

We ask that you make today the beginning of a bipartisan and comprehensive dialog to strengthen legislation to curb gun violence. The two measures before the Committee will take us down a path to meaningful reform and protection of the public, but they should be only the first steps toward reducing gun violence.

Speaking for the Chiefs and Sheriffs I represent from the Nation's largest cities – we will be with you for every step of that journey.

Exhibit 31

(Workers' Comp Benefits: How Much is a Limb Worth?)



[DONATE](#)

Workers' Comp Benefits: How Much is a Limb Worth?


by [Lena Groeger](#) and [Michael Grabell](#), ProPublica, and Cynthia Cotts, special to ProPublica, Mar. 5, 2015

If you suffer a permanent injury on the job, you're typically entitled to compensation for the damage to your body and your future lost wages. But depending on the state, benefits for the same body part can differ dramatically. [Related Story »](#)

Ever filed for workers' comp? [Help ProPublica investigate.](#)

Select a state to see the maximum it pays for different body parts.

The average maximum compensation for one in is **\$24,474**



NOTE: Compensation for the loss of certain body parts is only one part of a larger system. States may be more or less generous in other aspects of their workers' comp benefits.

SOURCES: ProPublica research of state workers' compensation laws. See the [full methodology](#) for details. Data last updated Feb 27, 2015.
Additional research by Abbie Nehring.



© Copyright 2017 Pro Publica Inc.

Exhibit 32

**(Verified Declaration of former ATF Acting Chief of
FTB Rick Vasquez)**

I, Richard (Rick) Vasquez, am competent to state and declare the following based on my training, experience, personal knowledge and prior qualification by the federal court as an expert:

- Exhibit A, Pg. 900

4. During my tenure with ATF, in my capacity as Assistant Chief of the FTB and the senior Technical Expert for the ATF, I evaluated the Slide Fire stock and concluded, consistent with my Slide Fire Analysis (*see* Exhibit 1), that the Slide Fire stock was neither a firearm nor machinegun under the Gun Control Act nor under the National Firearms Act.
5. My conclusion that the Slide Fire stock was neither a firearm nor machinegun was reviewed by ATF Chief Counsel and higher authorities within ATF and affirmed.
6. I have reviewed the video to be submitted by Firearms Policy Coalition as Exhibit 28 to its Comment in Docket No. ATF 2017R-22, RIN 1140-AA52.
7. The video depicts an individual, Adam Kraut, Esq., firing a Slide Fire stock, in the only three possible ways to fire a bump-stock-device (*i.e.* (1) single shot with the Slide Fire stock, locked; (2) single shot with the Slide Fire Stock, unlocked; and (3) as the NPR describes (83 Fed. Reg. 13444), unlocked, with the shooter maintaining “constant forward pressure with the non-trigger hand on the barrel-shroud or fore-grip of the rifle, and constant rearward pressure on the device’s extension ledge with the shooter’s trigger finger.”
8. The video fully, explicitly, and accurately depicts the function of bump-stock-devices, including, but not limited to, the function and operation of the firearm’s trigger, which is exactly consistent with my evaluation and review of the Slide Fire stock during my tenure with ATF and my Slide Fire Analysis (*see* Exhibit A).
9. Specifically, as depicted in the video,

- a. The bump-stock-device neither self-acts nor self-regulates, as the bump-stock never fires, in any of the three possible ways to fire a bump-fire-device, more than one round, per function of the trigger, even while the shooter maintained constant pressure on the extension ledge. In fact, as explicitly and accurately depicted in the slow motion portions, the bump-stock-device requires two functions of the trigger before a subsequent round can be discharged (*i.e.* after the firearm is discharged for the first time, the trigger must be fully released, reset, and then fully pulled rearward for a subsequent round to be discharged);¹
- b. Bump-stock-devices do not permit a continuous firing cycle with a single pull of the trigger, as the video clearly depicts that the trigger must be released, reset, and fully pulled rearward before the subsequent round can be fired;²
- c. The bump-stock-device requires additional physical manipulation of the trigger by the shooter, as the video clearly depicts that the trigger must be

¹ It must be noted, as made explicitly clear in the slow motion portions of the video, that the bump-stock-device actually requires over-releasing of the trigger, as the shooter's finger travels past the trigger reset by approximately a half-inch, before beginning the sequence to fire a subsequent round (*e.g.* video at 3:46 – 3:51; 3:52 – 3:55; 3:56 – 4:00). Thus, the video makes extremely evident and clear that bump-stock-devices are actually slower than a trained shooter, as a trained shooter, such as Jerry Miculek, would immediately begin the sequence to fire a subsequent round after the trigger resets.

² If the device had permitted continuous firing cycle with a single pull of the trigger, the video would depict a scenario identical to Exhibit 26 of Firearm Policy Coalition's Comment (*also available at* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NwQ1aZnVLFA>), where it clearly and accurately depicts the emptying of the entire magazine, while the shooter maintains constant pressure on the trigger.

released, reset, and fully pulled rearward before the subsequent round can be fired;

- d. Even when the shooter maintains constant forward pressure with the non-trigger hand on the barrel shroud or fore-grip of the rifle, and maintains the trigger finger on the device's extension ledge with constant rearward pressure, after the first shot is discharged, the trigger must be released, reset, and pulled completely rearward, before the subsequent round is discharged. *See* video at 3:47 – 4:01. This is no different than any factory semi-automatic firearm; and,
 - e. The bump-stock-device does not permit automatic fire by harnessing the recoil energy of the firearm. Harnessing the energy would require the addition of a device such as a spring or hydraulics that could automatically absorb the recoil and use this energy to activate itself. If it did harness the recoil energy, the bump-stock equipped firearm in the video would have continued to fire, while the shooter's finger remained on the trigger, after pulling it rearwards without requiring the shooter to release and reset the trigger and then pull the trigger completely rearward for a subsequent round to be fired.
10. The cyclic rate of a firearm is neither increased nor decreased by the use of a bump-stock-device, as the cyclic rate of a particular firearm is the mechanical rate of fire, which can be explained in laymen's terms as how fast the firearm cycles (*i.e.* loads, locks, fires, unlocks, ejects), which is an objective, not subjective, mechanical standard.

11. A factory semi-automatic and fully-automatic (*i.e.* machinegun) firearm, manufactured by the same manufacturer, will have identical cyclic rates, unless the machinegun version has some form of rate reducing mechanism; whereby, the machinegun version may have a slower cyclic rate than the semi-automatic version.
12. All factory semi-automatic firearms have an inherent ability to be bump fired, as the act of bump firing is a technique, which does not require any device, and can be performed through, among other things, the use of one's finger, belt loop or rubber band.
13. A firearm in a bumpstock/slidefire stock cannot be a machinegun because it requires an individual to activate the forward motion of the stock when the firearm is fired. Additionally, it requires a thought process of the individual to continually pull the trigger when the stock is pulled forward bringing the trigger into contact with the finger.

* * *

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on June 18, 2018.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Richard Vasquez', is written over a horizontal line.

Richard Vasquez

Exhibit A

Slide Fire Analysis
Rick Vasquez

When ATF makes a classification on any device, part, or firearm, the classification is based on the definitions in the Gun Control Act (GCA) and the National Firearms Act (NFA). Also, classifications are based on any previous Rulings or court decisions based on the GCA and the NFA.

The task of making evaluations is relegated to the Firearms Technology Branch (FTB). As the senior Technical Expert for ATF it was my role to render an opinion or concur or disagree with opinions rendered by technicians of the FTB. In relation to the Slide Fire examination, since it was submitted as a device that would enhance the rate of fire of an AR type firearm, the predominant definition used by FTB for classification was the definition of a machinegun

The complete definition of a machinegun is as follows:

*As defined in 26 United States Code, Chapter 53, section 5845(b) **Machinegun.** The term '**machinegun**' means any weapon which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger. The term shall also include the frame or receiver of any such weapon, any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a weapon into a machinegun, and any combination of parts from which a machinegun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person.*

The first sentence of the definition of a machinegun designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger,” is the basis for the determination that a slide fire stock is not a machinegun. Additionally, it was not classified as, *any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended for use in converting a weapon into a machinegun, a conversion device.*

Another key component in determining what should be classified as a machinegun is understanding what a single function of the trigger is. Pulling and releasing of the trigger is two functions. The single function is pulling the trigger straight to the rear and causing a weapon to fire. If a shooter initially pulls and holds the trigger to the rear and a firearm continues to shoot continuously, that is a firearm shooting

more than one shot with the single function of a trigger. This is critical to understanding why or why not a firearm is classified as a machinegun.

The Slide Fire does not fire automatically with a single pull/function of the trigger. It is designed to reciprocate back and forth from the inertia of the fired cartridge. When firing a weapon with a Slide Fire, the trigger finger sits on a shelf and the trigger is pulled into the trigger finger. Once the rifle fires the weapon, due to the push and pull action of the stock and rifle, the rifle will reciprocate sufficiently to recock and reset the trigger. It then reciprocates forward and the freshly cocked weapon fires again when the trigger strikes the finger on its forward travel.

After lengthy analysis, ATF could not classify the slide fire as a machinegun or a machinegun conversion device, as it did not fit the definition of a machinegun as stated in the GCA and NFA.

Method of Evaluation:

An item that has been submitted for classification is logged in and assigned to a firearm enforcement officer (technician) for evaluation and classification. A tracking number is assigned and it awaits its place in the queue.

The following are procedures for how items were evaluated when I was a member of the Firearms Technology Branch. There may have been changes to those processes so I can only speak to the processes during the timeframe that I was employed at FTB.

Firearms and firearm-related accessories are submitted to the FTB for analysis from the public and firearms industry. The item is generally accompanied by a letter of request on how the submitter wants the item to be classified as. There are many categories of classification. For example: Is it an importable firearm? Is it a sporting firearm? Will it shoot automatically and be classified as a machinegun? Does a component fit the definition of an accessory or a firearm, and so forth.

Housed in the FTB are Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) that memorialize the method of evaluation for most things that are submitted. Once a technician begins the evaluation, he will follow these SOPs in his evaluation. Many of the items submitted are redundant and have been seen time and time again. These items are reviewed and approved by the supervisor and the evaluation is over. For example, handguns for importation have a factoring criteria that must meet certain points to be imported.

Items such as the Slide Fire bump fire stock is a device that would have had additional scrutiny, especially since a device of this nature had not been previously approved. Once again, any evaluation is based on the definitions held in the GCA, NFA, previous opinions and rulings. These laws were implemented by Congress. Rulings and opinions were authored by council with input from the Department of Treasury and the Department of Justice.

The definition of a machinegun as stated above was used for the foundation of the classification of the Slide Fire and it did not meet the definition of a machinegun.

This opinion was sent to Chief Counsel and higher authority for review. After much study on how the device operates, the opinion, based on definitions in the GCA and NFA, was that the Slide Fire was not a machinegun nor a firearm, and, therefore, did not require any regulatory control.

Conclusion:

The methodology of evaluation listed above has been condensed for the reader. ATF is tasked with making classifications of items based on the GCA and NFA. Personal opinions are not tolerated in the classification process. The Slide Fire bump fire stock was properly classified in accordance with the definitions codified in 1968 in the GCA and Title II of the GCA which is the NFA.

Rick Vasquez

Former Assistant Chief and Acting Chief of the Firearms Technology Branch
Firearms Consultant and Security Advisor


Exhibit 33

**(Verified Declaration of Jonathan Patton of Patton
Media and Consulting)**

- on the barrel-shroud or fore-grip of the rifle, and constant rearward pressure on the device's extension ledge with the shooter's trigger finger.".
8. The same three scenarios were filmed close up on both the right and left hand side of the firearm to show the interaction of the finger and trigger.
 9. The resulting footage was incorporated into the video which is attached to the Firearm's Policy Coalition's Comments in Opposition to Proposed Rule ATF 2017R-22 as Exhibit 28
 10. Unedited, the slow motion footage contained in the video totaled 18 minutes and 5 seconds long.
 11. In an effort to make the resulting exhibit more easily digestible, I edited the footage.
 12. Other than the text additions, the only alterations to the footage of the firearm being shot was the speeding up of certain sequences as indicated on screen.
 13. The footage in the exhibit is a true and accurate representation of what is depicted in the raw footage that was captured at the range.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my information, knowledge and belief.

DATED: June 18, 2018



Jonathan Patton

Exhibit 34

**(FICG's Letter on Behalf of FPC to Acting Director
Brandon)**

FIREARMS INDUSTRY CONSULTING GROUP

A Division of Civil Rights Defense Firm, P.C.

Joshua Prince

Adam Kraut

Jorge Pereira

Phone: 888-202-9297

Fax: 610-400-8439



June 15, 2018

Thomas E. Brandon
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
99 New York Avenue, N.E.,
Washington, DC 20226

RE: ATF 2017R-22
RIN: 1140-AA52
Request of Firearms Policy Foundation and Firearms Policy Coalition for Hearing

Dear Acting Director Brandon,

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 926(b) and 83 Federal Register 13456, Firearms Policy Foundation and Firearms Policy Coalition, through its counsel, Firearms Industry Consulting Group, a division of Civil Rights Defense Firm, P.C., hereby formally requests opportunity to be heard on ATF 2017R-22, RIN: 1140-AA52, prior to the enactment of any final rule.

Thanking you for your time and assistance in this matter, I am

Respectfully Yours,
Firearms Industry Consulting Group

Joshua G. Prince
joshua@civilrightsdefensefirm.com

jgp/web
Matter no. 10377

Exhibit 35

**(FPC's Letter in Opposition to the ANPR of January
25, 2018)**

Thursday, January 25, 2018

VIA FAX (202-648-9741) & FEDERAL eRULEMAKING PORTAL
(<http://www.regulations.gov>)

Vivian Chu
Mailstop 6N-518
Office of Regulatory Affairs
Enforcement Programs and Services
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives ("BATFE")
99 New York Ave. NE
Washington, D.C. 20226

Docket No.: 2017R-22

Docket ID: ATF-2018-0001

Regarding: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; request for comments re
"Application of the Definition of Machinegun to Bump Fire Stocks
and Other Similar Devices"

Position: STRONGLY OPPOSED

Dear Ms. Chu:

I write you today on behalf of Firearms Policy Coalition ("FPC")—a grassroots, non-partisan, 501(c)4 public benefit organization—and our law-abiding members and supporters across the United States. The purposes and objectives of FPC are to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and the People's rights, privileges and immunities deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition, especially the inalienable, fundamental, and individual right to keep and bear arms; to protect, defend, and advance the means and methods by which the People of the United States may exercise those rights, including, but not limited to, the acquisition, collection, transportation, exhibition, carry, care, use, and disposition of arms for all lawful purposes, including, but not limited to, self-defense, hunting, and

To: Case 1:18-cv-02988 Document 1-3 Filed 12/18/18 Page 243 of 250
Vivian Chu, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives
Regarding: Docket 2017R-22 (ANPRM re “Application of the Definition of Machinegun to
Bump Fire Stocks and Other Similar Devices”)
Position: STRONGLY OPPOSED
Page: 2 of 6

service in the appropriate militia for the common defense of the Republic and the individual liberty of its citizens; to foster and promote the shooting sports and all lawful uses of arms; and to foster and promote awareness of, and public engagement in, all of the above.

Specifically, we write you to express our concerns about and strong opposition to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (hereinafter “BATFE”, the Bureau)’s advance notice of proposed rulemaking (“ANPRM”) regarding the “Application of the Definition of Machinegun to Bump Fire Stocks and Other Similar Devices” (no. 2017R-22, online at <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2017-27898>). Some FPC members and supporters currently own, or plan to own, devices that would be subject to the proposed rulemaking. Unless otherwise specified, the following comments are responsive to multiple questions presented in the BATFE’s ANPRM.

This troubling ANPRM raises serious constitutional concerns, including the violation of the separation of powers, abdication or improper delegation of authority, violation of fundamental rights guaranteeing citizens due process, protection against discriminatory and arbitrary enforcement of vague laws, and violation of the Takings Clause—not to mention an affront to the fundamental, individual Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. Should the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) and BATFE pursue this attempt to unlawfully and unconstitutionally exceed their statutory authority through regulatory efforts like this targeting these non-firearm devices, FPC (and almost certainly many others) will be forced to seek judicial relief.

The DOJ and BATFE clearly lack the statutory authority to re-define the targeted devices as “machineguns.” Indeed, as Mr. John R. Spencer (then-Chief of the BATFE’s Firearms Technology Branch) admitted in his letter dated June 7, 2010, “bump-fire” stocks have “no automatically functioning mechanical parts or springs and performs no automatic mechanical function

when installed....Accordingly, we find that the ‘bump-stock’ is a firearm part and is not regulated as a firearm under Gun Control Act or the National Firearms Act.” (See BATFE letter 903050:MMK, 3311/2010-434, available online at <http://bit.ly/atf-re-bumpfire-stock>.) BATFE even expressly concedes in the “Requests for Public Input” of this very ANPRM that: The “[BATFE] does not have the authority to regulate firearm parts and accessories...” (See “SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION” subsection III, “Requests for Public Input”, online at <http://bit.ly/batfe-anprm-bumpfire-stocks>.)

The Congress, through its enacted legislation, has specifically defined the term “machinegun” to mean a “weapon which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger.” 26 U.S.C. § 5845(b). (While the term also includes “the frame or receiver of any such weapon, any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a weapon into a machinegun, and any combination of parts from which a machinegun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person,” those provisions are not relevant here.) And BATFE has adopted a definition of “machine gun” (at 27 C.F.R. § 478.11) that, appropriately, mirrors the statutory definition.

“Bump fire” stocks and similar subject devices are not “firearms” or “machineguns” under the law. And the regulatory definition cannot be expanded to include such devices without prior authorizing legislation similarly expanding the definition of “machinegun” under the statutes. *Util. Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427, 2445 (2014) (quoting *National Assn. of Home Builders v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644, 665 (2007) (“An agency has no power to ‘tailor’ legislation to bureaucratic policy goals by rewriting unambiguous statutory terms. Agencies exercise discretion only in the interstices created by statutory silence or ambiguity; they must always ‘give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress.’”); *Wyeth v.*

Levine, 555 U.S. 555, 588 (2009) (conc. opn. of Breyer, J.) (citations omitted)(“[A] federal agency may pre-empt state law only when and if it is acting within the scope of its congressionally delegated authority . . . [for] an agency literally has no power to act, let alone pre-empt the validly enacted legislation of a sovereign State, unless and until Congress confers power upon it.”).

That is the end of the analysis, and this proposed rulemaking (no. 2017R-22) should be abandoned or withdrawn accordingly.

However, we also address some of the questions in the ANPRM. Specifically, as to question 21 (“In your experience, where have you seen these devices for sale and which of these has been the most common outlet from which consumers have purchased these devices (e.g., brick and mortar retail stores; online vendors; gun shows or similar events; or private sales between individuals)?”), we comment as follows:

FPC has knowledge of “bump stock” devices being sold or offered for sale at “brick and mortar” licensed firearm retailers, gun shows, by private sellers, and on the Internet. On information and belief, FPC believes that Internet sales are the primary channel for sales of subject devices.

Regarding question 22 (“Based on your experience or observations, what is (or has been) the price range for these devices?”), we comment as follows:

FPC has knowledge of subject devices having a price range of \$150-350 per device. However, due to recent market conditions (i.e., demand exceeding supply), FPC has seen and received recent reports of subject devices being offered for sale and/or fetching over \$1,000 per device.

Regarding question 23 (“For what purposes are the bump stock devices used or advertised?”), we comment as follows:

FPC has knowledge of subject devices being used and advertised for lawful purposes throughout the United States, including self-defense, except where they may be prohibited under state or local laws.

* * *

This proposed rulemaking would provide no public benefit (indeed, the proposed rulemaking articulates none), and yet it would certainly come at great societal and individual costs.

These costs would necessarily include likely millions of dollars in BATFE implementation and enforcement costs, in addition to potentially millions of dollars in fending off the inevitable litigation arising from the serious constitutional and statutory violations engendered by this regulatory process. Moreover, American taxpayers would also likely be stuck with the bill for the plaintiffs’ attorneys fees and costs should the government fail in attempting to defend this illegal and unconstitutional action.

And the extraordinary costs to American fundamental principles – stemming from the illegal aggrandizement of the executive branch by regulatory fiat that would deprive untold citizens of essential constitutional protections – is impossible to completely measure.

But, perhaps as a silver lining, an illegal rulemaking (such as is proposed here) would provide an excellent vehicle for the Supreme Court to revisit and eliminate the made-up judicial construct of agency deference under *Auer*, *Chevron*, and *Encino Motorcars*. See *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452 (1997); *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467

To: Case 1:18-cv-02988 Document 1-3 Filed 12/18/18 Page 247 of 250
Vivian Chu, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives
Regarding: Docket 2017R-22 (ANPRM re “Application of the Definition of Machinegun to
Bump Fire Stocks and Other Similar Devices”)
Position: STRONGLY OPPOSED
Page: 6 of 6

U.S. 837 (1984); *Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro*, 136 S. Ct. 2117 (2016) (“As in other areas of our jurisprudence concerning administrative agencies, [] we seem to be straying further and further from the Constitution without so much as pausing to ask why. We should stop to consider that document before blithely giving the force of law to any other agency ‘interpretations’ of federal statutes.” *Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 576 U. S. ____ (2015) (Thomas, J., concurring) (internal citation omitted)).

If the Congress wishes to re-define “machineguns” to include the targeted devices, it may attempt to do so through legislation—but not without incurring political and financial costs. And some members’ cynical efforts to lay these costs at the feet of the BATFE (and law-abiding people) for their own political convenience should be rejected.

For these and other reasons too numerous to list here, we urge the DOJ and BATFE to immediately abandon the proposed rulemaking on “bump fire” stocks and similar devices.

Please do not hesitate to contact us at policy@fpchq.org or 4212 North Freeway Boulevard, Suite 6, Sacramento, California, 95834, if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,




Brandon Combs
President

Fax Delivery Successful to 12026489741

MyFax <NoReply@myfax.com>

Thu, Jan 25, 2018 at 2:48 PM




Successful fax sent from MyFax.

Fax for Free.
Tell a friend about MyFax today.

Have a question?
support@myfax.com

Fax Delivery Number:	12026489741
Fax Recipient:	To:Comments re 2017R-22
Sent at:	01/25/2018 02:47:49 PM (GMT-8:00)
Pages:	7
Duration:	357
Cost:	0.0000 USD
Tax - GST:	0.0000 USD
Tax - PST:	0.0000 USD
Total Cost:	0.0000 USD
Customer Number:	5175634
Reference Number:	845538870
Billing Code:	5175634
Remote CSID:	

Thank you for using .

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

Page 1 of 1 (including cover)

Page 1 of 1 (including cover)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

100-100 (200-100-100) & 100-100 (200-100-100)

845538870.tif
350K

Certain browser plug-ins or extensions, such as Grammarly, may interfere with submitting comments on the comment form. If you have issues, please disable browser plugins and extensions and try submitting your comment again. If you need additional assistance, please contact the Help Desk at 1-877-378-5457.



Your comment was submitted successfully!

The **Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosives Bureau (ATF)** Proposed Rule: [Application of the Definition of Machinegun to Bump Fire Stocks and Other Similar Devices](#)

For related information, [Open Docket Folder](#) 

3

Your Receipt

Your Comment Tracking Number:
1k2-914m-pkfd

Your comment may be viewable on Regulations.gov once the agency has reviewed it. This process is dependent on agency public submission policies/procedures and processing times. Use your tracking number to find out the status of your comment.

✓ Your email receipt was sent successfully

Your comment:

Comment:

Position: STRONGLY OPPOSED

Please see our attached letter regarding docket no. 2017R-22 (docket ID ATF-2018-0001) regarding "Application of the Definition of Machinegun to Bump Fire Stocks and Other Similar Devices".

Uploaded File(s) (Optional)

- fpc-2017R-22-2018-1-25.pdf: **success**

This information will appear on
Regulations.gov:

First Name:

Brandon

Last Name:

Combs

**Organization
Name:**

Firearms Policy
Coalition

This information will **not** appear on
Regulations.gov:

**Mailing ZIP/Postal
Address: Code:**

4212 N. Freeway 95834
Blvd. Suite 6

City: Email Address:

Sacramento policy@fpchq.or
g

Country: Phone Number:

United States 916-378-5785

State or Fax Number:
Province:

CA 916-880-5499