

# **MARCH FOR OUR LIVES IOWA**

## **Legislative Agenda 2024**

By Trey Jackson

Edited By Roland Preston

Contact:

[trey@marchforourlivesia.org](mailto:trey@marchforourlivesia.org)

[roland@marchforourlivesia.org](mailto:roland@marchforourlivesia.org)

January 2, 2024

# Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
1.1 Background	4
1.2 Policy Team Introductions	4
1.3 Membership	5
2. Preface and Strict Scrutiny	8
2.1 Iowa Constitution and US Constitution	8
2.2 United States v. Rahimi	8
2.3 Strict Scrutiny	9
2.4 Consulted Sources	11
3. Extreme Risk Protection Orders	13
3.1 Summary of Recommendation	13
3.2 Evidence of Implementation	14
3.3 Criticisms and Responses to Criticisms	15
3.4 Bipartisan Safer Communities Act	17
3.5 Model Legislation	17
3.6 Consulted Sources	17
4. Closing Domestic Abuse and Misdemeanor Loopholes	20
4.1 Summary of Recommendation	20
4.2 Other Loopholes	21
4.3 Model Legislation	22

4.4	Consulted Sources	23
5.	Mandatory Reporting of Lost or Stolen Firearms	26
5.1	Summary of Recommendation	26
5.2	Evidence of Implementation	26
5.3	Criticisms and Responses to Criticisms	28
5.4	Model Legislation`	29
5.5	Consulted Sources	30
6.	Conclusion	32
6.1	Conclusion	32

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

The Iowa Chapter of March For Our Lives was officially created on July 26, 2018. Since then, we have been working to empower youth across the state to advocate for safety and security in their communities through common-sense gun regulation. Youth involvement in politics has never been more pressing. With shootings becoming more and more prevalent across the country and within Iowa itself, gun violence protection policy is more critical than ever.

March For Our Lives Iowa hopes that with the creation of this legislative agenda and with the support of many Iowans, safe, sensible, and necessary gun violence protection policy can be passed to repair the damage done to Iowa communities. Youth across the state believe sensible gun regulation should have been passed a long time ago, but now the responsibility of creating such legislation has fallen into our hands. The policy recommendations herein are the most critical legislation we feel must be passed in order to safeguard our communities and schools. While the Strict Scrutiny Amendment was added to the Iowa Constitution, March For Our Lives continues to push for sensible gun regulation. That is why the Legislative Affairs Team of March For Our Lives Iowa presents the 2024 comprehensive legislative agenda ahead of the 2024 Iowa Legislative Session. Our agenda includes policy related to extreme risk protection orders, closing domestic abuse loopholes, and mandatory reporting of lost and stolen firearms.

## 1.2 Policy Team Introductions

Trey Jackson serves as a Co-Director of Legislative Affairs and Lobbyist for March For Our Lives Iowa. He has previously served as a volunteer and team member on many political campaigns including current members of Iowa’s House and Senate. Trey has a passion for law, politics, and policy, which he often puts to use at his job as a legal intern for Herting Law PLLC or for March For Our Lives. He hopes to pursue a higher education and eventually attend law school. During his free time he enjoys running long distances and reading. Trey is excited for the upcoming legislative session and is looking forward to advocating for sensible gun regulation.

Roland Preston is a Co-Director of Legislative Affairs for March For Our Lives Iowa. He serves as captain of his school’s speech and debate team, and has canvassed for multiple political campaigns. He has a passion for politics and aviation and hopes to achieve his dream of becoming an airline pilot while also staying politically involved throughout his life. He joined March For Our Lives Iowa in the fall of 2022 because of his passion in regards to gun violence in particular, and felt that our leaders were not doing enough to tackle the issue.

### **1.3 Membership**

March For Our Lives Iowa is supported by several teams of youth working in collaboration. We have met every Sunday night at 9:00pm in addition to various events and individual meetings to further our mission. We would not be able to work to empower youth without our passionate and motivated team. The March For Our Lives Iowa Team for 2023-2024 is:

❖ Executive Team

- Akshara Eswar (She/Her/Hers): Co-Executive Director
- Hannah Hayes (She/Her/Hers): Co-Executive Director

❖ Legislative Affairs Team

- Trey Jackson (He/Him/His): Co-Legislative Affairs Director and Lobbyist
- Roland Preston (He/Him/His): Co Legislative Affairs Director
  - Ingrid Alg (She/Her/Hers): Legislative Associate
  - Megan Quinn (She/Her/Hers): Legislative Associate
  - Sophia Whitehead (She/Her/Hers): Legislative Associate
  - Sam McAlister (He/Him/His): Legislative Associate

❖ Organizing and Intersectionality Team

- Saw Gee Dow Saw (He/Him/His): Co-Organizing and Intersectionality Director
- Pratima Khatri (She/Her/Hers): Co-Organizing and Intersectionality Director
  - Angelina Dang (She/Her/Hers): Organizing and Intersectionality Associate
  - David Zhang (He/Him/His): Organizing and Intersectionality Associate
  - Jack Wang (He/Him/His): Organizing and Intersectionality Associate
  - Jemma Bullock (She/Her/Hers) Organizing and Intersectionality Associate
  - Sam Harrington (He/Him/His): Organizing and Intersectionality

## Associate

### ❖ Communications and Press Team

- Josue Aleman (He/Him/His): Co-Communications and Press Director
- Grace Fisher (She/Her/Hers): Co-Communications and Press Director
  - Ben Couvillon (He/Him/His): Communications and Press Associate
  - Christopher Ramirez Chavez (He/Him/His): Communications and Press Associate
  - Filiz Sonmez (He/Him/His): Communications and Press Associate
  - Ben Schaefer (He/Him/His): Communications and Press Associate
  - Kennedy Lein (She/Her/Hers): Communications and Press Associate
  - Lauren Wessling (She/Her/Hers): Communications and Press Associate
  - Lucas Wood (He/Him/His): Communications and Press Associate

In addition to the work of all of our routine members we would like to thank and recognize all of the youth who attend our events, fundraisers, and rallies. Without their support, along with other dedicated Iowans, March For Our Lives Iowa would not be able to continue its advocacy efforts.

## **2. Preface and Strict Scrutiny**

### **2.1 Iowa Constitution and US Constitution**

Critical to this agenda is the constitutionality of its contents. As has been reaffirmed in the courts for over a century, gun regulation by the government is completely constitutional. A clear example is the case of *United States v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 174, where the court found the National Firearms Act of 1934 constitutional as Miller’s sawed-off shotgun did not have “some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia” [I]. Even in the 2008 decision of *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 478 F.3d 370, the court suggested “the United States Constitution would not disallow regulations prohibiting criminals and the mentally ill from firearm possession” [I]. Our policy recommendations as well as our specific legislation initiatives are in complete conformity with both the United States and Iowa Constitutions, as well as the case precedent set out by the Supreme Court of the United States.

### **2.2 United States v. Rahimi**

On November 7th, 2023, the United States Supreme Court began to hear arguments for *United States v. Rahimi* (Case Number 21-11001) [II]. This case began when Zackey Rahimi was found in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8). Specifically, he was cited for possessing a firearm while under a restraining order [III]. Rahimi had assaulted his girlfriend and even threatened to shoot her. Later, several firearms were found in his possession when police searched his residence in connection with other shootings [III]. While a decision is not yet released, March For Our Lives hopes the court considers the strong precedent



around this decision. In Justice Thomas’s opinion in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., INC. v. Bruen* 818 Fed. Appx. 99, Thomas states, “In *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U. S. 570 (2008), and *McDonald v. Chicago*, 561 U. S. 742 (2010), we recognized that the Second and Fourteenth Amendments protect the right of an ordinary, law-abiding citizen to possess a handgun in the home for self-defense.” [IV].

Rahimi’s actions clearly prevent him from being an ordinary, law-abiding citizen. Should the decision be made by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit be upheld by the Supreme court, it would become significantly harder to prevent perpetrators of domestic abuse from possessing firearms. March For Our Lives Iowa stresses the problems this decision could hold. According to a report by Everytown Research, “Nearly two-thirds of the domestic violence–related mass shootings with four or more people killed (since 2015) included at least one child or teen killed” [V]. While the repercussions of allowing perpetrators of domestic violence is incredibly dangerous for women, it also has severe implications for youth. March For Our Lives Iowa is following this case closely and is confident the court will consider the precedent set by past courts and reverse the decision made by the 5th Circuit.

### **2.3 Strict Scrutiny**

On November 8th, 2022, Iowa became just the fourth state to pass strict scrutiny, the highest level of judicial review, for issues related to the second amendment [VI]. The Iowa Constitution now reads:

The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The sovereign

state of Iowa affirms and recognizes this right to be a fundamental individual right.

Any and all restrictions of this right shall be subject to strict scrutiny [VII].

The damage this will cause to Iowan communities is immense. It forces judges to a level of conformance completely unnecessary. This bottlenecks the judicial system and puts a stranglehold on all attempts for meaningful gun regulation. This explains why the Supreme Court of the United States has refused to endorse the strict scrutiny standard to gun regulation cases [VIII]. The outcome of strict scrutiny is very apparent in other states it has been passed in. Looking at firearm death rates, the results show a shocking reality. Alabama's firearm death rate went from 16.9 per 100,000 people to 23.6, in Louisiana it went from 19 per 1000 people to 26.3, and Missouri went from 15.3 to 23.9 [VI]. If Iowa follows the other states who have passed strict scrutiny, we should expect gun violence to increase dramatically.

While this is certainly an extra obstacle, strict scrutiny does not end March for Our Lives' mission. Instead, it creates a greater call for gun violence protection policy. Without the advocacy of organizations like March For Our Lives Iowa, strict scrutiny would be allowed to dominate policy, which has shown to be not only negligent on behalf of the legislature, but also deadly.

March for Our Lives will continue to advocate for the overturning of strict scrutiny. We believe our current policy agenda would survive strict scrutiny despite the level of judicial review. It is now more important than ever to pass this legislation to mitigate the effects of the dangerous strict scrutiny amendment.

## 2.4 Consulted Sources

- I. Legal Information Institute. (2023). *Second Amendment*. Cornell Law School.  
[https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/second\\_amendment](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/second_amendment).
- II. Supreme Court of the United States (2023). *Docket for 22-915*.  
<https://www.supremecourt.gov/docket/docketfiles/html/public/22-915.html>
- III. Chung, A. & Kruzel J. (2023 November 7). *US Supreme Court leans toward allowing domestic-violence gun curbs*. Reuters.  
<https://www.reuters.com/legal/us-supreme-court-mulls-legality-domestic-violence-gun-curbs-2023-11-07/>.
- IV. Legal Information Institute. (2023). *New York Rifle & Pistol Assn., INC v. Bruen*. Cornell Law School. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/20-843>.
- V. Everytown for Gun Safety Support Fund Analysis. (2023 March). *Mass shootings in the United States*. <https://everytownresearch.org/mass-shootings-in-america/>.
- VI. Miller, L. (2023 February 10). *Iowa's Strict Scrutiny Gun Amendment may be deadly for Iowans*. University of Iowa Journal for Gender, Race & Justice.  
[https://jgrj.law.uiowa.edu/news/2023/02/iowas-strict-scrutiny-gun-amendment-may-be-deadly-iowans-0#\\_edn6](https://jgrj.law.uiowa.edu/news/2023/02/iowas-strict-scrutiny-gun-amendment-may-be-deadly-iowans-0#_edn6).
- VII. State of Iowa Legislature. (2023). *Chapter 185 proposed Constitutional Amendment*.  
<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/publications/iactc/89.1/CH0185.pdf>.
- VIII. Legal Information Institute. (2023). *Strict Scrutiny*. Cornell Law School.  
[https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/strict\\_scrutiny#:~:text=Strict%20scrutiny%20will](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/strict_scrutiny#:~:text=Strict%20scrutiny%20will)

[%20often%20be,origin%2C%20religion%2C%20and%20alienage.](#)

### 3. Extreme Risk Protection Orders

#### 3.1 Summary of Recommendation

Formally called ‘Red Flag Laws’, Extreme Risk Protection Orders (EPRO’s) provide promising opportunities to mitigate gun violence. In essence, EPRO's authorize courts to temporarily block a person in crisis from accessing firearms [I]. This is critical when looking at the numbers for gun deaths in the state; in Iowa, 79% of gun deaths are suicides and 17% are homicides [II]. EPRO’s offer a method, subject to court decision, to help remove guns from a highly stressful situation to prevent tragedy from striking Iowa families. In many instances of gun violence, the perpetrator showed signs of possible violence before a shooting took place [III]. An example of when an EPRO could have been implemented was before a mass shooting in 2018 that killed 17 and wounded 17 others at Parkland High School. The shooter displayed violent behavior on several occasions, and had even been reported to law enforcement multiple times prior to the shooting [III]. If law enforcement had the ability to intervene, it is possible this tragedy, and many others like it, could have been prevented. Following this event, the Republican-controlled legislature in Florida passed EPRO’s, which continue to save lives in the state today [III].

An EPRO fills the gap many laws fail to cover. If a person is showing signs of violence against themselves, their family, or their community, law enforcement and subsequently the courts should be able to make a determination to remove guns from this potentially violent equation. EPRO’s can be filled by a variety of petitioners including law enforcement to intervene when gun violence, including suicides, homicide,

extremist-motivated violence, domestic violence, or school violence may be imminent for an individual [IV].

### **3.2 Evidence of Implementation**

Important to our mission is the effectiveness of our proposed legislation. EPRO's, while comparatively modern to other legislation, still has a large track record of success in states where they are implemented. A study performed by Duke University PHd professors concluded that within the State of Connecticut, "...approximately ten to twenty gun seizures were carried out for every averted suicide" [V]. Another state, Indiana, found similar results, finding "one life was saved for every 10 gun-removal actions" [VI]. Ultimately concluding, "such laws could thus save many lives and prove to be an important piece in the complex puzzle of gun violence prevention in the United States" [V].

These temporary gun orders have the ability to save countless lives from suicide. While much of this evidence comes from Connecticut or Indiana, plenty of states have passed EPRO's. Twenty-one states and the District of Columbia have passed EPRO's to reduce the daily loss of life from gun violence [VII]. When it comes to averting suicide, EPRO's have a track record of success. By empowering our law enforcement, families, and community, needless suicide deaths can be prevented. EPRO's have been instrumental in the prevention of mass shootings. Studies, like one in California by the National Library of Medicine, found 21 cases where EPRO's were used to avoid potential mass shootings, with other orders also preventing potential homicide and suicide [VIII].

The success of EPRO's cannot be measured by what has happened, only by what has

not yet happened. But it is this type of proactive, not reactive, mindset that will save the lives of many Iowans. We cannot wait for the next shooting to happen, especially when the perpetrator shows signs of violence while still having access to firearms. The results point to a clear effectiveness in reducing suicides, mass shootings, and homicide. In every state where EPRO's have been implemented, they have saved countless lives and families from tragedy. EPRO's are not the only solution to all gun violence, nor will they stop gun violence entirely. However, we must be willing to pass evidence-based, proactive, and common-sense legislation to fill in the gaps where we can.

### **3.3 Criticisms and Responses to Criticisms**

As is the case with most politically charged topics like gun legislation, there are critics. It is important to recognize these criticisms, and address the concerns of those in opposition, in order to come to a conclusion in favor of the majority. As is the case with nearly every gun policy, the National Rifle Association (NRA) vigorously opposes EPRO's. They cite a single case in California which concluded EPRO's (referred to as Gun Violence Restraining Order [GVRO's] in the article) had no statistically significant impact [IX].

While there is something to be said about the NRA's bias, it is important to acknowledge the researchers' own commentary regarding their conclusion. The researchers say the conclusions could be “partially explained by access to firearms through the underground market,” or “could reflect a true absence of association or limitations of our study; further research is needed to determine which of these is the case” [IX]. The NRA selected one of the few outlying studies that concluded EPRO's have little to no significant

impact in order to prove their own perspective. However, they failed to adhere to the researchers' own call to limit the drawing of over-generalized conclusions. Even if the study is scientifically valid, there is an abundance of evidence to suggest EPRO's are effective. The NRA does not address any of those cases or studies.

In addition, the NRA argues EPRO's violate the Constitution's Due Process Clause, claiming EPRO's "deprive citizens of their fundamental rights and property without due process safeguards and a clear evidentiary basis" [IX]. However, the NRA is ignoring the decades of case precedent surrounding both EPRO's and ex parte orders. The most compelling example comes from *Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation v Mallen*, 486 U.S. 230, 1988, where the court found the government could delay notice and the opportunity to be heard in urgent matters of public safety until after the deprivation occurs [X].

More often than not, EPRO's are being placed upon people who wish to harm others. These are the types of cases in which ex parte should most certainly be used in order to protect the public. This is especially true when these orders only temporarily deprive a person from their right to carry a firearm and allows the individual the right to be heard following the removal of their weapons [XI]. Johns Hopkins worded their conclusion regarding the NRA's claims well, stating:

ERPOs balance robust procedural safeguards with the need for timely judgments and do not violate the due process rights of respondents. A short, ex parte firearm prohibition with substantial procedural safeguards places minimal burdens on ERPO respondents that are outweighed by the valid governmental interest of protecting



public health and safety from foreseeable gun violence. [XII].

There is perhaps no situation more appropriate for an emergency order to be put in place than a person in crisis who is threatening violence. Certainly, that person should not have access to a firearm. EPRO's are proven to be effective and constitutional methods to mitigate gun violence.

### **3.4 Bipartisan Safer Communities Act**

While the effectiveness of Extreme Risk Protection orders should be reason enough to pass this legislation, the passing of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is adding additional incentive. The bill will provide 750 million in funding for crisis intervention services, including EPRO's, and unlock additional funding for their implementation [XIII]. To have access to these funds, Iowa should pass their form of an EPRO law.

### **3.5 Model Legislation**

March For Our Lives is in concurrence with model legislation drafted by the Department of Justice. As such, we offer their model legislation with our full and highest endorsement. For a full PDF copy of this legislation open the link below:

[EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER MODEL LEGISLATION](#) [I].

### **3.6 Consulted Sources**

- I. U.S Department of Justice. (2022 October 25). *Commentary for Extreme Risk Protection Order model legislation.*

[https://www.justice.gov/doj/reducing-gun-violence/commentary-extreme-risk-protection-order-model-legislation#model.](https://www.justice.gov/doj/reducing-gun-violence/commentary-extreme-risk-protection-order-model-legislation#model)

- II. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2020 February). *Gun violence in Iowa*.  
<https://maps.everytownresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Every-State-Fact-Sheet-2.0-042720-Iowa.pdf>.
- III. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2020). *Extreme Risk Laws*.  
<https://www.everytown.org/solutions/extreme-risk-laws/>.
- IV. Cantrell, S., Geller, L., Zale, C., Bengali, R., and Parsons, C. (2023 May 30). *Promising approaches for implementing extreme risk laws*. Everytown Research and Policy.  
<https://everytownresearch.org/report/extreme-risk-laws-guide/#conclusion>.
- V. Swanson, J., Norko, M., Lin Hsiu-Ju, M., et al. (2017). *Implementation and effectiveness of Connecticut's risk-based gun removal law: Does it prevent suicides?* Duke University.  
<https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=4830&context=lcp>.
- VI. Swanson, J. W., Easter, M. M., Alanis-Hirsch, K., et al. (2019). *Criminal Justice and Suicide Outcomes with Indiana's Risk-Based Gun Seizure Law*. The journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 47(2), 188–197.  
<https://doi.org/10.29158/JAAPL.003835-19>.
- VII. Frattaroli, S., & Horwitz, J. (2023 August). *Extreme risk protection order: A tool to save lives*. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.  
<https://americanhealth.jhu.edu/implementERPO#:~:text=Twenty%2Done%20states%20and%20the%20District%20of%20Columbia%20have%20enacted,is%20at%20risk%20of%20violence>.

- VIII. Wintemute, G. J., Pear, V. A., Schleimer, J. P., et al. (2019). *Extreme Risk Protection Orders Intended to Prevent Mass Shootings: A Case Series*. *Annals of internal medicine*, 171(9), 655–658. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-2162>.
- IX. National Rifle Association. (2022 May 16). *Follow the science, unless it leads where you don't want to go*. <https://www.nraila.org/articles/20220516/follow-the-science-unless-it-leads-where-you-dont-want-to-go>.
- X. Justia. (2023). *FDIC v. Mallen*, 486 U.S. 230 (1988). <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/486/230/#:~:text=U.S.%20Supreme%20Court,-FDIC%20v.&text=Title%2012%20U.S.C.,public%20confidence%20in%20the%20bank.>
- XI. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2020 March 13). *Extreme risk protection orders respect due process*. <https://www.everytown.org/report/extreme-risk-protection-orders-respect-due-process/>.
- XII. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. (2023). *Extreme risk laws and due process*. <https://publichealth.jhu.edu/sites/default/files/2023-04/erpo-due-process-march-2023-final.pdf>.
- XIII. Everytown for Gun Safety (2022 June 21). *What is the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act?* <https://www.everytown.org/what-is-the-bipartisan-safer-communities-act/>.

## 4. Closing Domestic Abuse and Misdemeanor Loopholes

### 4.1 Summary of Recommendation

With gun policy being as relaxed as it is there are bound to be loopholes. These loopholes should be considered completely unacceptable. An error in tax policy only means someone keeps more money, but an error in gun policy means people die. It is these omissions in policy that March for Our Lives is hoping to close.

One of the most known loopholes is the Domestic Abuse Loophole, often called the boyfriend loophole. According to a study as reported by NPR, “more than a thousand women are killed by intimate partners every year in the United States... and about half of the intimate partner homicides in the U.S. are perpetrated by an unmarried partner” [I]. It is important to note that steps have been taken in the right direction. The previously mentioned Bipartisan Safer Communities Act would partially close the loophole by preventing those who abused their current or recent dating partners from possessing firearms [II]. While this was done at the national level, gaps still exist in Iowa that keep the loophole open in most cases [III]. As defined by Iowa code, one must commit the assault “in an intimate relationship or have been in an intimate relationship and have had contact within the past year of the assault” [IV]. If the assault happens outside of the current or one year contact requirement, it can no longer be charged as a domestic assault and thus, the loophole continues. While that person may be charged with a crime, perpetrators can only be charged with other forms of assault, but most are misdemeanors, not felonies. [III].

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act does not even close the loophole in its

entirety. According to The 19th News, “while the bill expands the definition of who could qualify as a convicted perpetrator of domestic violence, it does not reference abusers who are subject to protective orders or add dating partners to the definition of an intimate partner” [V]. Additionally, “The bill includes a related provision, allowing people who were convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence to have their gun rights restored if their record stays clean for five years” [I]. The rationale for this provision is somewhat absent. If spouses who commit domestic assault are prohibited from purchasing a firearm for life, so too should individuals in a dating relationship.

Iowa should end this dangerous loophole for good. While it may seem small in totality, it is the continuance of many loopholes preventing significant strides against violence. Hopefully the closing of this loophole and others begins a trend toward closing harmful oversights in law.

## **4.2 Other Loopholes**

Another often dangerous loophole is the allowance of perpetrators of hate crimes to have firearms. In an average year, more than 25,000 hate crimes in the United States involve a firearm—more than 69 each day [VI]. Many states have passed legislation that prevents people convicted of a hate crime from purchasing a firearm. However, Iowa is not one of them. In Iowa, people convicted of violent hate-motivated misdemeanors remain eligible to access firearms in Iowa [VII]. According to Everytown Research, “In recent years, white supremacist movements have seen a resurgence, anti-government militias have become more active, and the United States has seen multiple shootings motivated by hate, including by

racism, anti-Semitism, misogyny, and anti-LGBTQ+ bias” [VIII]. Iowa should join the many other states in the nation that acknowledge the enormous and deadly repercussions of allowing individuals convicted of misdemeanor hate crimes from buying and having firearms.

In a similar dangerous oversight, individuals convicted of stalking are also often able to have access to firearms. Many stalking crimes are misdemeanors — meaning that, under federal law, some stalkers may legally be armed after a conviction [IX]. Iowa can fix this loophole by redefining these convictions as felonies, or by extending their gun laws to reach specified misdemeanors [IX]. The consequences of this negligent gap are devastating; female murder victims in 10 U.S. cities found that 76 percent of women who were murdered and 85 percent of women who survived a murder attempt by a current or former intimate partner experienced stalking in the year preceding the murder or murder attempt, respectively [X]. Even with all this research and the many states that have passed legislation to fill this gap, Iowa lags behind. By continuing to allow this loophole to continue, Iowa remains complicit in gun violence against women.

#### **4.3 Model Legislation**

To forever close the boyfriend loophole, Iowa should match states like Illinois who add a clause to their definition of domestic assault to include: people who are dating or engaged or used to date, including same sex couples. Additionally, we should adopt the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act to remove the provision that allows perpetrators within dating relationships to obtain a gun after 5 years.

To prevent perpetrators of hate crimes from possessing firearms, March For Our

Lives Iowa supports the federal passing of the Disarm Hate Act (H.R 5435) and recommends the state of Iowa pass legislation similar to this act. This act receives our full endorsement as written by Representative Veronica Escobar (TX-16). The full text of this legislation is available with this link:

[https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/5435/text?s=1&r=42#:~:text=Introduced%20in%20House%20\(09%2F13%2F2023\)&text=To%20prevent%20a%20person%20who,commission%2C%20from%20obtaining%20a%20firearm.](https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/5435/text?s=1&r=42#:~:text=Introduced%20in%20House%20(09%2F13%2F2023)&text=To%20prevent%20a%20person%20who,commission%2C%20from%20obtaining%20a%20firearm.) [XI].

Lastly, to fill the gap for perpetrators of misdemeanor stalking, March For Our Lives recommends a simple fix to Iowa Chapter 724, adding a clause making it unlawful to possess a firearm while convicted of stalking.

#### 4.4 Consulted Sources

- I. Treisman, R. (2022 June 23). *The Senate gun bill would close the 'boyfriend loophole'. Here's what that means.*  
[https://www.npr.org/2022/06/23/1106967037/boyfriend-loophole-senate-bipartisan-gun-safety-bill-domestic-abuse.](https://www.npr.org/2022/06/23/1106967037/boyfriend-loophole-senate-bipartisan-gun-safety-bill-domestic-abuse)
- II. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2021 July 21). *What is the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.*  
[https://www.everytown.org/what-is-the-bipartisan-safer-communities-act/.](https://www.everytown.org/what-is-the-bipartisan-safer-communities-act/)
- III. Anderson, E. (2022 August 1). *Domestic violence loophole closed by national gun safety law, but gaps remain in Iowa.*  
<https://www.thegazette.com/crime-courts/domestic-violence-loophole-closed-by-national-gun-safety-law-but-gaps-remain-in-iowa/#:~:text=CEDAR%20RAPIDS%20>

[%E2%80%94The%20Safer%20Communities,in%20most%20cases%2C%20experts%20say.](#)

- IV. Iowa Legislature. (2023). *Domestic Abuse Section 236.2*.  
<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/236.2.pdf>.
- V. Rummler, O. (2023 June 23). *Bipartisan gun violence bill tightens the ‘boyfriend loophole’ – but doesn’t close it completely*.  
[https://19thnews.org/2022/06/gun-bill-boyfriend-loophole/?itm\\_source=parsely-api](https://19thnews.org/2022/06/gun-bill-boyfriend-loophole/?itm_source=parsely-api).
- VI. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2023). *Disarm hate*.  
<https://www.everytown.org/solutions/disarm-hate/>.
- VII. Giffords Law Center. (2022 December 20). *Hate crimes in Iowa*.  
<https://giffords.org/lawcenter/state-laws/hate-crimes-guns-in-iowa/>.
- VIII. Everytown Research and Policy. (2019 May 13). *Disarm hate: The deadly intersection of guns and hate-motivated violence*.  
<https://everytownresearch.org/report/disarm-hate-the-deadly-intersection-of-guns-and-hate-crimes/>.
- IX. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2023). *Which states prohibit people with stalking convictions from having firearms?*  
<https://everytownresearch.org/rankings/law/stalker-prohibitor/#:~:text=What%20It%20Does,be%20armed%20after%20a%20conviction>.
- X. Parsons, C. (2018 July 31). *Stalking as a risk factor for future gun violence*.



<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/stalking-risk-factor-future-gun-violence/>.

## **5. Mandatory Reporting of Lost or Stolen Firearms**

### **5.1 Summary of Recommendation**

A common argument made by those in opposition of gun regulation is that stricter gun violence prevention laws will subsequently increase the illegal underground gun market. One step in combating this is to mandate the reporting of lost and/or stolen firearms. This legislation is being offered as a way to reduce the deadly gun trafficking market while also protecting legal gun owners and the community. With over 380,000 guns being stolen from private owners and additional guns being stolen from dealers and shipping companies, it is more pressing than ever to enact laws that make the reporting of these firearms mandatory [I].

Allowing guns to be stolen is fueling violent crime across Iowa and the nation. A nationwide study done between 2010 and 2016 “identified more than 23,000 stolen firearms recovered by police... the vast majority connected with crimes” [II]. Of those crimes there were “more than 1,500 carjackings and kidnappings, armed robberies at stores and banks, sexual assaults and murders, and other violent acts” [II]. Events like the killing of a Florida police officer in 2014 with a gun stolen from an unlocked Honda Accord four months prior have grown increasingly common [III]. The silent fueling of the gun trafficking industry by the failure to pass mandatory reporting laws is harming American communities and law enforcement alike.

### **5.2 Evidence of Implementation**

Like EPRO’s, mandatory reporting comes with its own merit and rationale for

implementation. Most critically, mandatory reporting laws “are associated with a significant reduction in gun trafficking” [I]. In fact, “one study found that these laws reduced traced illegal gun movement by 46% compared to states that do not have such laws” [I]. Without these laws, Iowa is allowing the underground gun market to thrive. We should not allow the state to harbor any stolen guns nor the criminals that utilize them to perpetuate heinous crimes in our state.

Another consideration Iowans must take into account is the lives of all Americans, including those in neighboring states. With nearly 60,000 guns being trafficked across state lines each year, Iowa must take some responsibility and enact its own mandatory reporting laws to eliminate its compliance in this criminal act [IV]. A study “found that crime guns originating in states with a lost-or-stolen reporting law were 30% less likely to end up in another state than guns that came from states without such laws” [V]. The lives of an Iowan are just as important as the lives of a Nebraskan, Missourian, or Minnesotan. We must be considerate of the implications of our weak gun legislation on other states and lives. In consideration of this, we must pass legislation to prevent Iowan guns from harming residents of other states.

It is important to add how mandatory reporting laws also help protect gun owners and law enforcement. The fact remains that the vast majority of gun owners in America are not maliciously allowing criminals to commit violent acts with their guns. But sometimes, gun owners can be blamed for their guns ending up at the scene of a crime. While certainly irresponsible, gun owners can be criminally accused for this action. These laws, according to

Giffords Law Center, can “protect rightful gun owners from unwarranted criminal accusations when a gun that was lost or stolen from them is later recovered at a crime scene” [V]. Furthermore, they serve the gun owner by aiding law enforcement in the safe return of their firearm [V]. According to the Justice Department, “the prompt reporting of lost and stolen firearms allows law enforcement to develop investigative leads and to identify recurring patterns that might indicate the involvement of illicit firearms traffickers” [VI]. To support our law enforcement, we must mandate lost or stolen firearm reporting. Any further neglect of this legislation is an additional obstacle law enforcement must face when serving to protect Iowan communities.

### **5.3 Criticisms and Responses to Criticisms**

Once again, we turn to the NRA for our criticism of mandatory reporting laws. In their report, “Oppose Lost or Stolen Reporting Requirements” they outline several arguments against this form of legislation [VII]. They first argue that these requirements “re-victimize the victim” because “victims are occupied with a host of concerns” [VII]. One of the concerns they point out is how “Victims will also be busy coordinating with law enforcement and the burdens of dealing with their insurance company” [VII]. While we recognize the burdens that come to a family after a breakin, and sympathize with that individual, we must also acknowledge the repercussions of allowing a stolen gun to remain at-large. Certainly, someone’s insurance payout is not nearly as important as someone’s life.

Additionally, the NRA is misrepresenting most mandatory reporting laws. The report seems to focus only on the aftermath of the burglary, as if most mandatory reporting laws

require immediate reporting. Mandatory reporting laws vary. While some do require guns to be reported missing immediately, in other states, mandatory reporting laws give individuals up to seven days to report their stolen guns. In fact the following states give gun owners 48 hours or more from the time of discovery: Virginia, New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Oregon, Michigan, California, Colorado, and Delaware [V]. In recognition of the burdens the NRA points out, states like Oregon write in “as soon as practicable” in the law [V]. This is more than generous given that people's lives are at stake. The argument that mandatory reporting laws only serve to re-victimize is a dangerous equivocation.

The NRA also argues that there is enough incentive to report lost or stolen firearms. Yet, so many guns are stolen and never reported. As explained by the Center for American Progress, “it is difficult to ascertain the exact number of guns that are stolen from individual gun owners because many of these thefts are not reported to law enforcement” [VIII]. This same point is reiterated by Giffords Law Center in their research [V]. Evidently, there is not enough incentive for stolen guns to be reported because if there was, perhaps there would not be so many unreported guns. Regardless of the reason the NRA puts forward, they cannot refute the mountain of evidence in support of mandating the reporting of lost or stolen firearms.

#### **5.4 Model Legislation**

Once again March For Our Lives endorses the model legislation as written by the Department of Justice. [VI] This model mandates reporting after 48 hours of discovery. We believe this is in consideration of the concerns of gun advocates while also acknowledging

the threat unreported stolen guns can have. The full model legislation can be found at the PDF below:

[FIREARM-THEFT/LOSS REPORTING MODEL LEGISLATION](#)

### 5.5 Consulted Sources

- I. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2023). *Report lost and stolen guns*.  
<https://www.everytown.org/solutions/report-lost-and-stolen-guns/>.
- II. Freskos, B. (2017 November 20). *Missing pieces*.  
<https://www.thetrace.org/2017/11/stolen-guns-violent-crime-america/>.
- III. Everytown Research and Policy. (2019 March 6). *Stolen guns pose a tremendous risk to public safety*.  
<https://everytownresearch.org/report/stolen-guns-pose-a-tremendous-risk-to-public-safety/>.
- IV. Everytown Research and Policy. (2019 March). *Stolen guns pose a tremendous risk to public safety fact sheet*.  
<https://everytownresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/03/Stolen-Guns-FACT-SHEET-030619B.pdf>.
- V. Giffords Law Center. (2023). *Reporting lost and stolen guns*.  
[https://giffords.org/lawcenter/gun-laws/policy-areas/owner-responsibilities/reporting-lost-stolen-guns/#footnote\\_6\\_5611](https://giffords.org/lawcenter/gun-laws/policy-areas/owner-responsibilities/reporting-lost-stolen-guns/#footnote_6_5611).
- VI. Department of Justice. (2023 December 13). *Commentary for firearm - theft/ loss reporting model legislation*.

<https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-12/Reporting%20Lost%20and%20Stolen%20Firearms%20Model%20Legislation.pdf>.

VII. National Rifle Association. (2020). *Oppose lost or stolen reporting requirements*.

<https://www.nraila.org/campaigns/2019/virginia/lost-or-stolen-firearms/>.

VIII. Parsons, C., and Vargas, E. (2020 March 4). *Gun theft in the United States: A state-by-state analysis*.

<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/gun-theft-united-states-state-state-analysis/>.

## 6. Conclusion

### 6.1 Conclusion

Iowan communities have suffered as a result of weak gun legislation for far too long. The consequences have been deadly. The shootings at East High School, Starts Right Here, and others are clear warning signs that prove now is the time to pass gun legislation that was needed years ago. As the saying goes, “the best time to plant a tree was 20 years ago, the second best time is now”. This same rationale is true for gun violence prevention. There is no undoing the violence that has already occurred, but there is still time to prevent future violence. This displays the goal of March For Our Lives Iowa. We look to understand what has happened in the past and ways to prevent the same loss of life in the future. Every year, we look at recent gun violence and recommend legislation to hopefully mitigate that violence from happening again in Iowa.

Our first recommendation was Extreme Risk Protection Orders. These are backed by many studies done in a variety of states. These orders look to temporarily remove guns from a situation that could potentially be lethal. Firearms have no place in the hands of someone in crisis. By temporarily removing guns from this equation, many lives can be saved from suicide and violence.

The second recommendation was to fix the misdemeanor loopholes keeping guns in the hands of criminals. These loopholes have disproportionately affected women in Iowa for far too long. People who have a record of criminal acts and violence should not have access to weapons. The consequences are far too grave. These oversights have been left untouched



to the dismay of many Iowan families and advantageous to criminals. It is time to acknowledge these oversights and side with Iowans.

Our final recommendation was the passage of mandatory reporting of lost or stolen firearms. This is aimed to crack down on the dangerous underground gun market fueling crime in Iowa and surrounding states. In addition, this recommendation aims to help law enforcement in their endeavor to protect our communities. Reporting a firearm should be inherently thought of by any gun owner. Unfortunately, this has not been happening. The result is the growth of a market that assists criminals in their violent acts against Iowans and others. We must show our solidarity with our communities, our law enforcement, and victims of gun violence by making it mandatory to report lost or stolen firearms.

The youth of this state are ready to pass gun violence protection legislation. We have waited far too long for action to be taken. The burden is now on youth to recommend and support the passage of legislation to protect all Iowans from the dangers of weak firearm legislation. We have seen first hand the consequences it has had on our schools and communities. Yet, we see instead the passage of strict scrutiny and the possibility of loosening gun regulation through *United States v Rahimi*. We remain undeterred in our endeavor to advocate for the protection of our communities. It is through these recommendations we believe further depreciation of our communities can finally be mitigated.