

## Roberta DiMezza

---

**From:** Paul Muller <paul.muller@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 16, 2024 11:47 AM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** House Bill H 7051

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good day,

I am writing in regard to House Bill 7051, which was brought to my attention by Ms. Martha DiMeo's letter in the March 10th issue of The Providence Journal. So, I went and read the bill. It sure makes a lot of sense on the surface, so long as due diligence has been done. Here are my reasoned thoughts:

- The 1-mile distance seems to be arbitrary, and comes across poorly in the firearms community of voters.
- How many ranges are currently within the 1-mile radius of a school? If there aren't any, then no problem, as no new ranges will be constructed within that radius. If there are some, these will be put out of business, along with the associated loss of jobs. (Not to mention the other benefits associated with ranges such as proficiency (to include law enforcement), ammunition taxes, etc.)
- Has anyone conducted an objective study using a decibel meter to validate the 1-mile distance? A more objective measure (vs. the arbitrary 1-mile) would be to establish a decibel rating. If a range is louder than the established norm (which could be debated) then there's an issue. If not, then there isn't a reason to shut down the range. There are many factors such as terrain, vegetation density, range construction, etc., which all impact how "loud" a range is perceived to be at a school.
- I'm not sure Ms. DiMeo's claim that this bill would put an end to mass shooting drills has any validity. How many mass shooters practiced at a range within 1 mile of the targeted school? These are unrelated topics, and to think that moving a range 1-mile away eliminates the need for these drills is a flat-out fallacy. I know I want my school-age daughter (and wife, who is a teacher) to be as safe as possible, and drills are a piece of the puzzle, as are school resource officers, hardened classroom doors, escape plans, etc.

The bottom line is that this is simply a "feel-good" bill, that at best gives a bit of a (false) heightened sense of security, and at worst puts tax-paying, honest businesses out of business and deprives law-abiding gun owners the opportunity to practice with their firearms. There are ways to keep the sounds of gunfire away from our classrooms (noble!) but they must be done objectively, based in science, and not emotion.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Colonel Paul Muller, USMC (Ret)  
West Kingston, RI  
(401) 284-2432