



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security

One Ashburton Place, Room 2133
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Tel: (617) 727-7775

TTY Tel: (617) 727-6618

Fax: (617) 727-4764

www.mass.gov/eopss

MAURA T. HEALEY
Governor

KIMBERLEY DRISCOLL
Lieutenant Governor

GINA K. KWON
Secretary

June 9, 2026

Firearm Control Advisory Board

Meeting #15 Notice

Meeting Date: June 12, 2026

Meeting Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: via Microsoft Teams- link below:

<https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/236723922951960?p=s9H6BjtXSnBOIBoTif>

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Review and approval of prior meeting minutes (pgs. 1-7)
3. Update regarding the board's recommendation to the Secretary of EOPSS regarding the prohibited assault-style firearms roster
4. Discussion regarding the content of the cover letter that will accompany the prohibited assault-style firearms roster when it is published
5. Discussion regarding the process for prohibited assault-style firearm roster submissions
6. Update regarding the Handgun Sales Regulation as it relates to the approved firearms roster
7. Review and approval of test report for approved firearms roster addition:
 - a. Elements U.S. Space & Defense
 - i. Lodestar Technology, LNK9, 9mm (pgs. 8-14)
8. Discussion of future meeting dates
9. Discussion of items not reasonably anticipated prior to posting the agenda
10. Member Comments
11. Public Comments
12. Adjourn

If any member of the public wishing to attend this meeting seeks special accommodation in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact John Melander at John.Melander@mass.gov



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security

One Ashburton Place, Room 2133
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Tel: (617) 727- 7775

TTY Tel: (617) 727-6618

Fax: (617) 727-4764

www.mass.gov/eopss

MAURA T. HEALEY
Governor

GINA K. KWON
Secretary

KIMBERLEY DRISCOLL
Lieutenant Governor

Firearms Control Advisory Board (FCAB) Meeting

Thursday, May 14, 2026

Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife

1 Rabbit Hill Road, Westborough, MA

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance:

- Michaela Dunne (Chairperson)
- Chief Ronald Glidden (Ret.)
- James (Jim) Wallace
- Judge (Ret.) Michael Fabbri
- Trooper Christopher Call
- AAG Brian Pearly

Non-Members in Attendance:

- John Melander, EOPSS Deputy General Counsel
- Aimee Conway, DCJIS
- Adrian Hatch, EOPSS
- Robert Vespa
- John Giaquinto
- Michael Harris
- Dwayne Adams

I. Call to Order:

Chairperson Dunne called the meeting to order at 10:06 AM.

II. Review and Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes (pgs. 1–6):

Judge Fabbri made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the April 2, 2026 meeting. The motion was seconded, a roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

III. Update Regarding the Board's Recommendation to the Secretary of EOPSS Regarding the Prohibited "Assault-Style Firearms" Roster:

Attorney Melander reported that there was no formal update. He noted that the Secretary is inclined to accept the Board's recommendation to adopt the roster, but that no formal announcement has yet been made. He anticipated that the announcement, approval, and publication of the roster would occur before the next meeting, and that public outreach would be needed to make stakeholders aware of the approval and publication. He indicated that the messaging would be distributed through existing channels, including MPTC, MCOPA, firearm dealers, and MIRCS. Attorney Melander thanked the subcommittee for assembling the recommendation and the Board for advancing it.

Chief Glidden emphasized that, even if the roster were approved the following day, the only assault-style firearms currently on the roster are the firearms specifically enumerated in the statute. He noted that nothing that is legal today would become illegal tomorrow simply by virtue of appearing on the roster; if a firearm is on the roster, it is already illegal under the statute and the features test.

Attorney Melander stated that, at the next meeting, the Board will need to discuss the process for assault-style roster submissions, which he described as a thoughtful and deliberate process. He noted that there is an existing process for the other rosters, under which firearms are submitted through laboratories, and that the Board will need to consider how it wishes to approach adding firearms so as not to do so haphazardly.

Attorney Melander recommended that an agenda item for the next meeting address the draft cover letter or written message that will accompany the roster when it is published, and indicated that he would hold the release of the roster until that letter has been prepared and approved by the Board. Chairperson Dunne agreed that publishing the roster without an accompanying explanation would be confusing, and noted that the cover letter could state that the Board is still developing the submission process. Judge Fabbri suggested that the Board develop the process, or an explanation of the process under development, before issuing the cover letter.

Mr. Pearly asked whether it was accurate to say that approvals would be made only by the FCAB at its public meetings. Attorney Melander confirmed that this was correct. Mr. Pearly observed that this should help address concerns about the public needing to check the roster daily or about items being added without the public being made aware that they were under consideration.

The Board agreed that it would not release anything related to the roster until after the discussion at the next meeting. Because the Secretary has not yet approved the recommendation, no motion was required.

Mr. Wallace provided information regarding a case out of Springfield involving a twenty-three-year-old subject of a restraining order who was charged with numerous firearms offenses. He noted that the arrest report discussed items that were readily convertible to a working firearm as well as items that were not yet serialized, and suggested that the case was worth watching to see how the court handles it. He identified the matter as Commonwealth v. Samuel Lacus. Chairperson Dunne indicated that she would circulate the case to the Board.

IV. Discussion of Handgun Sales Regulations as They Relate to the Approved Firearms Roster (pgs. 7–16):

Chairperson Dunne introduced the discussion, explaining that it concerned how the Attorney General's regulations interact with the approved firearms roster. Mr. Pearly apologized for not having attended the prior meeting.

Chief Glidden provided an oral summary, describing this as an issue that has been outstanding since 1998. He explained that he had undertaken a detailed review of the handgun sales regulations, with the understanding that the Board has no purview over the Attorney General's regulations, in order to compare how those regulations correspond to the statutory requirements governing the roster. He reported that the vast majority of the regulatory criteria have nothing to do with the roster and instead address unfair and deceptive practices by dealers and point-of-sale controls. He noted, however, that certain provisions do relate to the roster, in particular the testing requirements (such as the drop test and function test), which are the same as those required by the statute. If the testing were the only issue, the Board would be all set. He identified two additional points in the regulations: first, a requirement that a handgun include a child safety mechanism (such as an increased trigger pull weight and a heavier safety, making it more difficult for children to operate); and second, a requirement that semi-automatic handguns include a load indicator.

Chief Glidden suggested that, if the testing process is the same as that set forth in the statute and the only things preventing the Attorney General's Office from confirming that a handgun meets all of its criteria are the load indicator and child safety mechanism, the Board could reach out to the Attorney General's Office and ask it to establish a process for evaluating firearms against the Attorney General's criteria. If the Attorney General's Office then informed the Board that a firearm met its criteria and the Board approved the firearm, the Board could add a notation (such as an asterisk) to the roster so that an individual would know the firearm meets both the statutory and the regulatory requirements. Chairperson Dunne offered the example of recently approved Glock models, noting the open question of whether they may be sold and whether they comply with the Attorney General's criteria.

Mr. Pearly asked whether there had been a prior effort to meet with the Attorney General on this issue. Chief Glidden responded that there had been, in the early 2000s, with whoever was handling firearms matters at the time. Mr. Pearly indicated that he would be happy to begin the process by reaching out to provide an overview of the issue and to set up a meeting, noting that he is in the criminal bureau and would need to determine the appropriate contact, which he assumed would be within the consumer protection division. Attorney Melander indicated that he could set up a call with Mr. Pearly, Chairperson Dunne, and himself to open a discussion with the Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Pearly cautioned that the political appetite for this kind of change may be low. Chief Glidden responded that, while there is always a question of political appetite, the Board's aim is simply to ensure that the firearms on the roster are compliant with the child safety and consumer protection requirements, and that any effort to slow handgun sales should not be accomplished through confusion. He emphasized that these firearms are already on the roster and that the Board is not seeking to approve anything that is not already on it.

Judge Fabbri observed that, even without a formal process, if a manufacturer builds a firearm that meets the Attorney General's regulations and the firearm is on the roster, the manufacturer can sell it and the Attorney General's Office cannot take action. Chairperson Dunne and Chief Glidden noted that this is effectively the current practice. Mr. Wallace characterized the present

situation as selling at one's own risk. Trooper Call commented that it is a poor outcome for a firearm to be approved on the roster while the Attorney General retains the ability to bar its sale.

Attorney Melander stated that this is an opportune time to consider the issue given the new law and the creation of the FCAB. The Board agreed that the next step would be to set up a meeting with Mr. Pearly, Chairperson Dunne, Attorney Melander, and the Attorney General's Office.

V. Review and Approval of Test Reports for Handgun Roster Additions:

The Board reviewed test reports from Elements U.S. Space & Defense for the following firearms:

Sig Sauer, 365AXGCA-9-Legion-MS-MA, 9mm (pgs. 17–23)

Chairperson Dunne introduced the test report and asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Mr. Pearly made a motion to approve the addition. Trooper Call seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Springfield Armory, PX9117LAOS, 9mm (pgs. 24–30)

Springfield Armory, PX9119LAOS, 9mm (pgs. 31–37)

Springfield Armory, PX9123L, 9mm (pgs. 38–44)

Springfield Armory, PX9124L, 9mm (pgs. 45–51)

Springfield Armory, PC9105LCA18, .45 ACP (pgs. 52–58)

Springfield Armory, XDDG9101BLC-M4, 9mm (pgs. 59–65)

Chairperson Dunne introduced the Springfield Armory test reports together, consistent with the Board's recent practice of considering firearms from the same manufacturer collectively. There was no discussion. Trooper Call made a motion to approve the additions collectively. Judge Fabbri seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

VI. Discussion Regarding Certification Request from Susquehanna Labs (pgs. 66–76):

Chairperson Dunne reported that the Board had received an email from a new testing laboratory, Susquehanna Labs, inquiring about how it could be added to the list of certified testing laboratories. She explained that the laboratory had branched off from one of the laboratories already approved by the Board, that its representative, Mike Hinder, had previously worked for one of the approved laboratories, and that she had not previously handled such a request. She noted that there are currently only two laboratories on the approved list.

Chief Glidden explained that, in the past, the Board has reviewed the submitted information to determine whether anything constituted a conflict of interest and then voted. Trooper Call observed that nothing in the materials set pricing, and that competition is beneficial. Mr. Wallace noted that the laboratory is located in Maryland and that it does not need to be state-approved; Chairperson Dunne confirmed this.

Based on the information provided, Chief Glidden made a motion to add Susquehanna Labs to the list of approved testing laboratories. Judge Fabbri seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously. Chairperson Dunne indicated that she would update the testing laboratory contact information on the website and reach out to Mr. Hinder to add the contact information.

VII. Discussion of Future Meeting Dates:

The Board confirmed that the next meeting will be held on Friday, June 12, 2026. Mr. Pearly indicated that he would likely need to attend that meeting remotely due to a commitment in Middlesex Superior Court. Chairperson Dunne noted that a calendar invitation for the June 12 meeting had not yet been sent.

The Board discussed scheduling additional meetings, noting that the period between June and September would otherwise be a lengthy gap. Chairperson Dunne proposed holding a meeting in July, and the Board discussed July 21, 2026.

VIII. Discussion of Any Items Not Reasonably Anticipated Prior to Posting the Agenda:

Chief Glidden recommended that EOPSS issue another advisory addressing questions regarding the Firearm Identification (FID) card, which no longer permits the holder to possess a semi-automatic rifle or shotgun. He noted that there is no notification requirement associated with this change and that there is uncertainty about what an affected individual may do with such a firearm, such as whether it may be sold or must be surrendered. He referenced Section 153 of Chapter 135, observing that it operates as a kind of exemption but is framed in terms of possession, and stated that he has been advising attendees at law enforcement trainings to flag the new restrictions for the public.

Chairperson Dunne reported that a control had been built into the new MIRCS gun dealer application so that, if an individual attempts to sell a semi-automatic firearm using a regular FID, MIRCS will stop the sale.

Judge Fabbri raised the question of what an individual would be charged with, noting that under Section 10(a) the government need only prove possession, and asked whether a person could be charged for transporting such a firearm. He observed that, because Section 153 is an outside section and does not amend existing law, one could argue that the ordinary rules of statutory construction do not apply and that an individual who already possesses such a firearm may keep and use it.

Mr. Wallace observed that it appeared the only option available to an affected individual was to surrender the item. Trooper Call responded that it is inaccurate to say the firearm cannot be sold; while it cannot be sold within the Commonwealth, it may be sold in another state or transferred to a federal firearms licensee (FFL).

Attorney Melander stated that there are several items that could be addressed through an advisory, including the course requirements applicable to renewals, noting that individuals need to understand that they do not need to repeat live-fire training in order to renew. He added that EOPSS would add the transportation issue to the list for a future advisory. Mr. Wallace noted that some local licensing authorities are still refusing firearms applications on the basis of live-fire compliance, and Attorney Melander responded that EOPSS has been working to train police departments and to message this guidance.

Mr. Wallace noted that, depending on how far the Board pursues its review of the handgun sales regulations, an issue arises where an individual who is required to temporarily transfer a firearm to an FFL cannot have it transferred back because it is not on the roster. He suggested that it

would be helpful for any regulation to provide that such firearms may be transferred back to the owner.

Judge Fabbri asked about the status of the substantially similar states analysis relating to FIDs and hunting. He noted that the Massachusetts State Police completed that analysis, that the resulting list was approved, and that Attorney Melander believes the list has been published.

Mr. Wallace noted that he had recently needed to log into the FCAB website, and the Board discussed the need to review the website, including ensuring that the prior meeting minutes are uploaded.

Judge Fabbri raised questions regarding the surrender process, including who must provide notice and of what, the role of police department storage, the transfer of firearms to a bonded warehouse, and when and to whom a receipt is provided when a firearm is transferred to a bonded warehouse. Trooper Call explained that the Massachusetts State Police internal policy is to retain surrendered firearms for one year before they are sent to bonded storage, holding them initially to allow the underlying issue to resolve, and cited 515 CMR 3.00.

Attorney Melander noted that there is also the issue of voluntary surrenders, and that the Massachusetts State Police have drafted a new regulation concerning surrenders that has not yet been submitted. He reported that the basic firearm safety course regulation is ready for public comment, with a hearing scheduled for June 26, 2026, and notice going out to all stakeholders and the LGAC. He explained that this regulation is an amended version of the State Police regulation, with the surrender provisions removed and placed into a separate, not-yet-submitted regulation.

Mr. Wallace stated that the principal point of contention with bonded warehouses is that the government effectively enters the owner into a contract with a private entity against the owner's will, requiring the owner to pay fees that, in many instances, exceed the value of the firearm.

Chief Glidden explained that the new law requires the licensing officer to notify the individual of the right to transfer the firearm to another person who holds an LTC, rather than to the bonded warehouse, provided the matter does not involve a restraining order, and that the police are required to transfer the firearm within ten days, with the transfer not being optional for the department. Mr. Wallace responded that the firearm is sometimes gone within twenty-four hours, and that because the police department is not required to notify the individual that the firearm is being transferred to the bonded warehouse, the individual may not even be aware that the transfer is occurring.

Chief Glidden noted that the GCAB had drafted regulations for bonded warehouses previously but that they were not approved, and that Chairperson Dunne has a copy of that draft that could serve as a starting point. Attorney Melander indicated that it sounds like the Board should pursue this; he explained that the Board began with the mandatory regulations it is required to promulgate, that there are discretionary regulations that could fill certain gaps, and that this appears to be one that would be helpful, while cautioning that the Board should not promulgate regulations simply because it has the authority to do so. He asked whether Chief Glidden or Chairperson Dunne had the prior draft.

IX. Member Comments:

There were no member comments.

X. Public Comments:

Dwayne Adams, co-chair of the Massachusetts Conservation Alliance and part of the leadership of the effort to repeal Chapter 135, asked whether the Board would take up topics related to the repeal effort as the vote approaches, and how rapidly the regulations would be repealed if the effort were successful. Attorney Melander responded that EOPSS already has all of the prior regulations and a mechanism to file them on an emergency basis, such that if a repeal occurred the regulations could be filed and take effect immediately, though he noted that other issues, such as registration, may be more difficult to address.

Mr. Adams also noted that he receives many questions regarding FIDs and hunting as affected by Chapter 135, and asked how those portions of the statute will be enforced. He expressed concern that the Commonwealth is losing eco-tourism and license-fee revenue as a result of the present uncertainty.

John Giaquinto of Dudley, a member of GOAL, stated that, according to EOPSS, an individual who has an FA-10 from a gun dealer has a registered firearm and does not need to register it again, and that firearms purchased before the launch of the new system are not required to be registered in the new system until October 2028. He explained that he holds FA-10s for items purchased before the launch of the system and asked whether he needs to re-register those firearms. Judge Fabbri, Chairperson Dunne, and Attorney Melander responded that, if he has an FA-10, he is all set and does not need to register again.

Mr. Giaquinto also noted that a hearing had been held the prior Halloween regarding House Bill 2615, concerning stun guns, and asked whether anyone had seen what came of it. The response was that the matter did not advance and that a stun gun remains a firearm under the law.

Mr. Giaquinto further asked what recourse is available if there is a mistake on an individual's record. Chairperson Dunne indicated that she would provide contact information for correcting a record.

Mr. Adams raised concerns regarding incorrect information about firearm ownership. Chairperson Dunne explained that the database is transactional and will therefore show all transactions, even where the individual no longer owns the firearm. Mr. Wallace noted that it would be helpful if owners could log in to see what is reflected on their records, and Chairperson Dunne indicated that the June update will allow individuals to do so.

XI. Adjournment:

Mr. Pearly made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Judge Fabbri seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously. The Board meeting was adjourned at 11:19 AM.

Element U.S. Space & Defense Test Report

Project No.: PH00018774 Tested: 14 May 2026

Prepared For

Lodestar Technology
481 W 45th St,
Chattanooga, TN 37410 USA

Prepared By

Element U.S. Space & Defense | 4603B Compass Point Road | Belcamp, MD 21017 | (410) 297-8154 |
www.elementdefense.com

This report and the information contained herein represents the results of testing only those articles/products identified in this document and selected by the client. The tests were performed to specifications and/or procedures approved by the client. Element U.S. Space & Defense ("Element U.S. Space & Defense") makes no representations expressed or implied that such testing fully demonstrates efficiency, performance, reliability, or any other characteristic of the articles being tested, or similar products. This report should not be relied upon as an endorsement or certification by Element U.S. Space & Defense of the equipment tested, nor does it present any statement whatsoever as to the merchantability or fitness of the test article or similar products for a particular purpose. This document shall not be reproduced except in full without written approval from Element U.S. Space & Defense.

WARNING - This document contains technical data whose export is restricted by the Arms Export Control Act (Title 22, U.S.C., Sec 2751, et q.) or the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, Title 50, U.S.C., App. 2401 et seq. Violations of these export laws are subject to severe criminal penalties. Disseminate in accordance with provisions of DoD Directive 5230.25.

Subject to the EAR, ECCN EAR99. This information is subject to the export control laws of the United States, specifically including the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), 15 C.F.R. Part 730 et seq. Transfer, retransfer, or disclosure of this data by any means to a non U.S. person (individual or company), whether in the United States or abroad, without any required export license or other approval from the U.S. Government is prohibited.

Revision History

Rev.	Description	Issue Date
0	Initial Release	14 May 2026

The EOPS-Certified Laboratory identified below has completed the testing requirements by Massachusetts General Law c. 140 § 123 cl. 18-21 and is submitting this Compliance Test Report. The reference number/identifier should refer specifically to the testing of a named handgun model, not to the laboratory in general. The number/identifier must be noted in the space provided on each page of this report.

EOPS-CERTIFIED LABORATORY INFORMATION

Date Submitted: May 14, 2026

EOPS-Certified Laboratory: Element U.S. Space & Defense (NTS Technical Systems)

Address:

4603B Compass Point Rd,
Belcamp, MD, 21017

Name and Telephone Number of the EOPS-Certified Laboratory staff person to be contacted regarding this report:

Joshua Petty – 667.289.8808

Date of Test: 14 May 2026

Time of Test: 8:00 AM

Locations(s) of Test, including any off-site locations:

Element U.S. Space & Defense
4603B Compass Point Rd,
Belcamp, MD, 21017

Name(s) and Title(s) of EOPS-Certified Laboratory Staff who conducted and/or performed the required testing:

1. Jacob Arisman- Range Lead
2. Joshua Petty- Ballistic Engineering Specialist

HANDGUN MANUFACTURER INFORMATION

Name and address of manufacturer:

Lodestar Technology
481 W 45th St,
Chattanooga, TN 37410 USA

Name and address of entity submitting handguns for testing, if different:

HANDGUN MODEL INFORMATION

Handgun Type (check one):

Revolver: _____ Pistol: X

Make: Lodestar Technology

Model: LNK9

Caliber: 9mm

Barrel Length: 4.02"

Construction Material(s) for frame, barrel, cylinder, slide, and breechblock (e.g., stainless steel, alloy):

Stainless steel, alloy

Serial Numbers:

1. L100170
2. L100418
3. L100393
4. L100184
5. L100209

The manufacturer has certified in writing (attached) that each handgun identified above is the same as that sold or to be sold commercially to the public in the normal course, and is not modified in any way, and has been pre-tested only to the extent that each specimen of such model is tested prior to being sold commercially to the public in the normal course.

Yes X No _____

If the handgun has been submitted by an importer, then the importer has certified in writing (attached) that each handgun identified above is the same as that sold or to be sold commercially to the public in the normal course, and is not modified in any way, and has been pre-tested only to the extent that each specimen of such model is tested prior to being sold commercially to the public in the normal course.

Yes _____ No _____

AMMUNITION/TEST LOAD INFORMATION

Ammunition Manufacturer: CCI/Blazer

Caliber: 9mm

Bullet Weight and Type (i.e., FMJ, JHP, etc.): 9mm 124 gr. FMJ

Lot #: C27H504

Used most powerful ammunition recommended in manufacturer's user manual:

Yes ___X___ No _____

Used Primed case for Drop Safety Test Most Similar to the Most Powerful Ammunition Recommended in Manufacturer's User Manual:

Yes ___X___ No _____

Primed Case Manufacturer: CCI/Blazer

FIRING TEST

Each of three handguns have met both of the following conditions as set forth in M.G.L. c. 140 § 123 cl. (18):

Fired the first 20 rounds without a malfunction.

Fired the full 600 rounds with no more than 6 malfunctions and completed the test without a crack or breakage that increases the danger to the user.

DROP SAFETY TEST

Each of 5 handguns was dropped onto a solid concrete slab from a height of 1 meter and did not discharge during any of the following drop tests as set forth in M.G.L. c. 140, § 123 cl. (19):

Drop #1: Normal firing position (barrel horizontal)

Drop #2: Upside down (barrel horizontal)

Drop #3: On grip (barrel vertical)

Drop #4: On muzzle (barrel vertical)

Drop #5: On either side (barrel horizontal)

Drop #6: On exposed hammer or striker or, if none exist, on the rearmost part of the firearm.

Please note that all handguns should be tested with all manual safety off in each available hammer position. For instance, with traditional double action pistols and revolvers with exposed hammers, six drops must be done both with the hammer cocked back and in the forward position. Similarly, handguns that have a half-cocked position should be tested with the hammer cocked back, the hammer in forward position, and the hammer half-cocked.

Before each drop, the handgun must be test fired to ensure functionality.

SAFETY REQUIREMENTS as set forth in M.G.L. c. 140 § 123 cl. (20), (21

ALL HANDGUNS

Handgun is not prone to either:

Firing more than once per pull of the trigger

Explosion during firing

I declare under penalty of perjury according to the laws of the Massachusetts that this test was performed pursuant to the requirements of M.G.L. c. 140, § 123 cl. (19), 501 CMR 7.00, as further outlined in the Secretary's February 21, 2001 letter, and that all statements made in this report are true and complete

Signature: _____



Name/Title (Printed): Joshua Petty / Ballistics Engineering Specialist

Date: 14 May 2026

MANUFACTURER'S HANDGUN CERTIFICATION FORM

Approved Firearms Roster
M.G.L. c. 140, sec. 123, cl. 18-21; 501 CMR 7.00

This form must be completed by the importer.

The following handgun samples, which accompany this Certification, are submitted for testing for purposes of the Approved Firearms Roster, M.G.L. c. 140, sec. 123, cl. 18-21, and 501 CMR 7.00:

Manufacturer: Lodestar Technology

Model: LNK9

Caliber: 9mm

Serial No.:

1. L100170
2. L100418
3. L100393
4. L100184
5. L100209

Laboratory Reference Number: PH00018774

The undersigned manufacturer certifies that:

Each handgun identified above is the same as that sold or to be sold commercially to the public in the normal course, and is not modified in any way; and

Each handgun identified above has been pre-tested by the manufacturer only to the extent that each specimen of such model is tested prior to being sold commercially to the public in the normal course.

I declare under penalty of perjury according to the laws of the Massachusetts that this test was performed pursuant to the requirements of M.G.L. c. 140, § 123 cl. (19), 501 CMR 7.00, as further outlined in the Secretary's February 21, 2001 letter, and that all statements made in this report are true and complete

Signature: Laurel R Smith

Name/Title (Printed): Laurel R Smith

Date: 18 May 2026