

Firearm Control Advisory Board Meeting  
Friday, May 9, 2025  
200 Arlington Street, Chelsea, Massachusetts 02150  
Open Session Minutes

**Members in Attendance:**

Michaela Dunne- Statutory FRB Director Appointment (Chairperson)  
Chief Ronald Glidden (Ret.)- Massachusetts Chief of Police Association Representative  
Robert A. Cerasoli- Speaker of the House Appointee (Via Teams)  
James Wallace- Gun Owners Action League Representative  
Judge Michael Fabbri (Ret.)- President of the Senate Appointee  
Trooper Christopher Call – Massachusetts State Police Representative Brian Pearly – Office of the Attorney General Representative

**Others in Attendance:**

John Melander- Deputy General Counsel for EOPPS (Board Counsel)  
Victoria Carroll- Firearm Case Coordinator for DCJIS Aimee  
Conway- Assistant General Counsel for DCJIS  
Robert Vespa- Program Coordinator for DCJIS

**Members of the Public:**

No members of the public were present

**Call to Order:**

The Board Meeting was called to order at 10:22 a.m. by Chairperson Michaela Dunne. All Board Members introduced themselves, including the newest Board member, Attorney Brian Pearly.

**Review and Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes**

The second matter on the agenda was to review and approve the minutes from the board meeting on April 11, 2025. Mr. Wallace made a motion to approve the minutes. Judge Fabbri seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained).

**Discussion of the Sub-Committee's Work Regarding the Prohibited "Assault-Style Firearms"**  
**Roster**

The third matter on the agenda was to discuss the sub-committee's work on the prohibited "assault style firearms" roster. There has been no further work by the sub-committee regarding this roster since the last full board meeting as the sub-committee was waiting for the designation of a new representative from the Attorney General's Office. Chairperson Dunne asked Attorney Pearly to be part of the sub-committee and Attorney Pearly accepted. Judge Fabbri provided Attorney Pearly with an overview of the "assault-style firearms" roster and explained that M.G.L. c. 140, § 131M and § 131 ¾ require the creation of an "assault-style" firearms roster. Chief Glidden added that the sub-committee is working on preliminary language for the roster as opposed to compiling a list of firearms to be added to the roster. Judge Fabbri suggested that Attorney Pearly review the most recent draft of the roster, and the sub-committee will convene a meeting. Attorney Melander stated that the current draft is a good start, but there is still some more refining that needs to be done.

### Discussion Concerning Updating Laboratory Testing Forms

The fourth matter on the agenda was to discuss updating laboratory testing forms. Chairperson Dunne explained to the Board that DCJIS is working with a vendor to create a case management system. As part of that system, the vendor is developing a series of web-based forms, including a form for the submission of laboratory testing reports. This form will allow labs to submit test reports to DCJIS through the case management system. The forms will make submissions more uniform. Judge Fabbri asked if a testing form should be created for the "assault-style firearm" roster. He noted that per the M.G.L. c. 140, § 131 ¾ a person may file a petition to the Board seeking inclusion of a firearm on the roster. The Judge anticipates that an individual may also file a petition requesting that the Board not include a particular firearm on the roster. Judge Fabbri indicated that the form could include the current eight "assault-style firearms" that will be included on the roster and define what qualifies as a prohibited assault-style firearm. Chief Glidden explained that during his time with the former GCAB he only recalls one occasion on which a citizen petitioned the Board regarding a roster. In that instance, the person sought to add a firearm to the target roster. The petitioner did not file any paperwork. He simply showed up to the Board meeting and made his request.

### Review and Approval of Test Reports for Handgun Roster Additions

The fifth matter on the agenda was to review and approve test reports for handgun roster additions. Before any voting began, Chief Glidden provided an overview to Attorney Pearly regarding the approval of firearms for the roster. Chief Glidden explained that if a firearm is tested by a state approved laboratory and certified to satisfy certain conditions, the firearm satisfies the M.G.L. c. 140, § 123 restrictions. For testing, the manufacturer sends five samples of the handgun to the lab. The lab conducts the necessary tests, completes laboratory testing forms, and submits the testing results to the Board for approval. The role of the Board is not to second guess the testing results, but rather to make sure that the paperwork from the lab is complete. Chief Glidden further explained that as an alternative to testing, labs may designate a particular firearm to be a Functional

Design Equivalent. Functional Design Equivalents are submitted to the lab. However, testing is not required. Instead, with respect to Functional Design Equivalents, the lab will be asked to confirm that the submitted firearm is substantially the same as another firearm already tested and approved for inclusion on the roster. Functional Design Equivalents are those firearms that have the same main components, which are another roster firearm. However, the model number is different because there is a design change, such as color. If the Board approves either a newly tested firearm or a Functional Design Equivalent, they will be added to the roster. Sometimes the Board may receive requests for inclusion of a firearm on the target shooting roster. Such submissions must include documentation, amongst other requirements, that the firearm was designed and marketed exclusively for target shooting competitions.

The first test report detailed testing of the Ruger, MARKIV 22/45 LITE, .22 caliber. The report was submitted by Element U.S. Space and Defense. Chairperson Dunne asked if Board members had comments regarding this firearm. Judge Fabbri questioned one of the tests, in which three handguns were used instead of five. It was discussed that while five handguns are required for the drop test, other tests do not require testing of five firearms. Mr. Wallace made a motion to accept the test report. Chief Glidden seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

The second test report was for testing of the HS Produkt/Springfield Armory, Hellcat Pro Compact OSP Pistol Black/Low Capacity, 9mm. The report was submitted by Element U.S. Space and Defense. Chief Glidden asked how this specific firearm was going to be listed on the roster. Chairperson Dunne said that she would reach out to Element and ask how they would like the firearm listed on the roster. Judge Fabbri noticed that this firearm was referred to as "low capacity." Chief Glidden clarified that some companies use terminology specifically for Massachusetts to make it abundantly clear that the firearms are not high capacity. Mr. Wallace mentioned that the manufacturer did not check off what would be sold to the public. Chief Glidden stated that since this firearm was submitted by an importer, that box wouldn't be checked off. Trooper Call made a motion to accept this test report. The motion was seconded by Judge Fabbri. The motion carried unanimously. (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

The next vote was regarding the Sig Sauer, 365XCA-9-BXR3-MA-MA, 9mm. The testing report was submitted by Element U.S. Space and Defense. There was no discussion by the Board about this firearm. Mr. Wallace made a motion to accept the test report. Trooper Call seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

The final test report submitted by Element U.S. Space and Defense was submitted later than the other reports and can be found under item number eight of the agenda. This report pertains to the Taurus, GX2 CA, 9mm. There was no discussion by the Board about this firearm. Mr. Wallace made a motion to accept the test report. Trooper Call seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

The final test report was submitted by Professional Analysis & Consulting, Inc. The report outlined testing of the Smith and Wesson, 36 Classic-14076. Mr. Wallace asked if there was an issue related to the barrel length of this firearm or if that issue was resolved by the barrel/cylinder calculation.

Chief Glidden responded that according to the law, if the barrel is under two inches, an accuracy test must be administered. However, the cylinder is included in the calculation of barrel length. Thus, if the barrel plus the cylinder is over two inches, an accuracy test does not need to be administered. Mr. Wallace made a motion to accept this test report. Judge Fabbri seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

### Review and Approval for Addition to Formal Target Shooting Roster

The sixth matter on the agenda was to review and approve a petition for addition to the formal target shooting roster. The firearm submitted for consideration the Ruger SR1911, SKU 06766, 9mm. Mr. Wallace advised that he looked online and didn't see anything suggesting that this firearm was marketed for use outside of the target shooting arena. Chief Glidden noticed that the petition packet did not include a checklist. Chairperson Dunne indicated that the information typically found in the checklist was located in the included affidavit. Chief Glidden explained that the checklist identified a list of criteria. For inclusion on the roster, the firearm must satisfy four or more of those criteria. Chairperson Dunne and Chief Glidden compared the affidavit to the criteria listed in the statute and determined that the requirements of the statute were satisfied. Mr. Wallace made a motion to accept the test report. Trooper Call seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

### Discussion of Future Meeting Dates

The seventh matter on the agenda was to discuss future meeting dates. The Board agreed that the next full Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 25, at 10 a.m. in Chelsea, Massachusetts. The Board selected Wednesday, July 23, at 10 a.m. as the date and time for the subsequent Board meeting.

### Discussion of Items Not Reasonably Anticipated Prior to Posting the Agenda

The final item on the agenda was to discuss items that could not reasonably be anticipated in advance of the meeting. Please refer to above re: the approval of Taurus, GX2 CA, 9mm. The testing report for this firearm was the only item that could not reasonably be anticipated in advance of the meeting.

### Member Comments

Mr. Wallace mentioned that he is waiting for an official announcement regarding the long gun roster and would like something in writing from the Secretary of EOPPS. Attorney Melander

indicated that he will confer with the Secretary and that additional information, likely to include a cover letter and the memorandum prepared by the board and adopted by the Secretary, would be forthcoming. Chairperson Dunne stated that that information could be posted on the DCJIS website.

The next topic Mr. Wallace raised was the new firearms law as it impacts non-residents and hunting licenses. Mr. Wallace mentioned that the law is not completely clear as to whether nonresidents need a license to bring any firearm to the state of Massachusetts. Attorney Melander thought this issue was resolved in guidance from the Massachusetts Fisheries and Wildlife Division. Chief Glidden stated that non-resident hunting licenses from another state should be acceptable because most states have similar hunting licensing laws to Massachusetts. Mr. Wallace disagreed. He suggested that other state hunting license laws do not mirror the Massachusetts state hunting licensing law. Judge Fabbri mentioned that the Colonel of the Massachusetts State Police must determine if hunting laws and regulations of other states are similar to ours. Chief Glidden reviewed the Massachusetts statute and stated that if a non-resident has a hunting license from Massachusetts, they are good to go. Chief Glidden also noted that the statute states that individuals must have a non-resident hunting license “or” a hunting license from a state with substantially similar requirements. Mr. Wallace then questioned the ability for target shooting competition participants to come to Massachusetts for competitions. Chief Glidden explained that there is an exemption under M.G.L. c. 140, §129C stating that an individual can bring a rifle and/or shotgun into Massachusetts to go to the shooting range, and the exemption also allows that person to travel to the range with those weapons. However, a person cannot bring handguns and semi-automatic firearms into Massachusetts. Attorney Melander stated that he can include additional information about this topic in future guidance. However, in the meantime, we need to use our best interpretation of the law. Mr. Wallace asked the Board whether someone who purchases a Massachusetts non-resident hunting license is notified by the dealer that they are not permitted to bring semi-automatics or large-capacity firearms into Massachusetts. Chief Glidden stated that dealers do not make such notifications. Mr. Wallace suggested that Massachusetts is selling licenses without providing relevant information about the restriction associated with the license. If purchasers were aware of these restrictions at the time of sale, they may not wish to pursue the hunting license. Because dealers do not provide affirmative notice of the restrictions prior to purchase, nonresidents are left with an undesirable, sometimes unusable, hunting license that cannot be returned. Attorney Melander suggested adding a disclaimer regarding hunting license restrictions on the portal may be helpful.

Mr. Wallace asked Attorney Melander about training requirements. Attorney Melander stated that he is working with the Massachusetts State Police regarding training. The intent is not to reinvent the wheel. The intent is to look at courses that already exist and add information covering the topics required by the law. Mr. Wallace also inquired about the live fire report. Attorney Melander stated that the goal is to get pen to paper sometime in the next week as there is a report deadline of July 1<sup>st</sup>. The plan is to hold two public hearings in the next couple of months. Judge Fabbri indicated that he did some research and found out that 75-80% of firearms safety instructors/courses already require live fire as a component of the course. Mr. Wallace asked how hunting education would fall into this category. Chief Glidden informed Mr. Wallace that a person

can either elect to complete the hunter education course or a basic firearms safety course in order to satisfy the requirements to obtain an FID card.

Judge Fabbri inquired about the status of the Colonel of the Massachusetts State Police assessing which states have similar hunting statutes to Massachusetts. Attorney Melander stated that he will be working with the state police to develop the list. Judge Fabbri also inquired about the written test requirements for training. Attorney Melander stated that first they will focus on modifying approved courses so that they cover the new curriculum areas required by the law. Then they will work on ensuring that written exams will cover those new topics. Chief Glidden asked whether the authors of currently approved safety courses will be notified by MSP that their course curriculum will require modification and if those authors will be provided with the curriculum for those additional topics or if the authors will be responsible for developing new curriculum. Per Attorney Melander, this is yet to be determined.

Chief Glidden brought up continuing issues with respect to retired law enforcement members who are basic safety course instructors. Such instructors have applied for, and been denied, renewal of their instructor certification because they do not have an active instructor certification from the MPTC. Once an officer retires, they are unable to be recertified by MPTC. As such, by requiring active instructor certification by MPTC, retired officers are essentially ineligible to maintain firearms instructor certification. Trooper Call stated that the MSP always had their own standards and firearm instructors who served full-time as firearms instructors for MSP. They are now being told that only MPTC certification will be authorized, which will force members of MSP to attend courses at MPTC to obtain their certification. Judge Fabbri mentioned that the statute seems to give the Colonel of the MSP a lot of discretion regarding safety certification. Chief Glidden stated that pursuant to LEOSA, retired officers need to have ID cards and an LTC, there is case law in some states suggesting that this has been deemed unconstitutional. Attorney Melander stated that a law or regulation could be deemed unconstitutional by a court. Or, if appropriate, an agency could review and amend a regulation in light of a court ruling. Mr. Wallace asked if, presently, courses that do not incorporate the new requirements will continue to issue certifications. The answer was yes, with the NRA provided as an example.

Judge Fabbri's last comment was that Attorney Pearly should touch base with Attorney Mingo to discuss the sub-committee's work regarding the "assault-style" firearms roster.

## Public Comments

No members of the public were in attendance.

Judge Fabbri made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Trooper Call seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0; Attorney Pearly abstained from voting).

The Board Meeting adjourned 11:50 a.m.