



MN Gun Owners Law Center - SF3572

Chair and Members of the Senate Judiciary and Public Safety Committee:

On behalf of the Minnesota Gun Owners Law Center, I write to express concern with SF 3572. Our concern is legal as much as practical: the bill adds uncertainty to a criminal statute that already carries serious penalties, including felony exposure for possession on school property.

The bill expands the definition of “school property” to include “that portion of a building or facility” hosting a Minnesota State High School League event, so long as signs are posted at each entrance. That sounds precise until applied in the real world. Many facilities are jointly used. An ice arena, fieldhouse, or athletic complex may host an MSHSL event in one portion of the building while the rest remains open to the public for unrelated uses. The bill does not clearly answer whether only event attendees are covered, whether only the leased or controlled portion is covered, or whether all persons entering the facility become subject to criminal liability. A criminal law should not depend on a citizen guessing where temporary control begins and ends.

That same ambiguity reaches parking areas. The bill removes the current written-permission provision and the existing exception for unimproved property, while adding a new storage rule requiring an unloaded firearm, locked container, and locked trunk or concealed placement in the vehicle when the person is no longer in an “eligible on-duty status” or participating in the authorized activity. But “eligible on-duty status” is undefined, and the statute gives little guidance for joint-use parking lots serving schools, child care centers, churches, private businesses, and public events. Invisible boundaries and temporary uses are a poor foundation for criminal enforcement.

The bill also creates concern for lawful school activities, including trap shooting teams and supervised marksmanship programs, which may involve transportation, staging, and temporary storage questions not cleanly resolved by the new language.

Removing the written-permission exception is another mistake. Private schools and child care centers often do not have the benefit of School Resource Officers. Some rely on private security personnel who lawfully carry under a permit. Eliminating the ability of the principal or director to authorize possession removes a practical security option, especially for private institutions responsible for their own protection.

For these reasons, SF 3572 should not advance without substantial revision clarifying scope, preserving permission-based security arrangements, and protecting citizens from liability in joint-use facilities and parking areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Doar

President - Minnesota Gun Owners Law Center