

Doniece Gott

From: Carrie McGee <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Carrie in Fairbanks: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Carrie McGee
PO Box 84362
Fairbanks, AK
clmcgee@alaska.edu

Doniece Gott

From: Shoshanah Stone <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:29 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Shoshanah in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Shoshanah Stone
1705 Morningtide Ct
Anchorage, AK
shanah.stone@gci.net

Doniece Gott

From: Lawrence A Johnson <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Lawrence in Fairbanks: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Lawrence A Johnson
2194 Nottingham Dr
Fairbanks, AK
aklarryak@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Gregory Sorenson <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Gregory in Hope: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Gregory Sorenson
64191 Ferrin Drive
Hope, AK
johnny@truesecretogolf.com

Doniece Gott

From: Elliott Barske <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Elliott in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Elliott Barske
4821 Pavalof St
Anchorage, AK
ewxman@gci.net

Doniece Gott

From: John S. S. Sonin <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:39 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: John S. in Juneau: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

John S. S. Sonin
329 Fifth Street, #1
Juneau, AK
sojohn61@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Normand Dupre <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:01 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Normand in Ketchikan: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Normand Dupre
158 Thomas St
Ketchikan, AK
nedupre@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Joan Franz <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:22 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Joan in Faurbanks: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Joan Franz
1569 Northfield Road
Faurbanks, AK
joanbf Franz@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Rawn Fletcher <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:30 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Rawn in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Rawn Fletcher
2069 Eastridge Drive
Anchorage, AK
fletchdawg@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Carlton Russell <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Carlton in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Carlton Russell
5017 Garland Cir
Anchorage, AK
carlanc60@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Sharyle Bell <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:44 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Sharyle in Juneau: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Sharyle Bell
5010 N. Douglas #30
Juneau, AK
bell5429@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: J P FitzSimons <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:57 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: J P in Fairbanks: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

J P FitzSimons
1320 Conrad St
Fairbanks, AK
jpfitzs@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Kathleen Holman <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:59 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Kathleen in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Kathleen Holman
8740 Spendlove Dr
Anchorage, AK
kathy.holman74@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Dixie Belcher <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 12:00 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Dixie in Juneau: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Dixie Belcher
1991 Hughes Way
Juneau, AK
dixiebelcher@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Brooke Dudley <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 12:21 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Brooke in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Brooke Dudley
3000 McCollicie ave
Anchorage, AK
brookemaury@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: David Kreiss-Tomkins <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 12:25 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: David in Sitka: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

David Kreiss-Tomkins
313 Islander Dr.
Sitka, AK
d_kreiss-tomkins@riseup.net

Doniece Gott

From: Mary Scheie <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 12:58 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Mary in Wasilla: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Mary Scheie
7690 W Vecera Drive
Wasilla, AK
scheie@gci.net

Doniece Gott

From: Gael Irvine <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 12:58 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Gael in Palmer: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Gael Irvine
8220 E Edgerton-Parks Rd
Palmer, AK
gaellirv@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: David Hribar <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 1:41 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: David in Palmer: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

David Hribar
P.O.Box 737
Palmer, AK
dhribar@provak.org

Doniece Gott

From: Sandra Ryan <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 2:19 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Sandra in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Sandra Ryan
200 W 34th Ave #122
Anchorage, AK
sc07ryan@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Thomas Gregg <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 2:24 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Thomas in Craig: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Thomas Gregg
POB 1272
Craig, AK
tom.gregg53@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Marilyn Gardner <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Marilyn in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Marilyn Gardner
223 6 Alder Drive
Anchorage, AK
anmmgardner@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Becky Chan <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 3:01 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Becky in Anchorage: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Becky Chan
11721 Spyglass Cir.,
Anchorage, AK
beckymychan@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Lin Davis <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 3:31 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Lin in Juneau: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Lin Davis
3099 Nowell
Juneau, AK
molin@gci.net

Doniece Gott

From: Garry Utermohle <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 4:38 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Garry in Fairbanks: Guns on campus is a dangerous and expensive choice for Alaska

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB 174.

This bill would force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus -- even though the vast majority of campus police chiefs, college presidents, students and faculty oppose it. If passed, Alaska will be one of the few states in the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why:

Colleges have traditionally prohibited guns on campus and have been relatively safe from gun violence. But campus life is rife with other dangers -- like binge drinking and increased levels of suicide attempts -- that have devastating consequences when mixed with guns.

Not to mention, these policies come with expensive costs for increased security and insurance. In 2014, Idaho passed a guns on campus law, and as a result, five state schools had to spend over \$3.7 million to increase security in the first year alone. Last year, Texas campus carry legislation was estimated to cost six of the major universities in Texas \$59 million over six years. In Arizona, the state Board of Regents estimated that allowing guns on its three campuses would cost \$13.3 million in one-time expenses and \$3.1 million in annual operating costs.

Allowing guns on campus is a dangerous choice and an expensive one for Alaska. **It's for all of the above reasons that I respectfully urge you to vote NO on SB 174.**

Thank you,

Garry Utermohle
1479 Farmers Loop Rd.
Fairbanks, AK
garry_u@hotmail.com