

Doniece Gott

From: Kristin Schroder <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 9:38 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Kristin 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,

Kristin Schroder
2001 Milky Way Rd
Fairbanks, AK
kristin.schroder@colorado.edu

Doniece Gott

From: mary edwsrds <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 6:28 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: mary 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,

mary edwsrds
1444 gus grind
Fairbanks, AK
masharasha3@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: William Armbruster <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 6:22 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: William 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,

William Armbruster
1444 Gus' Grind
Fairbanks, AK
wsarmbruster@alaska.edu

Doniece Gott

From: Wendy Arundale <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 4:58 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Wendy 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,

Wendy Arundale
1629 Heather Drive
Fairbanks, AK
wharundale@alaska.edu

Doniece Gott

From: Mark West <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Mark 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,

Mark West
2238 Galatea Drive
Anchorage, AK
westybsa@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Marc Dumas <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 2:09 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Marc 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,

Marc Dumas
1166 Skyline Drive
Fairbanks, AK
skylinep@alaskan.com

Doniece Gott

From: Chelan Schreifels <chelan34@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 5:22 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Finance testimony No SB174

Dear Finance Committee,

I'm writing to urge you to vote NO on SB174.

But before I go any further I want to share with you why SB174 is such an important issue to me.

I know all too well what it's like to fear for your child's life -- which is why I'm fighting back against lawmakers who want to force Alaska's colleges to allow guns on campus. Last October, I got a call that changed my life. The woman on the phone told me she was calling from the hospital -- and that my 19 year old daughter, Caia, had been shot in the head.

Thankfully, my daughter survived and will make a full recovery, minus her left eye. When she was shot, Caia was a student at the University of Alaska -- Anchorage. Miraculously, Caia was able to return to classes just 5 weeks after she was shot. But if there were guns allowed on campus she would not have made that brave decision as her post-traumatic stress and anxiety would have been too great to allow her to return. Campuses should be a safe place for all students and faculty; if SB 174 is passed Caia and I will not feel safe to attend classes and events at the University.

If passed, Alaska will be one of the few state the country with such a dangerous policy, and here's why SB174 should not be passed:

SB174 is a dangerous and expensive choice for our state. This law don't just threaten the safety of students and faculty, they saddle schools with millions of dollars in security and insurance costs. UA has stated that in the first year SB 174 will cost them at least \$1.3 million in additional security fees. Our State and University system can't afford this additional financial burden in this time of fiscal constraint and uncertainty. As our elected officials, you should be improving education, not jeopardizing public safety and making schools pay for it.

If this bill passes, our state will be one of the few the country with such a dangerous law. 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.

Whether it's at a party or in chem lab, guns simply don't belong anywhere on campus except secured in the holster of a trained security guard, which many schools already employ. And the majority of campus police chiefs, students and faculty agree.

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.

Senator Kelly wrote this legislation at the urging of an outside group "Young American's for Liberty"; don't let outside interests push Alaska into passing laws!

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 SB174.

Thank you,

Chelan Schreifels

A concerned citizen, mom and voter

Doniece Gott

From: Ray Cammisa <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 12:47 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Ray in Eagle River: 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,

Ray Cammisa
17615 Lacey Dr
Eagle River, AK
raybird68@hotmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Shari Daugherty <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Shari in Anchor Point: 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,

Shari Daugherty
35979 Old Sterling Hwy
Anchor Point, AK
shari.l.daugherty@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Elisabeth Genaux <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 11:08 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Elisabeth 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,

Elisabeth Genaux
17420 Andreanoff Dr.
Juneau, AK
edgenaux@uas.alaska.edu

Doniece Gott

From: Janet Sutherland <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Janet in Lacey: 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,

Janet Sutherland
3976 Holladay Park Loop SE
Lacey, AK
jsuther@uni-bremen.de

Doniece Gott

From: Cliff Ward <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 9:56 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Cliff in Cordova: 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,

Cliff Ward
204 1st St.
Cordova, AK
cliffw@att.net

Doniece Gott

From: Dru Sorenson <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 9:24 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Dru 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,

Dru Sorenson
99605
Hope, AK
goldy@sourdoughdru.com

Doniece Gott

From: Duffy Armstrong <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Duffy 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,

Duffy Armstrong
1403 Valarian
Anchorage, AK
chromedebris@yahoo.com

Doniece Gott

From: Maureen Knutsen <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 6:15 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Maureen in Naknek: 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,

Maureen Knutsen
PO Box 134
Naknek, AK
maureen.knutsen@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Pete Braun <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 12:07 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Pete in Girdwood: 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,

Pete Braun
351 Hightower
Girdwood, AK
ERA_MetalHeart@icloud.com

Doniece Gott

From: shaun sexton <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 9:26 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: shaun in chugiak: 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,

shaun sexton
25043 schaff drive
chugiak, AK
sesexton@gci.net

Doniece Gott

From: Warren Keogh <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 9:12 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Warren in Chickaloon: 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,

Warren Keogh
P.O. Box 1166
Chickaloon, AK
warrenkeogh@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Charles Cozad <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 7:57 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Charles in Big lake: 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,

Charles Cozad
P.O.Box 521142
Big lake, AK
ccozaad@mtaonline.net

Doniece Gott

From: Michael Glasheen <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 6:26 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Michael in Kodiak: 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,

Michael Glasheen
P.O. Box 8663
Kodiak, AK
glashee2@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Dorothy E. E. Cuadra <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 4:16 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Dorothy E. 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,

Dorothy E. E. Cuadra
P.O. Box 33678
Juneau, AK
cuadra@gci.net