

Doniece Gott

From: mary garrett <mgarrett_2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 12:57 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: SB174

Respectfully consider my request to vote against SB 174. It is the responsible thing to do and is in the best interest of our state and our people. In a state where alcohol and drug issues are so high, we need, rather, to curb the availability of deadly weapons, such as guns, rather than increasing it. I pray that you will give this much thought, then act in the best interest of all Alaskans not just the few.

thank You,
Mary Garrett,
Anchorage

Doniece Gott

From: Cindy Westergaard <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 3:31 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Cindy 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,

Cindy Westergaard
300 Harbor Drive
Sitka, AK
Cindy.kw@live.com

Doniece Gott

From: Patti Saunders <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 9:56 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Patti 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,

Patti Saunders
3733 Henderson Loop
Anchorage, AK
saunders.patti@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Robert P. Rinehart <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 10:03 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Robert P. 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,

Robert P. Rinehart
9410 Eris Drive
Anchorage, AK
brinehart@gci.net

P. O. Box 957
Homer, Alaska 99603
March 15, 2016

Senator Anna Mackinnon
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Re: SB 174

Dear Senator Mackinnon:

My wife, Cathy and I both strongly oppose SB 174. We are both retired and have 78 years of combined Alaskan residency. Cathy is a retired Kodiak elementary school principal and I am a retired police officer with 24 years of experience in the criminal justice system in both Alaska and Oregon. I hold a Master's Degree in Administration of Criminal Justice. I have lived and worked as a police officer in Arctic bush Alaska and Kodiak, and in Portland, Oregon as a patrolman and a detective.

The March 14th [Alaska Dispatch News](#) Commentary by UAA professor Dan Kline was both a thorough and reasonable argument why SB 174 should not be passed into law. However, he omitted the most salient reason why firearms and knives have no place in a university classroom setting where the focus should be on learning, not fear. There are two kinds of fear present in an armed classroom. The first fear is for personal safety for both students and teaching staff. The second fear is from the perspective of the armed person because their primary thought must be the safety of their weapon and who might try to take it. Both of these fears are counter-productive to learning and teaching and therefore needs to be stopped from becoming law. Alaska does not need SB 174, because it will waste time and money in a legal battle if passed into law. Please vote no on SB 174.

Sincerely,

Mike and Cathy McCarthy

Doniece Gott

From: Sen. Anna MacKinnon
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 9:27 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: FW: Letter in Opposition to SB174
Attachments: SB174 Cindy Moore Letter.docx; Attachment SB174 studies and statistics_Cindy Moore letter.docx

From: Cindy Moore [mailto:moorecindy1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 11:58 PM
To: Sen. Pete Kelly <Sen.Pete.Kelly@akleg.gov>
Cc: Sen. Anna MacKinnon <Sen.Anna.MacKinnon@akleg.gov>; Sen. Peter Micciche <Sen.Peter.Micciche@akleg.gov>; Sen. Click Bishop <Sen.Click.Bishop@akleg.gov>; Sen. Mike Dunleavy <Sen.Mike.Dunleavy@akleg.gov>; Sen. Lyman Hoffman <Sen.Lyman.Hoffman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Donny Olson <Sen.Donny.Olson@akleg.gov>; governor@alaska.gov
Subject: Letter in Opposition to SB174

Dear Senator Kelly,

I have attached my letter of opposition to SB174, along with an attachment to the letter with supporting documentation.

Please distribute this letter to all the members of the Senate Finance Committee and submit it as part of the record of SB174.

Thank you,

Cindy Moore

Attachment: (Attachment SB174 studies and statistics_Cindy Moore letter)

Following are studies and statistics regarding concealed carry of firearms on college campus and why it is bad policy that endangers our young adults:

1) Guns on campus do not stop sexual assaults! A recent study by David Hemenway of Harvard examined data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and found that women, armed with a firearm, almost never successfully fend off a would-be rapist. Of the more than 300 cases of sexual assault in the NCVS data from 2007-11, a firearm did not stop even one from happening. A similar study examining NCVS data from 1992-2001 turned up only one case of defensive gun use out of 1,119 reported sexual assaults in the survey. [The epidemiology of self-defense gun use: Evidence from the National Crime Victimization Surveys 2007-2011](#)

Since concealed carry legislation passed in Colorado, the rate of forcible rape increased by 25 percent in 2012 and 36 percent in 2013. In Utah, campus rape increased nearly 50 percent between 2012 and 2013. By contrast, sexual assaults nationwide have been decreasing each year by approximately 3 percent. These statistics totally refute the idea that 'more good guys with guns' are deterring sexual assaults on campus. [FBI Uniform Crime Statistics and Clergy Act data from 2004-2013](#)

2) Good Guys with guns rarely stop bad guys with guns! An FBI report detailing 160 active shooting incidents from 2000-2013 found that a concealed carry permit holder only stopped one incident, and he happened to be a Marine. (Armed guards, and two more by off-duty police officers stopped four others.) By comparison, *unarmed citizens — good guys without guns, stopped 21 active shooters*. In several cases, when a 'good guy with a gun' has attempted to intervene, he has either been killed, injured, or nearly shot the wrong person. [A Study of Active Shooter Incidents in the United States Between 2000 and 2013](#)

The (NGVAC) study analyzed 77 participants of varying skill levels who went through three different self-defense scenarios. In the first scenario, 7 of the 77 participants shot an innocent bystander, and overall, in scenarios one and two, most of the participants, regardless of skill level, were killed. In the third scenario, where the suspect was not a threat, 23 percent of the participants fired anyway. As the NGVAC study highlights, none of the participants came close to the accuracy or judgment required to stop an active shooter or a criminal. [Does the Quality and Frequency of Training Determine the Realistic Use of Firearms by Citizens for Self Defense? Facts and Evidence for Policy Considerations](#)

In the New York City police department, for example, officers involved in gunfights typically hit their intended targets only 18% of the time, according to a Rand study. When they fired 16 times at an armed man outside the Empire State Building last summer, they hit nine bystanders and left 10 bullet holes in the suspect—a better-than-average hit ratio.

In the case of the 1999 Columbine High School shooting in Colorado, for example, the attacking students were aware that their school had an armed sheriff's deputy in the school parking lot. (The deputy exchanged fire with one of them but missed.) [TIME: Your Brain in a Shootout: Guns, Fear and Flawed Instincts](#)

Chipman, a former SWAT team, said, "The notion that you have a seal of approval just because you're not a criminal — that you walk into a gun store and you're ready for game-day — is ridiculous."

3) What happens in the human brain during a gunfight? And how much training would armed students or teachers need to prevail? "Under sudden attack, the brain does not work the way we think it will.

In life-or-death situations, human beings often lose basic motor skills that we take for granted under normal conditions. In moments of extreme stress, the brain does not allow for contemplation; it does not process new information the way it normally does. The more advanced parts of the brain that handle decision making go off-line, unable to intervene until the immediate fear has diminished.

Do you really believe the gun-toting student will be calm and collected enough to make safe and rational decisions in a split second?

Even highly trained police officers involved in shootings experience a kaleidoscope of sensory distortions including tunnel vision and a loss of hearing. Afterward, they are sometimes surprised to learn that they have fired their weapons at all.

Bill DeWeese, a veteran police officer and head of the National Ranger Training Institute, says the best training includes much more than firing a gun. "I'm an avid firearms person and always have been," he says. "The one thing I've learned is that it's not about possessing firearms. It's about possessing the skills to read a situation—learning how to adapt and maneuver, to respond to an unexpected, fluid situation." [TIME: Your Brain in a Shootout: Guns, Fear and Flawed Instincts](#)

Experts who study human performance in gunfights generally agree that people can train to perform better, but only through ongoing, highly realistic, dynamic simulation training.

4) More guns more suicides! The Brady Report points out; "Most suicides are impulsive actions, with 71 percent of suicide attempts occurring within an hour of the decision to commit the act. This means that even small barriers can help prevent suicides, and prevent them for good: Ninety percent of people who survive an attempt do not try again.

But few people survive a suicide attempt with a firearm. Such attempts are successful more than 85 percent of the time, compared with a success rate of 3 percent or less for overdosing and wrist-cutting, two of the most common suicide attempt methods.

States with the highest firearm ownership rates have the highest firearm suicide rates. The evidence that greater access to guns results in more suicides is nearly unanimous. As we have written previously, every single case study done in the United States has found the presence of a firearm in the home is a strong risk factor for suicide. (That's 24 separate studies)." [More Guns, More Suicides: Why Suicide Prevention Depends on Gun Restriction](#)

As Harvard's Dr. Miller emphasizes, "If every life is important, and if you're trying to save people from dying by gunfire, then you can't ignore nearly two-thirds of the people who are dying."

5) College is extremely safe for students – without guns! "It is useful to remember that the odds of a U.S. student's being killed at school are about 1 in 3 million, lower than the odds of being struck by lightning. Schools are safer now than they have been in 20 years. Kids do become victims of gun violence far too often in the U.S.—but almost always outside school, far from gun-free zones or teachers with pistols." [TIME: Your Brain in a Shootout: Guns, Fear and Flawed Instincts](#)

Doniece Gott

From: Sen. Anna MacKinnon
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 9:27 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: FW: SB174 Amendments-Please make this part of the record

From: Butch Moore [mailto:sushores@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 12:40 AM
To: Sen. Pete Kelly <Sen.Pete.Kelly@akleg.gov>
Cc: Sen. Anna MacKinnon <Sen.Anna.MacKinnon@akleg.gov>; Sen. Peter Micciche <Sen.Peter.Micciche@akleg.gov>; Sen. Click Bishop <Sen.Click.Bishop@akleg.gov>; Sen. Mike Dunleavy <Sen.Mike.Dunleavy@akleg.gov>; Sen. Lyman Hoffman <Sen.Lyman.Hoffman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Donny Olson <Sen.Donny.Olson@akleg.gov>; governor@alaska.gov; Sen. Kevin Meyer <Sen.Kevin.Meyer@akleg.gov>
Subject: SB174 Amendments-Please make this part of the record

Senator Pete Kelly,

For all the reasons that you support SB174, allowing the concealed carry of weapons on UAA Campus's, please amend the document to include language that permits the same for other Alaska locations.

This would include concealed carry of weapons in and on all State of Alaska properties including; offices, parks, open spaces, the Capital, all LIO's, court houses and all public places/areas.

I'm sure you agree, as the below is your language from SB0174B Page 2 Line 18:

"policies adopted or enforced under this paragraph may not abridge the right of the individual guaranteed by art. I, sec. 19, Constitution of the State of Alaska, to bear arms in defense of self or others"

ALL Alaskan's should have this right to bear arms, anywhere in Alaska. Certainly in the Capital and LIO's, not just in schools.

If you believe in the Law you sponsor, you must be willing to be subject to it. How can you sponsor a Law that that applies only to others at their workplace and excludes yourself at yours?

I understand with all the "mass shootings" we have experienced at UAA in the last many years, why you are concerned and want to add more guns to the campuses. WHAT ABOUT MASS SHOOTINGS? Alaska has had very few of them, by a common definition, at least four fatalities carried out by a lone shooter in a brief

period of time, not including himself and not including domestic violence. Alaska has not had a mass shooting **since 1984, 32 years.**

What should concern you is the gun deaths in Alaska that we do have. In 2014, my daughter Bree, 20 years old and a UAA student, was killed, shot in the head by her boyfriend, Josh Almeda age 21. If he had no gun, she would be alive today, Josh told us this.

Alaska leads all 50 states in gun deaths at 145 in 2014, which is more than all transportation-related deaths combined. Suicide 79%, Homicide 14% (Bree was one of them), Accident/other 6%. Alaska also leads the nation in men killing women and in most cases, with a firearm.

Tell me again why SB174 is a good idea???? STOP THIS BILL BEFORE IT LEAVES THE FINANCE COMMITTEE and quit wasting our time on this.

Thank you,

Butch Moore, Bree's Dad

You may find beneficial to your decision making process some facts in the article: Alaska: Gun death capital of the US by Egan Millard March 10, 2016 (link below)

<https://www.adn.com/article/20160310/alaska-gun-death-capital-us>

Doniece Gott

From: Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 7:02 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Nalinaksha 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,

Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya
9010 Rocky Cove Drive
Anchorage, AK
nalinaksha@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Roberta Rinehart <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 6:42 AM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Roberta 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,

Roberta Rinehart
16461 Saint James Cir
Anchorage, AK
Bobi.michael@gmail.com

Doniece Gott

From: Georgiann Crosta <bounce@list.everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 6:34 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee
Subject: Georgiann 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,

Georgiann Crosta
6827 E. Tudor Rd.
Anchorage, AK
ganncrosta@gmail.com