

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** john sonin <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 20, 2023 7:41 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs  
**Cc:** Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** Community & Regional Affairs SB 63 testimony

As a 25-year Alaskan resident and vested member of an organized human purpose (that, of "seeking fulfilled happiness" individually, and as a community-state-nation of organic human beings), the un-reasoned, delinquent, literally insane hypocrisy of Senate Bill 63 simply emboldens the dereliction of promoted duty by its sponsors, as many candidates lack virtue in their promotion - deceived in the belief monetized power is the end-all in life - to sponsor such waste. "Waste" of what little precious time and resources with which the divine 'Reason-for-All' has endowed us, and "waste" of that for which our Constitutions assures each so alleged!

Anyone who anticipates a crisis of State, or National emergency as the proper time to procure a sidearm is also duped into believing the commercial economy and its synergistic wealth will still sustain product availability?! If the economy remains functioning, the mission and reason for our State and Federal Constitutions are as valid as the Oath we bore/swore to protect, and it is the duty of that Oath that we commoners, and those promoted to govern us, insure the peace (and tranquility!) of society, unless insurgency be the intent?!

Would not, in this case, suppose SB 63 a Constitutional revocation? ... as well as a vehicle to codify criminality?

John Sonin  
[REDACTED]

Douglas, AK 99824  
[REDACTED]

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Emily Kane [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 19, 2023 9:08 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** Oppose SB 63

Civilian access to lethal weapons is one of America's most noxious problems. Yes we need to improve access to mental health professionals also, but why should a teenage boy ever, ever be granted access to machine guns? Especially during a natural

Disaster which would be extra chaotic. It makes no sense.

Kill SB 63 right now.

Sincerely

Dr Emily Kane

Juneau

[REDACTED]  
[www.naturopathic.org](http://www.naturopathic.org)

Be good to yourself :)

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Frank Rue [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2023 9:18 AM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Senator.Jesse.Bjorkman@akleg.gov; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Cathy Giessel; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Donny Olson  
**Subject:** SB63 Testimony

My name is Frank Rue, I live at [REDACTED]. I have lived in Alaska since 1977. I am a gun owner, hunter, and former Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). During my tenure as Commissioner of ADF&G two indoor shooting ranges, one in Fairbanks and one in Juneau, were completed. I say this only to stress that I support shooting sports, hunting, hunter safety, hunter education and the safe responsible use of firearms.

I do not support Senate Bill 63 for the following reasons.

Senate Bill 63 appears to be a solution in search of a problem. Have there been instances of Alaska Governors, Alaska state agencies or municipalities forbidding the possession, use, or transfer of a firearm, firearm accessory, other weapons during a declared disaster emergency? Has there been confiscation or seizure of firearms during a declared disaster emergency in Alaska? Have sales of firearms been restricted during an Alaskan disaster?

If Alaskans are currently forbidden by the state or municipal governments to possess firearms, ammunition, or other weapons in a school, for example, will this law override that statute or policy? And could anyone allowed to own a gun or other weapon then be allowed to bring loaded guns to a school during a disaster emergency declaration?

There is nothing in SB63 that lays out the purpose for prohibiting the Governor, state agencies or municipalities from taking the actions listed in Sec.44.99.510(a) (1-4) during a declared disaster emergency under AS 26.23.020. The Governor is given extraordinary powers under a disaster emergency declaration. Powers to, among other things, relocate all or some of the people from a stricken area; prescribe where people can and cannot travel; commandeer private property subject to compensation; change the duties of state agencies.... etc. But under this bill, even in the extraordinary circumstance of a disaster emergency declaration, the possession, use and transfer of firearms or other weapons, plus all the other actions in Sec.44.99.510(a) (1-4) would be out of the reach of the Governor, state agencies and municipalities. What is the purpose for drawing a line between a disaster emergency and non-disaster emergency times?

In normal times the legislature, governor, state agencies and municipalities have prohibited the possession or use of firearms in, for example: the capitol building; public schools; state offices; assembly chambers; public hospitals, or public shelters. Under SB63 during a disaster emergency they could not prohibit any of this (except the legislature). My question is: without any legislative Purpose/Intent as to why there is a difference between a disaster emergency and any other time, won't all of the prohibitions of Sec.44.99.510(a) (1-4), ipso facto, (inevitably) apply all of the time?

If the answer to my question is yes, then it will inevitably be illegal to restrict people legally allowed to own guns and weapons to take guns, ammunition and other weapons to schools, legislative buildings, and other public spaces whether there is a disaster emergency or not.

Finally, every disaster emergency will be different and the impacts felt most severely in the area of the disaster emergency. Local people will, with the help of state agencies, be best situated to determine what response is needed. I do not think it is in the best interest of Alaskans to tie their own hands as they deal with a disaster. Furthermore, a Governor's disaster declaration has a term of 30 days, unless the legislature extends it. The Legislature can address unacceptable overreach by the state or local government when it authorizes an extension.

Thank you for considering my comments.

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Victoria OConnell Curran <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 22, 2023 4:43 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Cc:** Sen. Bert Stedman; Rep.Rebecca.Himshoot@akleg.gov  
**Subject:** Oppose SB63

### Oppose Senate Bill 63, Limitations on Firearms Restrictions

Dear Committee Members:

My husband and I own 14 guns. We hunt to provide food for our family. We believe in common sense gun laws and we are opposed to Senate Bill 63. This law does not make Alaskans safer during a disaster and likely would have the opposite effect. As we read it is a narrowing of existing Alaska law and would allow individuals or special interest groups to act as the legal enforcers of this state law, through civil suit. It is ridiculous to mandate that a prevailing plaintiff would be due punitive damages of a minimum of three times their actual attorneys' fees, plus repayment of court and attorney fees. This bill seems to prevent common sense steps to provide for public safety and ensure the peace during a disaster We have much more pressing issues to address in our state, drop this please.

Please oppose SB63

Victoria OConnell Curran  
Sitka, Alaska

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Shonti Elder [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 22, 2023 2:49 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs

As a forty-five year resident of Alaska, I'm very much against SB 63. This bill is completely unnecessary, and actually harmful to public safety.

If there is a community disaster, such as an earthquake, tsunami, flooding etc., government needs to focus on public order and safety. Community leaders need to be able to take quick action to protect order and safety.

For example, it could be important to limit use of firearms in certain areas to ensure safety in public shelters, or to prevent firearms from being stolen from a gunshop or armory that has sustained damage.

Even more unnecessary is setting up groups to act as legal enforcers of state law and mandating that a prevailing plaintiff would be due three times the actual attorney's fees. This wording actually invites people to go to court over emergency declarations at a time when focus should be on safety and emergency response.

The bill does not in any way make Alaska safer during a disaster. Please don't add another layer of confusing law in the way of emergency situations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shonti Elder

[REDACTED]  
Wasilla, AK 99654

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Sue Libenson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2023 9:04 AM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** SB 63

Really? With a huge, looming deficit, you have nothing better to do than bring back this useless, false flag bill?

We have plenty of emergencies in Alaska and the last worry for anyone who actually responds is whether there is some issue with gun restriction. Those of us who have responded to floods, fires, oil spills, and fatal landslides are actually too busy getting people out of harm's way and making sure people have food and shelter.

If you want to worry about a gun emergency, then why not take on gun suicide where Alaska ranks at the top of the list? A real emergency gun issue is the local, often volunteer responder who is first on the scene to a suicide by firearm and then has to clean up the mess. How about some action on safe gun storage which is proven to slow down the suicide impulse? Maybe save some lives and reduce trauma for responders.

Thanks.

Sue Libenson  
[REDACTED]  
Haines, AK 99827

--  
[REDACTED]

**Alliana Salanguit**

---

**From:** Luann McVey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2023 8:18 AM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** Public Testimony SB 63

Chair Dunbar, Vice Chair Olson, Senator Gray-Jackson, Senator Bjorkman, and Senator Giessel,

I am testifying as a volunteer with the Alaska Chapter of Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense. I am opposed to SB 63 and strongly urge you to not to allow this unnecessary and potentially harmful bill to pass out of your committee. I cannot for the life of me understand the reasoning behind prohibiting the governor, a state agency, or a municipality from taking action(s) during a declared disaster emergency that would restrict the possession, use or sale of a firearm, a firearm accessory, ammunition or other weapon -- including not allowing the temporary closure of gun stores or gun ranges during a declared disaster.

During a disaster emergency, emotions tend to run hot and our leaders might find it necessary to restrict gun use or sales, in order to limit the chaos that can erupt when angry people have easy access to firearms. I believe in the ability of our elected leaders to decide when such limits are necessary.

Please do not take away a tool that could be used for constructive purposes, to disarm those who might cause harm to others. Guns are not the answer to human strife, especially during a declared disaster emergency. I hope you will prevent this bill from passing out of your committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Luann McVey, Retired Alaskan Teacher

[REDACTED]

Douglas, Alaska. 99824



## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Janice Caulfield [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] 59 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** OPPOSE Senate Bill 63

Dear Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee members,

I am 44 year resident of Juneau AK, my family owns a gun used for hunting, and I oppose SB 63. When there is a disaster, the State of Alaska and local municipalities need to have access to a wide range of tools to protect public and community safety. It is irresponsible to limit the actions that the governor, a state agency, or a municipality can take to protect us during a declared disaster, especially when each disaster situation is unique and it is impossible to predict what steps will be necessary to protect public safety and maintain order.

We give leaders special powers in disaster situations because they must be able to move quickly and take decisive actions to protect public health and safety. For example, it could be important to limit possession or use of firearms to ensure safety in public shelters managed by the military, a government agency or the Red Cross. This bill seems to prevent law enforcement from taking these common sense steps to provide for public safety and ensure the peace.

Providing the right for individuals and “membership organizations” to sue a state or local government or official under this law and collect triple punitive damages is particularly objectionable. Government officials will be dissuaded from taking actions that would protect people and communities in a timely manner, if they are concerned about subsequent specious and expensive lawsuits.

Why is the legislature spending time considering this bill — but ignoring the facts that: (1) firearms are the leading cause of death of children and teens in Alaska (59% of these child/teen deaths are gun suicides), and (2) our state has the second highest rate of gun deaths in the nation (68% are suicides)? I urge you instead to spend time considering adopting sensible tools, such as a secure storage law, that would reduce gun suicides and save lives in Alaska.

SB 63 would do nothing to keep Alaskans safer in a disaster. Please do not pass this bill out of committee.

Thank you,

Jan Caulfield  
Juneau, Alaska

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Marian Clough [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 22, 2023 3:47 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs  
**Cc:** Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** Oppose SB 63

### Written Testimony for Thursday, February 23, 2023 Alaska State Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee

Dear Honorable Members of the Alaska Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee:

I am Marian Clough of Auke Bay, Alaska and have resided in Alaska for the last 40 years as of this month. I am a mom (with children in Fairbanks, Anchorage and Juneau), a grandma, and a gun owner. I support citizens' rights to bear arms. However, I am asking you not to support passage of SB 63 for the simple reasons that it does not make sense and invites needless expensive and distracting legal battles.

One of the fundamental responsibilities of government is to protect and provide for citizens in the event of a disaster. The proposed legislation does not appear to have any rational relationship to that goal. It would **mandate** firearm stores and firearm ranges be allowed to remain open in any type of declared disaster emergency. What the bill does not do is offer any justification as to how this mandate serves to advance the state's mission of disaster relief.

Alaska's statutes at AS 26.23.900 (2) define "disaster" as "the occurrence or imminent threat of widespread or severe damage, injury, loss of life or property, or shortage of food, water, or fuel resulting from" followed by a long list of recognized disaster scenarios. Many of those are articulated in sub-paragraph (A) as follows:

(A) an incident such as storm, high water, wind-driven water, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, avalanche, snowstorm, prolonged extreme cold, drought, fire, flood, epidemic, explosion, or riot;

I think it is worth noting that over time Alaska has suffered every one of those disasters, most of them on many occasions. So this is a very real issue we are addressing.

Can anyone seriously argue that gun stores and gun ranges must be allowed to remain open – under any and all circumstances - as part of a tsunami relief effort? How does guaranteeing that firearm stores and ranges may remain open help dealing with fires, landslides, floods, or volcanic eruptions? This does not appear to be rational. To make matters worse, it is also too easy to envision scenarios where SB 63's proposed mandate could demonstrably impair the government's ability to protect its citizens in the event of a disaster. For example, the Anchorage Daily News published an article on October 2, 2021, describing a deplorable incident in Alaska history where a riotous armed mob in Juneau rounded up scores of Chinese residents and forcibly evicted them from town without any notice, without their property and in fear of their very lives. Do the sponsors of SB 63 believe that in such a situation our laws should guarantee that gun stores remain open making additional arms and ammunition available to the rioters?

SB 63 would mandate that – unlike every other type of profession, business or social club – gun shops and gun ranges must be allowed to remain open.

It makes no sense.

Remember, there is nothing in current Alaska law that requires gun shops to close every time an emergency is declared. As far as I know this is a non-existent problem that has never occurred in our state's history. Aren't there far more pressing – and real – issues for you to focus your efforts upon?

Finally I want to address subparagraph (c) of SB 63 (page 2, starting at line 13) which allows civil action by an individual or by two or more individuals in a membership organization to bring suit if adversely affected. This is another example of a disturbing new trend of allowing any politically motivated individual or interest group to act as the legal enforcers of state laws. It is made even more egregious by mandating that *at a minimum* a prevailing plaintiff would recover punitive damages in the amount of three times their actual attorneys' fees. Is this how the Alaska Legislature believes state laws should be enforced? If so, shouldn't we have similar statutes mandating triple attorneys' fees for groups who feel their interest is being adversely affected by some governmental action? Or, mandate triple attorneys' fees for anyone or any interest group who feels they are adversely affected by official misconduct such as ethics violations? Where does it all end?

Please ensure that our state or municipal agencies have the ability to respond to disasters unencumbered by the political agendas of interest groups. I respectfully request you not pass SB 63.

Thank you.

Marian Clough

## Alliana Salangit

---

**From:** Annette Marley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 21, 2023 6:47 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** Oppose SB 63  
**Attachments:** Opposed to SB 63.docx

Please find the following attached letter requesting you to oppose this bill that robs policymakers of the right and responsibility to protect Alaskans and keep them safe.

2/21/23

Subject: Vote against SB63

Dear Legislators:

I find it baffling that the substance of SB 63 is raising its head again this session. It simply does not make sense to tie the hands of government about operations of certain businesses and possession of firearms during some unknown future disaster. Policy makers at the state and local levels should continue to have full authority to make decisions based on the particular, unpredictable circumstances of a future disaster.

We own a gun, and I have family members who use guns regularly. However, this is clearly a bill that seeks to tie the hands of policymakers, shutting down their freedom and responsibility to potentially to take appropriate actions during a rare and emergent time. SB 63 seems like a carte blanche for the gun industry to keep selling guns no matter the circumstances, even if, for whatever unforeseen reason, it is contrary to the best interest of the public or public health.

Please vote against this obvious form of preemption.

Sincerely,

Annette Marley, MPH

[REDACTED]

Anchorage, AK 99504

[REDACTED]

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Laura Fleming [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 21, 2023 2:58 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson  
**Cc:** Senator.Elvi.Gray-Jackson@ak.leg.gov; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** SB 63, Limitations on Firearms Restrictions

Dear Chairman Dunbar and Vice-Chairman Olson:

Thank you for scheduling a hearing on SB 63, Limitations on Firearms Restrictions, sponsored by Senator Scott Kawasaki and co-sponsored by several other senators including Senate C&RA Committee member Sen. Bjorkman. I appreciate the opportunity to offer brief written testimony on this proposal.

I share with many long-time Alaskans a strong support for the U.S. Constitution and the Alaska Constitution, and also share with many Alaskans across our great state the commitment to responsible use and storage of firearms. Our Alaska Constitution is well crafted, and vests strong authority in the executive, giving our Governor strong authority. One of my objections to this proposed legislation is that it seeks to undermine the Governor's authority, and for the flimsiest of reasons. The Governor should not have limitations of this kind put on his or her ability to ensure public safety and maintain the peace during a state of emergency or natural disaster. In fact, this bill would not only limit the Governor, but also state and municipal government agencies and officials, potentially inhibiting their abilities to support disaster response and protect public safety in the process.

I find particularly repugnant the provisions to make it possible for an "injured party" (which at first blush looks like it could include any organization from anywhere with two or more members that is gung-ho about promoting firearms) to be granted standing to file civil suits against the state, and recover punitive damages. Surely only actual individuals and/or businesses in Alaska that would have been affected should be granted such standing, and then only for actual damages.

I hope that the Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee will consider its obligations to the Senate and the public to have been discharged by holding this single hearing and that the bill is allowed to move no further. Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Fleming  
Juneau, Alaska

## Alliana Salanguit

---

**From:** Ann Gifford [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 21, 2023 2:50 PM  
**To:** Senate Community and Regional Affairs; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Cathy Giessel  
**Subject:** Opposition to SB 63

Dear Senate Community and Regional Affairs Committee members,

I am a retired attorney and long-time resident of Juneau AK. I'm opposed to SB 63 because it would tie the hands of our governor and local officials when they most need flexibility to respond to catastrophes. When there is an earthquake, flood or fire governments often need to restrict access to specific areas or impose curfews to protect safety and prevent theft. First responders need to set up shelters, field hospitals and soup kitchens. Limiting the carrying or use of firearms in those times and places can be an important tool to protect public safety and maintain order. I think if we were to prohibit our leaders from using that tool we would come to regret it later.

I'm also concerned about giving favored status to commercial enterprises like gun shops and shooting ranges. I understand that this bill was prompted by complaints that these businesses were not considered "essential" and were subject to temporary closure at the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. The types of services that are considered essential can vary depending on the nature of an emergency and even on the nature of a particular pandemic. I can't fault our leaders for closing most shops and services to try to contain the spread of Covid 19, especially in the early days when we didn't know exactly how it was transmitted. Car and boat dealers didn't make the list of essential businesses, nor did health clubs. Why should a gun shop get favored status over a car or boat dealer? Why should a shooting range get preference over a health club? Please don't make decisions driven by economic protectionism.

Finally, I object to giving "a membership organization...dedicated...to the protection of the rights of persons who possess or use firearms..." special status as a "person" entitled to sue under this proposed law and to collect treble punitive damages if they're successful. This is a particularly offensive form of economic protectionism for the NRA and similar gun rights organizations. It would encourage needless litigation and the wasteful use of state funds to defend litigation where no actual person has been harmed and is motivated to sue.

SB 63 would do nothing to promote the public interest. Please do not approve this bill.

Thank you for your service to our State. Sincerely, Ann Gifford

--  
Ann Gifford  
Juneau, Alaska  
[REDACTED]