

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Eighth Session  
March 5, 2015**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Ira Hansen at 8 a.m. on Thursday, March 5, 2015, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was also videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada, and to Room 105 of the Great Basin College, 2115 Bobcat Dr., Ely, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015). In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Chairman  
Assemblyman Erven T. Nelson, Vice Chairman  
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz  
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore  
Assemblyman David M. Gardner  
Assemblyman Brent A. Jones  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblywoman Victoria Seaman  
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None



**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Diane Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst  
Lenore Carfora-Nye, Committee Secretary  
Jamie Tierney, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Darrol Brown, representing United Veterans Legislative Council; and  
Carson Area Chapter 388, Vietnam Veterans of America  
Tony Yarbrough, representing Veterans of Foreign Wars  
Vicky Maltman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Steve W. Sanson, President/Director, Veterans In Politics, International,  
Inc.  
Melissa Exline, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Marshall Willick, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Roger Harada, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
John Lott, President, Crime Prevention Research Center  
Chuck Allen, Sheriff, Washoe County  
Amanda Collins, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Lisa M. Thomas, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Alisha Ketter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Sarah Ketter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Vicky Kawelmacher, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Carol Morrell, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Tom Collins, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Catherine Cortez Masto, Executive Vice Chancellor, Nevada System of  
Higher Education  
Frank Slaughter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Nadege Barthelmy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Derek Washington, Chairman, Black Democratic Empowerment Project  
Caden Fabbi, Speaker of the Senate, Associated Students of the  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Todd Renwick, Commander, Police Services, University of Nevada, Reno  
Shannon Ellis, Vice President, Student Services, University of  
Nevada, Reno  
Theresa Davis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

**Chairman Hansen:**

[The roll was called, and Committee protocol was explained.] There are two bills to hear today. Because there is so much interest in Assembly Bill 148, we are going to limit the testimony on Assembly Bill 140. We will stop the hearing on Assembly Bill 140 at 8:30 a.m., which gives the proponents the opportunity to present their case. We will then have another hearing on the bill to provide the opponents the opportunity to testify. I apologize, but as you can see, there is a great deal of interest today in Assembly Bill 148. For that bill, I will allow the bill's sponsor to speak, and then I will allow nine people to speak as proponents of the bill. I will then provide nine slots for the opponents of the bill. As requested by Chancellor Dan Klaich, the opposition will be led by Catherine Cortez Masto. To make sure it is fair to everyone, I will then rotate three proponents and three opponents. We will go on until 11 a.m. today, if necessary, then we will adjourn. We have hundreds of people interested in this bill, and who would like to testify. I only have about two and a half hours to try to reasonably accommodate you. With all of that said, we will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 140.

**Assembly Bill 140: Revises provisions governing certain domestic relations matters involving veterans with a service-connected disability. (BDR 11-519)**

**Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39:**

Thank you for the opportunity to present this bill, which was originally brought forward two years ago. We have brought it back because we think that it has validity, and it is important enough to bring it back. This bill puts us into compliance with the federal code found in *United States Code*, Title 38, Chapter 11. Basically, this bill says that if you are a disabled veteran receiving disability pay, during a divorce proceeding that disability pay may not be used in the calculation of income. Disability pay is not there as an income. This bill does not change the use of retirement pay or any other outside income. The reason is that disability is not an income. Disability is not taxable; it is there to make our veterans whole again. If veterans have returned from overseas with a service-connected disability, they may need this money to build a ramp for a wheelchair or for a special vehicle. It gets them as close to being whole as they can possibly be. What we have seen in the past is that some people in Nevada are taking advantage of this. Some have married veterans and divorced them soon afterwards, and then received a piece of that disability pay. The U.S. Code put a stop to that, and it has been in effect for years. We are just trying to put Nevada into that code. With me today are Troy Yarborough and Darrol Brown from the Disabled American Veterans. They are going to help me present this bill.

**Darrol Brown, representing United Veterans Legislative Council; and  
Carson Area Chapter 388, Vietnam Veterans of America:**

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to support Assembly Bill 140. Our chairman, Caleb Harris, was not available to be here today. He has asked me to sit in his place. I am a member of the United Veterans Legislative Council, and I am the Government Affairs Chair for the Vietnam Veterans of America Nevada State Council.

I am now going to read the testimony of Mr. Caleb Harris ([Exhibit C](#)). Good morning Chairman Hansen and esteemed Committee members. My name is Caleb Harris, and I represent the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) and Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) for the state of Nevada. I am also the chairman of the United Veterans Legislative Council (UVLC). I apologize that I am not able to attend this meeting in person, but I am currently out of the state serving my DAV duties in Washington, D.C.

Despite my absence, I am hopeful that the Committee will take into consideration the veterans and their families that I represent. [Continued reading from written testimony of Caleb Harris ([Exhibit C](#)).]

**Tony Yarbrough, representing Veterans of Foreign War:**

I want to read the actual code from 38 U.S. Code § 5301, which is readily available on the Internet for reference. In subsection (a), paragraph (1) it states "Payments of benefits due or to become due under any law administered by the Secretary shall not be assignable except to the extent specifically authorized by law, and such payments made to, or on account of, a beneficiary shall be exempt from taxation, shall be exempt from the claim of creditors, and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever, either before or after receipt by the beneficiary." Nowhere is there a "specifically authorized by law" statement that allows this compensation to be considered as community property. Nor does Title 38 say that a state judge should have the ability to disperse these monies at his or her discretion, which is the current practice in Nevada in many divorce proceedings. [Continued reading from pages 2 and 3 of the written testimony of Caleb Harris ([Exhibit C](#)).]

**Chairman Hansen:**

Is there anyone else here in Carson City who plans to testify?

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I assume there are quite a few people who will testify in favor, but you may open it up for questions before we leave the table. That is up to you, of course.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Today, the Committee will be limited to one question each. Follow-up questions will not be granted because we want to give the public as much opportunity as possible to participate.

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

I am looking at *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 31.045 which makes it clear that veterans benefits are already exempt from execution. I am wondering about the need for this bill. When you talk about awarding community property, as in the Nevada statute and what is federally referred to in execution, those are separate concepts from awarding alimony. There are several stages in a divorce which consist of awarding different parts of the estate such as child support obligations and alimony. The way I read this bill, it does not speak to community property. It does not speak to execution because under Nevada law, it is already exempt from execution. This would not affect the awarding of community property; it only affects alimony. I am wondering how this is the same as the federal statute. It does not appear that we are just codifying the federal statute.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

In section 2, subsection 3, it says "Award any other income or property of a veteran to the veteran's spouse or former spouse...." I believe that is community property. At least that is the intent of the bill. You said you wonder why we need it. We need it because time and time again, even though it is in federal law, courts in Nevada are awarding veterans' disability pay to the spouse in the form of alimony. To us, that is community property.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Can you name a single situation or circumstance in which a veteran was jailed for not paying alimony under this clause?

**Darrol Brown:**

We can research that and get it to you.

**Assemblyman Araujo:**

If it is only confirming federal law, why have current practices that are in place not been challenged?

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

It has been challenged right here two years ago. It is being challenged today. That is what we are doing.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I appreciate what you are trying to do to make the disabled veteran whole. I wonder about the scenario where the veteran and spouse are stationed at a remote base. The spouse may have given up her career in the states to be with her loved one. Unfortunately, the marriage goes south, and they decide to split up. The spouse does not have the opportunities she had back home before they relocated to that remote base. She is trying to get on her feet. I wonder how this is equitable to that spouse, because that spouse made sacrifices for her loved one so he could serve.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

You and I have had this discussion before. What we are trying to do here does not affect retirement pay or current military pay. We are not talking about anything except the disability pay that makes the veteran whole. That is all that this bill is for. When you are talking about how that person survives, there are other avenues for that. We are only looking at the portion of the pay he receives which is nontaxable because it is not income.

**Chairman Hansen:**

I see no further questions. For the Committee, we will have this hearing again and will be able to thoroughly vet this. In the interest of time this morning, we will have to move things along. Are there three more people to testify in favor of A.B. 140 here in Carson City?

**Vicky Maltman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a nonpaid lobbyist for veterans, and I am also the wife of a disabled spouse. My husband turned 22 years old on November 4, 1966. Thanksgiving day in Vietnam in a rice paddy, he was shot twice. The first bullet went through his shoulder, and took a part of his lung and his aorta. He suffers from the loss of the use of his hand. He had major surgery and was in Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland, and a hospital in San Francisco for two years.

When I married my husband, I knew about his disabilities. At that time, the U.S. Army had retired him, and he received approximately \$300 per month in disability payments. It has been 40 years since he became disabled, and I have to say that when I married him, I knew what his disabilities were. I knew what to expect. I knew it would never get any better; it would only get worse with age. As his wife, I had my own career. I am a retired police officer. I do not need, nor do I expect, nor would I ever expect, to be entitled to anything he receives due to his wounds should I choose to leave my marriage. I am not the one that was shot. I am not the one that suffered in a hospital for two years. I have my own situation. My husband puts up with me, and I put up with him.

I had an argument with a judge in Washoe County about this. The judge was not aware of the federal law. There have been other cases where it has been considered community property; this is not. That money goes to my husband, or any veterans, whether they be male or female, for the suffering that they endure day in and day out because of the service they gave to our country.

**Steve W. Sanson, President/Director, Veterans In Politics, International, Inc.:**

I have spoken on many bills before the Nevada Assembly. Two years ago, I spoke on this bill. Looking around, I see some of you that I have already spoken to about this bill. Service-connected disability benefits are supposed to make the veteran whole again. It has nothing to do with a spouse. It has nothing to do with the choice the spouse makes to be with that veteran. This bill is only supposed to be used for the injuries the veteran sustained. I am 80 percent disabled because of injuries that I received when I was in the Persian Gulf War. A lot of people that protest this bill have never even served. Many people that protest this bill do not receive service-connected disability benefits. Listen to the person that receives the service-connected disability benefits because I had my injuries, and the government is paying me. Do you know what a veteran has to go through to even receive service-connected disability benefits? It took me years to get my service-connected disability benefits. It is not because I wanted it. It is because the government deemed it necessary for me to have it because of the injuries that I sustained. These injuries I live with every day. Where does it leave my injuries should I give even a portion of my service-connected disability benefits to an able-bodied spouse? Are you going to award my injuries to that spouse? If you cannot award my injuries to my spouse that I am leaving, leave my money alone. It is for my benefit. It is for my injuries that I received.

There are a lot of veterans that were very angry by this decision two years ago. It is really disheartening that the veteran has to even come before anybody to show the money was for the injuries incurred. Why are you awarding it to an able-bodied spouse? When I testified last time, I said if you cannot award those injuries, do not mess with the service-connected disability benefits. Thank you for listening to me.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Seeing no questions, thanks to you both. Is there anyone in Las Vegas to testify in favor of A.B. 140? Seeing none, is there anyone else here in Carson City? We have Ely on videoconference today. Is there anyone in Ely who would like to testify in favor of A.B. 140? [There was no one.] We are going to allow some folks in Ely to testify in opposition. I am going to allow 10 minutes time for the opposition to testify. All three of you will get to testify.

**Melissa Exline, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I think it is important to understand the perspective of where some of the family court practitioners stand. For me specifically, I would like to thank you for allowing us to testify remotely today. I am the daughter of a veteran. My dad was a master sergeant in the U.S. military. He retired after 23 years of service. Much of that time was spent in special forces. He spent a lot of time in Vietnam. As the daughter of a veteran, what that means is I was strongly instilled with the value of love of country. I love Nevada, and I have a strong love and respect for U.S. military members and veterans. I cannot say enough about how much I respect veterans. With that said, I also practice family law. With my perspective in family law, and coming from the position of respect that I have for veterans, I want to say that this bill might look as though it is protecting veterans and codifying federal statutes. I think that is not what is really going on here. There are better ways to advance the cause of veterans in our country.

This bill is essentially hamstringing the courts and judges from looking at the specific factors under alimony analysis required in a divorce situation. There are a significant set of factors that allow the courts and judges to look at the entire picture of what is going on. Military spouses and children give a lot for our country as well. I consider myself an army brat to a certain extent. The families are also a part of this picture. I would urge the Judiciary Committee today to take a step back from a very specific and narrow view about the service-connected disability benefits and the argument that it is to make that veteran whole. To see what is really going on here, can we take a step back and ask what is best for the entire family? When you hamstring the courts by saying, as this bill might, you cannot in any way, shape, or form, look at any service-connected disability benefits, it potentially creates situations that are unjust or inequitable. From that perspective, it is very important that everyone just look at what is really going on. Let us give the family court the tools to make good, fair, honest decisions. I thank you for your time.

**Marshall Willick, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have practiced family law in Nevada for over 30 years. I was the managing editor and the primary author of the *Nevada Family Law Practice Manual*. I wrote the textbook on the subject of military benefits about 17 years ago. I have studied the system and these benefits for decades. I teach the subject regularly, and I am well-versed in every aspect of each program in existence.

Assembly Bill 140 would be an extremely poor public policy. It would cause a great deal of harm to innocent parties. It is based on misrepresentations of what actually happens and why. One hundred percent of the experts on the subject are in full agreement. There is no dichotomy of opinion from the people



who know what this is and how it works. There is no significant adverse opinion. There is no example of division of disability benefits as community property. It does not happen. Every court, from the U.S. Supreme Court in rows on down, have indicated that what Assemblyman Wheeler said is simply not true. Veterans Administration (VA) benefits are intended for both the member and his dependents. That is the holding of the U.S. Supreme Court, and every court in the United States that has ever opined on the subject. They are collected in the materials that I have forwarded to each member of this committee ([Exhibit D](#)). This topic does not deal with the provision of disability benefits to members, but it does deal with the conversion of retirement benefits into disability benefits, usually after the divorce has been granted. Upon divorce, the property between the two parties is allocated between them. All other assets, such as houses, cars, and a spouse's pension, are all permanently divided. This bill would seek to take one particular kind of asset and allow it to be retroactively turned into something else, and pulled out of the pocket of the person to whom it had been previously rewarded. By converting it in form, it would turn into the property of the other person. That is what Assemblyman Wheeler was talking about in section 2 of the bill, which talks about conversion, and that is not to be permitted.

The *Brownell* case, which is discussed in detail in legal note 53, which has been provided to you (pages 26 through 29 ([Exhibit D](#)), is a wonderful example. There are \$3,000 in disability benefits, and \$200 in food stamps. The effect of this bill would say to the court that the \$3,000 per month in disability benefits is invisible to the court. The court cannot look at it, think about it, or know about it. The only thing there is to divide would be the \$200 in food stamps going to the spouse. The spouse would get \$100 worth of food stamps, and the member would get the other \$100 worth of food stamps, and the full \$3,000 in actual income. Disability income is income; all income is income. Divorce courts need to be able to see the entirety of the income of the parties in order to figure out the child support and spousal support because all of these people need to live after a divorce. There are a lot more analogies and arguments, but I think that is the simple version. With what time we have left, I would like to defer to our third speaker.

**Roger Harada, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am also a practicing domestic relations attorney in Nevada. Specifically, my objection to this bill is that this is something the federal government has done that does not make veterans whole for service-related disabilities. It is then being taken advantage of by veterans in the recharacterization of their retirement asset. Then later on, after retirement, recharacterizing that, or a portion thereof, in disability for service-related injuries making it an offsetting reduction in their retirement. Essentially, for the veterans they are at the same

level, but they have recharacterized it. It is still their benefit to do so with, if it is available. What this bill seeks to do is to say that if this veteran has done that, a court cannot consider the portion that has been recharacterized to disability. The disenfranchisement of the spouses and dependents has been spoken of accurately by Mr. Willick.

If this bill passes, what the Legislature is saying is that we do not trust our judges to know what they are doing. We are going to take away from the judges the ability to analyze the totality of the circumstances. In my opinion, one of the things that is really wrong with this bill is when the Legislature hears that the citizens are against this, yet choose to eliminate the ability of the judiciary to analyze the situation properly. We basically have to have the judiciary thinking in a box. I think that is a bit overreaching on the part of the Legislature and an infringement on the separation of powers. We can have an entirely different discussion there.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Mr. Harada, I am going to have to interrupt you. We will continue this conversation at some time, but right now I am going to close the hearing down on A.B. 140. I apologize, but the interest in the other bill is so enormous that I am going to have to. Thanks to everyone in Ely. We will now close the hearing on A.B. 140. We will come back and revisit this bill in order to provide more time for the opposition.

We will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 148. I was provided with a list, by the proponents, of the people that would like to speak initially. We will start with Assemblywoman Fiore, who will walk us through the bill. Then we will hear from Professor John Lott and Sheriff Chuck Allen.

**Assembly Bill 148: Revises provisions governing concealed firearms.  
(BDR 20-242)**

**Assemblywoman Michele Fiore, Assembly District No. 4:**

I am presenting Assembly Bill 148 to you today. I will start by taking you through the bill.

Sections 1 and 5 of this bill authorizes sheriffs and campus police, within the limits of available money, to provide concealed firearm permit holders with information regarding instructors and organizations that offer courses focused on firearm safety in educational environments.

Section 2 of this bill is a numbering change to accommodate the new paragraph added in section 3.

Sections 3 and 4 amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 202.265 and 202.3673 to authorize those who possess a concealed firearm permit to carry a concealed firearm on the property of the Nevada System of Higher Education, a private or public school, or a child care facility. Sections 3 and 4 are extremely important. We will hear testimony from Amanda Collins shortly. Also, I would like to point out that the teacher from Sparks, who was killed last year at his school, held a concealed carry weapon (CCW) permit, and was a 45-year-old former Marine. Our teachers are at risk. By not allowing them to bring their concealed firearms on campus they are defenseless. Also, we have left our teachers defenseless when they go to the gym at 5 a.m. before work, or when they stop for groceries late after work. A former maintenance supervisor of the Clark County School District contacted me in support of this bill because his former employees are dispatched for maintenance calls to our schools in the middle of the night. They are often alone and have no means to provide for their own safety. There is a young woman that works the night shift as a custodian at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). She rides her bicycle to and from work at night. She has a valid CCW permit, and requested permission to store her firearm in her locker at work. She was denied permission. She does not have the option to leave her firearm in a vehicle parked off campus. Our current law puts this woman at risk every night as she travels to and from work on her bicycle.

Reading the *Constitution of the State of Nevada*, Article 1, Section 11, it is my understanding that it is legal to openly carry a firearm in the nonsecure areas of public airports. Section 4 of A.B. 148 amends NRS to allow those with a valid CCW permit to carry a concealed firearm in the same areas of public airports where it is already legal to openly carry. There are 40 states that allow concealed firearms in the nonsecure areas. Nevada is one of only 3 states where open carry is legal, but concealed carry is not. This change makes Nevada law consistent with the vast majority of airports around the country. All firearms are still prohibited in secure areas and beyond Transportation Security Administration (TSA) screening checkpoints. Currently, it is also legal to open-carry firearms in portions of public buildings that are open to public access. Unless otherwise prohibited, section 4 would make it legal for CCW permit holders to carry a concealed firearm in those same public buildings. Law-abiding citizens with CCW permits would no longer be considered criminals because their shirt or jacket accidentally covered their firearm while standing in line at the Department of Motor Vehicles. Areas that are not open to access by the public may still prohibit concealed firearms

In all of 2013 and 2014, only two people with a CCW permit were granted permission to carry their firearm on campus. Section 6 instructs the Board of Regents that those with CCW permits must not be required to first seek

permission to carry a concealed firearm. The Board may still require permission for anyone who does not possess a CCW permit.

Section 7 directs the Board of Regents to prescribe new rules for granting of permission to carry or possess a weapon in accordance with section 6 of this act. If passed, section 8 makes this act become effective on July 1, 2015.

**John Lott, President, Crime Prevention Research Center:**

I have been a professor most of my life, having had positions at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, University of Chicago, Yale University, Stanford University, and Rice University. Right now I am speaking to you as President of Crime Prevention Research Center. There are three general issues that I would like to briefly address: 1) The general behavior of permit holders; 2) concerns about risks that may arise from permit holders being present at mass public shootings; and 3) the possible benefits from allowing people to carry in what had previously been gun-free zones.

**Chairman Hansen:**

You were the author of *More Guns, Less Crime*, correct?

**John Lott:**

Yes. It was published by the University of Chicago Press.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Are you actually from Illinois?

**John Lott:**

I lived in Illinois when I was at the University of Chicago. Right now, I am from the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, area.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Sorry to interrupt; please continue.

**John Lott:**

With regard to the behavior of permit holders, the data of 2014 ([Exhibit E](#)) shows a revocation rate for permit holders of a little over one tenth of one percentage point. If you look at anything related to felony convictions or violence, it becomes in the thousands of one percentage point. It is not clear, from the data I received from the legislative analyst, whether any of those cases involved firearms. Therefore, that may be an overestimate of the risk for people who have CCW permits. The behavior experience is similar in other states. If you look at states where we have information on firearms violations resulting in revocations, it is usually in the tens of thousands of one percentage point.

At the most, it would be thousands of one percentage point. Most of those are for relatively trivial cases. We have a lot of experience with regard to the gun-free zones that are being talked about in this legislation.

With regard to colleges, 11 states mandate that if someone has a CCW permit, the public universities and colleges are mandated to allow them to carry their firearms in some form on college campuses. There are another 21 states that leave it up to the individual university to decide. With regard to K-12, according to the National Council of State Legislatures, over 20 states allow permit holders to carry concealed handguns on school property in one form or another.

Prior to the early 1990s when the federal Gun-Free School Zones Act was passed, any of the states that allowed concealed carry allowed it on school property. We can look at a variety of behavior, but regarding crimes by permit holders on any type of school property, I have not been able to find an example of a crime that has been committed in a place where CCW permit holders are allowed to carry. I have been able to find three accidents that have occurred over time at either a university or K-12 property. All three of those accidents were trivial in terms of any harm that was done.

Just to give you an idea of how law-abiding permit holders are, we recently did an analysis that looked at crime rates by police officers and compared them to permit holders, which is also included in the handout ([Exhibit E](#)). You will find that the police officers are incredibly law-abiding. The rate that they are convicted of any type of felony or misdemeanor is less than 1/30 of the rate of the general population. If you compare the permit holders, the permit holders are very law-abiding compared to police officers. At most, their conviction rates are about 1/6 the rate of police officers. We can also look at the behavior of college-age permit holders. There are a lot of hypothetical concerns about what can go wrong. Rather than guessing about this, I have presented data from several states [page 5 ([Exhibit E](#)).] You will find that permit holders of college age, are at least, or more law-abiding than the general population. It is not a question of how young people behave, but rather how permit holders behave.

With regard to the concerns about the risks of mass public shootings, there are many hypothetical situations that are raised. One example is what happens if a permit holder accidentally shoots a bystander while trying to stop one of these mass public shootings? You can go through every single one of the cases where a permit holder has stopped a mass public shooting. There is not one single case where a permit holder has accidentally shot a bystander. Is it possible that something like that may occur? Yes, but at least it seems that you should be able to point to at least one incident where something like that has taken place.

With regard to the concerns that police may accidentally shoot a permit holder, is that a possibility? Sure, but when you look at the actual behavior of police officers, you will find there is not one single case where a permit holder has stopped one of these mass public shootings and a police officer was confused and shot the permit holder by mistake. There are other issues that I can go through, but these are the two main concerns.

The third general area is about the benefits for allowing permit holders to carry a handgun in a public place. Here is the most striking piece of evidence. Since 1950, with just two exceptions, every single one of the mass public shootings, where four or more people have been killed, have taken place where the general population is not allowed to carry handguns. In Europe, all of the mass public shootings have taken place where people are not allowed to defend themselves. These cases are not random.

In Nevada, if you have a CCW permit, you are allowed to carry your concealed handgun virtually any place in the state. If these types of attacks were random, you would think that 98 or 99 percent of the attacks would be taking place where concealed handguns are allowed rather than the tiny areas within the state where they are banned.

What is interesting to anyone who reads the documents about these mass public shootings, is how these attackers consciously pick out those areas where they know the victims are not able to defend themselves. I will give you some examples from this past year.

You have probably heard about the Santa Barbara shooting in May 2014 in which six people were killed. If you actually read the 141-page manifesto from the killer in that case, what you will find is that he goes through excruciating detail about why he chose that particular venue for this attack. There are multiple cases like this. He mentions in the manifesto how the ideal target would be spring break in Santa Barbara, which is where he was. Apparently, Santa Barbara is the mecca for students from around California to celebrate spring break. He said there would be a target-rich environment for him in terms of trying to kill the college-age students. He did extensive research, as they frequently do in these cases. He looked at old YouTube videos and read old news reports, and he said there were just too many armed police officers in some areas. He thought that maybe he could go and kill just one or two of the police officers, but since there were so many armed police officers, he was sure he would be killed before he could start killing the students. Instead, he went on to other possible targets.

A few weeks after the Santa Barbara shootings, there was another mass public shooting in New Brunswick, Canada. The killer had literally a dozen comments about gun-free zones on his Facebook page. He was making fun of gun-free zones. In one of his comments, he displayed a mass public shooter with a victim who was stumbling while trying to run away from the shooter. The victim was turning to the killer to say, "You cannot have a gun here; we ban guns in these places; you cannot shoot me." Above the killer's head was a bubble saying, "What a moron," as he aimed the gun at the victim. All I am trying to make clear here is that this person was obviously aware of gun-free zones, and thought about them in connection to his attack. Those are cases just from this last year. There are many other similar cases over time.

Let us look at the shooting inside a movie theater in Aurora, Colorado during a screening of a Batman movie. There were seven movie theaters within a 20-minute drive of the killer's apartment. Only one of the movie theaters actually posted signs banning permitted concealed handguns. The killer did not go to the movie theater that was closest to his home. He did not go to the movie theater that had the largest auditoriums in the state of Colorado, which you would think would have been attractive to someone wanting to kill as many people as possible. Instead, he went to the only movie theater that posted signs banning permitted concealed handguns. On our website, we also have a long list of mall shootings.

What you will find is in every single one of the mass public shootings involving malls, they were all areas where people were not allowed to carry permitted concealed handguns. There would have been many other malls closer to the killers' homes but they would continually choose the areas that were posted.

I will leave you with one general thought. After the Westgate mall killing in Nairobi, Kenya, in September 2013, which killed 68 people and wounded 157, Ronald Noble, then-Secretary General of Interpol, said there are two ways to stop these types of attacks. You can make an area a gun-free zone, or you can allow victims to be able to defend themselves. He said his views have changed dramatically over time. When he first became head of Interpol, he thought the obvious solution was to ban guns from certain areas. What he had learned over time is that it is basically impossible to ban guns from an area, particularly when you are dealing with terrorist groups or other people who are planning these attacks. Mass public shooters in the United States plan attacks over a long period of time. Adam Lanza was planning for two and a half years. Mr. Noble said that when they are planning these attacks over a long period of time, it is basically impossible to prevent them from bringing weapons into the area. He also said that the only people you are really disarming are the victims, and not the people who are perpetrating the attack. He and others have changed

their opinions on what might be the best way of trying to stop these attacks. What might seem the most obvious way to begin actually makes it safer for the criminals to attack, and it will be more likely they will be successful. When research was done on this at the University of Chicago, it was found that the one thing that determines how many people get killed or injured in these attacks is the amount of time that elapses between when the attack starts and when someone is able to arrive on the scene with a gun to stop it.

**Chuck Allen, Sheriff, Washoe County:**

I am here to show my support for A.B. 148. Being the 26th elected sheriff of Washoe County, I am fairly new to the organization. The majority of voters last year voted for my platform. My platform is a very pro-Second Amendment platform. I had the opportunity to address campus carry in many public venues, and my position on that bill has not changed today. I do believe that those citizens who have had a background check, and have obtained a CCW permit, should have the right to carry a firearm. I had the opportunity to sit down with Amanda Collins and her father Tom last year when she shared her story about the atrocious act that happened to her on the university campus. I do believe that folks know the rules when they are given the right and opportunity to carry their concealed firearms. The key is keeping the firearm concealed. Part of the training includes holstering, deploying, firing the weapon, and qualifying with the weapon. Primarily, I am here to show my support for the bill. I will not be able to stay here all day, but I would like to point out that my representative, Lt. Eric Spratley, will be here as well.

**Assemblyman Araujo:**

Assemblywoman Fiore, this question is for you. According to numerous surveys, there is widespread opposition to force colleges to allow guns on campus. Let me provide you with some statistics that I was able to pull up. Ninety-five percent of college presidents oppose guns on campus. Ninety-four percent of faculty oppose guns on campus. Seventy-nine percent of students said that they would not feel safe if faculty, students, or visitors were allowed to bring concealed guns onto their campuses. In a resolution ([Exhibit K](#)), the student government of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) voted to oppose A.B. 148. Furthermore, UNR President, Marc Johnson, said of lawmakers, "They are not doing this for us, they are doing this to us." Given this broad opposition from the folks who would be directly impacted by this legislation, why are we forcing them to abide by A.B. 148?

**John Lott:**

Assemblywoman Fiore has asked me to respond to your question. I have been an academic most of my adult life; I have been around academics and students. It is not something that I take lightly. I am not sure about the exact polls or



who conducted them, but this is a safety issue. You can look at polls from police officers, or people with expertise in safety issues, unlike the people who are participating in the polls you are referencing. PoliceOne is the largest private organization of police officers in the United States and has about 450,000 members. Of those, 370,000 are active duty, and about 80,000 are retired police officers. Nationwide, there are over 600,000 police officers. Eighty percent of PoliceOne members believe that allowing people with CCW to carry concealed handguns in previously gun-free zones will reduce the amount of carnage. When their members were asked what is the single most important thing that can be done to stop mass public shootings, the number one response they provided was to eliminate gun-free zones.

There are a number of states where concealed carry was passed after polls indicated that the people opposed it. If you look at how people's perceptions changed on concealed carry before and after states have adopted the law, after a year or two people have realized that many of their fears simply did not come to pass. General support for concealed carry has increased dramatically. I understand what people's reactions are. They think that by simply banning guns from an area, that will make it safer. The problem is you have to ask who obeys the law. We would like to believe that if you ban guns from an area, that will make it safer. Unfortunately, the people who obey the law are the good, law-abiding people and not the people who do the attacks. If the Somali terrorists go to the Mall of America, and they see a sign saying that guns are not allowed in the mall, do we believe they are going to honor that?

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

I wanted to talk about the learning environment, which is something that is important to me. I am a UNLV law student. When I go to school, I want to be focused. Personally, I am a little bit more comfortable with weapons. I have been around them, grew up with them, and was in the U.S. Marine Corps. I know that not every student is as familiar as the Sheriff, or you or I might be. What would be your answer to them, when you say that you are bringing this element into their learning environment? They are there to focus, and they are paying a lot of money for school. They are not as comfortable with it as we are. What would you say to them?

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

I would not say anything to them, because they will not know that I am the one standing next to them with my firearm on my person. There is no reason to fear. When I am walking through the building, you do not see my firearms. You do not see where I conceal my firearms. I think that the nonthreat that you guys are trying to visually paint is a nonissue.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

According to the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, four out of five college students in our country consume alcohol. Half of those college students that drink also binge drink. There is data showing that last year over 600,000 of those students hurt themselves during binge drinking. The University of Michigan has a study that states that in 2013, 34 percent of college students across the country use some kind of illicit narcotics. My concern is, if we add firearms to the mix of our college campuses with young people trying to decide what they want to do with their lives and are experimenting with substances, it creates a dangerous recipe.

**John Lott:**

That is the reason why I looked at the experience in other states. There are 11 other states that mandate that once people have a CCW permit, they are allowed to carry their weapons on university campuses. There are another 21 states that leave it up to the individual universities. Most universities do not allow it in those 21 states. The concerns you raise are hypothetical, but can you point to cases in any of those states where the examples of the type of things you pointed out have actually occurred? It is not just that there are some young people who are irresponsible; there are some older people who are irresponsible. The issue is do permit holders, which are the type of people willing to go through the process to get a CCW permit, represent a risk? If you look at the handout I gave you of the report we did last year ([Exhibit E](#)), it breaks it down by age. College-age permit holders are at least as safe, or safer, than the rest of the permit holders. Permit holders, as a whole, are extremely law-abiding. You cannot find a single example of the types of concerns having occurred in any of those states. If you could point to maybe a few examples, given how many states and schools we are talking about, it would be an issue to debate. Since you cannot even point to a single example, it is hypothetical, and does not seem particularly relevant for analyzing the bill.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

This question is for Professor Lott. I know you have done extensive work in Michigan, Texas, Chicago, et cetera. Since we are talking specifically about Nevada, do you have any data, statistics, or analysis of our state? This bill is going to deal with private schools, public schools, and child care facilities.

**John Lott:**

All of my work and research looked at data for all of the states. It looked at revocation rates for all states, including Nevada. Nevada is pretty typical. I have recently looked at revocation rates for college-age students in Nevada, and they are no different than the revocation for the general population in Nevada. Some things can only be looked at after the law is changed. You can

go and see those permit holders presumably when they are across the street from the college campus, or at other places in the state. They seem to behave just as responsibly with just as low of a revocation rate as the rest of the population that has a CCW permit. Unless you are concerned about CCW permit holders generally in the state, it does not seem as though there is any evidence that college-aged people would be a greater risk.

**Assemblyman Nelson:**

Following up on Assemblyman Ohrenschall's comment about alcohol and guns mixing, is it not true that campuses, including fraternity and sorority houses, are supposed to be dry?

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

Yes. Are you saying that the nongun people are breaking the law? They are supposed to be dry campuses. There is no alcohol allowed on those campuses.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I have specific concerns, especially about carrying guns in our airports. I think it is a little overreaching, especially when the driver of our Nevada economy is tourism. We have a lot of international tourists who come to our cities. They are not accustomed to environments where citizens can carry guns. There are 41 million people coming to visit. It is the biggest influx to our revenue. You are telling me that it is more important that we pass your bill allowing people to carry at airports and not really thinking about what it will do to our revenue or tourism.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

I do not think that you are aware that I can openly walk into our airport today with my gun on my hip. I prefer to conceal my weapon. Right now, it is the law in the state of Nevada. I can drive in to the airport, and I can walk all around the airport. I just cannot pass through the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Today, we are allowed to have guns at the airport.

**Assemblywoman Seaman:**

I think you have answered part of my question, because I was going to ask you if our open carry law has deterred any tourists.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

No, it has not. Our tourists are still coming to Nevada. I think it is really telling that after this last election cycle, with all of its anti-gun nuts from New York City spending millions of dollars, Nevada made a loud and clear statement: do not touch our guns.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Seeing no further questions, we will hear Amanda Collin's testimony. Then, we will hear from Lisa Thomas, Alisha Ketter, and Sarah Ketter.

**Amanda Collins, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I want to thank you and the members of your Committee for giving me time to talk with you this morning via videoconference. I will keep my comments brief as I am well aware that, for some of you, this is the third time hearing me give testimony on this piece of legislation.

Just the other day, I was asked why I would need a firearm on a college campus. I was asked what is so threatening about being educated? Here is the answer I have given for the last three years without yet receiving a response. How does rendering me defenseless protect me against a violent crime? When I was 22-years-old, I lived through my worst fear. What has become a story that people appreciate hearing is my reality. October 22, 2007, was a typical Monday evening. The only thing that seemed to be different was the midterm awaiting me at the university campus. At 10 p.m., I walked to the parking garage with a group of colleagues in an attempt to assure my safety. I parked in this parking garage because it was very close to where my class was being held, and it was presumably safer to park there than it was to park off-campus at night. As I approached the parking garage, I was the only one who had parked on the ground floor. Seeing no visible threat between myself and my vehicle, I wished everyone a good week and broke off from the group. Approaching my vehicle at an angle, what I did not see was a man hunched down by the wheel well of a truck, next to a sedan. As I passed him, he grabbed me, forced me to the cold hard asphalt, placed a pistol to my temple, and told me not to say anything. Then he began to brutally rape me. As I lay there defenseless, held down by a man much larger than me, out of the corner of my eye I could see the university police cruisers parked across the way. In that same moment, I knew the university police office had already closed. While my body was being ripped apart, I knew that no one was coming to help me.

Eventually the man who raped me, James Biela, was caught. He was tried and convicted for not only raping me at gunpoint in a gun-free zone, but also raping two other women and murdering Brianna Denison. At the time of my attack, I had obtained my CCW permit for the personal choice of not wanting to be a defenseless target. However, in Nevada permit holders are not allowed to carry firearms on college campuses. As a law-abiding citizen, I left my firearm at home which means that the very law that was meant to ensure my safety guaranteed the criminal an unmatched victim. I still wonder what would have been different if I would have been carrying my weapon that night. Had I been

carrying my firearm, I would have been able to stop my attack. Not only that, two other rapes would have been prevented, and three young lives would have been saved, including my own.

Any survivor of rape can understand that the young woman walking into the parking lot that night was not the same woman leaving. My life has never been the same after my attack. Legalized campus carry would have saved my family, who happens to be the collateral damage in my story, and me a great deal of untold torment. My case is a perfect example that despite law enforcement's best efforts to ensure our safety, they are unable to be everywhere at once. All I wanted was a chance to effectively defend myself. The choice to participate in one's self defense should be left to the individual. That choice should not be mandated by the government. As a law-abiding citizen, I should not have to hand over my safety to a third party. Laws that prohibit campus carry turn women like me into victims by stripping away our Second Amendment rights. Unfortunately, legislators and university officials opposed to campus carry are seemingly more intimidated by law-abiding citizens like me sitting in class with my legal and permitted firearm than they are of the rapist waiting for me in the parking garage.

I have heard all of the what if questions that have actually never happened in the 11 states that currently allow campus carry. Not a single one of those states has seen an increase in crimes committed with firearms. In fact, there has been a decrease in crimes committed on campus property. I know from my personal experience that threats to personal safety do not magically disappear in declared safe zones. Recently, I have also heard the argument against campus carry stating that it will arm the assailants too. That statement ignores the fact that the assailants are already armed. There is nothing in place to keep them from coming on to our campuses. My attacker was armed. As a law-abiding citizen, I had more to lose that night if I had carried my weapon than he did. If I had my weapon that night, I would have faced expulsion, loss of my permit, and possibly jail time. My attacker was not a student, nor did he have a CCW permit.

I am often told that my case is just so rare. In fact, just yesterday, the Reno Gazette-Journal quoted the speaker of the Senate of the Associated Students at UNR as saying there is a misconception that there is a guy jumping out of the bushes, and that is just not the case. Most people are unaware that one in four women will be raped while attending college. One-third of those attacks will occur on the campus they attend. A study from the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* found that 126 admitted perpetrators have committed 907 sexual assaults involving 882 victims. That is an average of 7 victims, some more than once, per perpetrator who is currently serving time for one

sexual assault. With this information, I can confidently say that what is rare about my case is that I am talking about it. Just because it is not making media headlines, or being reported at all, does not mean it is not occurring. The majority of rapes go unreported, as did mine initially.

What if a woman gets raped? This is the main argument that I hear in support of *Roe v. Wade* [410 U.S. 113, 93S. Ct. 705, 35 L. Ed. 2d 147 (1973)]. However, if we, as a society, cared about women getting raped, and really wanted the government to stay away from making decisions about women's bodies, we would do whatever we could to equip women with the ability to prevent rape. I believe in empowering women with the choice to protect their bodies. Therefore, law-abiding CCW permit holders should not be denied their fundamental constitutional right to protect themselves on college campuses in the same manner they are able to protect themselves everywhere else in their daily lives. With that, I will leave you with the same question that I have been asking for the last five years. How does rendering me defenseless protect you against a violent crime?

**Lisa M. Thomas, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a tenured associate professor at UNR. Before I begin my remarks, I need to be very clear that my testimony today is on behalf of myself as a private citizen. I am not authorized to speak on behalf of UNR, and my remarks are not intended to reflect the position of UNR.

I am pleased to be here today in support of Assembly Bill 148, a bill that would allow concealed weapon permittees to lawfully carry a concealed weapon on the properties of the Nevada System of Higher Education. To be clear, this bill is not about allowing violent criminals to brandish firearms in the classroom. This bill also is not about allowing private citizens without training to carry weapons on campus. Rather, this bill intends to allow Nevada residents, over the age of 21, who have received documented training, who do not have a violent or drug-related criminal history, who have not been judicially declared incompetent or mentally ill, and who do not habitually use alcohol or controlled substance, to exercise their right to carry a concealed weapon. [Continued reading from prepared statement ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chairman Hansen:**

I am going to have to ask you to wrap it up as we have many others waiting to testify before I move on to the opponents. I am running out of time. Can you summarize?

**Lisa M. Thomas:**

The day after the event referenced in my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)) took place, I wrote to the university president asking for permission to carry a concealed weapon on campus. His response outlined the fact that students under the age of 18, such as preschool students and elementary school students, spent time on the campus. I would like for the Committee to consider that those same children spend time in parks, restaurants, and right across the street from the campus. What is it that makes them at risk when they cross an arbitrary boundary onto the university campus? And what makes that weapon carrier suddenly a risk to them?

As I close my remarks, I would like to be absolutely clear that my personal philosophy with regard to defense mirrors that of most lawful CCW carriers. This shared philosophy is to retreat until the option no longer exists. Being forced to use my personal firearm in a personal defense situation would be the worst day of my life, but I would be here.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Thank you very much. Let us go to Alisha Ketter now.

**Alisha Ketter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I would offer a slightly different perspective. I am a resident of Reno, Nevada. I am a professional software architect for a Fortune 500 company. I am a wife and mother of two. I am also a firearms instructor with the Women's Shooting Academy. I hold five National Rifle Association (NRA) firearms instructor ratings and am authorized to certify students for their CCW permits in four states. I fully support [A.B. 148](#). It would remedy a number of issues that I face every day.

I am accompanied here today by my husband and two children who are also directly impacted by this proposal. In the fall, my son will be attending the University of Nevada Reno (UNR). Under the current law, I would be forced to park off campus, in a dangerous neighborhood and walk unarmed to any campus event or even to visit my son. While on campus, I am offered only a blue callbox and the hope of a nearby campus officer to assist me. I am not satisfied with that option. [Continued reading from prepared statement ([Exhibit G](#)).]

**Sarah Ketter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am an elementary school student. Both my parents are CCW permit holders. I want to know my mom is able to protect me in troubling situations anywhere, any time. If that takes place at a school, I want to know she will not be facing

charges for pulling her gun to protect me. My mom is my first responder. [Continued reading from prepared statement ([Exhibit H](#)).]

**Chairman Hansen:**

I am going to allow the proponents to continue until 9:50 a.m. Then I will allow nine people to testify in opposition, which should take us to 11:05 a.m. I am trying to give both sides equal time. We will hear from three more people, with a little less than 15 minutes time. Are there any questions currently? Seeing none, let us hear from Vicky Kawelmacher, Carol Morrell, and Tom Collins. These three will wind up our testimony for the proponents. We will then move on to the opponents.

**Vicky Kawelmacher, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a legal law-abiding American citizen. I am a wife, mother, sister, daughter, grandmother, and friend. I am also a women's safety advocate and speaker. For the record, I am a firearms instructor for my company, The Women's Shooting Academy, in Reno, Nevada. I fully support A.B. 148, and want to personally thank Assemblywoman Fiore for spearheading this effort once again. I urge the Committee to pass this bill

Seven and a half years ago, I got the biggest wake-up call of my life. Two men sitting in a parked car on my street attempted to abduct my ten-year-old daughter. We immediately called 9-1-1 and guess what? They did not come. I was told I could go to the sheriff's substation the next morning and file a report. Wow! Not very comforting to know that help was not coming but a reality that I had to embrace. The next morning, I walked into a local gun store and purchased my first "official" carry firearm. [Continued reading from prepared statement ([Exhibit I](#)).]

**Carol Morrell, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

My husband and I moved to Storey County in 2001 from southern California. The reason we moved to Nevada is because Nevada gives us a lifestyle that we greatly appreciate. There are very few restrictions on our personal freedom, and it hugely supports our Second Amendment rights.

I have been shooting firearms for about 30 years. I have been a National Rifle Association member since 1985. I am a firearms instructor, and I have taught women and men safe gun handling skills for about 6 years now. I hunt and I have been a competitive shooter for about 12 years total. I am also a parent and a grandmother. I am going to quote from Wikipedia, "The Bill of Rights is the collective name for the first ten amendments to the *United States Constitution*. Proposed to assuage the fears of Anti-Federalists who had opposed Constitutional ratification, these amendments guarantee a number of



personal freedoms, limit the government's power in judicial and other proceedings, and reserve some powers to the states and the public. Originally, the amendments applied only to the federal government, however, most were subsequently applied to the government of each state by way of the Fourteenth Amendment, through a process known as incorporation."

The Second Amendment is more than just a "rule." It relates to the basic human right for self-defense. I respectfully submit for your consideration passage of A.B. 148. [Continued reading from prepared statement ([Exhibit J](#)).]

**Thomas Collins, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

Thank you for the opportunity to hear this bill and to bring it to a vote. What a refreshing difference an election can make. You cannot believe how hard it is as the father of Amanda to be here to testify. The further away we get from this event, the more emotional I get about it.

What I learned at an early age is that we have a couple of choices in life. Are you going to be defenseless, or are you going to be able to protect yourself? When I was in law school, my parents had a friend who was shot and killed at a rest stop that used to exist east of Reno. Nothing was taken from him. He was not robbed. That taught me that bad things can happen to good people any time, any place, such as with my daughter. Criminals do not make appointments. Victims are not told ahead of time when to show up. Being a victim is not a choice.

As angry as I have been at James Biela, I have been equally as angry at the institution that rendered Amanda defenseless when she did not need to be. This Legislature conspired with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to deny her the opportunity to defend herself. One question that has never been answered is, what is it about a university property that is so unique that it makes a person who functions rationally on one side of a street suddenly become irrational? The University of Nevada, Reno likes to brag about being a top-tier university. So what is it? Is it like a Twilight Zone episode or something from the Outer Limits? These people talk to you with gushing accolades when they come to you for money, but when they are in the presence of a firearm on campus, their minds just turn to mush. What is it? These very same people, as Professor Lott has testified, are no problem off campus. Why do they suddenly become irrational on campus? Do you think that the drinking and use of drugs does not happen off campus? Apparently, it must happen only off campus, because the campuses are dry, right? We know that by passing a law, it goes away. That is what is supposed to happen with gun-free zones, is it not? No guns, no problem; tell James Biela that. Tell the

person that cut up Sergeant Sullivan that. Tell that to the person who abducted and killed Michelle Mitchell in the 1970s. Tell their families how safe it is.

How many times have I heard, by the people that want to restrict the use of firearms, if it saves one person, it is worth it. We know because we have one glaring example. If my daughter had been able to defend herself, chances are very good that you never would have heard of Brianna Denison. The state of Nevada would not be supporting James Biela on death row. How smart is it to think that being convicted of a misdemeanor for carrying on campus is more dissuasive than the possibility of winding up as James Biela's cellmate?

The response of law enforcement for an active shooter is the same on or off campus. The problem of identifying a perpetrator versus a good guy is the same on or off campus. Do not let them off with those arguments. When the opponents come up here to tell you about all the hypothetical situations that John Lott stated do not exist, do not let them off the hook. They cannot bring you examples because they have not happened, despite the fact that on 11 other campuses this is allowed. Thank you for listening to my rant. It has been very frustrating and angering all these years not to have these questions answered by the opponents. Ladies and gentlemen, it is time to allow women and others the right to choose their means of defense. Thank you.

**Chairman Hansen:**

I sincerely appreciate all three of your testimonies today. Are there any questions at this time? [There were none.] We are now going to move to the opposition. We have former Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto in Las Vegas to testify. If there are three opponents who would like to occupy the seats here, please come up. It will be first come, first serve. We will try to hear from at least nine people to give equal time to the opposition. We will close this hearing at approximately 11:05 a.m.

**Catherine Cortez Masto, Executive Vice Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education:**

Good morning. I am here on behalf of the Chancellor, the Board of Regents, and many students, faculty, and staff within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE). The Chancellor and the Board of Regents are not here today because they are participating in the regularly scheduled board meeting. They have sent me here to oppose A.B. 148. I will start off by explaining why.

We believe the current law is a good law. The *Nevada Constitution* gives the Board of Regents the authority to control and manage the affairs of the university. Case law has been interpreted to also say that the Legislature may not invade the constitutional powers of the Board through legislation which

directly interferes with an essential function of the university. The safety and security of the students, employees, and guests on our college campuses and universities is an essential function to us. We take the safety and security very seriously. For that reason, pursuant to the *Nevada Constitution*, and the law, we have adopted policies and procedures. We are working very hard to keep our universities and campuses safe. The adopted policies and procedures create an environment that is secure for our students, faculty, and staff. The policies do not allow a CCW permit holder to bring a weapon on college campuses, but there is permissive language allowing someone to go to a university president to seek permission if there are certain provisions to allow them to have a CCW on campus. We believe that A.B. 148 interferes with our essential function of keeping the college campuses safe.

There has been some talk about the Second Amendment. From our perspective, this is not a Second Amendment issue. Even the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that schools are sensitive places where prohibitions on the possession of firearms are permitted. The majority of the states either ban concealed firearms on campus or they leave it to the colleges and universities to regulate, like here in Nevada. According to the Education Commission of the States, an overview by the National Conference of State Legislatures indicates that only seven states consisting of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin allow concealed firearms on campuses. There are 20 states that ban carrying a concealed firearm on campuses. There are 23 states allowing individual colleges and universities to regulate those concealed firearms. Of those seven states that allow CCW on campus, five recognize that there are sensitive places on campuses that should remain weapon free. In Idaho, concealed and open carry firearms are prohibited in dormitories, public entertainment facilities, and buildings with a capacity of over 1,000 individuals. In Kansas, colleges and universities prohibit concealed carry if the building has adequate security measures and the governing boards of the institution may still request an exemption to prohibit CCWs for up to four years. In Mississippi, although the trustees voted to allow guns to be carried through campus, they can only be carried as long as the guns remain outside of campus buildings. The Oregon State Board of Higher Education retained its authority to have internal policies for certain areas of campus. A docketed new policy from 2012 bans guns from classrooms, buildings, dormitories, and events. In Wisconsin, campuses can prohibit weapons from campus buildings if signs are posted at every entrance explicitly stating that weapons are prohibited.

If A.B. 148 were to pass, Nevada would be in the minority of states and would be an extreme outlier on this issue of CCW permits on college and university campuses. This bill is overly broad. Right now, the Board of Regents has the

rules and regulations to prohibit alcohol on campus, and prohibit smoking in dorms for the safety of our students and others, but A.B. 148 would take away our right to regulate firearms. It makes no sense. Universities and college campuses know best. You should leave the day-to-day life of these campuses to be regulated by the board legally charged with that oversight. Take into consideration all of the constituents on those university campuses, and not people working outside that do not come onto our campuses. Quite frankly, many, if not a majority, of the NSHE are opposed to A.B. 148. This includes our administrators, presidents, faculties, students, and staff. For the record, if there is not enough time for everyone who is in opposition to come up and testify, I would like for everyone to stand up. The reason I do this is because we have faculty members, and we have those who brought petitions with signatures in opposition of A.B. 148. This is the community that knows best as to how to protect ourselves, and that is not by somebody coming from the outside. Thank you very much to all of you in attendance and standing up today.

The concern for all of us is that guns on campuses would have a chilling effect on academic freedom, robust classroom discussions, and already difficult faculty and student discussions about failing grades. It would also require more police presence at meetings or hearings that involve emotional volatilities such as disciplinary hearings, or grade and financial aid appeal hearings.

With me today are some of our campus law enforcement. They are unanimously opposed to A.B. 148. Their enforcement concerns are legitimate. For example, let us look at an active shooter situation such as we have all heard about. In general, training for active shooting situations, and allowing CCWs on campuses, would lead to operational uncertainties, which will confuse campus life, school police, and administrators. Currently faculty, staff, and students are trained to report to campus police if they see a gun on campus. If CCWs are allowed on campus without any permission or knowledge by campus police or administrators, reports of individuals with a gun on campus would immediately generate an aggressive response by our police officers who would seek to disarm the person before ascertaining whether or not they are licensed to carry a firearm. What training protocols can be adopted by campus police and administrators to share with faculty, staff, and students when they see a gun on campus if A.B. 148 were to pass? Are faculty, staff, and students now required to inquire whether or not the person has a permit to carry when they see someone with a gun? Is it fair to place that burden on them to determine if a person is a legal CCW holder, or a potential predator, or both?

During an active shooter situation, established police response tactics call for the neutralization or the elimination of the threat. Responding officers always

look for anyone with a firearm in their hand or on their person. During these scenarios, anyone with a weapon could be shot including the CCW holder, who may be acting as a good Samaritan. Eight hours of CCW training does not train permit holders on how to engage and neutralize an active shooter. The premise that an elementary trained individual can successfully thwart an attack by an armed assailant is flawed. Anyone who has ever shot a gun or has gone hunting knows that it is more likely that individual would pose an additional danger to other students in the area, or himself. During an active shooter situation on campus, an individual with a concealed weapon could face the danger of being overpowered by an assailant. This would actually provide the assailant with an additional opportunity to gain access to weaponry and ammunition. Unlike police officers, most owners of concealed weapons are not trained to protect themselves or their weapons from that possibility.

We have heard discussions on sexual assaults. In my career, I have spent many years working to find solutions to stop violence against women and children, and to bring awareness of domestic violence issues, dating violence, sexual assaults, sex trafficking, and domestic homicides. Not one of the solutions that I have come across involves arming individuals on college campuses. Why? Because, the data does not support it. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, the National Crime Victimization Survey indicates that between 1995 and 2013, females between the ages of 18 and 24 have the highest rate of rape and sexual assault compared to females in all other groups. Within this age group, for victims identified as students versus nonstudents, the data shows that the rate of rape and sexual assault was one point higher for nonstudents than for students enrolled in a college, university, trade school, or vocational school. For both students and nonstudents, about 70 percent of rape and sexual assault victimizations occurred either at the victim's home or the home of another known person. It showed that 51 percent of student rape and sexual assault victimizations occurred while the victim was away from home pursuing leisure activities or traveling to and from other places like shopping or running errands, and not while attending school or traveling to school. For both college students and nonstudents, the offender was known to the victim in about 80 percent of the incidents. For student victims, offenders were 50 percent more likely to be friends or acquaintances than intimate partners, which was at a rate of 24 percent.

What does the data tell us? It tells us that sexual assaults do not predominately occur on college campuses, and the majority of them are committed by someone known to the victim. The incident usually begins as a consensual sexual activity, but becomes nonconsensual for many reasons. Oftentimes, alcohol and intoxication are involved with both parties partaking. In this situation, the chances that victim would be within reach of a gun, or even of

a rational mind to use it, would be very low. Gun rights advocates have co-opted this important discussion about preventing violence to women and children, but they redefined it to suit their agenda.

Assembly Bill 148 is a perfect example of how those tone-deaf to the issue of preventing violence against women and children continues to distort the policy discussion to suit their needs instead of the needs of the women and children that many of us have been fighting to protect over the years. To obtain a CCW permit in Nevada, you have to be 21 years of age. We all know that, but many do not realize that of the students attending NSHE institutions, 36.4 percent are under the age of 21. That is 34,373 students on our campuses who are under the age of 21. There are 483 preschool age children, and 681 elementary school children on our campuses. There are 2,896 high school students attending programs on NSHE campuses. This bill does not help to protect these students. Instead, it gives predators an additional tool to use to prey upon them.

We have all heard talk about the use of alcohol on college campuses. The 2013 National Survey on Drug Use and Health indicates that college students aged 18 through 22 who were enrolled full-time in college were more likely than their peers that were not enrolled full-time, to report current binge or heavy drinking, 39 percent were binge drinkers, and 12.7 percent were heavy drinkers. According to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, abusive and underage college drinking are significant public health problems for students between the ages of 18 and 24. About 4 out of 5 college students drink alcohol. Each year, an estimated 599,000 students are unintentionally injured while under the influence of alcohol, an estimated 696,000 students are assaulted by another student who has been drinking, and 97,000 students are victims of alcohol related sexual assault or date rape. On NSHE campuses, there is a zero tolerance for underage drinking. That is different than a dry campus. There is confusion on this discussion about these being dry campuses. We have a zero tolerance for underage drinking, yet we all know alcohol finds its way into the hands of underage drinkers. Alcoholic beverages are sold during university athletic events, and at parties and campus venues for those of legal age. I have just identified that many of those on our college campuses are going to be 21 years of age or older. There will be alcohol legally sold to those individuals. However, the combination of alcohol, individuals carrying firearms, and binge drinking can be potentially lethal.

The allowance of concealed weapons on campus without any limitations would increase the potential for accidental discharges of these weapons with resulting injuries or fatalities on campus. The *Idaho State Journal* had a perfect example.

An instructor in Idaho accidentally shot himself in the foot in front of his class. He was carrying a concealed weapon.

Most importantly, campus requests for CCW permits have been de minimis for the last three years. Again, this is a solution in search of a problem. There are some questions that I would like for you to consider. How would dorm students safely store their weapons? Would they leave them unattended in their rooms? What if their dorm partners objected to the weapons? Would the university be obligated to provide storage or change the dorm room occupants? Would CCW permit holders be able to bring loaded firearms to university sponsored events where political candidates are in attendance or speaking? What about controversial speakers, student, and staff disciplinary or human resource hearings? Why are we passing a law that benefits a minority instead of the majority of individuals who are attending our campuses and have legitimate concerns about CCWs?

Providing for campus safety of the NSHE is constitutionally controlled and managed by the Board of Regents. As such, the Board has adopted policies to provide for the safety and security of its students, employees, and guests on each campus, and to create an atmosphere of respect, friendliness, and community on the campus providing the most efficient, extensive security for each campus within the resources available. The regulation of firearms on campuses is an important function of our campus safety policies and is best left to the discretion of the Board of Regents, as recognized under current law and best practice across the country.

Finally, based on what I heard today, if the law is changed under A.B. 148 as it applies to campus life, but it is not changed in the legislative building, what are we saying to our parents and students about their safety if we allow guns on campuses but do not allow them in legislative buildings in order to protect our politicians? If we are really concerned about this issue, let us focus on the data and what it tells us. Thank you very much.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Thank you. We have several questions for you.

**Assemblyman Araujo:**

Thank you for being here today and for working so hard to create an environment that is conducive to learning. Are you concerned at all that this policy would make it less attractive to prospective students that are looking into Nevada public schools? Furthermore, are you concerned that this may impact the retention rate when it comes to the top faculty that we want to be teaching our students?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Yes, those are absolutely two legitimate concerns. I think you have the opportunity to hear from students and faculty about those considerations. That is a great question.

**Assemblyman Gardner:**

You talked about the data, and I thank you for that. That is what I have been looking for. You said that it would cause us to lose faculty. There are a lot of other states with campus carry. Is there evidence that they are losing faculty? You said it could cause a negligent discharge. Do we have evidence that negligent discharge would hurt people? Do we have evidence that students in other states are killing each other because they have CCWs on campus? I am looking for evidence for all of those claims you are making. So far, I have not heard any. Do you have evidence to back up what you are saying? Are they just your thoughts or what ifs?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

The first question that you asked me, I did not have in my statement. That was a question posed by the previous Assemblyman. I responded that it was a legitimate concern he had about the students and faculty attending a campus that allows CCW. You should hear from the faculty and staff that are here today. I would leave that question for them.

With respect to negligent discharge, I can give you a perfect example. There was a faculty member in Idaho who shot himself in the foot in front of the classroom. From my perspective, the concern should not be about what does the data show us with respect to guns when they are on campuses. It should be more about the safety of our students, in general, when it comes to all of the variables impacting them in campus life. It is not just about the guns. It is about the alcohol that is introduced. It is about the sexual assaults that may occur whether on campus or off campus. It has to do with suicide rates. Nationally, our college campuses have some of the highest suicide rates. You cannot just look at it in a vacuum. It is taking all of those variables together. From that perspective, that is why our educational system is in the best position to say what is appropriate when it comes to securing our campuses, taking into consideration all of those variables.

At the same time, I will say that the current law is good law. It takes safety into consideration, but it also recognizes that Second Amendment right when it comes to CCWs, because it gives a pathway for someone who wants to carry the opportunity to ask permission and be able to talk to somebody about being able to carry concealed firearms on campuses. They would be allowed if they fall within the right criteria. Those are the concerns that we have.



**Assemblywoman Seaman:**

In prior testimony regarding gun laws, I heard that you have approximately two to four officers per day at UNR to protect approximately 10,000 students. What practice or protocol do you have in place currently to keep nonpermit holders or criminals with guns off your campuses to protect those students?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Your data is not correct, and I do not know where the previous testimony comes from. There are more officers than that. There is a representative from UNR police here. He can come forward right now and give you statistics on the total number of officers who are armed. It is not just bodies. There are other areas that we use to secure our facilities, and there is technology that we use to help us. Of course, we can never be everywhere. I am going to ask Mr. Renwick, who I believe is in Carson City, to answer your question.

**Chairman Hansen:**

He will have a chance. He is sitting at the table to testify. We will go to him after we hear from some others in Las Vegas.

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

I was thinking about this. First of all, thank you for clarifying the issue about dry campuses versus zero tolerance. As any UNLV student knows, there are a lot of bars right across the street. While we were talking about all that, I was thinking about how I worked a lot with suicide through my work with veterans. It is on my mind because I know, in general, college students have a higher rate of suicide. When you introduce weapons into the equation, you have a higher rate of completed and successful suicides versus other types of methods. I am wondering if there were any thoughts about how this could impact suicides on campus by forcing guns onto the campuses?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

Yes, this is always a concern of ours. When it comes to any type of prevention, intervention, or education awareness for social issues that are impacting our students, we always work very hard to ensure we are pushing information out there. Do we do the best job at it? Probably not. I do not have the statistics regarding suicide rates, but there is a professor in Carson City who has the research on this data and is ready to testify in opposition to the bill as well. Yes, that is a concern. Regarding the high suicide rate that we see nationally on college campuses, we are going to do everything we can to address any variable. If A.B. 148 is introduced and firearms are allowed on our campuses, it goes back to the same question. It is going to require us to really consider where they are going to be allowed, where the students will be carrying them, and how they will be utilized. We must now consider a new

factor which, unfortunately, is the issue of suicides that may be involved as a result of it.

**Assemblyman Jones:**

My question is pretty direct. It seems to me that most of your testimony is very general, such as the suicide discussion. Regarding the topic of rape, you were talking about people that knew each other and being in their own homes or a friend's home. The statistics that came out earlier were very specific to CCW permit holders. We are talking about a very specific issue. We are not talking generally about suicide or rape at home with someone that is known. When we ask for specifics, it does not seem like you have any specific statistics regarding CCWs. If your police officers are so available, where were the police officers when Amanda Collins was raped? Why are you so opposed to responsible people, in a very specific category, who have been trained to be able to defend themselves?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I cannot speak to the issue with respect to the testimony of Ms. Collins. I was not there at the time, and I do not have the specific data. Regarding the specific data of CCWs that Mr. Lott referred to, I am not sure that I agree with you. I did not see specific data. It was very general in nature. The reason why he does not have specific data is because of the data that I identified previously; many of the college campuses do not allow CCWs. There is a reason for that. Why are we trying to force an issue that does not exist? That was the point of my comments. When we talk about those college campuses that allow CCWs, there are only seven states, and five of those seven still prohibit them in sensitive places. Therefore, why are we being overly broad by allowing CCWs everywhere on our campuses? There does not seem to be data that supports the need for it. That was my point.

**Chairman Hansen:**

You did cite some data. You stated there was one case in Idaho where a professor shot himself in the foot. Can you please elaborate beyond that single point?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

No, I did not pull the data to do so. I am happy to do so if you would like.

**Chairman Hansen:**

I am definitely interested in getting the data. We have a few more Committee members with questions then we will have some other folks testify.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

My question is related to NRS 202.3673, section 4, subsection 4, paragraph (c), which states, "A permittee who is employed in the public building [is not prohibited] from carrying a concealed firearm while he or she is on the premises of the public building." It allows an employee to carry in a public building, and it describes that a public building is any building or office space occupied by any component of the Nevada System of Higher Education, and is used for any purpose related to the system. It goes on to explain some others. Why is NSHE currently putting a blind eye to this statute? There is conflict with NRS 202.365 by not allowing CCW permit holders to carry their firearms in their place of employment, when other state employees are allowed to.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I actually read that statute differently than you do. If you read it, NRS 202.36734, subsection 4 says, "The provisions of paragraph (b) of subsection 3 do not prohibit:" and then it goes into (a), (b), (c), and (d). Therefore, subsection 4 is only referring to subsection 3, paragraph (b), which is a public building. If you look above it, in subsection 3, it says, "A permittee shall not carry a concealed firearm while the permittee is on the premises of: (a) A public building that is located on the property of a public school or a child care facility or the property of the Nevada System of Higher Education...." Therefore, subsection 3, paragraph (a) is very specific and does not allow it. Subsection 4 refers to paragraph (b), which is a public building. In that instance, if you look at paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d), it is really referring to courthouses. They are identifying that in those buildings, judges, prosecuting attorneys, and employees who work in courthouses are allowed to carry. I suspect that is what they are referring to. Therefore, the reason why we interpret that section as disallowing concealed firearms is because subsection 3, paragraph (a) is the specific provision that does not allow a permittee to carry a concealed firearm in or around NSHE campuses. Does that make sense?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I think we will agree to disagree.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

Can you tell us how many requests were actually approved in NSHE within the last year? This would be for CCW permit holders who have gone through the request process at the schools. Also, I do not believe anyone has actually ever answered Assemblywoman Seaman's question. How many students per police officer are there in NSHE?

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

As to Assemblywoman Seaman's question, I had referred that to our UNR police representative, Todd Renwick. The Chairman has said that he will come up to testify to that specific issue. With respect to the CCWs on our college campuses, the statistics that I have available show that there were nine requests at UNR last year. Four of them were nongun related because they were for weapons in general. Five of them were for guns. At UNLV, there were three requests last year. At Truckee Meadows Community College, there were six requests. Western Nevada College had one request. I am sure you would like to know how many were denied or approved. Of the nine at UNR, five were denied, and four were approved.

**Chairman Hansen:**

You mentioned that if allowed, CCWs would have a chilling effect on academic performance. For the state of Utah, which has numerous college campuses, I would suspect there are at least 100,000 students there. They have full-on campus carry. I am wondering if you have any data that suggests they have had an academic decline in their overall performance after the introduction of CCW laws.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I do not have that, but what I do have is the actual data from our faculty who have concerns. I think that is something we have to consider. They are concerned about the chilling effect that it would have. They are here to testify, as well as the students who participate in a lot of the discussion on our college campuses. To me, that is the hard data that we look at for how to keep our campuses safe. We cannot ignore their concerns.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Basically, you are saying that you have no data from all of these other states that allow it that shows an actual decline in academic performance.

**Catherine Cortez Masto:**

I do not have the data with me. Honestly, I have not looked for it. If you would like me to look for that data, I am happy to do so.

**Chairman Hansen:**

I am hoping to get some data from the opponents of the bill. Are there other people in Las Vegas who are willing to testify?

**Frank Slaughter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a former UNLV boxing coach and a parent of a UNLV student. I would like to urge you to oppose A.B. 148, as well as any other bill that would allow guns

on campus. I have brought articles and research describing a myriad of reasons why campus carry endangers our students. We have heard the quote that says "if it is not broke, don't fix it." Common sense tells me that A.B. 148 is a bill that aims to fix a problem that does not exist. While sexual assault is a growing problem around the country, no evidence has proved that allowing concealed carry will reduce crime in any way. In fact, gun crimes at colleges are significantly lower than in the general public. Concealed carry would not aid safety on campuses but would do the opposite by taking away the idea that campuses are sanctuaries.

We have also disclosed the cost of campus carry. In Texas, it would be estimated to cost \$47 million. In Idaho, it cost the university \$3.7 million in one year. While the numbers are still being compiled for the estimated cost in Nevada, I assure you that the cost to this measure is not only in the lives it would endanger, but also the economic cost to our students and the educational system as a whole. I ask you to oppose A.B. 148. It will further burden our colleges and universities with undo costs which will be passed on to our taxpayers as well as our students. Every campus security officer that I have spoken to at UNLV and the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) are not in favor of this bill. It would make their jobs more difficult. I have also interviewed more than 200 students and found the vast majority do not want campus carry. This is the same for the handful of professors and staff that I have spoken with. Some professors have even mentioned that they would resign in protest. I have photos of over 100 students from UNLV and CSN that have voiced their opposition to campus carry. We have also gathered over 1,000 signatures on petitions voicing opposition. If you would like, I can make all of this available. I am sorry I do not have it today.

It frustrates me that various legislators do not understand how foreboding a bill like A.B. 148 would be to our campus community. They do not understand or they do not care. My purpose is to gather your support to stop A.B. 148. I hope that my testimony here today persuades you, our lawmakers, to not have this bill enacted. Thank you for your time. I hope this bill dies in Committee and that good common sense will prevail.

**Chairman Hansen:**

You mentioned that campuses are sanctuaries. You also said this would create havoc of some sort. Out of all the other states doing this right now, including Utah, which has had these same laws for almost a decade, do you have any evidence to show that there is an increase or even a single instance of violence that has disturbed the sanctuary aspect of the Utah campuses or any of the others, with the exception of the professor who shot himself in the foot?

**Frank Slaughter:**

No. I am sorry, but I did not do any research in that area. I can tell you that guns are incompatible to education. That is all I can say on that matter.

**Assemblyman Jones:**

In your testimony, you represented that millions of dollars would have to be expended in the event that the campus carry bill is passed. You referenced multiple places, but you did not say what would be expended. On the fiscal note analysis by the Legislative Council Bureau, there is no fiscal note. This means there is no extra expense as a result of this bill. What are you citing for all of the multiple millions of dollars if this campus carry bill goes through?

**Frank Slaughter:**

There are articles that I have read that stated that in Idaho alone there was \$3.7 million dollars incurred to the university, probably due to liability insurance. I am just a regular person. I am not a professor or part of the university system. This is what I read. There is also an article that states that \$47 million has been spent at the University of Texas in Houston for liability costs. I can provide that article to you if you would like.

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

I wanted to clarify that we are only able to ask one question per witness. What is going to happen is that the opposition will not get as much time. I was hoping we could maybe even ask for another hearing to get more testimony in.

**Chairman Hansen:**

I have the same rules for everyone from the beginning. If you wanted to ask questions of every single witness, I gave everyone on the Committee an equal shot. I have set the limitations as one question per person, per witness. I do not think we are limiting the opposition. Ms. Mastro's testimony was about 35 minutes. However, she was specifically requested to testify by the University's Board of Regents. I am trying to be fair to both sides.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

We appreciate getting input from parents. If this law passes, do you believe that you and your child will consider transferring out of state or out of the university system?

**Frank Slaughter:**

No, I do not think I would take my son out of the university system if this law passed. However, it would be an unsettling and unnecessary law. There is no problem on the UNLV campus. If it is not broken, why fix it? To me, this bill is

all about the NRA and the gun lobbyists trying to push stuff down our throats that we do not need.

**Nadege Barthelmy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a former active duty U.S. Air Force member. Currently, I am the UNLV Black Student Organization vice president. I oppose A.B. 148. My deepest sympathy goes out to Amanda Collins. I definitely understand her anger and belief that if she would have had her gun on her, the events that happened during that unfortunate night might have been different. Like her, I am a mother, a student, and a woman. Unlike her, I do not believe this bill is a solution to preventing crimes. I am a law-abiding citizen. Amanda Collins does not speak for me; neither does Nevada's Assemblywoman Michele Fiore, former Senator John Jay Lee, or any other supporters of this bill.

As a veteran trained in handling guns and assault rifles who has served in Iraq in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, I am a first-hand witness to even the best and brightest losing their better judgment when it comes to handling a gun. This bill is a representation of what is wrong with America. America has a huge issue with the application of appropriate use of force and exercising the escalation measures. This is apparent in cases like the state of Florida versus George Zimmerman, or the case involving the murder of Jonathan Ferrell, a man who was shot ten times by a police officer while attempting to seek help after his car hit a tree. Please note that even police officers who are trained still have issues with applying appropriate use of force and implementing the escalation measures when perceived fear overcomes actual circumstance. In accordance with NRS 200.130, bare fear is insufficient to justify killing. The goal of this proposed bill is to arm people with guns in elementary schools, middle schools, day cares, colleges, and universities. Uneducated and untrained civilians motivated by their perceived fear will have their firearms cocked and loaded to pump lead into students.

Assemblywoman Michele Fiore believes that this bill is a women's right issue. She believes if women like myself, or as she puts it, hot little girls, were allowed to carry firearms into class, it would deter perpetrators because they would be too afraid of getting a bullet in their head. It must be fun to live in this pretend and imaginary world that Assemblywoman Fiore has contrived. Fortunately for me, I live here in the real world. I know that the same rights that would have allowed these little girls to carry a gun into elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, colleges, and universities would also have allowed perpetrators to carry guns too. Assemblywoman Fiore is a self-described conservative, Catholic, gun-toting, Second Amendment, strong-ass woman.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Ms. Barthelmy, I am going to have to interrupt you. Please keep on the topic, with no personal attacks. Please stick to the issues.

**Nadege Barthelmy:**

The reality of this bill is that teachers will now have access to guns at elementary schools. Teachers will have guns at middle schools. Care providers will be allowed to have guns at day care centers. In addition, instead of assisting law officials and school officials, who are both against the passage of this bill, we would rather engage in victim blaming. Public safety is the job of law enforcement. This bill makes it harder for police officers to discriminate between criminals and victims. In the event that police were called out to a school shooting, in those crucial moments when perceived fear takes over, there would be no way to identify the assailant from someone who may have just happened to have his or her gun out. Due to these reasons, I urge all of you to vote no on this bill. If you are strongly in favor of this bill, vote no. Then, reinvest your energy into helping law enforcement make our community safe again. Just to answer Vicky Kawelmacher's question about possible alternatives to this bill, I would like to point out a statement as testified by Professor John Lott. He testified that a person who did research did not choose a particular place because there was a lot of police force there. As an alternative, I would encourage looking into increasing police presence to deter perpetrators.

**Assemblyman Gardner:**

You were talking about how police officers would not be able to decide who was a CCW permit holder and who was not. Currently, when they are not on campus, police officers have to do that every single day. Are you saying that they lose that ability by crossing over onto a campus?

**Nadege Barthelmy:**

Yes, I am saying that. I do not know if you have walked down our hallways, but they are very small and narrow. If you walk into a building as a police officer knowing there is a shooter on campus, you are looking for someone with a gun. If someone with a gun walks up into the hallway, in those few seconds there is no way to determine if that person is a CCW person or the active shooter. Those moments are crucial to police officers. That is the difference between a bullet in their head or a bullet in the head of a perpetrator.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Everyone is making broad generalizations. Can you give me a single example? We have numerous states that allow CCWs on campus. Is there one case of people being shot by a CCW person on a college campus?



**Nadege Barthelmy:**

I do not live on a college campus.

**Chairman Hansen:**

We are talking about CCWs on a college campus. In many states, it is allowed. I want to know if anyone can give examples of people that have been physically harmed by somebody carrying a CCW on a college campus in any of these states that allow it.

**Nadege Barthelmy:**

With respect to your question, this bill is not just about college campuses. It is about elementary schools as well as middle schools and day care facilities. My son goes to an elementary school, and I do not want him in the same classroom as a gun. I do not allow it in my house, and I do not want guns in my son's classroom. If you would like data, I can come back with some.

**Derek Washington, Chairman, Black Democratic Empowerment Project:**

You keep asking for facts. I am going to be perfectly honest with you. I am not a person who can quote chapter and verse of the Bible or laws. I will tell you a few facts. The fact is that I am a 6 foot, 1 inch, 220 pound black man. My fear is that if I am at UNLV or UNR, and I rush up to a woman who is about to drop something, and she is carrying a loaded weapon, she will feel threatened and shoot me. I am afraid of a father with a gun in his backpack who may be delivering cookies to his toddler's school. The toddler may grab it and shoot another toddler. That is what I am afraid of.

To the young lady who was raped, my God, I feel so bad for you. I was held hostage by three drug addicts. They held guns and knives to my head. I still cannot sleep with the lights off. Every day I suffer. The people who held me hostage did not give me time to go get my gun. They did not give me time to unlock the case. They did not give me time to load the gun. I do not see where having guns in school, around children and students, is going to give anyone the clarity of mind to grab his weapon and defend himself or others. It is a nice theory, but when we talk about data, how many people have been able to think clearly in situations like that and do something? Many, many times I thought to run for the door. The one time I did, they grabbed me and threw me to the ground. They told me if I did it again, they would kill me. Honestly, this is sort of a made-up issue.

Lastly, what I am really fearful of, or more ashamed of, is that we are sitting here with so many things going on in this state that need to be fixed like our roads, our environment, and our schools. We are trying to allow people, who

feel they have a God-given right, to carry guns on campus. I am not afraid of that; I am ashamed of that.

**Assemblywoman Seaman:**

You have a lot of fear so I am just wondering if you are afraid that if campuses are a gun-free zone, it may attract someone who wants to do a mass shooting. Does that scare you at all?

**Derek Washington:**

I am afraid of anyone, anywhere, who wants to do a mass shooting. Look at what happened in Norway. A guy killed 91 people there, and they do not allow guns. To be perfectly honest, he was on a mission to kill people. The point is, if a person is bound and determined to do this, they will do this anywhere. Why do we need to have guns everywhere? Why do we need to have guns in a place that is supposed to be safe for our children? You just foster the idea that guns are normal, guns are good, and guns can be everywhere. That is not right. You are basically telling little kids that guns will solve all of their problems.

**Chairman Hansen:**

Although the term God-given right may have been a little bit extreme, do you believe we have a Second Amendment constitutional right to own firearms in the United States?

**Derek Washington:**

I believe that anyone who wants a gun and goes through the proper process should have a gun. I do not necessarily know exactly what the founding fathers meant in the Second Amendment, although I believe they were talking about militias to protect the country. Having said that, I believe that if you are trained and can get a license, after going through all the things you have to do to get a gun, go for it, but be responsible about it. That does not mean just because you have the training and the license, that you are not going to snap one day and take your God-given right to a school and shoot someone. Yes, I do agree that people do have the right to have guns in this country. Until a higher force says differently, I agree absolutely, but with the right training.

**Assemblyman Gardner:**

You said you have fears about these kids getting their hands on guns brought on campuses. Do you have that same fear if you are not on campus?

**Derek Washington:**

Honestly, I have that fear anywhere someone feels they have a God-given right to have a gun. At Kmart, Costco, UNLV, or 7/11, yes, I have a fear of people walking around with chips on their shoulders about God. Yes, absolutely.

**Chairman Hansen:**

We are going to come back to Carson City at this time.

**Caden Fabbi, Speaker of the Senate, Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Reno:**

I currently serve as Speaker for the Senate of the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Reno. I am here today to present the resolution that was passed on February 25, 2015, in opposition of A.B. 148. I have submitted a copy of the resolution to the Committee for your reference ([Exhibit K](#)). The Senate of the Associated Students stands with administration of both the University of Nevada and NSHE in the sentiment that guns do not belong on NSHE campuses for many reasons.

The current system to allow persons to carry concealed weapons on campus with the president's discretion is appropriate. No one knows a campus and whether or not concealed carry is appropriate in certain situations more so than the president of that institution.

According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, there is no recorded incident in which a victim or witness of a violent crime on a college campus has prevented it by brandishing or using a gun. Further, why should students feel that they need to carry guns to feel safe on a college campus?

The insinuation that sexual assaults on college campuses will decrease or end if this bill were to pass is wrong. There is no proof to back this claim. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) does not recommend additional guns to protect individuals from sexual assault. It says that preventing sexual violence perpetration before it happens will achieve the greatest population-level impact. Effective prevention strategies are comprehensive, addressing the multiple levels of influence for sexual violence, victimization, and perpetration in the social ecology. These levels include characteristics in individuals, their relationships, and their physical, social, and cultural environments. To decrease the amount of sexual assaults on our campuses, we hope to educate the students on what sexual assault is and how it most often happens. According to statistics from the Bureau of Justice, and the National Institute of Justice, in the vast majority of cases of sexual assault, the victim knows the perpetrator and thus will be unlikely to brandish a gun in this situation anyway. This was proven on our

campus in a recent survey from the student body regarding the sexual assault climate on the University of Nevada, Reno campus. It found that 80 percent of incidents occurred off campus, and 80 percent of victims knew the perpetrator prior to the incident occurring.

The majority of college students simply do not support campus carry legislation. The proof is in a poll which was conducted recently by the *New York Times*. It showed that 67 percent of males and 86 percent of females are opposed to campus carry.

In the case of an emergency situation occurring on our campus, first responders would have difficulty differentiating between an active shooter and a student legally carrying a concealed weapon. The training required for a citizen to obtain a concealed weapons permit does not necessarily mean that the person is able to react in the case of an active shooter being on campus as opposed to professionals who have been trained in crisis situations.

The Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Reno, in conjunction with the university, has created several successful campus safety programs. These include a blue-light emergency call system and campus escort, which will give any student on campus a ride at night to their home or car.

Institutions of higher learning should be a place for diverse ideas that are shared in a free-flowing manner. Adding a concealed weapon to the picture would detract from this.

The Senate is concerned with the fiscal impact. When campus carry was passed in Idaho, the universities there spent millions of dollars for additional security measures. Recently, a 17 percent tuition hike was approved by the Board of Regents. The Senate supported this under the assumption that those funds would be allocated to hiring tenure-track faculty and lowering the faculty-to-student ratio, and not for additional security measures because of a campus carry bill.

Finally, you must be 21 years of age to obtain a CCW permit in Nevada. This bill would only allow for a percentage of our student body to even carry. Students under the age of 21 could feel defenseless on a campus where only older students, who are also allowed to drink legally, can carry. I, on behalf of the Senate of the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Reno, strongly urge this body to oppose A.B. 148. Thank you for your time.

**Chairman Hansen:**

We have some Committee members who would like to ask you some questions.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

I want to thank you for being a leader in your college campus, more specifically, for doing your polling. You are actually asking your students, and I appreciate that. If this legislation were to pass, did you talk about what that would look like? Would some of the students reconsider going to other campuses if this legislation is passed?

**Caden Fabbi:**

I cannot say with absolute certainty, but I do. I feel there are students that would not come to this campus. I think there are some that are here today who would choose not to go to an NSHE campus if this were to pass.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

You cited a *New York Times* poll. Was that taken in New York, or was that taken in Nevada? Do you know how many students actually participated in the poll?

**Caden Fabbi:**

I do not have that specific information with me, but I would be happy to provide it. In addition, I know that Mrs. Cortez Masto provided some information as well regarding statistics. I would be happy to provide the information that you request.

**Assemblyman Gardner:**

You mentioned the polling. Assuming that is correct, are you saying that all rights should be determined by the majority, or just in this case?

**Caden Fabbi:**

I experience this as a Senator when making tough decisions that impact students. Am I to go with what the student body thinks, or am I to go with what I think is best? I have to ask if there was any formal polling done between your constituents. I think that people are deeply, deeply concerned about this. It is not a laughing matter. I think that people are deeply concerned about this across our state. I would encourage you do that.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I just want to remind everyone on this Committee that it is our responsibility as legislators to imagine possible harms without having hard data. I also wanted to ask if you knew that a lot of the proponents of the bill were citing information from the professor and his book. Have you also read the scrutiny over that data? Entities like the *Washington Post* have weighed in with checks and balances on this hard data in that book. Did that come up in your conversations?

**Caden Fabbi:**

We did not have specific conversations about that book, but I can imagine that there have been some critical remarks on it. I have not read that, but I will.

**Todd Renwick, Commander, Police Services, University of Nevada, Reno:**

I am here on behalf of Adam Garcia, Director of Police Services. As you have heard, most of our higher administration members are conducting business at the Board of Regents meeting. I am here to testify in opposition. I would like to point out some things that we have heard come up. I cannot give you specific data, but I think that Assemblywoman Diaz said it right. I do not want to be the campus that has to have the data to show you. Keep in mind that we have tens of thousands of students and community members that are on these campuses every day. We have large-scale public events. We have venues that host thousands of people for sporting events, concerts, career fairs, and conferences. Unlike most of what you see, we do have unsportsmanlike conduct that occurs at these athletic events. Oftentimes, if not in most of the cases, alcohol is fueling those unsportsmanlike behaviors. We also have rivalry that we deal with at these sporting events. We just do not want these types of environments to potentially become killing fields if something goes south during an event.

It should also be noted that alcohol is widely used around our campuses. To put this into perspective, for the demographic area that we serve, we have cited or arrested over 260 students for alcohol-related incidents on our campus in 2014. We all have heard about suicide issues. Suicide is the leading cause of death among college students in the United States. There have been about 1,100 successful suicides on college campuses. There are an additional 24,000 attempts each year. When a gun is used in those attempts, more than 90 percent of the time it is fatal. That compares to the 3 percent fatality rate for suicide attempts by drug overdoses.

I would like to point out an initiative where we did some polling on our campus. Our recent survey from November 2014 about sexual conduct and campus safety told us that students generally feel safe on campus. Most occurrences of these unwanted sexual contacts happen off campus. Many of our key findings also reflected the reported trends that sexual assault is vastly underreported. We also know that the victim most often knows the perpetrator in 80 percent of these incidents. We also want to point out that 33 percent of these incidents involve alcohol and drugs.

We do have a duty to protect and promote these policies. I want to reiterate that under this current law, the policies that we have are working.

**Assemblywoman Seaman:**

Can you answer the question that I had earlier? When Mr. Garcia was here, those were the statistics that he gave me.

**Todd Renwick:**

Yes, I can answer your question. Our staffing does vary. We have anywhere from two to four officers on shift. Today, we have five uniform officers working patrol.

**Assemblywoman Seaman:**

Today, per approximately 10,000 students, but it can go as low as two to four per day. Is that correct?

**Todd Renwick:**

Absolutely.

**Assemblywoman Seaman:**

So my data was correct. Thank you.

**Shannon Ellis, Vice President, Student Services, University of Nevada, Reno:**

In my capacity as vice president, I come into contact with prospective and current students along with their families, on a very frequent basis. I also have frequent contact with the faculty and the staff who are there to teach them and to provide programs and services for their success. I will tell you that when this issue was in the news last week, I received four telephone calls from the mothers of prospective students who said they would not let their children come to our campus if guns were allowed. I have also had face-to-face conversations with up to ten parents asking me if this is a possibility. Fear is an overriding theme. There is fear from my staff and me, who are frequently involved in heated conversations with students who are frustrated. They may have mental health issues ranging from being frustrated for not doing well in class, to Asperger's Disorder, to Bipolar Disorder.

A campus environment in this day and age is a reflection of the real world in some scary ways. We still adhere to the belief that students learn best at a university level through discourse, dialog, and disagreement. It can become quite heated. It can be offensive. It can be hurtful. Do I have data? No, but I know that my staff are scared, and we have faculty that are scared as well. The thought of engaging our students in a conduct situation, a mental health counseling situation, or in a spirited conversation in class when someone has a gun, has a chilling effect, at the very least.

I do talk to my counterparts at the universities in Utah and Colorado. I talked to them quite a bit before and after these laws went into effect. With all due respect, students in Utah do not drink, do drugs, or party to the extent that our students do. That is from my counterpart in that state. I will tell you that Utah and Colorado have gone through great pains to spend quite a bit of time with staff, and recruitment, and discussing what they need to do in their residence halls in order for students to keep their guns in a safe place. All of these kinds of things have had ramifications. I am talking to them about the what ifs.

I will close with the fact that we all share, no matter how we feel about this bill, that we want our campuses to be safe. I find that common ground is very compelling. You are hearing from us that sexual assaults predominately happen off our campus, and among people that know each other. Therefore, please do not look to guns to solve our sexual assault issue on college campuses because that is not where it is happening in significant or compelling numbers. It is an issue, but this is not the solution.

**Chairman Hansen:**

We will have no questions now because we are out of time. We will have one final person testify from Las Vegas.

**Theresa Davis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

First and foremost, I am a mother. I am also on the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority Board as a commissioner for the North Las Vegas jurisdiction. I am in opposition of this bill. I have children who are currently students in the Clark County School District. I am also a student at an NSHE campus. I would not feel safe with my professor, or the teachers of my children, being a CCW holder. I work with students and youth who have documented mental and emotional disabilities. What if one of those students with documented disabilities should have an issue and a CCW permit holder, who is not aware of that disability, and feels threatened? I feel that a service would not be done in favor of that youth due to his or her documented mental disability.

I am in opposition of this bill and hope that it does not pass. We here in opposition are in fear that those who are qualified to be granted a CCW permit may not continue to be qualified after the permit is granted to carry these concealed weapons. Professor Lott stated that currently there may not be any data or documentation proving that those current CCW permit holders have committed these acts. Are we going to pass this bill just to get the data? That is my statement.



**Chairman Hansen:**

At this time, we are five minutes over on time allowed. I have provided an equal amount of time and testifiers for both sides. I am going to call the sponsor of the bill back up to wind up the hearing on A.B. 148. For those of you not able to testify today, please put your testimony in writing or emails and send them in to us. We would love to hear from you but, unfortunately, with the volume of people who wish to testify on this bill, we would probably be here a week and still not get to everyone.

[Further testimony received and not heard include: Nevada State Education Association ([Exhibit L](#)), Nevada Firearms Coalition ([Exhibit M](#)), Nevada Faculty Alliance Statistics ([Exhibit N](#)), Christopher Lively ([Exhibit O](#)), Greg Ross ([Exhibit P](#)), Mary Cozad ([Exhibit Q](#)), Christopher Morgan ([Exhibit R](#)), Ananda Tomas ([Exhibit S](#)), Carole Chouinard ([Exhibit T](#)), Stillwater Firearms Association ([Exhibit U](#)), National Rifle Association ([Exhibit V](#)), Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence ([Exhibit W](#)), John Saludes ([Exhibit X](#)), Leandro Gonzalez ([Exhibit Y](#)), Rethinking the Nevada Campus Protection Act ([Exhibit Z](#)), miscellaneous letters of support ([Exhibit AA](#)), letters in opposition ([Exhibit BB](#)), and other letters in support ([Exhibit CC](#)).]

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

Thank you for hearing A.B. 148. I just want to make sure you understand that everything that I presented to you today is factual. There was a lot of testimony from Clark County that was not factual, nor was there any backup data. This includes the testimony from Ms. Cortez Masto who had either wrong facts or no facts. I have the facts on the concealed weapons applications from our NSHE campuses. There were 13 concealed weapons permit applications. One was approved, and one was approved for a one-day pass. Therefore, we have one concealed weapons permit to carry on campus which was approved throughout the whole state of Nevada. In her testimony, Mrs. Cortez Masto said there were four approved. As for the other three, I want you to understand that it was not a concealed weapon that was approved. If I was doing a presentation on firearms on one of the NSHE campuses and I wanted to bring in my acrylic AK-47 lamp, which is plastic and not a firearm, I would have to get permission to go on campus with it. Just like this necklace of a firearm that I always wear, they would find it offensive because it is a firearm. These are things that we would have to get permission for. Therefore, the three other permissions granted were for things like that.

As a legislator, and listening to your questions and concerns, I must tell you that I disagree with Assemblywoman Diaz's comments that we should imagine things to make up laws. I just do not think that is appropriate. I will end with a question that many people, including Amanda Collins, have shared. What

gives you the right, and how does rendering me defenseless protect you from a violent crime? Thank you very much.

**Chairman Hansen:**

With that we will end the hearing on A.B. 148. That does not end our hearing, however. We still have some Committee introductions to take care of and then we will go to public comment. Public comment will be limited significantly.

We have an introduction of a bill draft request (BDR) 10-1025.

**BDR 10-1025: Revises provisions governing homeowners' associations  
(Later Introduced as Assembly Bill 233)**

**Chairman Hansen:**

I will entertain a motion at this time.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO INTRODUCE  
BDR 10-1025.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Hansen:**

We will now open up the hearing to public comment, but it cannot be in relation to the bill. Seeing no comments, the hearing is adjourned [at 11:14 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lenore Carfora-Nye  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Judiciary

**Date:** March 5, 2015

**Time of Meeting:** 8 a.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 140	C	Caleb Harris, Disabled American Veterans	Written Testimony
A.B. 140	D	Marshall Willick, Willick Law Group	Testimony and backup documentation
A.B. 148	E	John Lott, Crime Prevention Research Center	Concealed Carry Revocation Rates by Age
A.B. 148	F	Lisa M. Thomas, Private Citizen	Written Testimony
A.B. 148	G	Alisha Ketter, Private Citizen	Written Testimony
A.B. 148	H	Sarah Ketter, Private Citizen	Written Testimony
A.B. 148	I	Vicky Kawelmacher, Private Citizen	Written Testimony
A.B. 148	J	Carol Morrell, Private Citizen	Written Testimony
A.B. 148	K	Caden Kabbi, Associated Students of the University of Nevada	A. RES. 82-122
A.B. 148	L	Ruben Murillo, Jr., Nevada State Education Association	Letter
A.B. 148	M	Don Turner, Nevada Firearms Coalition	Letter
A.B. 148	N	David Steel, Nevada Faculty Alliance	Statistics
A.B. 148	O	Christopher Lively, Students for Concealed Carry	Letter
A.B. 148	P	Gregg Ross, Private Citizen	Letter
A.B. 148	Q	Mary Cozad, Private Citizen	Letter
A.B. 148	R	Christopher Morgan, Private Citizen	Letter
A.B. 148	S	Ananda Tomas, Private Citizen	Testimony

Assembly Committee on Judiciary

March 5, 2015

Page 52

A.B. 148	T	Carole Chouinard, Private Citizen	Letter
A.B. 148	U	J. L. Rhodes, Stillwater Firearms Association	Letter
A.B. 148	V	Daniel S. Reid, National Rifle Association	Letter
A.B. 148	W	Kristy Oriol, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence	Letter
A.B. 148	X	John Saludes, Private Citizen	Links for Testimony
A.B. 148	Y	Leandro Gonzalez, Private Citizen	Letter
A.B. 148	Z	Brian Vasek, Private Citizen	Rethinking the Nevada Campus Protection Act
A.B. 148	AA	Miscellaneous	Letters of Support
A.B. 148	BB	Miscellaneous	Letters of Opposition
A.B. 148	CC	Miscellaneous	Letters of Support