



City of Maricopa

City Hall
39700 W. Civic Center
Plaza
Maricopa, AZ 85138
Ph: (520) 568-9098
Fx: (520) 568-9120
www.maricopa-az.gov

Meeting Minutes - Draft City Council Special Meeting

Mayor Christian Price
Vice-Mayor Marvin L. Brown
Councilmember Peggy J. Chapados
Councilmember Bridger Kimball
Councilmember Vincent Manfredi
Councilmember Nancy Smith
Councilmember Henry M. Wade Jr.

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. **Call to Order**

The City Council special meeting was called to order at 6:09 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Present 7 - Mayor Christian Price, Vice Mayor Marvin L. Brown, Councilmember Peggy J. Chapados, Councilmember Bridger Kimball, Councilmember Vincent Manfredi, Councilmember Nancy Smith, and Councilmember Henry Wade

3. **Agenda Items**

3.1 **[SP 16-01](#)**

The Mayor and City Council shall discuss permitting the carrying of a concealed fire arm on City property. Discussion only.

Mayor Price introduced the subject and discussed the logistics of the meeting. He requested that speakers keep their comments between 3 to 5 minutes and keep the meeting civil. He stated that the City of Maricopa is different from other cities, and while there is some universality in the issue, the City of Maricopa believes in local control. He added that Senate Bill (SB) 1257 was currently moving through legislature and it would be preemptive of tonight's issue. He stated that it was possible that whatever was decided tonight could be preempted by legislature. He stated that SB 1257 was resurrected, but that the bill was not assigned to rules and might not see the light of day.

Mayor Price read a letter (attached to minutes) from Dave Verlennich in support of allowing Concealed Carry Weapons (CCW) permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

Councilmember Kimball read a letter (attached to minutes) from former Councilmember, Alan Marchione in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

Joshua Babb approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings. He recommended that the City be a leader in providing firearm trainings. He stated that if elected as a Council member, he would support allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms in City buildings, including City employees.

Shirley Ann Hartman approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. She spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

Gary Metivier approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He stated he submitted 2 letters to go into the record (attached to minutes). He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings. He detailed CCW training and stated that those who have taken the steps to get a CCW permit should be allowed to protect themselves.

Paul Bick approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He clarified that he was not a voting Maricopa resident, but temporarily resides in Maricopa with his wife. He stated he was not comfortable with the gun lockboxes being outside of City Hall. He stated that if harm came to him in a City facility, it would be the City's responsibility for prohibiting him from defending himself. He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

Bob Bash spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings. He stated that the gun lockers need to be moved inside the building. He expressed concerns previously brought up by Councilmember Smith about concealed weapons left in gym bags at Copper Sky and reiterated that putting the gun lockers inside would address the issue.

Hyrum Grissom approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings. He stated that the costs to provide extra security measures would be overwhelming and that having the lock boxes might be more dangerous than allowing CCW permit holders to carry guns. He discussed CCW training and reiterated his support.

Dan Frank approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He stated he strongly supports Constitutional rights to carry and spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

John Turcott, local gun-shop owner, approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings. He argued that while he has a choice to avoid businesses that don't allow guns, he does not have that choice when doing business with the City.

Jacob Schellenberg approached the lectern and addressed the Mayor and Council. He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

Greg Todd submitted an email (attached to minutes) in opposition of allowing weapons into public buildings.

Mayor Price clarified that no decisions would be made tonight, but direction would be given on how to proceed. He discussed CCW permit training and opened the discussion for Council.

Councilmember Kimball clarified the difference between constitutional carry and CCW permit holders, including the training required to get a CCW permit. He spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings. He explained why the gun lock boxes were placed outside of the building and then expressed concerns that the lock boxes could be dangerous and cause more accidents than avoid them.

Mayor Price reiterated that the discussion was whether to allow CCW permit holders to carry into City building and not the general constitutional carry.

Councilmember Manfredi spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders to carry firearms into City buildings.

Councilmember Smith stated that she did some research and reached out to the public and employees. She stated that she was surprised at the number of people expressed being comfortable with allowing CCW permit holders to carry guns into the facility. She spoke in support of allowing CCW permit holders, including volunteers and employees, to carry firearms into City buildings.

Councilmember Wade thanked the meeting attendees. He stated that it was concerning that there were no opposing arguments. He stated that the majority of those who came forward expressed support and that in a democracy the majority rules. He spoke in favor of going forward with adding the issue to a regular agenda meeting. He stated that when the time comes to vote on the issue, he would vote based on his research and feedback from the citizens.

Mayor Price addressed concerns with treating everyone equally including employees and volunteers. He explained that the City of Gilbert was able to distinguish in one facility because they shared employees with the county and explained that Maricopa would have a similar approach with the Court. He agreed that concealed firearms need to be kept on the person and it would have to be clearly stated. He noted that an informal survey was sent out to staff and it appeared the majority of staff that responded was against it. He spoke in favor of adding the discussion to a regular agenda item.

Councilmember Kimball addressed the issue of leaving guns in duffle bags. He explained that CCW permit training emphasizes that permit holders are responsible for their guns at all times. Next, he agreed that staff with CCW permits should also be allowed to carry firearms into City buildings.

Councilmember Manfredi stated the policy could state that firearm must be in your person at all times. He spoke in support of allowing employees with CCW have to carry as well.

Councilmember Chapados stated that there might be some exceptions in which volunteers and staff with CCW permits should not be allowed to carry guns such as during committee meetings. She stated that personally she would rather not have guns carried into City buildings but that gun ownership is important to the citizens and she would like to see the issue thoroughly vetted. She inquired if they would go forward with a policy or code.

City Attorney, Denis Fitzgibbons explained that some City Code provisions would have to be modified, but that the decision was up to the Council. Councilmember Chapados suggested going forward with a policy.

Councilmember Wade asked how legislature might affect any decisions. Mayor Price elaborated. Discussion ensued regarding legislation.

Vice Mayor Brown stated that he was not persuaded that legislature would pass the initiative. He thanked the attendees for coming and added that he suspected that opponents did not attend because they were intimidated by the passion of those in favor. He addressed concerns with guns left in duffle bags at Copper Sky. He stated

that Copper Sky was place for recreation and that in the case of an active shooter, there would not be anyone quick enough to react and reach for a gun in a duffle bag. He stated that CCW permit holders do tend to be careful and as long as every concern is addressed he would support going forward with placing the issue on a regular agenda.

City Attorney Fitzgibbons clarified that city code would need to be modified. Councilmember Chapados asked if that section of the code could be repealed. Discussion ensued regarding whether to create a policy or modify the code.

Mayor Price stated that local control was a major issue in Maricopa and agreed with Councilmember Manfredi to be preemptive in addressing the issue.

Councilmember Wade stated that Maricopa was fortunate to have low crime levels. He stated that he also has to represent those who were not present who expressed fear and intimidation of firearms.

Consensus was to move forward with bringing the item to a regular council agenda with possible exceptions and exclusions.

City Manager Rose suggested modeling an ordinance after the Gilbert model with some exceptions, adding language to address concerns with guns in bags, exempting court employees from carrying guns, and allowing employees with CCW permits to carry.

Agenda Item SP 16-01 was discussed.

4. Adjournment

The meeting was concluded with a minute of silence for the victims of the terrorist attack on Brussels. The City Council Special meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

A motion was made by Councilmember Bridger Kimball, seconded by Councilmember Henry Wade, to Adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

Certification of Minutes

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the special meeting of the City Council of Maricopa, Arizona, held on the 22nd day of March, 2016. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2016.

**Vanessa Bueras
City Clerk**

Date: Monday, March 21, 2016

To: Mayor and Council, City of Maricopa

From: Alan Marchione
[REDACTED] W Palmen Dr.
Maricopa, AZ, 85138

Subj: Carrying of Firearms on City Property

Dear Mayor Price and Council,

As you begin your discussion on whether or not to allow citizens with concealed firearm permits to carry firearms on city property, I respectfully request you consider my position on the matter. As a veteran and patriot, I'm in support of allowing law-abiding responsible gun owners to carry firearms on city property.

An individual intent on inflicting harm to others represents a one hundred percent threat to their potential victim(s). However, a responsible, law abiding gun owner represents a zero percent threat to themselves or others. Law Enforcement does well to respond to crime after it's been committed, but it has little to no impact on preventing a crime from happening when an individual is intent on committing a crime. There is a non-emergency line one can call, but currently no "pre-crime" hotline exists.

When it comes to situations involving "active shooters," seconds can mean the difference between life or death. Calling 911, and waiting several minutes for law enforcement to arrive (just so they can then begin to evaluate the situation,) may be entirely too late to have any positive impact on saving lives. Unless the City can guarantee the safety of it's citizens, then clearly, those citizens should have the inherent right to protect themselves. Does not the citizenry of the community own the very buildings to which its elected government operates? Arguments have been made that many with concealed permits don't have the proper training... Says who? Most, if not all concealed carry permit holders have had training in firearm safety, and many are former law enforcement or military with extensive training.

Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito recently made comments referencng that if the fundamental right of self-defense does not protect Americans, then the safety of all Americans is left to the mercy of state authorities who may be more concerned about disarming the people rather than keeping them safe.

How does disarming responsible law-abiding gun owners, exercising their constitutional rights, benefit the overall safety of our community?

Respectfully,

Alan Marchione
Former Councilman, City of Maricopa
Former US Marine

Member, National Rifle Association

Mr. Mayor, and Council Members,

In a previous letter, I addressed some of the legal aspects of this issue.

I will now comment on some of the peripheral issues brought up by Council members, and City staff at recent Council work sessions.

Let's start with the City's liability should it allow carry of firearms by CCW permit holders in it's buildings. Should the City allow this group to exercise their right to bear arms in City buildings, and an incident were to take place, what would be the basis for a lawsuit? That the City did not infringe on a Constitutionally protected right! I am not an attorney, but it might be a stretch for the City to find itself in that position. In any case where lethal force is used by an armed citizen, that individual will bear the total responsibility for their actions. I expect the Council to follow the advise of the City Attorney in this matter.

Chief Stahl expressed concerns about officer safety, and that of armed citizens should his officers have to respond to an active shooter situation. I submit that his officers will be at the same level of risk whether the incident takes place on public property, in a public building, or on private property. The Chief knows that his officers will use the same tactics to deal with the situation regardless of the location, so this should be a non issue. He also made an interesting statement to the effect that "His job is to prevent tragedies". Although I have not seen the job description for the position of Chief of Police for the City of Maricopa, I seriously doubt that "preventing tragedies" in in there anywhere. The Chief of Police is an administrative position. Chief Stahl's job is to act in that capacity, and to enforce the laws. Additionally, he is not a patrol officer, and most likely would not be in a position to prevent any kind of crime the majority of the time. Further, I am unaware of any technology in current use outside of a science fiction movie that would allow any law enforcement officer, or agency to predict, and then act before the fact to "prevent" any crime. Sadly, the fact is law enforcement is reactive, not predictive. A

crime must be in process, or have happened before a response takes place. It is in those seconds, and minutes before law enforcement arrives that innocents are in the most danger. It is for this reason alone that armed citizens go about their daily affairs bearing arms. They understand that law enforcement has no duty to protect an individual citizen, but are only charged with protecting society at large, and this legal doctrine has been upheld at every level of our court system up to, and including the Supreme Court of the United States.

Council member Chapados stated that as a senior citizen, a percentage of the input she has received concerning this has been from other seniors (mostly female) with whom she interacts socially. They have told her that it would make them uncomfortable if they knew there were armed citizens present in public buildings. Perhaps it might be best to explain to them that any time they are out in public, outside of the walled in, protected by unarmed private security neighborhoods in which they live, they are surrounded by armed citizens. We shop in the same stores they do, fill our prescriptions at the same pharmacy's, eat in the same restaurants, recreate in the same parks, drive on the same roads, and so on as we go about our daily routines. At any given time armed citizens are probably standing in line next to them at the checkout aisle, seated at the table next to them as they dine, fueling our vehicles at the gas pumps, and they don't even know it. Their comfort comes from their ignorance of just how many citizens there are out there bearing arms, and that number is growing by leaps, and bounds. If they gave any serious thought as to how many times they are encountering armed citizens on a daily basis, they might never leave their homes. I am a senior citizen myself, and I know that the predators out there view us as easy prey, because many of us, myself included have age related handicaps that prevent us from protecting ourselves against violent crime by any other means than that of bearing arms. It might also be asked of them just how much time they actually spend in public buildings. Aside from the library, or Copper Sky, most business conducted with the City should be of very short duration, thus minimizing any potential interaction between armed citizens, and unarmed

citizens that might cause some to feel uncomfortable. When all of this is taken into consideration, along with the fact that any firearms would be carried discreetly (concealed) they would not know if someone was armed, or not. Simply stated, they live in a society where both good, and bad guys carry firearms, and if they can't deal with that fact, then they had best stay at home behind locked doors, and never venture out in public. Here is another thought to consider. I have studied our founding documents extensively, and I have been unable to find any "right" to feel comfortable, or "right" to feel safe, expressed in writing. These invented "rights" are not part of the natural law, are the creation of the minds of anti rights proponents that have a personal aversion to firearms, and those that own them, and are wrongfully used in an attempt to limit the free exercise of a right that is protected by the Constitution. My sincerest apologies to those that feel this way, but your need for personal comfort, or your need to feel safe, does not now, and never should, trump my Constitutionally protected right to bear arms!

I have also seen comments in local news media that "We don't live in that kind of community", or "the people that live in Maricopa aren't the kind of people that would carry out a mass shooting". Those are statements that defy logic. How anyone could speak to the mental state of every one of the residents of the City of Maricopa with any degree of certainty is baffling to me. Also, Maricopa is not protected by a wall around the city with all access controlled to keep out those that present a threat to the residents. People from outside the city travel through it every day. Is it possible that one of them might pick Maricopa as the ideal place to carry some perverted act of aggression? I have no doubt what so ever that the residents of Aurora, Co., or Newtown, Conn. felt the same way about their quiet little communities before the psychopaths that lived next door decided that it was a good time to get their 15 minutes of fame by going on a murderous rampage. We live in an age where there is no safe place, and that includes our own homes. One may be subjected to an act of violence at any place, and at any time. If one fails to recognize that fact, they do so at their own peril.

This brings us to the concept that a place may be made "safe" by placing a sign on a door. The myth of the "gun free zone" has by this point in time been rendered moot. The idea that a "safe" place can be created by placing a sign on a door has been thoroughly discredited. The only people affected by this sort of nonsense are those that are predisposed to obey the law. Criminal psychopaths

are not likely to be deterred in their actions by prospect that they might be charged with a misdemeanor violation of some firearms law when they are contemplating an act of mass murder, or carrying out a personal vendetta against some individual.

They understand that there is unlikely to be any resistance in a place where the law abiding citizens have been disarmed for their convenience, which is why they select these locations to carry out their carnage. "Gun free zones" are in reality hunting preserves for the predators in our society created by well meaning public officials, and private property owners who honestly believe that this approach will in fact work to the overall benefit of society as a whole. After having seen the repeated failure of this concept on a national basis, it is difficult to understand why this approach is still under consideration.

There now exists substantial evidence that in localities, and states where large numbers of CCW permit holders are present, the rates of violent crime drop. Why? Because those that would harm others are tempered in their actions by the mere possibility that there may be present, someone with the training, and the tools to thwart their plans. Every day armed citizens somewhere in the country use a firearm to protect their lives, or those of another innocent. A biased media does their best to hide this information from the public, while glorifying the exploits of the mentally defective, or criminal class to fulfill an anti gun agenda that is counter to the public safety.

Those that will urge the Council to keep the City's buildings posted for their own personal comfort misunderstand the role the armed citizen plays in our society. We are not a threat to those that choose not to bear arms. We do not carry a firearm with the intent to threaten, or harm anyone. We also do not carry with the intent to act as

vigilante's. I do not carry a firearm to protect others, I carry it to protect myself, and my family. Protecting them is the job of law enforcement, not an armed citizen. As an instructor, I caution my students that they are liable for their actions, and that to act in defense of others is a legal minefield where they should fear to tread. We armed citizens are asking for nothing more than the freedom to exercise our right to bear arms in defense of self, and family. Give us an opportunity to show not only you as elected officials, but the residents of Maricopa that we can do this in a responsible manner. Your actions as public officials might even influence some private property owners that have posted their property to reconsider their positions. Give us a chance to show that we can carry the burden of responsibility that comes with bearing arms, and we will not disappoint you, or our community.

Thank you for your kind consideration in this matter

**Gary A. Metivier
Maricopa, AZ.**

Mr. Mayor, and Council Members,

I am an NRA Certified firearms instructor, a holder of CCW permits from several States, and have carried a firearm for personal protection for over 35 years. Recent actions taken by the city staff posting selected city buildings with "No Firearms Allowed" signs, and installation of firearms lockers at these locations, has prompted me to express my thoughts on this issue.

If my understanding of the situation is correct, since the incorporation of the City of Maricopa in 2003, the City Code has prohibited the carry of firearms in the city's public buildings. From 2003 until the fall of 2015, the City had not posted their buildings in compliance with state law, and citizens with CCW permits bearing arms had been routinely entered these buildings to conduct whatever business they had to with the city. During the 11 year period between incorporation, and the posting of the buildings, no incidents of misconduct with weapons took place in any public buildings. This change in policy has caused many citizens to question why the City has, without a good reason, chosen to take the actions it has. As a result of public inquiry, and comment sent to the Mayor, and City Council, a Councilperson has introduced a resolution that would once again permit the carry of firearms in public buildings by CCW permit holders. The Mayor, and City Council now find themselves in the position of having to have a public debate on this issue. If any of the forgoing statements, or chronology of the events is incorrect, please, let me know, because I want to be fully informed on this issue. There are so many factors that must be taken into consideration during the decision making process that they can not all be covered in one opinion letter, so I have chosen to address the legal aspects of the issue first.

Perhaps the best place to start would be with a quick review of Civics 101. In the schools I attended I was taught that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. The first 10 Amendments to that document, which we all know as the Bill of Rights, secures the rights of the people from government

intrusion in no uncertain terms. As everyone knows, the 2nd Amendment protects the right of the people to keep, and BEAR arms. The Constitution of the State of Arizona also contains language that protects that right. Both documents further state that this right may not be "infringed", or "impaired".

I can see the eyeballs rolling up toward the ceiling as you read this, accompanied by the mental reaction of "Oh boy, here we go again with the 2nd Amendment argument.....", but the simple fact is that what is going to be debated as the City Council reconsiders it's recent actions is whether, or not, the free exercise of a Constitutionally protected right by CCW permit holders will be allowed in the City of Maricopa public buildings. Please, do not lose sight of this as the decision making process moves forward. Each of you in a public forum have expressed your support of the 2nd Amendment. You are being offered an opportunity to back up your public statements with an action that will demonstrate that you do in fact support "the right of the people to keep, and bear arms", by restoring the free exercise of that right by a select group of trained individuals in the City of Maricopa's public buildings. End of review of Civics 101, now let's move on to Arizona State Law.

In Arizona, the State reserves unto itself the power to regulate firearms statewide. Political subdivisions of the State are prohibited from enacting any ordinances regulating virtually every aspect of firearms ownership, and carry by the state firearms preemption statute ARS 13-3108. What limited authority that the State does allow political subdivisions to exercise is covered by Subsection "G" of that statute. The main reason that the State reserves the power to regulate firearms unto itself is to keep the laws consistent throughout the state. This prevents the political subdivisions from creating a patchwork of restrictive laws that are different in every jurisdiction, that would make it difficult, if not impossible for an armed citizen to remain in compliance with the law by simply passing a line on a map while in transit through the state. Councilperson Smith has raised this point in Council work sessions. Uniformity is important. It is for this reason alone that

the State has a preemption statute. Mayor Price stated in a work session that he felt that local control would be a better idea, and that the legislature might be out of touch with the needs of local government. I submit that that opinion is probably shared by every elected official in every political subdivision in the state, and in some cases it may have merit, but not when the exercise of a protected right is to be the subject of that control. Let me cite an example. Prior to 2010, state law allowed the State, and it's political subdivisions to restrict the possession, and carry of weapons in public parks. Not surprisingly, the State, and every political subdivision in the state had laws, ordinances, or rules prohibiting weapons in parks. Since they had the authority, they exercised it. Government power should never be exercised arbitrarily. There must always be a demonstrated need for freedom to be limited, and the decision to limit it must be for a just cause. In 2010, legislation was introduced, and was subsequently passed, and signed into law by the Governor that strengthened the preemption statute and removed the section that prohibited weapons in parks. The media, and the anti rights naysayers all predicted that as a result of that change in the law, that the wholesale slaughter of innocents in our parks at the hands of all those "yahoos", "cowboys", and "NRA nuts" carrying guns would soon have us reevaluating the decision to "just let anyone carry a gun in the parks". Here we are now 5 1/2 years after the "unwise, and misguided" repeal of that portion of the law, but for some strange, and inexplicable reason, the predicted bloodbath hasn't occurred. Park maintenance workers are not mopping up the blood in the parking lots, and around the picnic tables. Those that are armed are recreating side by side with those that are not, and society as a whole is reaping the benefits.

Now let's get back to the state preemption statute, and what authority it does allow the political subdivisions to exercise. It does allow political subdivisions to prohibit the carry of arms in public buildings, and as was the case with the parks, every one of them has exercised that authority, and posted their buildings. So the question is "Why hasn't the State removed this authority from the preemption statute?" The answer is simple.

They would have to allow weapons in State buildings, so this part of the statute is still in force to allow local governments the same authority. City Manager Rose brought to the attention of the Mayor, and Council that there has been legislation introduced at the state level that could impact the decision of the City to post their public buildings. The legislation he is referring to is SB 1257, which at this time has passed out of the Senate, and is moving forward in the House. The reason that bills like SB 1257 are submitted is because public officials at all levels of government insist on posting public buildings. As this pertains to actions at the local level that restrict the rights of citizens that bear arms, those citizens have to go to the State Legislature to seek their relief. None of this would be necessary if public officials would simply allow the free exercise of a protected right. I include a link here for your convenience should you wish to view the bill as written.

<http://www.cgstatetrack.com/teaxis/redirect?id=56a1be6e1e5f>

The proposed legislation would not change the preemption statute, but would change the Misconduct with Weapons Statute 13-3102 in regard to who may, or may not bear arms in public buildings. In simple terms SB 1257 would prohibit the disarming of a CCW permit holder bearing arms who wishes to enter a public building unless that public building is equipped with what amounts to TSA level airport security, i.e. metal detectors, and security personnel at every entrance. The main argument against this legislation is that it would be prohibitively expensive to equip all public buildings with the required equipment, and personnel This is not the case though, as the costs can be avoided by simply allowing the carry of firearms in public buildings. The legislation also reveals a fact that is often ignored in debates of this issue, and that is the fact that a sign on a door doesn't make a building secure, and when elected officials proclaim that these posted buildings are now a "safe place", they are not in fact any safer than they were before they were posted. Absent the aforementioned equipment, and personnel that would in fact make the building truly secure, the public has only the illusion of safety, not safety in fact. Currently State law is almost totally prohibitive as to who may, or may not enter a public

building while carrying a firearm. Exceptions are made for selected groups such as law enforcement personnel, some members of the armed forces, and others that must bear arms in the performance of their official duties. SB 1257 would add CCW permit holders to that group. Why would the State Legislature consider adding CCW permit holders to the list of persons that are exempt from those prohibitions? Aside from the fact that it is the result of lobbying efforts, I believe that the reason for the change is that the members of the Legislature recognize that CCW permit holders, like the members of the groups already permitted to bear arms in public buildings, do not constitute a threat to public officials, government employees, or society at large.

This country has enacted thousands of laws regulating firearms at all levels of government since 1968. This experiment in controlling social behavior has been a dismal failure, and hasn't prevented one death at the hands of those members of society that chose not to be constrained in their actions by signs, and laws.

Firearms sales are skyrocketing across the nation, as are applications for CCW permits as more, and more people realize that their government can not protect them, and they are taking the steps that they feel will make them safer. It is time for a new paradigm that defies the conventional thinking. It has been said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over, and over, and expecting a different result. Let's follow the example of the City of Gilbert, and try some out of the box thinking. Let Maricopa set an example that other local governments can look at and say "Hey it's working for them, maybe we should give it a try."

I believe that more freedom is always in the best interest of the people. The choice is in your hands. Please choose wisely.

**Gary A. Metivier
Maricopa, AZ.**

Dear Mayor Price,

I am writing to ask for your support in the upcoming 12/15/2015 council work session, regarding the carrying of firearms within the city owned building at Copper Sky. In August, I expressed my concerns to you over the gun free zone posting at Copper Sky. At that time I had asked that the policy be amended to allow for an exception for State issued carry permit holders. This is not just my concern nor just the concern of a few local citizens. It is much larger than that.

In recent radio broadcasts, both Pinal County Sheriff Babeu and Maricopa County Sheriff Arpaio expressed their concern over recent events, such as the Colorado Springs and San Bernardino attacks.

Sheriff Babeu said, "I will encourage every citizen to be armed to protect themselves." and "You have to take your safety into your own hands or you're setting yourself up to be a victim."

Sheriff Arpaio said, "All Arizona's civilian gun owners need to take action in the event a terror attack or other violence occurs until law enforcement arrives." He also called on the 250,000 current Arizona concealed weapons permit holders to join the fight against terrorism and mass shootings.

The carrying of a firearm is a fundamental liberty and freedom, guaranteed by the Second Amendment of our U.S Constitution and by the State of Arizona. In fact, since Arizona became a constitutional carry state in 2010, a recent study shows the violent crime rate has dropped from 6.4% per 100,000 to 4.7% per 100,000, while gun ownership continues to increase.

We can not continue to promote fear of the gun or the law abiding citizen with a gun. The reality is, violent force must be met with an equal or superior force. By taking that force away in gun free zones, they become victim zones. Let's not let this happen in our city. Together, we must all stand against violence.

I ask you again, to support this initiative, allowing the citizens of Maricopa to defend themselves in this public facility, should unsuspected violence occur.

Respectfully,

Dave Verlennich

██████ W. Chambers Dr.

Maricopa, AZ 85138

████████████████████

Gregory Rose

From: Greg Todd <gtodd03@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2016 2:13 PM
To: Gregory Rose
Subject: City of Maricopa, Arizona Contact Inquiry

Greg Todd has sent a contact form inquiry from *City of Maricopa, Arizona* on Feb 01 2016.

Name: Greg Todd
Email: gtodd03@yahoo.com
Day Phone: [REDACTED]
Evening Phone: [REDACTED]
Would like to be contact by: Email

Special Requests/Comments:

Mr Rose - I am against allowing weapons (open or concealed) into public buildings or our city parks. I have faith our law enforcement team will provide all reasonable protection required by myself and family. Weapons, legal or otherwise, do not belong in public gathering places!

Generated by Work Force Feb 01 2016 15:12:43