

**2021 HOUSE JUDICIARY**

**HB 1311**

# 2021 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Judiciary**  
Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1311  
1/27/2021

Relating to possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon at a public gathering.

**Chairman Klemin** called the hearing to order at 3:00 PM.

Present: Representatives Klemin, Karls, Becker, Buffalo, Christensen, Cory, K Hanson, Jones, Magrum, Paulson, Paur, Roers Jones, Satrom, and Vetter.

**Discussion Topics:**

- Public safety

**Rep. B. Koppelman:** Introduced the bill. Testimony # 3856 3:02

**Andrew Kordonowy, Dickinson, ND:** Testimony # 3476 3:32

**Amy Dekok, Legal Counsel ND School Board Association:** Testimony #3855 3:40

**Russell Ziegler, NDCEL:** Testimony #3749 3:49

**Rosalie Etherington, DOCR, ND State Hospital:** Testimony #3618

**Michael Hellman, ND Small Organized School:** Testimony #3817

**Katie Fitsimmons, ND State University Systems:** Testimony #3827 4:00

**Jane Vangsness Frisch, ND State College of Science:** Testimony #3581 4:07

**Susan Beehler, Moms Demand Action For Gun Sense of America:** Testimony #3747  
4:11

**Christopher Dobson: ND Catholic Conference:** testified orally in opposition. 4:22

**Additional written testimony:** 3759, 3761, 3824

**Chairman Klemin** closed the hearing at 4:23.

DeLores D. Shimek  
Committee Clerk

HB 1311

Rep. Ben Koppelman- Testimony

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to introduce HB 1311 to you today. The purpose of this bill is to allow an individual who has a valid dangerous weapons license to carry concealed in publicly owned and operated buildings. This would not apply to schools as they are still specifically excluded in this section. The other small change in this bill is to qualify 'athletic or sporting event' as school sponsored, which would apply to all K-12 and college events.

As many of you know, I am a big proponent of the Second Amendment. And as such, it has been a goal of mine to reduce or remove burdensome regulations in state law that limit the ability of individuals to exercise those rights.

In North Dakota we have several methods in which we can carry a dangerous weapon concealed. We can carry concealed through a provision known as 'constitutional carry', which allows residents that have lived in the state for a year to carry if they possess a valid state photo ID. An individual may also carry concealed if they possess a valid dangerous weapons license from North Dakota or a state that has reciprocity with our state.

In North Dakota, we offer two classes of dangerous weapons licenses. The primary differences in the licenses is that a class 1 license requires classroom learning, shooting proficiency, and the individual must be 21 to be eligible. The class 1 course must be repeated at each renewal whereas the class 2 may be renewed by simply filling out the paperwork and paying a fee. Both licenses have the same applicability in ND, but class 1 license holders have reciprocity with more states. Both license classes require a background check, and individuals who are not allowed to possess firearms are not eligible for a dangerous weapons license.

Currently in North Dakota, one may carry concealed in most places, with exception of schools, sporting events, churches (in some cases), bars, bingo halls, and government buildings. I believe the main reason people carry concealed is for protection, and there is no data to suggest that individuals that carry concealed in North Dakota are a threat to public safety. In fact, the restrictions in

our law are followed by the honor system, as most of the prohibited places do not have equipment that detects weapons. In other words, these laws are followed by “the good guys” and likely will not prohibit “a bad actor” who intends to do someone harm while carrying a weapon. I think it is very important for individuals to be able to carry concealed to protect themselves, as it is unreasonable to believe that the police or private security can protect us wherever we happen to be. As a rule, I believe one should be able to have the tools to protect themselves anytime they cannot reasonably be guaranteed protection by the police or private security.

In most of our neighboring states, individuals are able to carry concealed in the capitol buildings as well as many other government buildings. This has not led to any increase in violence, and in-fact may have even deterred violence since these areas are not soft target “gun-free zones”, where most active shooter events occur.

With HB 1311, I have attempted to create a reasonable path to achieve this goal in North Dakota. The changes would allow those with a valid dangerous weapons license to carry in most publicly owned and operated buildings. This group of individuals are those that are the most dedicated to carrying concealed on a regular basis as they have chosen to apply for that license even though they could carry concealed through the “constitutional carry” provision. This allows them to carry in other states as well. I believe this group is much more likely to practice firearm proficiency so that they are prepared if they ever need to use their weapon. Thus, it only seems logical that this is where we start when considering who may carry in government buildings.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I request that you give this bill a Do-Pass recommendation. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

The "public gathering" as currently defined is confusing and leaves more questions than answers. An athletic event could include a game of horseshoes on public property or walking past a park bench with people playing chess. The defining factor seems to be who the prosecutor is and how expensive of a lawyer you can afford. HB 1311 changes the wording of the law to better fit into my perceived intent of the law. No one should become a criminal for exercising their rights. I urge a Do Pass on HB 1311.



**NDSBA**

**NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL  
BOARDS ASSOCIATION**

P.O. Box 7128  
Bismarck ND 58507-7128  
1-800-932-8791 • (701)255-4127  
[www.ndsba.org](http://www.ndsba.org)

**HB 1311  
Testimony of Amy DeKok  
House Judiciary Committee  
January 27, 2021**

Chairman Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee, my name is Amy DeKok. I am in-house Legal Counsel for the North Dakota School Boards Association. NDSBA represents all 178 North Dakota public school districts and their boards. I am here today in opposition to HB 1311.

Our schools serve arguably the most vulnerable population of citizens. Parents entrust their children to our schools to protect them and keep them safe from harm. If passed, HB 1311 would likely make it more difficult for schools to keep kids safe and protected. NDSBA opposes this bill because the reference to school as a public gathering where at it is generally unlawful to possess a firearm or dangerous weapon is inadequate. The reference, which appears in subsection 1(a) is: "at a school or school athletic or sporting event." This does not take into account non-athletic or non-sporting events sponsored or sanctioned by a school. It also does not factor in property that may be leased by a school and used for school purposes, but may not be a "school." The language should be amended to include: "a school, property or facility owned or leased by a school, or at a school sponsored or sanctioned event."

Additionally, NDSBA opposes the bill because it seeks to allow individuals with a class 1 or class 2 license to possess a firearm or dangerous weapon at a publicly-owned or operated building. This would include any publicly owned building where youth sports or activities occur, such as the World War Memorial building here in Bismarck. These activities are typically not school-sponsored or school-sanctioned; rather, they are run through the parks and recreation department.

For these reasons, NDSBA stands in opposition to HB 1311 and asks this committee to give it a do not pass recommendation. Thank you for your time. I would be happy to answer any questions the committee may have.



1 **HB 1311 – Relating to possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon at a public gathering.**

2 **January 27, 2021**

3 Chairman Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee. Thank you for the opportunity  
4 to testify on this HB 1311. I am Dr. Russ Ziegler, assistant director for the North Dakota Council  
5 of Educational Leaders. I am also a former United States Marine Reservist where I served in the  
6 infantry as a mortarman. Today I will be providing testimony in opposition to HB 1311.

7 I think the intent of this bill was to define what a public gathering would mean. However, making  
8 the changes suggested would muddy the waters for schools. The current language in the bill states  
9 that an individual may not possess a firearm or dangerous weapon at: a. A school or school-  
10 sponsored athletic or sporting event; b. A church or other place of worship; or c. Except as provided  
11 in subsection 6, a publicly owned or operating building.

12 Letter A concerns us because there are numerous activities that are school sponsored and yet are  
13 not athletic or sporting related. For example, speech meets, Science Olympiad, FFA events,  
14 spelling bee's and numerous others. Many of these events take place in public areas but not  
15 necessary on school grounds or even in buildings This is our concern with letter c. in the bill. An  
16 example of this would be FFA events, some of these are hosted at the county fairgrounds or rodeo  
17 grounds. In these cases, would those areas be designed as places where carrying would not be  
18 allowed? And if so, how would individuals know that when FFA is at the fairgrounds you are not  
19 allowed to carry? Would the county fairgrounds or rodeo grounds be considered a building?  
20 Section 6 of this bill states that "an individual possessing a valid class 1 or class 2 firearm and  
21 dangerous weapons license under section 62.1-04-03 may possess a firearm or dangerous weapon  
22 at a publicly owned or operated building". Is the term building literal – would a public park or  
23 other public grounds fall under this code or is it strictly in a brick and mortar building?

24 If public parks fall under this provision, then individuals could carry at the public soccer fields in  
25 the communities. In Bismarck non-school sponsored activities occur in our public parks. Youth  
26 soccer for example could have numerous kids participating in the city sponsored tournament or  
27 even practice. Flag football, at public tennis courts, at public pools, are all other examples where  
28 this bill will have an effect.

29 Another concern of ours for this bill is that the minimum age for an individual to possess a Class  
30 2 license is 18. In most schools that could be ½ or more of the senior class. With this bill could a  
31 student carry in a publicly owned building such as the community bowl, Fargo Dome, or the Alerus  
32 Center? Would the school be able to say that students are not allowed to carry at those places? Or



33 does this bill take that authority away from the local boards? This also bring up another issue that  
34 deals with blurring the lines between regular school discipline and criminal activities. IF you have  
35 a student, for example, who is carrying a weapon that is accused of bullying or harassment, since  
36 that student is carrying a firearm or dangerous weapon on public grounds, during a non-athletic  
37 event would that issue be moved up to a criminal activity with larger consequences since they are  
38 armed?

39 With my years of military service and years of experience working in public schools I could give  
40 you more scenarios of the what ifs. I will not do that however, I would like to say that if this bill  
41 were to pass, I would not want to be the youth soccer referee with individuals who are carrying a  
42 weapon, or the school official who will have to try to calm down patron at the Bismarck  
43 Community Bowl because they did not like the call on the field.

44 Because of these and other concerns I have to respectfully request a DO NOT pass on HB 1311.

**Testimony**  
**House Bill 1311 - Department of Human Services**  
**House Judiciary Committee**  
**Representative Klemin , Chairman**  
January 27, 2021

Chairman Klemin, and members of the House Judiciary Committee, I am Rosalie Etherington, Superintendent of the North Dakota State Hospital (NDSH) and Chief Clinics Officer of the Human Service Centers, of the Department of Human Services (Department). I am here on behalf of the Department in opposition of House Bill 1311.

Current statute allows the North Dakota State Hospital, regional human service centers, and Life Skills and Transition Center , to prohibit weapons on our grounds and in our facilities. House Bill 1311 removes this ability and would allow individuals possessing a valid class 1 or class 2 firearm and dangerous weapons license to possess a firearm or dangerous weapon at a publicly owned or operated building, including these facilities.

As hospital and clinic administrators we need the discretion to restrict firearms and dangerous weapons on our grounds in order to provide a safe and secure environment for our patients and staff. Individuals we serve, sometimes in altered states of mind, require extraordinary caution to prevent harm.

For these reasons the Department opposes HB 1311.

This concludes my testimony and I am happy to answer any questions. Thank you.



# North Dakota Small Organized Schools

#3817

Mr. Michael Heilman  
Executive Director  
3144 Hampton Street  
Bismarck, ND 58504  
[mheilmanndsos@gmail.com](mailto:mheilmanndsos@gmail.com)  
701-527-4621

Mr. Brandt Dick  
President  
PO Box 100 – 123 Summit Street  
Underwood, ND 5857  
[Brandt.Dick@underwoodschool.org](mailto:Brandt.Dick@underwoodschool.org)  
701-442-3274

Mr. Steven Heim  
Vice-President  
PO Box 256  
Drake, ND 58736  
[Steve.heim@k12.nd.us](mailto:Steve.heim@k12.nd.us)  
701-465-3732

HB 1311 – Related to carrying a firearm at a public gathering

Testimony in opposition

Michael Heilman – Executive Director North Dakota Small Organized School

January 27, 2021

Chairman Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee, my name is Michael Heilman. I am the Executive Director of the North Dakota Small Organized Schools (NDSOS). I represent 154-member school districts of the North Dakota Small Organized Schools. NDSOS stands in opposition to of HB 1311 as it is currently written.

NDSOS also testified in opposition to a very similar bill last week, HB 1297. With HB 1297 Representative Ben Koppelman’s key amendment addressed NDSOS’s concerns dealing with the removal of the infraction section of the bill and addressing Section 1 1-a of the bill to include school sponsored athletic and sporting events.

Although NDSOS greatly appreciated the amendments made to address athletic events on or of school sites. The same concerns exist for non-athletic events held on or off school sites. Events like school dances, banquets, speech and drama events, career and technical education competitions, graduations... it is a very expansive list. We would respectfully ask that sponsors of HB 1311 consider the addition of all school sponsored events held on or off school grounds, be included in section 1 - 1 a of HB 1311.

a. A school, a or any school-sponsored ~~athletic or sporting~~ event;

Thank you Chairman Klemin and member of the House Judiciary Committee. I would stand for any questions.

Mr. Michael Heilman – Executive Director  
North Dakota Small Organized Schools  
[mheilmanndsos@gmail.com](mailto:mheilmanndsos@gmail.com)  
701.527.4621

---

## Board of Directors

### Region 1

Mr. Tim Holte, Supt. Stanley  
Mr. John Gruenberg, Supt. Powers Lake

### Region 2

Mr. Jeff Hagler, Supt. North Star  
Mr. Steven Heim, Anamoose & Drake

### Region 3

Dr. Frank Schill, Supt. Edmore  
Mr. Dean Ralston, Supt. Drayton

### Region 4

Mr. Kelly Koppinger, Supt. New England  
Mr. Justin Fryer, Supt. Solen

### Region 5

Mr. Joel Lemer, Bd. Member Carrington  
Mr. Brandt Dick, Supt. Underwood

### Region 6

Mr. Mitch Carlson, Supt. LaMoure  
Dr. Steven Johnson, Supt. Lisbon

**The mission of NDSOS is to provide leadership for the small/rural schools in North Dakota and to support legislation favorable to their philosophy while opposing legislation that is harmful.**

## **HB 1311**

House Judiciary

January 27, 2021

Katie Fitzsimmons, NDUS Director of Student Affairs

701-328-4109 | [katie.fitzsimmons@ndus.edu](mailto:katie.fitzsimmons@ndus.edu)

Chair Klemin and Committee Members: my name is Katie Fitzsimmons and I serve as the Director of Student Affairs for the North Dakota University System. I am representing the System Office but not the State Board of Higher Education, as the SBHE has not met since this bill was introduced, in opposition to HB 1311. The bill would allow an individual holding a valid class 1 or class 2 firearm and dangerous weapons license to possess a firearm or dangerous weapon functionally everywhere except in a school, at a school-sponsored athletic or sporting event, in a church or place of worship, or in a portion of a publicly owned or operated building used as a court. The unexcluded areas would include our eleven colleges and universities, as they are publicly owned and operated buildings. I would like to focus on three issues in my testimony today: current State Board Policy regarding firearms, the definitions of public gatherings and schools in NDCC, and our campus police departments and crime rates.

Under current law, NDUS institutions are classified as “public gatherings,” where the possession of firearms and dangerous weapons is restricted. As a result, the State Board of Higher Education enacted State Board Policy 916.1 to be in compliance with state law, which prohibits the possession of firearms and dangerous weapons in campus buildings owned or operated by the State Board of Higher Education. However, recognizing that there may be necessary exceptions to this general rule, Policy 916.1 authorizes the Chancellor or institution president to permit a qualifying individual to store a firearm or dangerous weapon in a campus residence provided that certain requirements are met. Additionally, most of our campuses provide secure weapon storage options for our students. At this time, this policy works well for our students, faculty, and staff and the System Office has received few complaints as to its functioning. As a result, the System Office sees no benefit, and many potential drawbacks, to expanding firearm possession on our campuses.

This bill addresses the ambiguity of the definition of a “public gathering”, which is a great move in transparency and understanding for not only the public, but for all legislators and state entities. As stated in NDCC 62.1-02-05, “public gathering” means an athletic or sporting

event, a school, a church or other place of worship, and a publicly owned or operated building.” According to our legal counsel, the North Dakota University System lands in the bucket of publicly owned or operated buildings, but not in the definition of a school. I think we are all pretty clear on what a school is, what a church or place of worship is, what an athletic or sporting event is, but when it comes to lumping publicly owned and operated buildings into one category, things can get a bit hairy.

Our campuses are places where students of all ages go to learn, live, eat, workout, perform, practice, research, and compete. Students sleep on the property, faculty and staff work all hours, we have campus police and security to respond to emergencies, and our campuses have cafeterias, swimming pools, and theaters while boasting classrooms, labs, and libraries. Most of these spaces are open to the public. When you compare the happenings of a campus to that of a courthouse, a K-12 school, or a state office building, it is plain to see that we are a different animal. Therefore, the North Dakota University System finds it prudent to distinguish us from other publicly owned and operated buildings. What is allowable in Memorial Hall of the Capitol building looks very different than what is allowable in the lounge of a residence hall or at a ping pong table in a student union.

To my third point, like all of the excellent law enforcement officers in the state of North Dakota, NDUS campus police officers do a remarkable job at the often thankless task of keeping our campus communities safe. These officers get to know the students, faculty, and staff and are familiar with the physical environment and the flow of life on campus. This allows campus police officers to intervene and deescalate situations, often before they become dangerous. The North Dakota University System would like to leave the enforcement of law and order in the hands of the trained professionals. Furthermore, our campus police interface with the public community members that are present on our campuses on a daily basis. Adding the complicated factor of having armed visitors on our campuses could pose additional challenges to our campus police and security teams. Which brings me to the discussion of how each of our campuses have different levels of policing and security. While NDSU and UND have robust police departments with sworn officers, some of our campuses have unarmed part-time security staff that lock the doors at night. For state statute to broadly administer new public safety implications for all of our campuses is not equitable. To make things equitable after a sweeping update, there is usually a new cost to North Dakota taxpayers or a marked disparity on our campuses. If a new weapons possession consideration

were to pass, the North Dakota University System would respectfully request that campuses and the State Board make determinations for what is best for each unique campus.

And finally, while the North Dakota University System understands that criminal behavior is not predictable, historically speaking, we experience very little violent crime on our campuses and thus, our students report feeling safe. In fact, 97% of UND students report feeling safe on campus. Which stands to reason that many students, faculty, and staff, do not feel the need to be armed and why some of our campuses do not have a need for a full police force. Here is a comparison of the crime rates on our campuses compared to the state of North Dakota:

	NDUS 2019	Per 100,000	ND 2019	Per 100,000
Robbery	0	0	176	23.09
Burglary	15	34.09	2429	318.74
Motor Vehicle theft	6	13.63	1681	220.58
Rape	6	13.63	426	55.90
Weapons violations	2	4.54	609	79.91

<https://crimestats.nd.gov/public/View/Dispview.aspx?ReportId=3> and 2020 Annual Campus Safety Reports

As you can see, our campuses experience rates of crime that are miniscule compared to some of the statewide rates. Though in saying such a thing, I do not intend to downplay the impact of the crimes simply because it happened less frequently, my note is that our campuses are safer than what the rest of North Dakotan might experience in their communities.

Currently, State Board Policy prohibits firearms and dangerous weapons from campus buildings, and the State Board has not yet weighed in on this bill or any others pertaining to firearms, but the upcoming Board meetings will likely include discussion of these issues.

On behalf of the System Office, I respectfully request a Do Not Pass on HB 1311 or for the committee to consider an amendment to carve out the campuses and/or the State Board of Higher Education from the public gatherings designation in order to allow them/it to make and enforce their own policies regarding firearm possession on campus. We would be happy to work with the committee on alternative language. I thank you for your time and stand ready to answer your questions to the best of my ability. Thank you.



## HB1311 Hearing

January 27, 2021 – 3 p.m. – House Judiciary Committee

**Jane Vangsness Frisch, Ph.D.**

*Vice President for Student Affairs*

Chair Klemin and Committee Members: my name is Dr. Jane Vangsness Frisch, and I serve as the Vice President for Student Affairs at the ND State College of Science.

I am here today in opposition of HB 1311. As an individual who recognizes and values the need and desire to be armed; I also come to know that there is a time and appropriate place for this.

As the founding coach for our NDSCS clay target team and an avid hunter – I appreciate that at NDSCS we recognize there is a time and place in which firearms are appropriate. We enable students to safely secure and store their weapons through our College police department. This allows students to continue hobbies, such as trap shooting and hunting, while living and learning at NDSCS. This is a service that is important to our students and allows for monitoring and safety.

It is our perspective that expanding the ability to carry a concealed weapon into our living and learning spaces would decrease the safety and security of our students, employees, and visitors at NDSCS.

Introducing the possibility of concealed firearms into a learning environment is risky for various reasons. College is a time for growth and development when students' dreams, aspirations, failures, and emotions all crowd together in one location (the campus) and are present in every building. Our faculty and staff members work to foster growth and development among our students – which sometimes results in difficult and/or disappointing conversations. These tough conversations could shift to feared conversations - where employees will have another layer of concern: *will this disappointed, angry, suicidal and/or depressed student use their concealed firearm to harm me and/or themselves?*

Perhaps, more concerning, is the possible misuse and/or storage of these firearms – especially in our living facilities. With 830+ students living on our campus, we pride ourselves in maintaining safety and trust throughout our living facilities – this would erode if we would introduce weapons. Combining firearms with students who are possibly experiencing anxiety/depression, experimenting with alcohol and other drugs, and do not have fully developed brains has the possibly to shift from being safe to being tragic very quickly.

Finally, we are incredibly fortunate to have highly trained police in our communities and on-campus. In the event of the unthinkable – like an active shooter situation – we need to ensure those that are trained can effectively react to mitigate the risk. Walking into a high-risk situation – the officers would be unable to know who the threat is. We know that for most what to do in a high-adrenaline moment does not come naturally. That is why our military and law enforcement officers spend countless hours practicing, training, and testing in hopes that

they react appropriately to counter violence. This is not something you learn in one field training or by passing one written test.

Passage of this bill, as presented, could compromise the safety and security of our students, employees, and visitors. We respectfully request a do not pass on HB 1311, or for the committee to consider an amendment allowing for concealed weapons to be excluded from our campuses.

Thank you.

Good Afternoon Chairman Klemin and members of the Judiciary committee,

My name is Susan Beehler a mother of 5, a grandmother of 3. I was born in North Dakota, a life long resident of North Dakota, a Mandan resident for almost 30 years, District 31, a small business owner, a founding member of Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense of America, a former Girl Scout leader, camp director, camp cook, youth church director, camp director, camp cook, a domestic violence shelter advocate, a survivor of domestic violence not by my husband but my father.

I am opposed to HB 1311. I urge a do not pass.

I am not the "left". I am a common sense North Dakotan as are many of you. We all want safety in our homes, our communities. Safety is often times a perception what makes one feel secure may make another insecure.

I have been testifying since 2013 to a long string of bills which have loosened our gun laws with the most hashing over being able to have a loaded firearm anywhere and it seems like everywhere. I often hear scenarios of an unknown assailant coming into a home and the proliferation of our long-standing laws is being justified by the fear of this unknown intruder.

Looking to the crime reports from our ND Attorney General's office this is not the reality of the murders happening in our state. The reality is the victims know their killer.

Looking at the Homicide report for 2018 P2

<https://attorneygeneral.nd.gov/sites/ag/files/documents/2018-HomicideReport.pdf>

P. 7 a handgun was used in more of those murders in 2018 then since 1999.

Is this a correlation to the relaxing of our gun laws?

P. 10 of the report of the murders involved domestic violence, a husband, a family member, a boyfriend committing the murder.

P. 11 & 13 An adult male is doing most of the killing.

In the Report for 2019 <https://attorneygeneral.nd.gov/sites/ag/files/documents/2019-HomicideReport>.P. 4 Our state has had the most murders since 2000. Has the change in laws

made us safer or less safe. Since most of the killings are women. These changes to the law do not make me as a woman feel safer. It seems it has made it easier for the assailant to obtain their weapon of choice, a firearm.

P. 13 most murders occur in the residence/home.

The boogie man is not a stranger.

The scenarios of the women needing protection from some random assailant is not the North Dakota reality. It is a fantasy where some guy with his concealed permit is going to come in and save his family, his damsel in distress.

The reality is their is blood running in our homes

P29 we have had a 75% increase in murder.

Will this Bill make our homes safer? You have been elected to make laws that protect all our citizens and insure our rights are protected. Dead women no longer have rights, so when you vote are you protecting those most likely to be murdered by a firearm or making it easier for them to be killed? The majority of this committee is men. I urge you to protect your daughters, mothers and the women in our great state by voting a do not pass on HB1311.

Susan Beehler

[Suzybbuzz@gmail.com](mailto:Suzybbuzz@gmail.com)

Dear Representatives:

As a registered nurse for nearly 38 years, I have seen a lot.

In my experience, mental illness and gun violence continues to increase. These are a dangerous combination.

To allow guns into more facilities is to invite trouble. This legislation would embolden those who feel they have been harmed by a person or by the government.

I am a wife, a grandma, and a concerned citizen. I am opposed to guns in schools, I am afraid for my precious grandbabies and yours too.

I fear for those who are only doing their jobs on the front lines, vulnerable to the misguided souls such as those who attacked the capital on January 6.

I ask you please to oppose this legislation, and move on to something that helps hard working, gun owning citizens like myself who are tired of extremism from certain members of your body.

Sincerely,

Terri Hedman

5524 16 Street South

Fargo, ND 58104

**Testimony on HB 1311  
27 January 2021**

My name is Cheryl Biller, from Fargo. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into your deliberations on HB 1311 – I ask that you give this bill a do NOT pass recommendation.

This bill is yet another attempt to put guns, in the hands of virtually anyone who can complete a simple permit application, in more public places. Places like schools where a gun could fall out of a busy mom's purse and unintentionally discharge. Or where a teacher has to be concerned that an angry parent might threaten them. Or places like the VA where health care providers might have to be concerned a patient could shoot them. This bill does nothing to support law enforcement who have come out in opposition – so how can you say you support law and order and vote in favor of a bill that puts all officers in danger?

The end result of this bill is that tension and fear in the community generally will go up. Violence will be escalated, not de-escalated. And more people will be injured and killed. Our state will be less safe – and more specifically our kids and front line workers will be in danger. You have a duty to protect the citizens of the state and this bill does the opposite. Guns have but one purpose and that is to kill. They are dangerous tools and the average citizen is not appropriately trained to know how to use them.

I appreciate your careful deliberation of this bill, and ask you for a DO NOT PASS vote.

Cheryl Biller

As a public-school elementary educator, I urge you to vote no in opposition to allowing guns in schools or other public gathers. Schools are no place for weapons of any kind.

Thank you,

Kaatin Holmberg

West Fargo Public Schools

# 2021 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

## Judiciary

Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1311

2/3/2021

Relating to possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon at a public gathering.

**Chairman Klemin** called the meeting to order at 3:41 PM.

Present: Representatives Klemin, Karls, Becker, Buffalo, Christensen, Cory, K Hanson, Jones, Magrum, Paulson, Paur, Roers Jones, Satrom, and Vetter.

**Rep. Vetter** made a motion to adopt an amendment verbally for school and school sponsored events on line 12 to be added.

**Rep. Magrum** seconded the motion.

**Rep. Roers Jones:** Wanted this held to see how HB 1297 goes Thursday because it relates to the same thing.

**Rep. Vetter** withdraw his proposed amendment

**Rep. Magrum** withdrew his second.

**Chairman Klemin** closed the meeting at 3:48.

DeLores D. Shimek  
Committee Clerk

# 2021 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

## Judiciary

Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1311  
2/16/2021

Relating to possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon at a public gathering.
--

**Chairman Klemin** called the meeting at 11:00 AM.

Present: Representatives Klemin, Karls, Becker, Buffalo, Christensen, Cory, K Hanson, Jones, Magrum, Paulson, Paur, Roers Jones, Satrom, and Vetter.

### Discussion Topics:

- Public firearm carrying
- School sanctioned events
- Amendment

**Rep. Roers Jones:** Motion to adopt amendment Page 1 Line 12 add "Property or facility owned or leased by a school" Testimony #6760

**Rep. T. Jones:** Seconded

Voice vote carried

**Rep. Roers Jones:** Motion to adopt amendment line 14, page 3 to delete class 2

Rep. T. Jones: Seconded

Voice vote failed

**Rep. Becker:** Do pass as amended

**Rep. Christensen:** Seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Representatives	Vote
Chairman Klemin	N
Vice Chairman Karls	Y
Rep Becker	Y
Rep. Christensen	Y
Rep. Cory	Y
Rep T. Jones	Y
Rep Magrum	Y
Rep Paulson	Y
Rep Paur	N
Rep Roers Jones	N

Rep B. Satrom	N
Rep Vetter	N
Rep Buffalo	N
Rep K. Hanson	N

7-7-0 Failed

**Rep. Paur:** Motion do Without Committee Recommendation as amended  
**Rep. Buffalo:** Seconded

Roll Call Vote:

<b>:Representatives</b>	<b>Vote</b>
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	Y
Representative Karen Karls	Y
Representative Rick Becker	N
Representative Ruth Buffalo	Y
Representative Cole Christensen	N
Representative Claire Cory	N
Representative Karla Rose Hanson	Y
Representative Terry B. Jones	N
Representative Jeffery J. Magrum	N
Representative Bob Paulson	N
Representative Gary Paur	Y
Representative Shannon Roers Jones	Y
Representative Bernie Satrom	Y
Representative Steve Vetter	N

7-7-0 Failed

**Rep. Cory:** Motion to amend page 3, line 19  
**Rep. Christensen:** Seconded

Voice vote carried

**Rep. Magrum:** Motion Do Pass as amended LC 21.0683.04001  
**Rep. Christensen:** Seconded

Roll Call Vote:

<b>Representatives</b>	<b>Vote</b>
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	N
Representative Karen Karls	Y
Representative Rick Becker	Y
Representative Ruth Buffalo	N
Representative Cole Christensen	Y
Representative Claire Cory	Y
Representative Karla Rose Hanson	N
Representative Terry B. Jones	Y
Representative Jeffery J. Magrum	Y
Representative Bob Paulson	Y
Representative Gary Paur	N
Representative Shannon Roers Jones	N
Representative Bernie Satrom	N
Representative Steve Vetter	Y

8-6-0 Carrier: Rep. Christensen

Stopped 11:45 AM

DeLores D. Shimek  
Committee Clerk

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1311

Page 3, line 19, after "personnel" insert "or to the life skills and transition center, the North Dakota state hospital, and the regional human service centers' buildings, including satellite locations"

Renumber Accordingly

February 16, 2021

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1311

Page 1, line 12, after "a" insert "property or facility owned or leased by a school."

Page 1, line 12, after the first "or" insert "a"

Page 1, line 12, remove "athletic"

Page 1, line 12, replace "sporting" with "school-sanctioned"

Page 3, line 19, after "personnel" insert "or to the life skills and transition center, the North Dakota state hospital, or the regional human service centers' buildings, including satellite locations"

Renumber accordingly

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1311: Judiciary Committee (Rep. Klemin, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS** and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (8 YEAS, 6 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1311 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 12, after "a" insert "property or facility owned or leased by a school."

Page 1, line 12, after the first "or" insert "a"

Page 1, line 12, remove "athletic"

Page 1, line 12, replace "sporting" with "school-sanctioned"

Page 3, line 19, after "personnel" insert "or to the life skills and transition center, the North Dakota state hospital, or the regional human service centers' buildings, including satellite locations"

Renumber accordingly

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1311

Page 3, line 19, after "personnel" insert "or to the life skills and transition center, the North Dakota state hospital, and the regional human service centers' buildings, including satellite locations"

Renumber Accordingly