

**IN LIEU OF  
DIRECTORS' MEETING  
ADDENDUM  
Monday, September 30, 2019**

**I. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE**

1. Firearm Ordinances - Austin Adams
2. Home Protection - Richard Cave
3. Safe Storage Ordinance - Eric Reiter

## Angela M. Birkett

---

**From:** Austin Adams <austindoniphan@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 26, 2019 7:50 PM  
**To:** Council Packet  
**Subject:** Firearm ordinances

I'm contacting you today as one of many licensed concealed carriers in Lincoln in regards to your vehicle storage law. This law would not have a measurable affect on gun thefts in my opinion and would only be used as a way to turn victims of theft into criminals.

This ordinance would require me to do something I was specifically told not to do by my CCW instructor/LEO who used to drive to a local lake after work, put his gun in a lockbox in the trunk of his car and run around the lake. One day when he got back from his run he came back to a broken window and a stolen lockbox that had the cable cut. Someone had seen him do his routine before and waited again with bolt cutters because they saw him stow his sidearm. He said he now locks his car and keeps the gun out of sight at all times.

The second amendment is something I truly believe in, I've been licensed to carry for years, shooting all my life, and earned the 'Governor's Ten' award for handgun marksmanship this year at the state games. Yet I can't legally carry at work, so I keep my firearm stowed accessibly but out of sight in my locked car that has no gun stickers to indicate I even own a gun. I work at one of Lincoln's largest employers, so if every single day I'd be forced to lock my gun in a lockbox. Every day that's an opportunity for someone to see what I'm doing, seeing me lock up a gun and walk in to work in uniform at the same time every day. Motive + opportunity + intent. Why would I ever want to add one of the three main ingredients for crime to my daily routine? And if I choose not to do this in addition to all the "no firearms allowed" signs around town that carry the weight of law, it's essentially a defacto CCW ban. Why would you do that?

**Angela M. Birkett**

---

**From:** Richard Cave <rcave506@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 27, 2019 9:29 AM  
**To:** Mayor  
**Cc:** Council Packet  
**Subject:** Home protection

On July 16, a San Diego, Calif., homeowner was assaulted and stabbed by a burglar. While the victim's wife called 911, his 20-year-old son retrieved a firearm and shot the attacker, who stumbled from the home and died. After authorities arrived, paramedics took the wounded homeowner to the hospital where he was admitted in stable condition.

A greater tragedy for the homeowner and his family was likely averted because of quick thinking by the son and quick access to a firearm. Had the home invasion taken place two weeks later, however, the outcome may have been much different.

On July 30, the San Diego City Council gave final approval for a new ordinance that requires gun owners to store firearms in the home in a locked container or with a trigger lock. Those found not in compliance face up to six months in jail and a \$1,000 fine.

So, had the ordinance been in place, and had the homeowners been in compliance, the assailant's attack would have certainly continued for the additional time it would have taken for the son to either remove the firearm from the storage device or remove the trigger lock. That is, if he even knew how to do so. When lives are at stake, as in this case, every second counts, and it is almost guaranteed that the assailant would have done more damage in the time granted him by the city council. Perhaps his attack would have even spread to the other occupants of the home.

And what if the homeowners had decided to not obey the tragically flawed ordinance? Would there now be the threat of jail time for simply deciding they knew the best, safest method for storing a personal-protection firearm?

One-size-fits-all mandatory-storage laws are a real threat to the safety of law-abiding gun owners—as this case clearly highlights. But they are not, by any stretch of the imagination, the only threat.

## Angela M. Birkett

---

**From:** Eric Reiter <reiter.eric.j@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 30, 2019 2:00 PM  
**To:** Council Packet  
**Subject:** Safe Storage Ordinance

Good afternoon, members of the City Council.

My name is Eric and I live in District 3 in the Near South neighborhood, represented by Councilwoman Raybould. I am writing to you after having just read the horrific news that a young man from Lincoln was murdered last night by a gunman. Ali Al-Burkat, a 15 year old freshman at Northeast High School, was pronounced dead after having been shot while riding in the backseat of a vehicle.

Several members of the Council scoff at the need for a safe storage ordinance. Some members have publicly supported it while taking no action on it whatsoever. I, along with many in the community, are sick of inaction. Gun violence is not some far-away boogeyman that you can dismiss as “their problem”. This happened in our city, to one of our Lincolniters.

I expect the response to this will be swift and meaningful. Safe Storage is not only the bare minimum that can be done, it’s also extremely necessary. I look forward to the council’s action on this.

Thank you,  
Eric Reiter  
--  
**Eric J. Reiter**