

Ohio Senate Veterans and Public Safety Committee
Opposition Testimony on SB 168
Submitted by Pat Krummrich

To Chairman Hoagland, Vice Chair Johnson, Ranking Member Thomas, and Committee Members: thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.

I am writing to oppose SB 168. I am an Ohio resident, mother of 2, and a retired healthcare provider from Akron Children's Hospital. I cared for a number of children who had been shot during my medical career.

I appreciate the fact that this bill states that OPOTC shall make suggestions regarding the training of people who are armed in schools and requires quarterly firearm recertification. I thank Sen. Hoagland for trying to do something to ensure adequate training for those who carry guns in schools. However, I have major concerns over several provisions of the bill:

1. The bill does not tell voters and parents how many hours of training these armed "designees" will be required to complete. This is ultimately left up to the State Atty General to decide *after* the bill is passed. So in this highly partisan environment, voters are asked to "trust" one individual to decide. What constitutes the "basic firearms training" referred to in the bill? If we have a Republican State AG, will they decide that trainees need 8 hours? 10 hours? 100 hours? Zero hours? Ultimately, It will be solely up to the AG and parents will have no say in the safety of our children. Why not have the OPOTC and Director of Public Safety make these recommendations first and then write at least a minimum number of hours of training for parents to see and comment on before the bill is voted on?
2. There is no discussion in the bill of the need for training in de-escalation of violence, child development and behavior, and communication/hearing/cognitive disabilities. These are important skills to have to carry a gun in our schools where ambiguous situations involving children frequently arise. The decision to shoot a child cannot be made based on war-time scenarios. Just this week, a School Resource Officer in Long Beach, Calif. shot an unarmed 18

year old girl in a parking lot near a school because she'd been involved in an argument with a teenaged student and fled in a moving car. She is being taken off life support this week. (L.A Times, Oct. 1, 2020 online). Parents need to know, *before this bill is voted on* if it is in the best interest of our children.

3. The creation of a category of "School Safety Designees" may just encourage school systems to place more armed personnel in close contact with students. Children and guns do not mix. There have already been over 90 publicly reported incidents where teachers AND/OR TRAINED SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS have mishandled their guns, some of which have been discharged or ended up in the hands of students.

Please do not assume that I do not understand the difference between this bill and HB 99. I have thoroughly read the OLSC bill analysis published on ohiosenate.gov.

I do not have experience with "wasting people". But I do have experience with trying to put children back together after they have been shot. As a bereaved parent (I lost my older daughter at age 15), I also have plenty of experience with grieving. Please do not pass something that risks children's lives. Parents need to know what is in the bill. SB 168 is not ready for passage.

Respectfully,
Pat Krummrich