1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 1. The Library District supplements Section VII.B.1.b (pages 18-22) with the following authority:
  - a. Doe v. Medford School Dist., 549C, 221 P.3d 787, 793 (Or. Ct. App. 2009) (holding that school district's internal employment policy prohibiting employees from possessing firearms on school district property was not preempted by state statute because (1) the term "ordinance" as used in the statute dictating that "no county, city or other municipal corporation or district may enact civil or criminal ordinances" related to firearms refers to a local law that "is 'enacted' into law by governmental entities acting in their legislative capacities; and (2) the statute vesting "the authority to regulate in any matter whatsoever. any element relating to firearms" in the legislature "intended to target only 'regulations' in the sense of enacted laws by municipal authorities acting on their 'organic authority as a governmental entity'") (citations omitted).
  - b. Wolfe v. Twp. of Salisbury, 880 A.2d 62, 68-69 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2005) (holding that State Game Law which occupied the "field of public safety and the regulation of hunting and trapping" did not preempt the

township's ordinance(s) regulating hunting in parks owned by the			
township because the ordinance(s) did not seek to regulate hunting			
throughout township—"the township was not acting as a <i>municipality</i> ,			
but rather as a <i>property owner</i> ").			
2. The Library District supplements Section VII.B.1.b (pages 22-25) with			
the following authority: Mich. Gun Owners, Inc. v. Ann Arbor Public Schools,			
No. 155196 & 155204, 2018 WL 3614337, at *6 (Mich. July 27, 2018) (holding			
that state law did not preempt school districts' policies limiting firearms on			
school grounds because the "statute's partial list of local units of government			
that may not regulate firearms" demonstrates "intent to preempt some local			
units of government from regulation but not others"—i.e. "legislative intent not			
to occupy the field").			
DATED this 21st day of August, 2017.			
BAILEY * KENNEDY			
By: <u>/s/ Kelly B. Stout</u> Dennis L. Kennedy Kelly B. Stout  Attorneys for Respondent Las Vegas-Clark County Library District			

Page 3of 4

## BAILEY \* KENNEDY 8984 SPANISH RIDGE AVENUE LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89148-1302

1

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2	I certify that I am an employee of BAILEY KENNEDY and that on		
3	the 21st day of August 2017, service of the foregoing RESPONDENT'S NOTICE		
4	OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES, was made by electronic service through the		
5	Nevada Supreme Court's electronic filing system and/or by depositing a true		
6	and correct copy in the U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, and addressed to		
7	the following at their last known addresses:		
8	Alicia R. Ashcraft, Esq. Jeffrey F. Barr, Esq. <b>ASHCRAFT &amp; BARR LLP</b>	Email: ashcrafta@ashcraftbarr.com barrj@ashcraftbarr.com	
9	2300 West Sahara Avenue, Ste. 900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	Attorneys for Appellant MICHELLE FLORES	
10	Lee I. Iglody, Esq. <b>IGLODY LAW, PLLC</b>	Email: lee@iglody.com	
11	2300 West Sahara Avenue, Ste. 1130 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	Attorneys for Appellant MICHELLE FLORES	
12	Persi J. Mishel		
13	2832 Faiss Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89134	Settlement Judge	
14			
15	/s/ Kelly B. Stout Employee of BAILEY <b>∜</b> KENNEDY		
16			
17			
18			