

I feel that HB24-1174 is not only unnecessary, but an attempt to discourage and add difficulty to both obtaining and maintaining CCW permits. Claims of it enhancing safety are either false or exaggerated; CCW permit holders as a whole have been shown to be one of the safest groups of society in regards to “gun crime”, especially in Colorado (according to FBI statistics). It merely aims to stifle – thorough extra hoops and cost – law-abiding citizens’ desire to defend themselves.

Instead of adding punishment to violent crimes or free safety classes for local citizens, HB24-1174 further infringes on rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Recent SCOTUS decisions have supported citizens’ right to bear arms in self-defense. This bill would add cost to both money and time to law-abiding citizens who have already put forth that effort. Further, it will cost state money while it is argued repeatedly up the chain in courts.

It would be much better to have bills aimed at adding free or mandatory classes in schools devoted to firearm safety. Spending a few hours a semester in elementary or middle schools learning this would actually add knowledge AND safety; something the anti-rights crowd has been clamoring for for years. It would probably be possible to get NRA-approved teachers to do these classes for free, only a space would be required. Even parents or adults could attend if an after-school time was allotted.

Please stop HB24-1174 from further infringing on our Constitutional rights. Look at some true safety enhancing educational opportunities.

Sincerely,

Lance Touve

Testimony in opposition to: HB24-1174

Thank you, Chair and Committee

My name is Robert Edmiston. I am with the Firearms Coalition of Colorado, an NRA-affiliated, all-volunteer, grassroots organization dedicated to the protection of individual rights and public safety. I am a former U.S. Army officer and vocational rehabilitation counselor. I have a master's degree in psychology, counseling, and guidance.

I am writing in opposition to the measure under consideration. This bill lacks a legislative declaration citing any problems with current concealed carry regulations. We are unaware of any news reports alleging concerns with the present system. A Google search of "problems with concealed carry in Colorado" produced no issues in a review of 130 results. It seems like this bill is a solution looking for a problem.

HB24-1174 will make it more difficult and expensive for Colorado Citizens to obtain concealed carry permits. This will reduce the safety of all citizens in the state by lessening the deterrent effect of possible armed resistance to violent criminal attacks. (Please see the attached file regarding research on the effect of armed citizens on criminal behavior.) The bill will also decrease the number of potential innocent victims able to use armed self-defense to protect their own lives and the lives of those around them. This burden will fall most heavily on those least able to afford the time and expense of the required range component in the measure.

Over half of the states in our country have enacted "Constitutional Carry." Under this system, no permit at all is required to exercise a fundamental natural right to self-defense. We would like to see Colorado side with most of the states on this issue.

We urge a "No" vote by members of the committee.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Edmiston
Volunteer Lobbyist
The Firearms Coalition of Colorado
PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

To whom it may concern,

After reading through HB24-1174, I have some questions regarding the wording and approach of this house bill. First, this bill conflicts with existing practices already in by the local sheriff's office in granting and revoking the issuance of concealed carry permits for Colorado. For example, 18-12-105, 18-12-105.5, 18-12-204, 18-21-211, 18-12-209 and 18-12-214. Second, why is more governing power being authorized to the Colorado Bureau of Investigation (CBI) in these matters, as the local Sheriff's office is responsible for the county or counties they represent? For example, the current practice now authorizes the local sheriff's office to issue, grant, revoke, and authorize concealed handgun permits for permittees. In addition, CBI, in its current state, is to 'support and assist' local, county, and state criminal justice agencies through the provision of professional investigation and forensic laboratory services.' To allow additional governing power to a 'supporting' agency appears to be grossly misrepresenting CBI's purpose in 'support and assist'. The request to expand CBI overreach appears to conflict with the local sheriff's office in this house bill. Third, how can it be determined to obtain a 'qualifying score' of '70' percent on a live-fire exercise conducted on a firearm range for initial training and 'refresh' training that leads to a completed training certificate?

The current training offered to obtain a conceal carry weapon (CCW) at local institutions in Colorado meets or exceeds the requirements set forth in the current laws. The training offered and received shows that I have necessary skills, background, and nerve to determine 'threat' or 'non-threat'. To introduce another law over an existing law doesn't not bring 'safety' only confusion and misunderstanding.

Based on the wording and description of HB24-1174, there appears to be some lack of knowledge of existing laws that need to be known. Implementing an 'enhanced' law over the

current one only brings confusion and loses the weight of its purpose in exercising such recommendations. Increasing the power of an agency only brings more bureaucracy in a system that is already plagued by other domestic issues that need to be addressed. Focusing on limiting citizens' rights for self-defense, the local community, and the local sheriff's office is not the right thing to do. The sheriff's office has been handling this matter exceptionally with no issues. In military terms, don't fix it if it ain't broken.

Tuesday, February 13, 2024
To the General Assembly

Good afternoon Committee Members,

My name is Brittney Norton, and I am a law abiding citizen of Colorado. I am also a Certified Firearms Instructor. I work to educate women specifically in the world of personal protection and self-defense. I hold a number of certifications in order to teach a variety of protective means to every woman. I also take time to pursue my training, and expand my knowledge, to bring back and educate the women I teach. I value life. I also value my Constitutional Right to bear arms under the 2nd Amendment. I find HB24-1174 to be Unconstitutional. These extreme measures to obtain both firearm education and a Concealed Handgun Permit are more than our Founding Fathers required of us under the Constitution. These additional measures are unnecessary and a tactic to disarm good people. There is overwhelming evidence that armed citizens reduce crime and increase the safety and well-being of all people. Current CHP holders also carry with them good judgment, and the ability to discern under current law and firearm safety training, when to stand and protect and when not. Our current Conceal Carry and Instructor Training requirements already provide the education necessary for safe ownership, carry, and concealment. Committee members you are in a position to look out for our safety, HB24-1174 is disarming, unconstitutional, and does not promote safety. I am against this bill, and you should be too, vote in opposition.

I appreciate your time in hearing me today. I hope my testimony has not fallen on deaf ears.

Kind regards,
Brittney Norton

Dear Committee,

I am submitting testimony in opposition of HB24-1174 which would create unnecessary restrictions on law abiding concealed carry holders who are statistically a safer demographic of citizen. Instead of putting steeper punishments on violent criminals which should be done instead, this proposition is walking entirely in the wrong direction, as we don't see Concealed Carriers committing violent crimes with their firearms and the Data Shows this. This kind of logic is either ignorant or has a deeper malicious intent towards this state's citizens because A right delayed is a right denied. With over half the states in the United States actually moving forward Constitutional Carry is becoming the norm and you cannot deny the data for the crime rate dropping in those states either, so why would you impose a higher bar for an already safe demographic? With the Bruen decision this type of bill is walking the wrong direction, if you are truly progressive you will Oppose HB24-1174 and look into an alternate solution like Constitutional Carry. Oppose HB24-1174.

Regards,

Benjamin O'Loughlin

I am opposed to this bill because it gives the state too much authority and only hinders the people's right to keep and bear arms and does very little to reduce criminal behavior.

It should be stated primarily that both the Colorado and US Constitutions do not allow governments to restrict citizen right to keep and bear arms.

The bill's changes in "CRS 18-12-202 Definitions" to allow only the state-run CBI ability to designate "certified instructors" instead of NRA and USCCA ("a national non-profit organization that certifies firearms instructors") is a conflict of interest because it gives the state the power to decide which citizens can defend themselves.

Section 2, Subsection (2) is unreasonable. There are very good video resources online showing the various handgun actions, from revolver to double-action/single-action pistols, hammer and striker-fired. It's reasonable to allow students to learn these differences in a video format without wasting everyone's time in class. The student should already be familiar with the firearm they've purchased. The user manual already covers safe use of the firearm.

Section 2, Subsection (3)(d) is not necessary as there are many good books available to anyone interested in the basics of self-defense. Some examples are:

"Deadly Force: Understanding Your Right to Self-Defense", 2nd Edition by Massad Ayoob, 2022 <https://a.co/d/4QZzsBu>

"The Law of Self Defense: The Indispensable Guide to the Armed Citizen" by Andrew Branca 2016 <https://a.co/d/1cN9s58>

Laws specific to Colorado can be easily researched online through "Readable Colorado Revised Statutes" <http://readable-crs.com/> and LexisNexis Legal Resources <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/colorado/>

Section 2, Subsection (3)(g) is too vague and should not be left up to the discretion of the CBI. It's almost as if this bill is meant to allow the CBI (the state) to set the bar so high that NOBODY can get a concealed handgun permit.

Section 2, Subsection (3)(h) is redundant and unnecessary as citizens are (supposed) to be taught that "Ignorance of the law is no excuse." Therefore, we are already expected to be 100% aware of what the laws are regarding firearm use.

Regarding safe-storage around children, I'm interested in the lifestyles of parents who leave their guns around for kids to acquire. The cases of the shooting of Kayla Rolland in 2000 (<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/murder-in-the-first-grade/>) and the shooting of Abby Zwerner by her student in 2023 (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2023/12/15/richneck-shooting-teacher-newport-news/>) are examples of parents who are too busy doing drugs to pay attention to what their kids are doing. It is doubtful that this bill if it becomes law will do anything to change the negligent behavior of drug users.

In summary, I'm opposed to this bill because it gives too much authority to the state through the CBI to decide who can obtain a concealed handgun permit and mandates responsible behavior from people who already want to stay far away from being in trouble with the law. The bill does little to deter criminal behavior.

February 13, 2024

Greetings!

My name is Matthew Keenan and I am a Colorado Native who has lived in various places all over the state during my life. I am also disabled from medical negligence which occurred in a Denver Metro Hospital in 2001. That issue is passed, I have moved on to what God has for me each day now. I grew up in a suburban neighborhood with real no exposure to fire arms. It really wasn't until I helped pastor a church in Salida Colorado when a number of men from our fellowship invited me one Saturday morning to go "shooting." Having grown up second half of my formative years in the Boulder area, I said to the guys excitedly, "Sure! Let me get my CAMERA!!" They turned to each other and just laughed and we headed out to go to the park to do some plinking.

Salida is hunting country as are most Mountain towns here. So I was exposed to their lives of providing for their families with the game for which they hunted which continues to this day. I was later introduced to the world of self-protection when I moved to Colorado Springs, Colorado and became a member of a local Rotary Chapter. In the Chapter, we had shot gun shooting competitions, as well as recognized the local law enforcement for their stellar and heroic efforts to protect the public. It was there I learned that even though there was a police outpost located not more than 3 miles away that I could not guarantee their response in less than 20 – 25 minutes. According to Your own 9News Investigative piece in August 26th and updated on September 6th, 2022 titled, Denver Sees Alarming Increase in Police Response Times, Denver residents would now see law enforcement arriving at a critical scene within 34.25 minutes. Even your Chief of Police has gone on record saying, "this is unacceptable!" Meanwhile, the perps (which have become more emboldened by these restrictive bills on the general public which only takes seconds to do harm to their victims. My family and I cannot nor will not sit by and let that happen! Having learned from other violent crime calls in my work with various Law Enforcement, the times are extended depending on the time of day, location, perpetrators.... I choose to defend my family and those I care for as best I am able.

Look what happened just over the weekend in Houston, it took TWO OFF DUTY OFFICERS to engage the Transgender perp (who had a record of psychological problems) who was using their own child as a HUMAN SHIELD!! That will certainly continue especially here as Transplants from other places make this place their residents. These Bills put an unnecessary burden on the public to conform to a situation which need no alterations.

I fear for my state, town, and neighborhood if these foolhardy attempts to further restrict the law-abiding public from its desire to and duty to defend for itself. I ain't waiting on you to come and protect us! I am appealing that you consider those who can't defend themselves but are trying to do the best we can with the resources available. Don't tie our hands or any further!

Thank you very much!

<https://www.9news.com/article/news/investigations/denver-police-longer-response-times/73-313872e8-945c-4ce8-a1d5-8f31a35ca724>

House Judiciary

02/13/2024 01:30 PM

HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits & Training

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
Kristen Molsness For themselves	Hi, my name is Kristen Molsness and I'm a parent in Lakewood, CO. I'm in favor of this bill because I think it's important for people to demonstrate a responsibility, respect and knowledge for firearms if they are going to be carrying one in our community. Firearms are deadly and I don't think it should be an easy or quick process to own a concealed weapon. Requiring in-person training is one more step to ensure the person looking to carry a concealed weapon is of sound mind and ensures it is the person actually taking the training whereas an online course makes it far easier for someone else to complete the training for them. This makes sense. Gun violence has become a public health crisis in our country, something that is not true in any other country in the world. We should be doing everything in our power to prevent gun violence and this is just one such step. Thank you for your consideration in keeping our community safe.
Elena Belov For themselves	It is essential for people who are allowed to have a gun to go through proper training and to improve selection of people who should have this right and able to follow all the rules associated with this responsibility.
Sergey Belov For themselves	It is essential for people who are allowed to have a gun to go through proper training and to improve selection of people who should have this right and able to follow all the rules associated with this responsibility.
Mark Kaiser Against themselves	This bill is extremely dangerous and empowers the criminals and illegal aliens that have and are being welcomed to our streets. This bill would not address the criminals that don't read signs, and don't obey laws. It would only further more opportunities for those who do obey laws to be little more than "sitting ducks" for those who wish to practice their mayhem on helpless people. Bill HB24-1174 is not just unconstitutional; it would leaves law abiding residents of our

	<p>State who wish to protect themselves and their families vulnerable and empowers deranged psychopaths to commit heinous acts.</p> <p>Mark Kaiser 7035 Zenobia ST Westminster, Co 80030 Registered Volunteer Lobbyist 3035980630</p>
<p>Joseph Pero Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Joseph Pero, live in Lakewood, and am a current concealed carry permit holder. I am writing to urge you to vote AGAINST this bill. It is a complete constitutional overreach. In fact, I submit we should not have to get a permit to carry a self-defense weapon in the first place.</p> <p>Also, this bill requires current & future instructors to teach about the Red Flag Gun Confiscation law and to recommend using it. How onerous this requirement is! The Red Flag laws are a terrific way to get spouses/SOs to annoy their ex's.</p> <p>There are so many gun laws already in the books that this bill appears to be yet another roadblock to law abiding citizens' ability to defend themselves against the onslaught of crime occurring now. And it is getting worse!</p> <p>I STRONGLY urge you to vote AGAINST this onerous bill.</p> <p>Feeling Unrepresented, Joseph Pero</p> <p>P.S. - I have a rhetorical question: do you all have a homework assignment that requires you to dream up all these bills when you are not in session? Is there any requirement for bills that really help the whole state?</p>
<p>Stephanie Musick Against themselves</p>	<p>As we have seen in so many other Democratic Party dominated states this new bill, if signed into law will add many additional requirements to obtain and renew a CHP; ie. Additional classroom instruction, a written examination and live fire test. To renew a CHP a citizen must now obtain classroom instruction, take a renewal examination and engage in renewal live fire testing. Will the State be funding these new educational requirements and reimbursing citizens for the time they have take off work to attend all this new instruction and testing?</p>

	<p>As per the current DNC narrative, (as dictated by Michael Bloomberg’s Gun Control Inc. organizations) the Democratic Party is now couching all proposed infringements on our Constitutionally protected right to keep and bear arms for all lawful purposes, including self defense as “common sense gun safety.” This carefully crafted and curated language is propaganda and rational people recognize it as such. I am certain that the authors and supporters of this bill will suggest that this is akin requiring a written and driving test to obtain a license to drive a motor vehicle on public thoroughfares. Here’s the rub, the right to keep and bear arms is a protected right, not a privilege granted by government.</p> <p>I was interested in the language at the end of the bill summary that states that there will be penalties for anyone presenting themselves as a concealed carry instructor that has not been “verified” as such by the Colorado Bureau of Investigation. Will the State now be dictating terms as to who will permitted to provide firearms instruction?</p> <p>Will the Colorado Democratic Party now be introducing legislation to require an examination to register to vote? Will all citizens now be required to receive instruction in communication skills in order to exercise their right to free speech in the public domain? Will paralegal education and examination now be required to exercise our guaranteed protections under the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments?</p> <p>Nothing in this bill would make one peaceable, law abiding citizen in Colorado safer. This bill is an unconstitutional infringement on the right of citizens of our state and our nation to keep and bear arms. This bill is in direct contravention to precedent set in the Supreme Court of the United States. See: Heller v. The District of Columbia, c. 2008; New York State Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen, c. 2022.</p>
<p>Linda Magid For themselves</p>	<p>A firearm is designed to kill. If someone is carrying a firearm on them in public, then they should have the highest amount of training as well as safe storage to keep communities safe. I am fine with having a financial and time barrier to carrying a gun in public - those who really want the right to do it then have to work for it.</p>

	<p>I prefer not to have any guns in public. If I have to accept that as a reality, then those who want to carry a firearm should have to prove they are up to the task.</p>
<p>Anthony Hillerson Against themselves</p>	<p>Against HB24-1174</p> <p>Members of the committee,</p> <p>As a law abiding Colorado citizen with a concealed carry permit, I ask you to exercise common sense when reviewing this proposal. This bill is trying to solve a problem that does not exist, namely violent crime committed by concealed carry permit holders.</p> <p>I, and other law abiding firearms owners abhor any violence, including that in which a firearm is used. But can the sponsors of this bill point to a significant percentage of firearm violence perpetrators who are concealed carriers? Can they even point to a non zero percentage?</p> <p>On the contrary, citizens with a permit to carry have stopped many violent crimes from happening or being worse. The most famous recent such case, where Johnny Hurley stopped a violent criminal from killing more innocent people in Arvada is well known. There are many others.</p> <p>Why then do this bill's sponsors seek to punish and limit concealed carriers? This proposed bill is at least misguided, and likely in fact merely another attack on Second Amendment rights by those who dislike them. This bill should not move past this committee.</p>
<p>Richard Ryman Against themselves</p>	<p>The intent of this bill is to provide for more restrictions for lawful gun owners. It will not stop or prevent any crimes or victims of gun violence. It will probably increase those due to making and keeping a carry conceal permit more difficult to obtain. Most people who seek a Carry conceal permit are more than competent in the handling of firearms and are also very aware of the legal and how serious it is to use a weapon in any situation.</p> <p>The criminals of which this state seems to be more concerned about their rights and welfare, have no interest or concern in the law and have zero concern about using weapons to get what they want.</p>

	<p>Do something to mitigate crime in the state and empower law enforcement not put more useless rules and regulations on law abiding citizens who are just seeking to protect their families from the growing threats they face everyday.</p>
<p>Erin DeCesaris Questions Only themselves</p>	<p>I am submitting testimony in support of HB24-1174: Concealed Carry Permits & Training. This bill will ensure that gun owners are educated on the responsible practices for handling and using firearms, storing them securely at home, as well as carrying guns in public.</p> <p>I am not anti-gun. My husband is a gun owner, we have guns in our household and we both shoot recreationally. I believe in responsible gun ownership, and know firsthand that part of being a responsible gun owner includes being trained in the safe handling and storage of firearms.</p> <p>Beyond my personal feelings on this matter, data supports requiring safety training for a concealed carry permit. Analysis of 11 states that removed concealed carry licensing that mandated firearm training or proficiency requirements found that when the 11 states with shall issue licensing laws that require safety training for obtaining a concealed carry permit went to permitless concealed carry, the annual rate of assaults with guns increased by 21 per 100,000 (source: a 2023 study led by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Violence Solutions at the Bloomberg School of Public Health). And, a 2017 study by John Hopkins School of Public Health found that over 80% of gun owners, non-gun owners, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents agree that high safety standards are critical in issuing concealed carry permits.</p> <p>Please support efforts to continue to improve public safety in Colorado and reduce the risk of accidental firearm injuries and deaths, and support this bill.</p> <p>Thank you. Erin DeCesaris Golden, CO</p>
<p>Laura Jensen Against themselves</p>	<p>This atrocity of a bill is clearly designed to make obtaining a Concealed Handgun Permit nearly impossible for everyday Coloradans. The training requirements are extreme, forcing law-abiding citizens to spend a long day (and a large amount of money)</p>

	<p>listening to the CBI's anti-gun propaganda and proving themselves to be more competent with a firearm than many Law Enforcement Officers. Recent cases of citizens using firearms in self-defense have already proven that the average person using concealed carry has a great deal of skill. This is an unconstitutional attempt to make the RIGHT to carry firearms unrestricted nothing more than a privilege granted to a select few. Colorado Democrats MUST stop infringing on our rights. This bill, along with all other gun control measures they are attempting to pass, must be struck down.</p>
<p>Jonathan Mell Against himself</p>	<p>Ladies and gentlemen,</p> <p>Today, I address a critical issue concerning our Second Amendment rights, particularly in Colorado. Concealed carry classes have sparked debate, but let's examine why they may infringe upon our constitutional rights.</p> <p>The Second Amendment states: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." "Shall not be infringed" unequivocally declares that the government should not interfere with citizens' right to bear arms.</p> <p>Concealed carry classes, often mandated for permit acquisition, impose an additional burden and cost on law-abiding citizens. Requiring training to exercise a constitutional right can be viewed as an infringement, limiting access for those needing firearms for self-defense.</p> <p>Further modifications would compound this infringement, potentially disproportionately affecting certain demographics. Access to firearms risks becoming a privilege, not a right.</p> <p>While some argue for public safety, responsible gun ownership is primarily individual responsibility. Mandating training doesn't guarantee safe use and assumes government knows better, contrary to our liberty principles.</p> <p>In conclusion, Colorado's requirement for concealed carry classes, and potential modifications, may violate our Second Amendment</p>

	<p>rights. Let's reevaluate to uphold our freedoms without unnecessary infringement. Thank you.</p>
<p>Walt Goodman Against themselves</p>	<p>I have been a resident of Colorado for 14 years now and pretty much every year there are ineffective gun control/gun safety laws passed. Violent crime with firearms has pretty much been going up year over year because you are targeting the wrong user. Criminals don't care about your laws. Mentally unstable don't understand your laws. You cannot succeed trying to legislate evil. The only people you are impacting, and after this long I have to think it is intentional, is the law abiding gun owner.</p> <p>You claim to be all about safety and then try to dramatically increase the number of times carry permit holders must handle their loaded carry weapon. Where is the increased safety in that.</p> <p>You claim to be about reducing crime, but only focus on the segment of population least likely to commit crime with a firearm and you would be hard pressed to identify one law in the last 10 years that you could tie to a reduction in gun crime with an unbiased study.</p> <p>You claim that the NRA training courses are insufficient for your safety needs, but believe everything coming out of Everytown for Gun Safety without question. Just like the progressives in this state, they cherry pick statistics as well. This leaves everyone open to the 'ol 'we haven't created those courses yet' line so that concealed carry permits cannot be issued.</p> <p>Lastly, Ohio passed a law for permitless carry/constitutional carry in 2022. This year a study of Ohio specifically was published and 'The study showed significant decreases in the number of crimes involving firearms in Akron, Columbus and Toledo, and across all eight cities combined.' (https://www.ohioattorneygeneral.gov/Media/News-Releases/January-2024/Change-in-Concealed-Carry-Law-Did-Not-Drive-Violen). So, instead of trying to hobble the demographic least likely to commit crime with a gun why don't you actually do something about the crime</p>
<p>Robert Slay For themselves</p>	<p>I strongly support this bill due to the safety factors for home and community built into it. It is about time that we require anyone wishing to concealed carry to have safety training . Safe storage could help prevent many problems. Thanks.</p>

<p>Nolan McGlasson</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>This is a one size fits NOBODY bill.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It puts an additional financial and time burden on a license holder as the class cost will increase as will the time required to complete the arbitrary testing. 2. It gives no consideration to holders who utilize personal resources and obtain training far and above what the requirements for initial and recertification requirements test. <p>It gives no account to those of us who maintain our skills through regular shooting and maintenance of our skills as members at a local range.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. It awards "proficiency " status arbitrarily to someone simply because of their role in law enforcement when many private licensed citizens shoot more, train more and are more familiar with their weapons than many LEO's. <p>Stop wasting yours and our time creating bad bills that increase burdens, achieve no additional safety and bad additional barriers to the right to self defense bib this state.</p>
<p>Mark Kaat</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>Thank you for allowing me the time to air my concerns. A little about me. I grew up in Wisconsin where deer hunting is almost a religion so the safe handling weapons was taught me by my father. Since moving to Colorado in 1995 I've had a number of different jobs My last job was being a TSA Officer at Denver International Airport.</p> <p>Presently I hold a Concealed Carry Permit in Colorado. Prior to obtaining the permit and the classes required I took a hunter safety course many years ago in Arvada. I've spent many hours at the shooting range to improve my skills. I also have a lazer system so that I can shoot at home without having to spend the high cost of live rounds.</p> <p>The House Bill as it stands will add unnecessary classes, time and money to law abiding citizens like myself who take carrying a handgun very seriously. What is worse is the fact that the Bill does nothing to stop thugs and criminals form carrying concealed weapons. With the dramatic rise in crime a better solution would be for you to take crime seriously and take a hard line against criminals by truly supporting our law enforcement agencies. Adding more</p>

	<p>regulations and requiring more classes does nothing to decrease crime. It only punishes law abiding citizens.</p> <p>As a Concealed Carry Permit holder I encourage you to oppose any additional rules and regulations for those who have and those who desire having a Concealed Carry Permit. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>AnnMichelle Hill For themselves</p>	<p>Dear House Judiciary Committee,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong support for the standardization of training requirements for obtaining a concealed carry permit. As a concerned member of our community, I believe that establishing consistent and comprehensive training standards is crucial for promoting public safety and ensuring that individuals who carry concealed weapons are well-prepared and responsible.</p> <p>Standardizing the curriculum and requirements for concealed handgun training classes across the state ensures consistency and quality in the instruction provided to permit applicants. This helps eliminate variations in training quality and ensures that all applicants receive adequate education on firearm handling and legal responsibilities.</p> <p>By establishing a uniform set of guidelines, individuals seeking a concealed carry permit would be required to undergo comprehensive training that covers essential topics such as firearm safety, safe storage, conflict resolution, and current laws pertaining to firearms. This standardized approach would guarantee that permit holders possess the necessary skills and knowledge to handle their firearms responsibly and make sound judgments in various situations.</p> <p>Moreover, standardizing training requirements fosters a sense of accountability among concealed carry permit holders. Knowing that their fellow permit holders have undergone the same rigorous training would instill a collective commitment to responsible firearm ownership. This, in turn, would contribute to a positive and responsible gun culture within our community.</p> <p>In conclusion, the implementation of standardized training requirements for obtaining a concealed carry permit is a crucial step toward enhancing public safety, promoting responsible firearm</p>

	<p>ownership, and ensuring that all permit applicants receive consistent and high-quality education. I urge you to consider these points and support the adoption of consistent and comprehensive training standards.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ann Michelle Hill Colorado resident</p>
<p>Paula Fernquist Against themselves</p>	<p>Good afternoon Committee Members,</p> <p>My name is Paula Fernquist, and I am a law abiding citizen of Colorado. I value my life and the lives of many others. I value my Constitutional Right to bare arms under the 2nd Amendment. I have my USCCA certification and have done several NRA Classes and received much training and continue to train. I find HR24-1174 to be Unconstitutional.</p> <p>These extreme measure to obtain both firearm education and my Concealed Handgun Permit is more than our Founding Fathers required of us under the Constitution.</p> <p>There is overwhelming evidence that armed citizens reduce crime and increase the safety and well-being of all people. Our current Conceal Carry and Instructor Training requirements already provide the education necessary for safe ownership, carry, and concealment.</p> <p>I appreciate your time in hearing me today. I hope my testimony will be heard, and that I, along with a lot of my constituents take our gun ownership very seriously. Thank you,</p> <p>Paula Fernquist</p>
<p>Beth DeHaven For themselves</p>	<p>As a concerned parent and grandparent and a firm believer that gun violence is a public health issue that must be addressed with common sense gun laws, I am writing to you today in support of HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits & Training.</p> <p>Although our current Colorado law requires a firearm training class before an applicant can receive a CC permit, the fact that there are no established standards for the training and no requirement for range fire training is a huge concern.</p>

	<p>HB24-1174 will not remove the public safety dangers inherent in citizens who are not part of law enforcement carrying concealed firearms in public, but it will at least provide a consistent standard and more comprehensive training to show that the permit holder is competent in handling a firearm and can demonstrate knowledge of gun safety protocols and all federal and state laws surrounding firearm use and safety.</p> <p>An additional requirement for the training course to include techniques for avoiding a criminal attack and how to manage a violent confrontation, including conflict resolution and judgmental use of lethal force is another feature of the bill that I believe will help CC permit holders to recognize situations where the use of a firearm can be avoided and lives can be saved.</p> <p>I am not a gun owner, but I believe that responsible gun owners will also applaud this bill as a means of ensuring that those who are permitted to concealed carry firearms are doing so with an increased ability to handle a firearm safely and responsibly.</p> <p>Please vote YEA on HB24-1174 and ensure that this bill makes its way to the assembly floor.</p>
<p>Carol Callicotte-Belmon For themselves</p>	<p>My name is Carol Callicotte-Belmon and I'm writing today in support of HB24-1174.</p> <p>I married a Frenchman, so we spend a fair amount of time in France each year. One of the things I've grown to notice is how my stress and tension dissipates whenever we're there. It's not because I'm on vacation, it's because I am not maintaining the constant vigilance I do here in every public place. Here, I always position myself facing doors, never with my back to them. I don't wear flip flops to the grocery store, because I can't run fast enough in those. I no longer enjoy concerts, crowds, festivals, because too often those have been where gun violence happens. When I'm here and an argument erupts, I scan bodies worried that one of those involved is carrying a gun. When I'm in France and an argument erupts, I just eavesdrop to see if I can decipher what it's about with mild interest and no fear.</p>

	<p>States where gun owners are allowed to carry concealed weapons without permits, so called "right to carry" states, experience a 13 to 15 percent higher rate of violent crime 10 years after the adoption of such laws. Several studies have shown that loose conceal carry permitting requirements increases violent crimes and gun crimes. The moment someone decides to bring a gun into public, the chances of a confrontation turning into a shooting rise. If we are going to continue to allow private citizens to carry lethal weapons into the public square, we should at the very least ensure that they've been educated in safe handling and conflict reduction. Those who oppose this bill like to claim that concealed carry permit holders are already safe and responsible and "never" commit gun crimes. They cite John Lott's widely debunked research to support their point. The truth is that there are thousands of cases of concealed carry permit holders committing gun homicide in non-self-defense murders.</p> <p>Allowing people to carry guns into the public sphere puts us all in danger. At the very least, we can take steps to make sure that those who hide weapons on their bodies have learned some basic safety essentials. Standardizing training and who trains people to use a deadly weapon that they are allowed to carry, hidden, in public seems so obvious that I'm shocked it's not already a law. Safe handling, competency, and safe storage is a crucial component of responsible gun ownership. I ask for a yes vote on HB24-1174.</p>
<p>Maxwell Hayes Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Maxwell Hayes, I am against Hb24 1174, and while being an instructor and a civilian that wants protection, I can agree that a good firearms education can go a long way in to helping new shooters be confident, and more disciplined inches firearms life. I don't agree that the government should mandate what the class contains. Every class and every instructor brings their own personal experience and knowledge to the classroom, and having government agencies water down those experiences to boxes to check will lead to water down education.</p> <p>The education system in America is proof positive government educational standards fall short of the private sector. The government by putting g it's hands in the classroom will create a more dangerous society. For proof of that look at the billions the federal government is spending to arm piss and tears (ukraine) to murder Russians for no reason. The government has the worst history of violence and murder just ask the kids at Kent state</p>

<p>Derek Henkowski Against themselves</p>	<p>This bill will not protect a single person. This ridiculous permitting system will only serve to stratify the citizenry more than we already have. My granddaughter was murdered in downtown Denver with an AK47 in the middle of the day. The semi-automatic rifle used was provided to the shooter by his (named) best friend a Denver police sergeant. Who is more trained and permitted than that? I believe my point is made. Stop trying to legislate away our 2nd amendment rights and freedoms!</p>
<p>Richard Koepfel Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose HB24-1174 as it makes a serious road block to individuals that want to get a concealed carry permit. Which is doing the Correct thing, vs a criminal, which DOES NOT get a permit or does a background check, they just steal a firearm or buy one on the black market. A 8 hour class is absurd, that is a complete day of work and I am sure it would be priced at a rate to be unaffordable for the normal citizen. I am also confident that the "test" would be rigged and made almost impossible to pass. As for the Certified instructors, they would also be instructed to fail almost all of the students. This is another stunt to rid us of our 2A rights. YOU have enough bills and laws on the books. You and your prosecutor's are just too lazy, lax, and stupid enough to not prosecute people who break the current laws.</p>
<p>Brian Christie Against themselves</p>	<p>To our esteemed legislators:</p> <p>I would like to say a few words about HB24-1174.</p> <p>Although I'm certain the intent of this legislation comes from a good place, the implementation of this is extremely burdensome.</p> <p>The United States Constitution declares the right of the people to bear arms to be off-limits by our government. This legislation ignores that right and, instead, inserts the government in a way that makes the peoples' right to bear arms overly burdened and taxed.</p> <p>Although I can agree with the intention and I know some concealed carry permittees and applicants could really benefit from additional training requirements, it is simply an infringement of their second amendment right. Additionally, those of us who have grown up around firearms and / or served in the military really should not be subjected to these burdensome requirements. Additionally, you are burdening every renewal to require a class and recertification as well? That is way over the top.</p> <p>With the additional requirements for the CBI to "validate" every instructor (also financially burdening them with more), you are going to create a shortage of instructors and classes. This will inevitably</p>

	<p>prevent citizens in the state from renewing their permits due to not having a class available.</p> <p>The financial and time burdens are way too much to be considered constitutional. This bill is, without a doubt, government overreach, reaching far beyond what is allowed by our founding documents.</p> <p>A driver license, which is not a guaranteed right, is easier to get than a concealed carry permit under this legislation.</p> <p>I must also ask, what problem is this legislation trying to solve? How many crimes are committed by those licensed to conceal carry?</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>Karen Bandhauer For themselves</p>	<p>Dear Members of the House Judiciary Committee,</p> <p>As a concerned parent and citizen of our beautiful State, I am writing to you today in support of HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits & Training.</p> <p>Although our current Colorado law requires a firearm training class before an applicant can receive a CC permit, the fact that there are no established standards for the training and no requirement for range fire training is a huge concern that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Gun rights advocates often point to cars and an analogy to guns, both are objects subject to the whims of their users. In the case of education and permitting, I think there is much we can learn from Colorado's vehicle licensure system. My twins are about to turn 16 next month - they have had to take a \$500 driver safety course, which required 30 hours of classroom instruction, 6 hours of on road driver training, and then pass a drivers test to prove competency in handling a potentially deadly vehicle. Why should someone carrying a deadly weapon in public and not be held to a similar standard of care for public safety?</p> <p>I am not a gun owner, but I did grow up with guns, and my father was a police officer. He taught me that gun ownership requires a tremendous amount of responsibility and care and that responsible gun owners are eager to be part of the solution in solving gun violence. Therefore, I believe that responsible gun owners will also applaud this bill as a means of ensuring that those who are permitted to concealed carry firearms are doing so with an increased ability to handle a firearm safely and responsibly.</p>

	<p>Please vote YEA on HB24-1174 and ensure that this bill makes its way to the assembly floor.</p>
<p>Sheila Wheeler Amend themselves</p>	<p>My name is Sheila. I am testifying on behalf of myself. I am a resident and constituent of CO House District 4. I am strongly for the committee to vote yes on this bill with the request to amend by adding clarity that the examination be "closed book."</p> <p>Guns and gun ownership must be subject to the same rules, regulations and common sense parameters that govern all other tools of power. As a commercial loan officer in the community development finance industry, I work on a daily basis with credit reports, property and liability insurance, financial statements and financial reporting standards. Further, I can do my work only after completing multiple annual trainings on Bank Secrecy Act, OFAC, etc. The standards, transparency, and training are the currency to participate in capitalistic financial services and perform my paid job. A similar approach can and should apply to concealed carry permits and training.</p> <p>Please vote resoundingly for this bill. Thank you.</p>
<p>Hayley Walter For themselves</p>	<p>I am for this bill. We should expand current concealed carry safety protocol as listed. This will save lives and make our community safer. Just as we require people to pass a driving test, people should be required to pass gun safety exams.</p> <p>Other states have moved in the opposite direction and those results are clear:</p> <p>By making it easy for almost anyone to carry a concealed handgun in public, right-to-carry laws increase violent crime, firearm robberies, gun thefts, workplace homicides, and mass shootings. Right-to-carry laws make it harder for law enforcement to solve violent crimes and are opposed by many law enforcement leaders across the country. Similarly, permitless carry harms public safety by removing essential safety measures designed to ensure that those carrying handguns in public have been properly trained and vetted. Evidence overwhelmingly suggests that the removal of concealed carry permitting systems is associated with higher rates of gun homicide and violent crime.</p>

	<p>Lets continue to make colorado a fine example for the safety and well being of its citizens.</p>
<p>Kyle Wille Against LT Arms</p>	<p>This bill will make it difficult for law abiding citizens to obtain their legal right to bear arms. Requiring an 8 hour course will alienate a majority of the population who are barely able to survive paycheck to paycheck and are unable to sacrifice a full day. An exam to obtain a constitutional right is both illegal and discriminatory to people that have learning problems and test anxiety. Requiring a live-fire portion is also putting restraints on the same people who can barely survive paycheck to paycheck due to the fact that a live-fire course is expensive and the ammo required for such a course is costly. I strongly oppose this bill and urge everyone else to oppose it as well.</p>
<p>Sean Langlais Against themselves</p>	<p>I am opposed to House Bill 24-1174. A similar version of this bill is already being fought in other states and will ultimately be deemed unconstitutional. Why are members of the Colorado legislature attempting to supersede the constitution? Concealed carry permits are already unconstitutional, why make it more difficult for the average citizen to defend themselves? This will inevitably and drastically raise the cost to obtain a CCW and increase the time to do so. Additionally, this blatant attack will make average citizens LESS safe and will simply provide an enormous win for the criminal. If one cares to check honest statistics, they will find states that have constitutional carry (no permit to carry a firearm), do not have a corresponding increase in gun related crime. In fact, the opposite is often true. Please add this unconstitutional bill to the dust bin of history - where it belongs.</p>
<p>Leslie OBrien For themselves</p>	<p>Dear House Judiciary Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for HB 24-1174 the Concealed Carry Permits and Training Bill.</p> <p>The current process for obtaining a concealed carry permit is a joke. There is no standardized training and no range time requirement, just to name a couple glaring issues with the current permit process.</p> <p>This new legislation will be hugely beneficial to those choosing to pursue a concealed carry permit by:</p> <p>Learning from verified firearm instructors,</p>

	<p>Having the CBI creating a standardized training program for all conceal carry permit applicants, including a range time component and a written exam,</p> <p>Teaching applicants to be better prepared to deal with a violent confrontation, instead of a "shoot first, ask questions later" mentality.</p> <p>I personally would feel better as a citizen of CO knowing that if someone chooses to conceal carry that they have received legitimate firearm safety and handling training, and they have obtained their conceal carry permit by demonstrating a certain level of competency.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to vote YES for HB 24-1174: Concealed Carry Permits and Training Bill to continue moving forward and out of committee.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Leslie O'Brien Broomfield, CO 80023</p>
<p>Craig Bauer Against themselves</p>	<p>The second Ammendment CLEARLY srates the inalienable right which no government agency has the constitutional authority to enact decree against is to keep AND BEAR arms. That means to hold and administer their possession as the OWNER sees fit. You do not have the authority to force ANY license upon weapons ownership and possession. You are notified that this is also a matter of NATIONAL SECURITY as stated in the clause of the second Ammendment "Security of the free state". You a further noticed that signers upon any legislation that infringes upon the second Ammendment can be viewed as treason AND/OR felony conspiracy. TITLE 18 ss 241 united states code. CONSPIRACY AGAINST RIGHTS. You are hereby notified, in writing, that you do not have the authority to enact this or other Unconstitutional legislation. Rethink your position before its too late.</p>
<p>Sandra Ramlet Against themselves</p>	<p>To the General Assembly - I respectfully submit to you that HB24-1174 is unconstitutional. Colorado currently has good regulations in place allowing law-abiding citizens to train and earn a permit for conceal-carrying firearms. This law would make obtaining a permit ridiculously difficult, and puts unreasonable, nearly impossible requirements on firearm instructors.</p>

	<p>Statistics clearly show that armed citizens often "take out" criminal types, making the world a safer place. Remember the old saying, "If guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns." It's true. Don't disarm your God-fearing, law-abiding citizenry. We have elected you to look out for our safety. This bill does the opposite. Vote no.</p>
<p>Jon Doe Against themselves</p>	<p>What's the point of this Bill other than to make it harder for people to protect themselves. We have a duty to protect ourselves and family. It's foolish to think that law enforcement is responsible for the safety of me and my family. CHP license is already expensive, so now you want to make it harder for financially strapped people to exercise a constitution right. Its obvious Democrats that you do not care about safety and human life. It's all about the power and the control. Strongly oppose this garbage bill. We will see this go all the way to SCOTUS.</p>
<p>Jon Doe Against themselves</p>	<p>What's the point of this Bill other than to make it harder for people to protect themselves. We have a duty to protect ourselves and family. It's foolish to think that law enforcement is responsible for the safety of me and my family. CHP license is already expensive, so now you want to make it harder for financially strapped people to exercise a constitution right. Its obvious Democrats that you do not care about safety and human life. It's all about the power and the control. Strongly oppose this garbage bill. We will see this go all the way to SCOTUS.</p>
<p>Sarah Banchefsky For themselves</p>	<p>Dear House Judiciary Committee,</p> <p>I'm Sarah, a constituent strongly urging you to support HB24-1174.</p> <p>The 2003 CCW law states that in order to obtain a concealed carry permit, a person must "demonstrate competence with a handgun." Unfortunately, in some classes no firing of a handgun takes place, so we do not know a person's competence in firing a handgun. Other loose attitudes towards training people to carry hidden handguns on our streets and into our public venues have created classes that some students described as "a joke."</p> <p>Statistics from one study show that those with less firearm training and experience more likely to "shoot" innocent bystanders and unarmed people (Vince, Wolfe, and Field, "Firearms Training").</p>

	<p>Teaching how to handle a deadly weapon and carry it around in public should never be a joke, and the vast majority of gun owners and non-gun owners across party lines agree.</p> <p>Over 80 percent of gun owners, non-gun owners, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents agree that high safety standards are critical in issuing concealed carry permits (Webster et al., 2017).</p> <p>Thank you for your work to make Colorado safer for all of us.</p> <p>Sarah Banchefsky</p> <p>Citations:</p> <p>Daniel W. Webster et al., "Concealed Carry of Firearms: Fact vs. Fiction". Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Center for Gun Policy and Research. (2017), https://bit.ly/2QJr2Mi.</p> <p>Joseph J. Vince Jr., Timothy Wolfe, and Layton Field, "Firearms Training and Self-Defense: Does the Quality and Frequency of Training Determine the Realistic Use of Firearms by Citizens for Self-Defense? Facts and Evidence for Public Policy Considerations" (Mount St. Mary's University and the National Gun Victims Action Council, 2015)</p>
<p>Mark Kaiser Against himself</p>	<p>Recently Kevin Flynn expressed concern that the gun violence the city and state sees isn't necessarily coming from concealed carry permittees, wondering what problem the a proposed bill was seeking to solve.</p> <p>"I'm just having trouble understanding why we're keeping the whole class in from recess because of the misbehavior of some who don't have a permit," Flynn said.</p> <p>Now I see that the legislature is seeking to once again punish and control those that want to protect themselves.</p> <p>It is a known fact that concealed carry gun owners don't cause gun violence, factually are some of the most law abiding citizens a city can have. And quoting Kevin Flynn—like him, " I having trouble understanding why we're keeping the whole class in from recess</p>

	<p>because of the misbehavior of some who don't have a permit". Add to that that criminals don't obey laws so how is penalizing people who obey the law going to stop gun violence?</p> <p>Additionally for me and others like me who carry strictly because of the increased crime in Colorado, and secondly, it gives us even more reason not to cross into the City of Denver. Many of us do not consider Denver a safe city and find other sources for items we need, we do not patronize restaurants, service suppliers, or any other merchant in Denver. If we need to deal with a government service in Denver, we do it by mail, online, on the telephone or seek out an alternative option instead of crossing into Denver.</p> <p>This bill would only encourage the criminal element who see it as a free pass to commit even more serious crimes.</p> <p>Please consider reality before passing this bill.</p> <p>Mark Kaiser Registered Volunteer Lobbyist 7035 Zenobia Westminster, Colorado 80030 3035980630</p>
<p>Lilianna Setzke For themselves</p>	<p>Dear House Judiciary Committee -</p> <p>My name is Lilianna Setzke and I am a 12th grade student in Louisville, Colorado. I am writing in support of HB24-1174.</p> <p>As a student, my job is to learn, and I should feel safe in school, and everywhere in my community and throughout the country. It is important to me that people who do have guns know how to use them and store them properly, just like people have to learn how to drive properly before getting a license. According to Everytown, more than 500 people are unintentionally shot and killed every year, and over 40,000 are wounded from accidental gun causes in an average year. In addition, proper training and storage methods may prevent guns from getting into the</p>

	<p>wrong hands. A required 8 hour course and basic testing for concealed carry permits has the potential to go a long way in keeping our communities safe.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Lilianna Setzke</p> <p>12th grade student</p>
<p>Caden Crisp</p> <p>For themselves</p>	<p>Dear House Judiciary Committee -</p> <p>My name is Caden and I am a 12th grade student in Louisville, Colorado. I am writing in support of HB24-1174.</p> <p>As a student, my job is to learn, and I should feel safe in school, and everywhere in my community and throughout the country. Stricter gun safety standards are imperative to creating a safer community for everyone. With HB24-1174, concealed carry permit holders would undergo increased training to try to mitigate the danger that the firearm poses to either themselves or others around them, as they would be more educated in regards to the capabilities and intended use of their weapon. From my perspective as a student, this would make my community vastly more safe, as there are hundreds of deaths and injuries from firearms each year in Colorado, many of which are self-inflicted or accidental. Standardized training reduces the possibility that gun owners with concealed carry permits will use their firearms to hurt others or themselves, so people like me can feel certain in the efficacy and consistency of the courses these individuals will complete. Furthermore, the efficacy of the courses the gun owners will take can be increased as a result of required tests, ranging from live-fire exercises to written tests. With safeguards like this, people like me can feel safer in their</p>

	<p>community because we can be sure that individuals carrying a concealed firearm have been trained on how to use their weapon in a safe and responsible manner. Safety should be the utmost priority when tackling issues like gun violence, and I believe that bill HB24-1174 is an extremely important step in decreasing gun violence in both the present and the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Caden Crisp 12th grade student</p>
<p>Joseph Wilkey Against themselves</p>	<p>This goes against the Constitution of the United states of America. "The right of the people, to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."</p> <p>To bear arms is to have in ones possession. Concealed or open carry. Yes it's good for people to be trained. But at their discretion. The minimum standard should be Constitutional carry. Learning the laws and safety of course is a good idea. But to make it compulsory is not ok.</p> <p>As an instructor, I understand that my students, being adults will make their own decisions on what level of training will be needed for them.</p> <p>You should all be removed from office for continuing to brake your Oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.</p>
<p>Bridget Weaks Against themselves</p>	<p>Ms Duran, Mr Snyder, Mr Mullica and all representatives -</p> <p>I'm writing today as a concerned citizen, wife and mom of three. Each day I find myself increasingly concerned about safety and crime in our once very safe neighborhood, city and state.</p> <p>If you had asked me 4 years ago about whether I'd ever own a gun I'd have told you emphatically 'NO'. The summer of 2020 was educational and having had 2 attempted break-ins of our home, my opinion changed. I now own guns and have thoroughly educated myself on responsible gun ownership and practice shooting regularly. Every gun owner I've met is very responsible and serious about safe gun use, storage etc.</p>

	<p>I am strongly opposed to any changes you are attempting to make to the concealed permit process through HB24-1174. Having recently taken a concealed carry class and working to obtain my permit, it seems that there are already thoughtful rules and regulations in place. The instructor who taught my class was a law enforcement official, very knowledgeable and professional. I understand the gravity of carrying a concealed gun in public.</p> <p>It seems that the intent of this bill is to discourage law-abiding citizens from pursuing the concealed carry permit. This is a blatant violation of every citizen's constitutional rights...'the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed'.</p> <p>Respectfully needs to be put in the rubbish bin.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Kim Kordich Against themselves</p>	<p>Judiciary Committee, In regards to HB 24-1174.</p> <p>I am opposed to this Bill in committee today. It imposes an unrealistic burden on law-abiding citizens to conceal carry, which is our constitutional right under the 2nd Amendment. This Bill would have a direct Infringement on the 2nd Amendment which states: " A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."</p> <p>Is this the goal of the Bill to make it extremely difficult for law-abiding citizens to obtain their concealed carry license, while the criminals obtain their weapons illegally? Why are you wasting tax payer monies trying to infringe on our constitutional rights when you can be spending more time, money, and resources taking illegal guns off the streets.</p> <p>For the record my vote is Opposed.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
<p>John Gorrell Amend themselves</p>	<p>I'm writing to express my concern and opposition to proposed legislation HB24-1174 (in its current form) concerning Concealed Carry Permits and Training.</p> <p>Prerequisites to any productive, successful legislation are threefold: 1) The law must attempt to solve a problem; 2) It must be enforceable; 3) It must not infringe on any existing rights enjoyed by law-abiding citizens. With the exception of the introduction of a training requirement as a prerequisite for obtaining a concealed carry permit (which I wholeheartedly support), HB24-1174 in its current form fails on all accounts.</p>

	<p>Most glaring is the disconnect between any purported 'problem' that it might seek to solve. Indeed, concealed carry permit holders are some of the most law-abiding citizens, and there is simply no evidence to support the claim that permit holders pose some nefarious threat to public safety. On the contrary, there are numerous examples demonstrating how citizens lawfully carrying a handgun have actually saved lives in mass shooting scenarios or even prevented them from happening. Research compiled by John Lott effectively corroborates this.</p> <p>The list of public places where firearms are not allowed is already substantial and is anchored in Colorado law. It includes such locations as schools, public transport, government buildings, etc. Expanding that list to include public parks or places of worship, precisely where concealed carry holders have demonstrated the positive impact of lawfully carrying a firearm, seems both superfluous and reckless.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, I fully support ensuring that permit holders are properly trained and can demonstrate that they are capable of assuming the enormous responsibility of carrying a firearm on a daily basis.</p> <p>It is for the reasons above that I ask you to kindly review HB24-1174 and consider only maintaining the portion of the bill pertinent to firearms training. Concealed carry holders do not pose a threat to public safety (on the contrary), particularly at a time when law enforcement funding continues to dwindle and the attrition rate among agencies is at an all time high, something to which I can personally attest.</p> <p>Thank you very much for taking the time to consider my thoughts on this matter.</p> <p>Best regards, John Gorrell</p>
<p>Steven Reams Against</p>	<p>I'm providing written testimony in opposition of HB24-1124. As the County Sheriff Of Weld County and a member of the County Sheriffs of Colorado, I report to you that my citizens and the membership of my organization believe this is unnecessary and cumbersome</p>

<p>Weld County Sheriff's Office and the County Sheriff's of Colorado</p>	<p>legislation at best. While gun crime in Colorado is a definite concern, the suspects associated to the commission of those crimes are rarely, if ever, concealed handgun permit holders. In fact, it is just opposite; most concealed handgun permit holders are law abiding and well trained in the use of their firearms. They have gone through extra training and background checks to ensure they are able to protect themselves from being the victim of violent crime. This bill is aimed at increasing the difficulty for a person who wants to exercise their gun rights without any tie data that would support that this change would increase public safety; it is likely to have the exact opposite effect.</p> <p>I believe there is a reason to advocate for higher penalties for persons who commit crime with the use of a concealed handgun permit, or while in possession of said permit, but this bill is poorly crafted to increase public safety and should be rejected.</p> <p>Respectfully, Sheriff Steve Reams</p> <p>Weld County Colorado & County Sheriffs of Colorado</p>
<p>Russell Dare Against themselves</p>	<p>This proposed legislation would impose onerous requirements on exercising your constitutionally protected right to bear arms. There are already unreasonable requirements on getting a concealed carry permit and this is another step further in the wrong direction. The 15% of coloradans who conceal carry on a daily basis are not responsible for violent crime. There is not a single study or metric that shows they are remotely a problem. In fact they are shown to be much more law abiding and responsible than law enforcement. This proposed legislation explicitly targets innocent people and is nothing more than a political attack. It doesn't even pretend to solve any sort of problem. Try placing similar restrictions on voting and see how constitutional that turns out to be.</p>
<p>Norah Krause For Students Demand Action</p>	<p>Chair and members of the committee, my name is Norah Krause and I'm here on behalf of Students Demand Action at East High School, testifying for HB24-1174. This is my second week in a row being at the capital for testifying and that is because fighting the fight to end gun violence is a top priority, especially of how closely myself and my peers have been impacted. So, before I begin I would like to take a second to recognize the life of Luis Garcia, who was shot in front of my school a year ago today (pause).</p> <p>Now, I'm a sophomore which means that the hot topic right now for my grade is driving, who has their license, who's saving up to get</p>

	<p>a car of their own etc. I have a summer birthday which means I won't have my license for a while. However, I spent 30 hours online completing Drivers Ed, took a written permit test, and now am logging all of my driving hours with a parent before getting to take my drivers license test in August. This is a grueling process however, nobody wants irresponsible drivers on the road.</p> <p>In 2021, 638 people died from car accidents in Colorado. Our average gun deaths a year in Colorado is 930. Meaning that more people in our state die from gun violence each year than car accidents. This makes sense, because of the immense training and automobile education drivers go through nowadays in order to attain their license, while currently inadequate training is required to attain a concealed carry permit. It should be common sense to require live fire training and a written test when obtaining a concealed carry permit. Firearm safety training empowers gun owners to know how to use and handle their firearms properly, and this bill will ultimately lead to better educated gun owners who are more responsible and less likely to pose a threat to themselves or others. Carrying guns in public is a huge responsibility, just like driving a car is, and we need to treat it as such.</p> <p>I am proud and incredibly grateful to live in a state with strong gun legislation. However, being in school still causes me anxiety. My heart skips a beat everytime the announcements come on, and everytime I enter a classroom I try to sit the closest to where I would hide if there was an active shooter. I urge you all to vote in support of this bill so that the students that come after me don't spend their school days on edge, and as a state we can lower gun fatalities and keep more of my peers alive.</p>
<p>Sean Smith Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Sean Smith and I am representing myself. I am voicing my opposition to HB25-1174. With Colorado ranked fourth in the nation for crime it would make sense that our representatives would be focusing their legislative efforts reduce crime. Instead the sponsors of this bill are more focused on persecuting the law abiding than prosecuting the lawless. This bill has nothing to do with public safety if anything it is a threat to it. I do not expect the sponsors of this bill to understand that the people who take on the responsibility to defend their rights of life, liberty, and property do not take that responsibility lightly. If anything from what I have witnessed from members of the 2A community unwavering commitment to that responsibility. It is insulting that you think that gun owners are not</p>

	<p>dedicated in their training and are not responsible enough to have the right to defend themselves without a state certified instructor stamp of approval. Not only would this bill make it more difficult for members of the community to receive a license , but It would also impact their training options by limiting instructors to licensing requirements.</p>
<p>Kendra Stokes Against themselves</p>	<p>Dear legislators,</p> <p>While it's important for people to be trained on the use of firearms this bill needs to be ammended to include more training for Police officers and stricter rules for them when carrying off duty.</p> <p>I am a 2A supporter and have voted Democrat in the past, however, the more restrictions placed on Responsible firearm owners makes me lean towards voting in a different direction. Liberal firearm owners exist and continue to grow across CO.</p> <p>I digress. We know criminals will Not abide be any of these restrictions and in the end you are punishing those who follow the rules. Please use data when making decisions, not emotional responses to what you see in the media.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p>
<p>Lydia Ferrante-Roseberry For themselves</p>	<p>Honorable Reps,</p> <p>In January of 2021, my 19 year old daughter got her first 'real job' as a front end employee at the Table Mesa King Soopers. On March 22nd, a day she was thankfully off, 3 of her coworkers died at the hands of a mass shooter; one of them, 25 year old Rikki Olds, was her manager. Seven other innocent victims died that day. I can't begin to imagine what our lives would be like if she'd been working that day.</p> <p>As a Unitarian Universalist minister serving a congregation in Lafayette CO, I found myself ministering to my congregation and the Boulder County community while tending to my family's trauma and my own. In the aftermath of being so close to that amount of suffering, I have vowed to do everything I can to promote sensible gun laws.</p>

	<p>Although it pertains less to these kinds of random mass shootings, HB 24 1174 is a law that can save lives. If someone is carrying a gun around, I don't feel it's too much to ask that they be well-trained in how to use it and how to store it safely. Having better regulations around what the training entails and have CBI be in charge of training is very reasonable.</p> <p>In fact, a new 2022 study by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health found that the average rate of assaults with firearms increased an average of 9.5 percent relative to forecasted trends in the first 10 years after 34 states relaxed restrictions on civilians carrying concealed firearms in public. **** For states that did not require live- firearm training, the average rate of gun assaults increased to 8.28 per 100,000 people (18.3 percent increase).</p> <p>I urge you to support HB 24 1174 so the people of CO who wish to have a conceal carry permit are well-trained.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Rev. Lydia Ferrante-Roseberry Unitarian Universalist Louisville, CO</p>
<p>Steven Lahvic Against himself</p>	<p>Dear Members,</p> <p>I am writing this to vehemently oppose HB 24-1174. This bill is one of many designed to hobble the 2nd Amendment of The Constitution. Let me relate a short discussion I had with one of Mr Sullivans foot soldiers during his latest re election campaign. She said "we are not going to come and take away your guns". That might be true in that there will be no physical confiscation, however, the incremental implementation of garbage legislation like this will lead to a total end result of making it impossible to "legally" own a weapon to defend oneself. That is the goal of the Marxists that support it.</p> <p>HB 24-1174 must not pass as it presents a clear and present danger to this great Republic.</p>

	<p>Regards, Steven Lahvic</p>
<p>Jeany Rush Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: House Judiciary Committee 2-13-24 RE: HB24-1174 Concerning Permits to Carry a Concealed Handgun, and , in Connection Therewith, Establishing Standards for Concealed Handgun Training Classes FROM: Jeany Rush Colorado Springs Concerned Constituent - VOTE NO ON THIS BILL AND MANY ITERATIONS COMMITTEE: We already have too many laws, bills, regulations, and much more to control our Constitutional Right to Carry and the 2nd Amendment. These constant, now over 400, bill attempts each year, are like a constant attack on our rights as citizens to carry open, concealed, etc., and basically to defend ourselves against tons of bad players. We already had to train to learn responsible ownership of weapons, within the legal limits of the law, including Stop the Bleed certifications, and much more. The bad actors, like the many drugged, mentally manipulated criminals being allowed into our nation with open borders, are much more of a threat than the legal, law-abiding citizens already being responsible in this nation. The bad actors will not be stopped! You are continuously stopping the good folks from defending themselves, and it is Quite clear this is nothing more than the marxist takeover of a free nation. One Nation Under God, and with liberty and justice for all, has been perverted to allow criminals more rights than We the People. Please Wake UP NO NO NO ON violating our constitutional rights.</p>
<p>Frank Lehnerz Against themselves</p>	<p>Dear Lawmakers, I am writing to express my concerns regarding HB24-1174 (Concealed Carry Permits & Training), a bill proposing unnecessary and burdensome requirements for obtaining and renewing permits to carry a concealed handgun in Colorado. To be honest, I get the impression the authors of this bill are not aware of the current requirements for concealed handgun permit (CHP) applicants or for current CHP renewals and/or this bill is meant</p>

	<p>to "punish" law-abiding Coloradoans who wish to use a handgun in extreme cases where their lives are under threat.</p> <p>While I understand the intention behind promoting firearm safety and competence, something all responsible firearms owners are well familiar with, this legislation will inadvertently restrict law-abiding citizens' rights to self-defense. By imposing stringent training requirements and limiting access to permits, the bill will disproportionately affect individuals who, due to time, mobility, or financial constraints, are unable to meet the new criteria. This will leave them vulnerable and unable to legally protect themselves or their families especially in a time when violent crime is increasing in many Colorado communities and law enforcement are unable to quickly respond to calls.</p> <p>HB24-1174 has no effect on criminals and only seeks to inadvertently make accidental criminals out of safe and responsible Coloradoans who wish to defend themselves from threats. More laws don't automatically create more safety and as the tiring cliché goes, "criminals, by definition, don't follow laws."</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider the provisions of HB24-1174, by either sending it back to the draft stage with a better understanding of the facts surrounding current CHP requirement or by dropping it altogether.</p> <p>Sincerely, Frank Lehnerz</p>
Delores Kaiser Against	We Don't Live in a Utopia©Provided by Wealth of Geeks

<p>themselves</p>	<p>In trying to express my self about this bill, I found the following that expresses my opinion.</p> <p>“Whether you believe in the second amendment right to bear arms or not, many have resigned themselves to the fact that we don’t live in a perfect world. “Anytime someone asks, and I tell them I’m in favor of carrying, I usually tell them the same thing,” said one person.</p> <p>“I believe, truly, the world would be a much better place without guns, but that I don’t live in that world. There are more guns than people here, and while 99.9% of gun owners are decent, law-abiding people, that 0.1% is all it takes to justify needing a gun to defend yourself.”</p> <p>This bill would only exacerbate that criminals who don’t read or obey laws would still have guns.</p>
<p>John Howard Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is John Howard, and I opposed this bill.</p> <p>First and most obviously, this would be another direct violation of the 2nd Amendment to The Constitution. "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" is pretty straight forward. I have the right to carry a firearm for an assortment of reasons and this bill serves no purpose other than hindering that right.</p> <p>This bill affects me as both a concealed carry permit holder and as an instructor. I would like to point out the redundancy. The process of getting a concealed carry permit in Colorado is already extensive and time consuming. It's already a requirement to take a class given by a certified instructor and a background check is already required. I submitted my fingerprints and I actually had to pay to do research on myself to accurately fill out the background check with my sheriff's department and then I waited nearly 3 months while my background check was conducted. Again, this bill is redundant and is just going to cost more taxpayer money. Essentially, we're going to be involuntarily paying to have our own freedom taken away.</p> <p>These additional requirements for concealed carry permit holders and instructors are on top of an already complex background check, which means, the only people truly affected by this are the law-abiding citizens that have not committed a crime. Given the rising</p>

	<p>crime in this country and knowing that no criminal is going to have a need to change their plans because of this bill, this will only make it more difficult for law abiding citizens to defend ourselves, our families, and the people around us, which is truly asinine.</p> <p>Understand that guns are not the problem. It's been made clear in every way for decades but our rights our constantly under attack. We are not bad people that you're targeting but we will continue to defend ourselves no matter how difficult you try to make it in your quest for authority and power.</p> <p>I challenge you to put your politics aside and be introspective about this. Even if you do truly disagree with those of us that oppose this bill and even if your intentions are pure, this is still a direct violation of The Constitution. To look at yourself and believe you have the right to reject the Constitution of The United States is simply arrogance or ignorance. The right of the people to KEEP and BEAR arms shall not be infringed. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>Barbara Niederhoff For themselves</p>	<p>My name is Barbara Niederhoff, I live in Aurora, and I come from a family with deep roots in the American West and a long history of gun ownership. I am asking you to consider the broader historical context of American gun laws and vote yes on HB24-1174.</p> <p>From our earliest history as a nation -- even before independence -- American communities have set expectations and required accountability around gun ownership. Townspeople from east to west set up a variety of local laws around purchase, permits, storage, and concealed carry. They enacted these laws according to local needs across the US, in every century, without conflict with the Second Amendment, because Americans understood that rights and responsibilities go together. The freedom to swing your fist ends at another's nose, and if that "fist" has great deadly capacity, Americans have historically required some advance precautions to prevent tragedy.</p> <p>One example out of many, close to home: in 1884, Denver passed an ordinance banning concealed carry and confiscating weapons from offenders, regardless of the carrier's skill or purpose -- a measure far exceeding the bill under consideration today.</p>

	<p>https://lawcollections.colorado.edu/colorado-municipal-codes/islandora/object/muni%3A71 (chapter V, article III, section 12)</p> <p>The claim that the Second Amendment bestows rights WITHOUT responsibilities only began to spread in the late 20th century, when gun industry lobbyists -- in order to widen their market and maximize their profits -- began a expensive and coordinated campaign to both</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) get common sense safety laws out of their way <p>and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2) use scare tactics to create a false fear of loss, fear of missing out, and fear of other Americans. <p>This multimedia campaign was so widespread and so successful that many of the customers don't remember anything else. That success does not change its falseness.</p> <p>HB24-1174 is a moderate and reasonable balance between a gun owner's historic rights as an individual and their historic responsibility to their neighbors. Thank you for keeping this in mind, and vote yes on this bill. Thank you for reading.</p>
<p>Susan Enfield For themselves</p>	<p>Hello Chair Weissman and members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Susan Enfield. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in support of HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits and Training Bill.</p> <p>I raised my two children, now 20 and 22, in Boulder. Our family and community have been negatively impacted by the steady increase in gun deaths in Colorado. My son and daughter no longer feel safe in their classrooms, at the grocery store, or in public spaces. Our community regularly grieves the loss or injury of neighbors due to gun violence including assaults, suicides, and accidents.</p> <p>The number of Coloradans applying to get or renew concealed carry permits continues to rise after the surge during the pandemic in 2020 and 2021. According to data from the County Sheriffs of Colorado, Colorado issued 27,031 new concealed carry permits and renewed 26,622 existing permits in 2022.</p>

	<p>I commend law-abiding gun owners who choose to complete the current permitting process. Yet, given the significant increase in residents carrying, I believe we can and must improve the process to ensure it is sufficient to enhance public safety and reduce the risk of accidents and misuse.</p> <p>By mandating standardized in-person firearm training that includes live-fire exercises and a written exam with minimum thresholds to “pass,” HB24-1174 will ensure permit holders have the necessary skills to handle firearms safely and effectively. Better-educated gun owners will understand firearm safety, laws, and self-defense techniques and are less likely to pose a danger to themselves or others.</p> <p>HB24-1174 also assures the integrity of the training process by providing for verification of instructor qualifications and protecting permit applicants from fraudulent or misleading claims regarding the qualifications of instructors.</p> <p>Enhancing public safety is the highest goal for Coloradoans and our legislative representative. Therefore, I stand in support of HB24-1174. By establishing higher-quality, standardized training and permitting, we can all feel safer in our daily lives.</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to address this committee today.</p>
<p>Peggy Darrah For themselves</p>	<p>I'll be at the capitol today to support common sense gun safety laws, I'm testifying remotely to save us all a little time.</p> <p>Other countries require what this bill is asking for and more for people to purchase a gun, let alone carry a concealed firearm. In my opinion what this bill is promoting should be the case for all firearm purchases. America has a terrible gun problem, our lives are in constant danger with so many people who are not trained to shoot a gun having them ready to shoot in public places, as well as at home. We just need to put the guns down!</p> <p>Promoting responsible gun ownership by requiring individuals to demonstrate handgun competency through live-fire exercises and written exams promotes responsible gun ownership. It ensures that permit holders have the necessary skills to handle firearms safely and effectively, reducing the risk of accidents and misuse.</p> <p>This just makes sense and I hope Colorado lawmakers will cross party lines and vote in favor of this bill because it makes good sense.</p>

	Thank you.
Benjamin Short Against themselves	<p>My name is Benjamin Short. I'm a graduate student and researcher at the University of Colorado Boulder and a member of the Rocky Mountain Gun Owners.</p> <p>I am writing in opposition of this bill because it places further restrictions on a population which is least likely to commit violent crimes.</p> <p>I've lived in three states in which I have acquired a permit to carry a concealed handgun. One in which only fingerprints and a clean record were required, one in which 4 hours of training were required as well as live-fire testing, and the state of Colorado which requires a course but no other training.</p> <p>In order to obtain a permit, my wife and I each spent around \$100 on the course to acquire the permit and \$125 for the carry permit in Boulder County. We each went to the Boulder County Sheriffs office where our pictures were taken and fingerprints submitted. I met and chatted with the officer in charge of handgun permits, Jodi Biekert, who I recall was very personable and friendly and whose contact card has been in my wallet since.</p> <p>In summary: my wife and I spend several hours in a course, spent a sizable portion of our money, submitted fingerprints, and got to know our local sheriff. As does every person seeking to obtain a permit to carry a firearm in the state of Colorado. The type of people that consent to this manor of carrying a firearm are not prone to random acts of violence or in need of any additional requirements to help increase public safety. There is nothing wrong with the way that Colorado is issuing permits at present and no change in legislation is needed.</p> <p>The states that do require obscene hours of training; California (16 hours), Illinois (16 hours), and New York (16 hours), are among the worst in violent gun crime while states which institute Constitutional Carry laws like Ohio saw drops in violent crime. If you must put some live-fire component into Colorado law, I would suggest an approach like Minnesota which requires an in person course with a live-fire</p>

	<p>exercise and certification of competence, but limits the total duration to 4 hours. 8 hours of training (or more), is insulting and leads many to suspect that this is less about public safety and more about increasing the obstacles to legal practice of rights.</p>
<p>Robert Bonnell Against themselves</p>	<p>I am opposed to HB24-1174. Colorado has a relative high percentage of permit holders compared to other states. As of 2022, nation wide, women made up 29% of all handgun permit holders. As of 2022, Colorado had 16.41% of the adult population with a valid concealed permit. During that period, the average monthly crime rate for the general population was 530.3 per 100,000 people. Permit holders had a rate of 5.7 per 100,000. Concealed permit holders are 39 times less likely to be arrested for a crime then those without a permit. This comes from actual government sources. Why are you making it more difficult for law abiding citizens when at the same time your recent laws have made it a great place for criminals. As a retired law enforcement Officer in both Indiana and Colorado who has over 40 years in the system, I urge you to vote against this bill. It is not needed. I have also worked in Probation and community Corrections. Mandatory sentencing for people using firearms to commit crimes needs to be used. They work! I have spent time interviewing numerous criminals throughout my career. Obeying laws has not been their priority. Not getting caught and not serving time has always been their goal. Why are you trying to punish people that obey the law and bother to get a permit in the first place?</p> <p>This bill does nothing to deter crime. I strongly oppose it! Make Colorado safe again by making it tougher on those that break the law. Not on those who obey it! Colorado used to be a great place to live with relative low crime. Now look at it.</p> <p>Please reconsider this bill as it will not accomplish anything. Do you actually have an outcome study to back up your bill. All bills show have an outcome based study prior to their introduction. Again, please reconsider this bill as it is not needed.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>

**Mark Ricard**

To: Jackson, JD >

Yesterday

HB24-1174

My name is Mark Ricard and I have been a "Handgun Safety and Concealed Carry Instructor for over 10 years, in the state of Colorado. I want to speak out against HB24-1174.

Why would you put forth a bill that would make Colorado citizens less safe in a state that is already ranked 8th in the nation for violent crime and 3rd in the nation for property crime?

During each class time is allowed for students to tell me why they are attending a concealed carry class....Overwhelmingly the answer is because they feel the need to protect themselves and their families. It's not a secret that average response times for law enforcement in the Metro area is 14 minutes-21 seconds. Statistically the average deadly force encounter is 7 seconds or less and 3 shots. What verbiage in this bill gives and already concerned and scared populus peace of mind as they go about their lives in a state that is ranked 21st in the nation for gun deaths?

As an instructor I have been vetted by county sheriffs. My credentials are not in question and as a retired Deputy Chief of a large metropolitan size department and as a person who has worked at DIA in very secure areas and passed background checks by the CBI that alone proves my honesty and integrity.

Everything in this bill is being addressed in the classes I teach and I don't need another level of bureaucracy to interfere with an already successful product delivered to people who want to do what's legal and exercising their right granted by the Constitution.

Please consider the fact that this bill will make citizens less safe and the criminal element more bold. Colorado has laws that can be very harsh when it comes to gun law abuse. Put the teeth back in those laws and start enforcing them. Colorado does not need this.



February 13, 2024

Greetings!

My name is Matthew Keenan and I am a Colorado Native who has lived in various places all over the state during my life. I am also disabled from medical negligence which occurred in a Denver Metro Hospital in 2001. That issue is passed, I have moved on to what God has for me each day now. I grew up in a suburban neighborhood with real no exposure to fire arms. It really wasn't until I helped pastoral position at a church in Salida Colorado when a number of men from our fellowship invited me one Saturday morning to go "shooting." Having grown up second half of my formative years in the Boulder area, I said to the guys excitedly, "Sure! Let me get my CAMERA!!" They turned to each other and just laughed and we headed out to go to the park to do some plinking.

Salida is hunting country as are most Mountain towns here. So I was exposed to their lives of providing for their families with the game for which they hunted which continues to this day. I was later introduced to the world of self-protection when I moved to Colorado Springs, Colorado and became a member of a local Rotary Chapter. In the Chapter, we had shot gun shooting competitions, as well as recognized the local law enforcement for their stellar and heroic efforts to protect the public. It was there I learned that even though there was a police outpost located not more than 3 miles away that I could not guarantee their response in less than 20 – 25 minutes. According to Your own 9News Investigative piece in August 26th and updated on September 6th, 2022 titled, Denver Sees Alarming Increase in Police Response Times, Denver residents would now see law enforcement arriving at a critical scene within 34.25 minutes. Even your Chief of Police has gone on record saying, "this is unacceptable!" Meanwhile, the perps (which have become more emboldened by these restrictive bills on the general public which only takes seconds to do harm to their victims. My family and I cannot nor will not sit by and let that happen! Having learned from other violent crime calls in my work with various Law Enforcement, the times are extended depending on the time of day, location, perpetrators.... I choose to defend my family and those I care for as best I am able.

Look what happened just over the weekend in Houston, it took TWO OFF DUTY OFFICERS to engage the Transgender perp (who had a record of psychological problems) who was using their own child as a HUMAN SHIELD!! That will certainly continue especially here as Transplants from other places make this place their residents. These Bills put an unnecessary burden on the public to conform to a situation which need no alterations.

I fear for my state, town, and neighborhood if these foolhardy attempts to further restrict the law-abiding public from its desire to and duty to defend for itself. I ain't waiting on you to come and protect us! I am appealing that you consider those who can't defend themselves but are trying to do the best we can with the resources available. Don't tie our hands or any further!

Thank you very much!

<https://www.9news.com/article/news/investigations/denver-police-longer-response-times/73-313872e8-945c-4ce8-a1d5-8f31a35ca724>

Dear Members of the Colorado House Judiciary Committee,

I am a 23-year-old Coloradoan living in El Paso County, and one of the bills you are considering concerns me deeply. HB24-1174, which changes the requirements for obtaining a concealed carry permit and establishes the standards for the new training requirements, is well-intentioned; however, while I agree that education and training on this subject are valuable, I perceive several significant problems with it that will have deleterious effects on Colorado's various communities. I firmly believe it is not in your constituents' best interests to pass this bill, and as one of those constituents, I urge you all to vote against it. Putting aside classic arguments that such legal barriers to the use and concealment of weapons by the citizenry are infringements upon the human right to bear arms as described in the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, this bill will make it more difficult for those living in marginalized communities to obtain concealed carry licenses for their protection while failing to deter most criminals, to say nothing about the general burden placed on all citizens by the bureaucratic process this bill would necessitate to exercise their right to self-defense.

First, I would argue that it is excessive, punitive, and immoral to force law-abiding citizens to grind themselves through the crushing gears of bureaucracy before they may legally exercise such a fundamental human right as self-defense. We all know what dealing with the DMV is like. Bureaucracy is an agonizingly protracted test of one's patience, often acting as a punishing deterrent that people generally avoid as much as possible. The process of obtaining one's concealed carry permit is already excessively drawn out, often taking many weeks to

receive, in my experience. If the state government adds these requirements to the process, how much worse will it be? It is simply unjust to put a law-abiding citizen through these obstacles so that they can exercise one of the essential freedoms Americans have historically enjoyed, and this bill may discourage many from trying to do so. I cannot imagine this is the intended effect of these measures as that would be antithetical to liberty and justice; I hope that our leaders would still care about such values regardless of politics. However, this is not the end of the bill's potential adverse effects.

In addition to the more generalized barriers it erects, this bill amplifies its obstructive influence on disadvantaged Coloradoans, becoming particularly inequitable. Due to various economic factors, the cost of living is rising rapidly, causing many Americans to struggle to make ends meet. A survey by Forbes Advisor showed that 40.7% of respondents reported "living paycheck to paycheck" (Pokora, 2023). If this legislation aims to improve public safety, it will not help these people. The training and permit fees imposed on those seeking a concealed carry permit would be prohibitive for most underprivileged citizens under the requirements enumerated in this bill. For example, only *one* class on basic pistol orientation with the NRA in Denver costs \$124.99 (National Rifle Association). That does not include the cost of driving there, which may vary and matters significantly, considering the NRA does not offer that class anywhere else in the state. When people can barely feed, clothe, and house their families, low-income Coloradoans must prioritize the costs of living over self-defense. This issue is especially problematic when the most affordable housing in my city, Colorado Springs, is often located in rougher parts of town. Considering the cheapest pistols I have seen in town are usually around \$200, not to mention the price of ammunition, poorer Coloradoans are already heavily disincentivized by their finances to protect themselves. If you require them to pay for specialized

training courses, the problem becomes even worse. Unless the state intends to provide such training as a public service, likely raising taxes in the process, HB24-1174 will ensure that proper self-defense is a luxury the disenfranchised cannot afford.

Finally, if part of this legislation's purpose is to prevent the criminal use of concealed weapons, it will likely fail in that respect as well. Criminals, by definition, lack regard for the law and are often barred from possessing firearms in the first place. This prohibition rarely dissuades them from possessing firearms, of course, as demonstrated by the various gangs and criminal organizations across the United States, even in the cities with the most stringent gun laws. Likewise, I fail to see how this bill's measures will deter criminals from carrying their firearms concealed. If they already disregard the laws about possessing guns illegally and using them to commit crimes, then why would they comply with these regulations? It is illogical and superfluous.

Though I agree that broader education and training regarding the legality, maintenance, safety, and use of firearms is needed, this bill will only encourage the well-off to obtain it while discouraging the average citizen, outright barring the disadvantaged, and doing nothing to dissuade the criminal elements. Therefore, as one of your constituents, I strongly urge you to vote against this bill and pursue an alternative path toward public safety that is more equitable and effective.

Sincerely,

Justin McCurdy

References

National Rifle Association. (n.d.). *NRA Training*. Retrieved from

[https://www.nrainstructors.org/CourseDetails.aspx?Courseid=816845&seats=6&State=y
&SearchState=CO&id=9&bsa=&youth=&women=](https://www.nrainstructors.org/CourseDetails.aspx?Courseid=816845&seats=6&State=y&SearchState=CO&id=9&bsa=&youth=&women=)

Pokora, B. (2023, December 1). *Survey: How Many Americans Are Living Paycheck To Paycheck?* (J. Morales, Ed.) Retrieved from Forbes Advisor:

<https://www.forbes.com/advisor/credit-cards/survey-living-paycheck-to-paycheck/>

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

11250 WAPLES MILL ROAD FAIRFAX,

VIRGINIA 22030



NRA

February 12, 2024

House Judiciary Committee
200 E Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Chair Weissman:

I am writing to you regarding HB24-1174 and the National Rifle Association's (NRA) position on this piece of legislation. HB24-1174 would further-restrict access to concealed carry firearms by law-abiding Coloradans.

Firearms are used by law-abiding Americans for personal protection on a regular basis, with estimates ranging from 500,000 to more than 3 million occurrences each year.^{1,2} Neither of which is a small number.

The 2021 National Firearms Survey, directed by William English of Georgetown University, surveyed more than 54,000 Americans and identified 16,000 firearm owners. The survey used the largest sample size of any study that has ever been conducted on defensive firearm use, being nearly ten times greater than that of the next largest survey.

Mr. English found that "guns are used defensively by civilian firearms owners in approximately 1.67 million incidents per year. Handguns are the most common firearm employed for self-defense (used in 65.9% of defensive incidents), and in most defensive incidents (81.9%), no shot was fired."

This survey also found that:

- 81.4 million adult Americans own guns.
- A majority of gun owners (56.2%) indicate that there are some circumstances for which they carry a handgun for self-defense.
- About a third of gun owners (34.9%) have wanted to carry a handgun for self-defense in a particular situation, but local rules prohibited them from doing so.

People who take steps to obtain their concealed carry permit are law-abiding, responsible firearm owners. These are exactly the kind of people we should be encouraging to exercise their rights.

Our state and our neighbors are safer today because of the thousands of Coloradans with active concealed carry permits. Encouraging more law-abiding Coloradans to go through the training and background check associated with getting these permits is a good thing, but the legislation before you today would achieve the opposite result by raising even more barriers in the path of those wishing to legally and responsibly protect themselves.

Over recent years, the move to eliminate unreasonable barriers and misplaced restrictions on self-defense rights has gained popularity in many states, with residents of all but one of our surrounding states enjoying the free exercise of their right to carry a concealed firearm for self defense without even the requirement of a permit. None of those states or the many others that make up a majority of our nation today have experienced the ‘wild west’ that gun control advocates warned against with the passage of permitless carry.

At a time when a majority of states have seen the wisdom of relaxing restrictions on law-abiding firearm owners and focusing their attention on violent criminals instead, the addition of even more stringent training requirements for law-abiding Coloradans to practice their Constitutionally-protected right to self-defense is a major step in the wrong direction.

For these reasons, and several others, the NRA strongly opposes the passage of HB24-1174.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Travis L. Couture-Lovelady". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Travis Couture-Lovelady
State Director – Colorado
NRA-ILA

Sources:

1) <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2021/oct/5/guns-used-more-for-self-defense-than-crimes/>

2) English, William, 2021 National Firearms Survey (July 14, 2021). Georgetown McDonough School of Business Research Paper No. 3887145, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3887145> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3887145>

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

11250 WAPLES MILL ROAD FAIRFAX,

VIRGINIA 22030



NRA

February 12, 2024

House Judiciary Committee
200 E Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Chair Weissman:

I am writing to you regarding HB24-1174 and the National Rifle Association's (NRA) position on this piece of legislation. HB24-1174 would further-restrict access to concealed carry firearms by law-abiding Coloradans.

Firearms are used by law-abiding Americans for personal protection on a regular basis, with estimates ranging from 500,000 to more than 3 million occurrences each year.^{1,2} Neither of which is a small number.

The 2021 National Firearms Survey, directed by William English of Georgetown University, surveyed more than 54,000 Americans and identified 16,000 firearm owners. The survey used the largest sample size of any study that has ever been conducted on defensive firearm use, being nearly ten times greater than that of the next largest survey.

Mr. English found that "guns are used defensively by civilian firearms owners in approximately 1.67 million incidents per year. Handguns are the most common firearm employed for self-defense (used in 65.9% of defensive incidents), and in most defensive incidents (81.9%), no shot was fired."

This survey also found that:

- 81.4 million adult Americans own guns.
- A majority of gun owners (56.2%) indicate that there are some circumstances for which they carry a handgun for self-defense.
- About a third of gun owners (34.9%) have wanted to carry a handgun for self-defense in a particular situation, but local rules prohibited them from doing so.

People who take steps to obtain their concealed carry permit are law-abiding, responsible firearm owners. These are exactly the kind of people we should be encouraging to exercise their rights.

Our state and our neighbors are safer today because of the thousands of Coloradans with active concealed carry permits. Encouraging more law-abiding Coloradans to go through the training and background check associated with getting these permits is a good thing, but the legislation before you today would achieve the opposite result by raising even more barriers in the path of those wishing to legally and responsibly protect themselves.

Over recent years, the move to eliminate unreasonable barriers and misplaced restrictions on self-defense rights has gained popularity in many states, with residents of all but one of our surrounding states enjoying the free exercise of their right to carry a concealed firearm for self defense without even the requirement of a permit. None of those states or the many others that make up a majority of our nation today have experienced the ‘wild west’ that gun control advocates warned against with the passage of permitless carry.

At a time when a majority of states have seen the wisdom of relaxing restrictions on law-abiding firearm owners and focusing their attention on violent criminals instead, the addition of even more stringent training requirements for law-abiding Coloradans to practice their Constitutionally-protected right to self-defense is a major step in the wrong direction.

For these reasons, and several others, the NRA strongly opposes the passage of HB24-1174.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Travis L. Couture-Lovelady". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Travis Couture-Lovelady
State Director – Colorado
NRA-ILA

Sources:

1) <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2021/oct/5/guns-used-more-for-self-defense-than-crimes/>

2) English, William, 2021 National Firearms Survey (July 14, 2021). Georgetown McDonough School of Business Research Paper No. 3887145, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3887145> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3887145>



OFFICE OF RESPONDENT PARENTS' COUNSEL

Dear Chairman Weissman and Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

I write on behalf of the Office of Respondent Parents' Counsel (ORPC) seeking amendments to HB 24-1122. The ORPC is an independent judicial agency responsible for ensuring high-quality interdisciplinary legal representation for parents in dependency and neglect proceedings. The ORPC supports the intentions of HB 24-1122. However, due to the breadth of the language expanding the criteria for issuing a protection order, the ORPC is deeply concerned that:

- 1) Protection orders could increasingly be used as a tool employed by abusive parties with more resources against domestic violence victims;
- 2) Almost every child subject to a dependency and neglect proceeding may meet the criteria to have a protection order issued, interfering with reunification pursuant to Title 19; and
- 3) The overly broad language may lead to the bill being unable to survive strict scrutiny analysis, leading to protection orders issued under it being found unconstitutional.

As introduced, the language in the bill would allow protection orders to be issued when there is a risk or threat of physical, psychological, or emotional harm. What is meant by psychological or emotional harm is not defined. Risk is similarly not defined in the bill, but two definitions from other sources illustrate the concern:

- Volume 7, the common name for the regulations that control county departments of human services, defines risk as “detailed worries/concerns of what could happen in the future.” 12 Colo. Code Regs. § 2509-1-7.000.2
- Black’s Law Dictionary defines “risk” as the “uncertainty of a result, happening or loss; the chance of injury, damage or loss, esp. the existence and extent of the possibility of harm.”

Both definitions refer to a chance or possibility. In the child welfare context, “risk” is a term of art, and every assessment of a family by a county department of human services includes a “risk assessment.” Risk is understood to stay static based on the family’s history, meaning that they are assigned a score of their level of risk that does not change greatly over time.

By contrast, Black’s Law Dictionary refers to “threat” as “a communicated intent to inflict harm or loss on another or on another’s property, esp. one that might diminish a person’s freedom to act voluntarily or with lawful consent; a declaration, express or implied, of an intent to inflict loss or



OFFICE OF RESPONDENT PARENTS' COUNSEL

pain on another.” It is much more tailored to address intentional actions of a person than “risk” which requires a judge to make a determination of the possibility of a harm occurring.

Similarly, “psychological or emotional harm” are not defined by the bill. In the legal context, we assess for damages based on intentional infliction of emotional distress or often require that emotional harm be serious or substantial. This bill does not contain any of that language, and without a definition, and coupled with the word “risk,” the language is incredibly broad. Similarly, though the bill title refers to “victims of crime” nothing in the actual bill language restricts this new language to being applied only to victims of criminal acts.

When children are separated from their parents or abused or neglected, as they often are in dependency and neglect proceedings, it is hard to see how children would not be at risk of psychological or emotional harm or threatened by psychological or emotional harm. The breadth of this definition could lead to almost every child subject to a dependency and neglect proceeding being eligible for a protection order. The court issuing the protection order would have very broad authority to restrict a parent from their home and to restrict a parent’s contact with their children. Additionally, if the parent violates the terms of the protection order, they could be criminally charged and incarcerated rather than just being subject to civil contempt proceedings.

Many domestic violence victims who are respondent parents in dependency and neglect cases are also trying to address conditions such as PTSD or Substance Use Disorder. These conditions are often the result of or a response to the cycle of domestic violence. Because the language of this bill is so broad, an abusive partner or ex-partner could use the victim’s disabilities against them to argue that their behavior risks or threatens physical, psychological, or emotional harm to children. This already happens, and the expanded language risks it happening even more frequently.

Just this past summer, in *Counterman v. Colorado*, seven U.S. Supreme Court justices overturned a Colorado stalking conviction, holding that in order to punish a criminal defendant for speech, the First Amendment requires that the defendant must have some subjective understanding of the threatening nature of their statements. 600 U.S. 66, 69 (2023). The dissent observed that the majority opinion implied that under the same First Amendment reasoning, civil protection orders could not be obtained without proof that the person issuing a threatening statement intended it to elicit fear. *Id.* at 119 (Barrett, J., dissenting).

Without passing judgment as to the correctness of the Supreme Court’s opinion or its desirability, we are bound by the decision. To pass sweeping changes of this breadth that are not narrowly



OFFICE OF RESPONDENT
PARENTS' COUNSEL

tailored to meet the requirements of the First Amendment or the strict scrutiny required to curtail 14th Amendment rights to family integrity is to risk domestic violence victims having protection orders that they need for their safety being overturned as unconstitutional. The ORPC was unable to find any examples of civil protection order criteria being this broad in any other state, and the proponents of the bill were unable to provide any examples relied upon in drafting this legislation. This language is untested. As a result, in trying to go as broad as possible, the breadth of the language may doom the statute's constitutionality and any protection orders issued pursuant to it.

For all of these reasons, the ORPC urges the Judiciary Committee to consider an amendment to more narrowly tailor the language of this bill to its purposes. Specifically, the ORPC requests the following amendment:

- page 6, line 7; page 7, line 7 and 10; page 8, line 2, 5, and 15; page 14, line 21 - strike "RISK OR"
- page 6 lines 7-8; page 7, lines 8 and 10; page 8, lines 3, 6, and 16; and page 14, line 22 - strike "PHYSICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, OR EMOTIONAL HARM" and replace with "PHYSICAL HARM, OR SERIOUS PSYCHOLOGICAL OR EMOTIONAL DISTRESS." Alternate language might accomplish the same objective.

Words have meaning, and the Judiciary Committee has an important function in considering and anticipating how the words chosen for statutes will be interpreted by courts. This bill can still accomplish its important objectives without running afoul of the Constitution or subjecting more victims to protection orders and abuse of the legal system. The ORPC urges adoption of the straightforward amendment set forth above. We are happy to meet with any member or answer any questions regarding this position.

Best regards,

Melanie Jordan
Policy Director

Office of Respondent Parents' Counsel