

Gun Control Research- Dr. Gary Kleck- Gun most effective way to resist robbery and assault- up to 2.5 million defensive gun uses per year by U.S. adults

Dr. Kleck, a professor of criminology at Florida State University is a registered Democrat, a member of the ACLU, does not own guns, and takes no money from anyone on either side in the debate. In 1988, Kleck published an article in the journal, *Social Relations*. This article, the first major research effort that measured defensive gun use, was based on state and national studies.

Dr. Kleck estimated that about 1 million adults per year use a gun for self-defense in the U.S. Kleck's research included studies done for the anti-gun National Alliance Against Violence, and the National Crime Victimization Surveys. Kleck concluded that gun use was the most effective and safest way of resisting a robbery or assault, safer than not resisting, running away, or using another method of resistance.

In 1991, Dr. Kleck published *Point Blank: guns and violence in America*. The book won an award in 1993 from the American Society of Criminology for an "outstanding contribution" to the field.

Not satisfied with the sources for his previous work, Dr. Kleck and his colleague Marc Gertz created a new survey with a sample size of about 5,000 individuals to better measure defensive gun use. With the new survey, Kleck and Gertz estimated between 2.2 to 2.5 million defensive gun uses per year in the U.S. Women were the defenders in about 46% of the cases reported. Less than 25% of the reporting defensive users indicated that they fired a shot during the incident under consideration. There is a less than 1% chance that a defender's gun will be taken from him or her by an assailant, according to Dr. Kleck.

Dr. Marvin Wolfgang was asked to critique the Kleck/Gertz Study. Dr. Wolfgang's review included the following: "I am as strong a gun-control advocate as can be found among... criminologists... they (Kleck and Gertz) have provided an almost clear-cut case of methodologically sound research in support of something I have theoretically opposed for years... the use of a gun in defense against a criminal perpetrator... I do not like their conclusions that having a gun can be useful, but I cannot fault their methodology."

The absolute lowest estimates of about 100,000 defensive gun uses per year in this country come from the Department of Justice, using U.S. Census information. There is no question in the survey that asks about defensive firearms' use. This estimate is probably a serious undercount.

The Clinton Justice Department funded what was supposed to be a counter study debunking the Kleck/Gertz research. In 1996, anti-gun researchers Ludwig and Cook came up with about 3 million defensive gun uses per year. They then decided that it is impossible to measure the true number of persons who use guns in America for self-defense.

The research done by Kleck and Gertz indicates that defensive use of firearms by private citizens is a significant factor in stopping criminal violence. The research also lends itself to the conclusion that in most cases where a gun is used to resist robbery or assault, no shots are fired.

Sources:

- ❑ Blackman, Paul H., Ph.D., "Armed Citizens and Crime Control," <http://www.nraila.org/issues/articles/read.aspx?id=125>.
- ❑ Kopel, David, Independence Institute, panel discussion on guns and self-defense, Warwick Hotel, Denver, Colorado, July, 2009. <http://vids.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=vids.individual&VideoID=60107462>
- ❑ "How Often Are Firearms Used in Self-Defense?" http://www.guncite.com/gun_control_gcdguse.html.
- ❑ Stevens, Richard W., "Statistics and 'Gun Control,'" Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, Inc, <http://www.jpfo.org/filegen-a-m/data-docs.htm>.
Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Gun Control Research-Wright and Rossi Department of Justice Study
(Deterrent effect of armed citizens upon criminal behavior)

Professors James D. Wright and Peter Rossi of the Social and Demographic Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts conducted a study in 1982 and 1983 paid for by the U.S. Department of Justice. (Professor Rossi was a former President of the American Sociological Association.) The researchers interviewed 1,874 imprisoned felons in ten states.

Professors Wright and Rossi initially believed that strict gun control deterred crime. The results of their research led them to the conclusion that armed citizens have a beneficial effect in reducing criminal behavior and that harsh laws, such as handgun bans, could result in criminals using sawed off rifles and shotguns with more deadly results. 88% of the criminals surveyed by Wright and Rossi agreed with the statement that, "A criminal who wants a handgun is going to get one."

A 1986 review of the professors' work, *Armed and Considered Dangerous*, by Raymond G. Kessler of the Department of Criminal Justice of Memphis State University, concluded, "Although *Armed and Considered Dangerous* is not free of methodological problems, it is the best policy-oriented study of criminals and their guns available."

Wright and Rossi reported that:

81% of interviewees agreed that a "smart criminal" will try to determine if a potential victim is armed.

74% indicated that burglars avoided occupied dwellings, because of fear of being shot.

57% said that most criminals feared armed citizens more than the police.

40% of the felons said that they had been deterred from committing a particular crime, because they believed that the potential victim was armed.

57% of the felons who had used guns themselves said that they had encountered potential victims who were armed.

34% of the criminal respondents said that they had been scared off, shot at, wounded, or captured by an armed citizen.

Based on this government-funded research by Wright and Rossi, it would appear that armed citizens do have a deterrent effect on crime.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., Daly, Kathleen, *Under the Gun, Weapons, Crime, and Violence in America*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York, 1983.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., *The Armed Criminal in America*, U.S. Department of Justice, 1985.

Wright, James D., Rossi, Peter H., *Armed and Considered Dangerous, a Survey of Felons and their Firearms*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York, 1986.

Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454 Englewood, CO 80150-1454



April 2024

TO: House Judiciary Committee

RE: SB24-131-- Concerning Prohibiting Carrying a Firearm in Sensitive Spaces

Dear Committee Members:

The American Association of University Women (AAUW) is one of the oldest women's organizations in the country, empowering women since 1881. The mission of AAUW is to advance equity for women and girls through research, education and advocacy. More than 700 community leaders are members of AAUW branches around Colorado.

AAUW has declared that gun violence is a public health crisis, with women and girls being especially victimized by violence involving firearms. Gun safety is a complex issue, one which we need to deal with on many different fronts. Although it has been significantly amended, SB 131 will provide an additional measure of safety in the State Capitol, courts and schools.

AAUW of Colorado strongly supports SB 131 and requests your AYE vote in committee and throughout the process of becoming a law.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Su Ryden".

Su Ryden
AAUW of Colorado Public Policy Co-Director

16699 E. Kentucky Ave. • Aurora, CO 80017
303.898.5797
suryden25@gmail.com

American Association of University Women--AAUW is a top-rated 501(c)3 charitable organization whose mission is to advance gender equity for women and girls through research, education, and advocacy.

Claire Lunzer
Fort Collins, CO 80521

April 16, 2024

House Judiciary
200 E Colfax Ave
Denver, CO

Re: Testimony in Support of SB24-131

Dear House Judiciary,

I am expressing my strong support for SB24-131, "Prohibiting Carrying Firearms in Sensitive Spaces." As a resident of Colorado and a graduate student who spends 85% of my time on a college campus, I believe this bill is crucial for the safety and mental well-being of students of all ages. I am currently earning my Master's in Social Work, and the last thing I want to have to worry about is a shooting on campus. I want to focus on my studies to become a productive and passionate community member. The additional security provided by SB24-131 would significantly contribute to my overall mental well-being.

As a high school student, I remember experiencing a terrifying lockdown due to a phone call that there was an active shooter on our campus. I remember crouching under a desk with my friends, terrified as our teacher blacked out our windows. The fear we all experienced was debilitating, and many students turned to school counselors for added support. When it turned out it was our security guard who had a mental breakdown and called 911 impersonating a student, our illusion of safety was shattered. Bills like SB24-131 can help rebuild students' safety so they can focus on being teenagers.

Additionally, my best friend is an ICU nurse and has frequently told me the horrors of shooting victims, including, most recently, a 28-year-old Yale graduate who was paralyzed from his eyes down as he was struck in the neck as a passerby in a shooting. He elected to be taken off his life support, surrounded by his fiancée and family, so that he could donate his organs. Legislation such as SB24-131 can help to minimize the chances of incidents like these shootings from occurring.

In conclusion, SB24-131 is a necessary step forward for students' psychological and literal safety. I urge the committee to support this bill for the betterment of our community and the state of Colorado.

Thank you for considering my testimony.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Claire Lunzer".

Claire Lunzer

20240417 EMERSON TESTIMONY REGARDING SENATE BILL SB24-131 as reengrossed April 3,2024.

“CONCERNING PROHIBITING CARRYING A FIREARM IN SENSITIVE SPACES...”

My name is Keith Emerson. I am here representing myself to testify against this bill.

This bill has been considerably modified for the better. That said, it is not needed, in part due to earlier action by the Colorado Legislature. It also does not appear to yet meet the stated goal of prohibiting carry only in areas recognized by the US Supreme Court.

Regarding earlier action by the Legislature I would like to point out two Colorado and one Federal law currently on the books:

* SB21-256, “Local Regulation of Firearms” concerns regulation of firearms. This bill delegates such decisions from the State to local governing bodies. Now you want to raise this to a state level again. A wide group of entities is allowed to make such ordinances, such as local governments and universities. Boulder, for instance, has already taken advantage of this delegation to local authorities as has Denver and other organizations. Even without a local bill, posting “no guns allowed” signs on the doors makes someone carrying a firearm into a trespasser.

* HB22-1086, sponsored by Senators Sullivan and Fields among others, made open carry of firearms illegal within 100’ of polling places. This bill would add concealed carry to that prohibition, with “concealed” meaning no one knows whether a person is carrying a firearm or not. It would require disarming to put a ballot in a drop box. Has a concealed carry permit holder ever created “gun violence” while carrying concealed at a drop box in Colorado? With the firearm concealed how could they intimidate? This proposed change is just ridiculous.

* Federal Law already covers school zones out to a 1,000’ circle around the perimeter.

Looking at some of the bill’s details there appears to be an excess of space considered by the sponsors to be “sensitive”. For instance, while a government building may be sensitive that criteria likely does not include its parking lot, which is outside what is going on inside the building but is specifically included in this bill, see Page 3 line3. Parking lots need to be deleted from sensitive spaces.

The bill even considers a building containing the official office of any elected member or even their staff to be “sensitive”. 17th Street Plaza in Denver has 33 floors. A few of those floors are now occupied by the Denver District Attorney’s staff. Under the current language the entire building, parking, etc. would be considered a “sensitive space”.

Page 3 line 21 and 22 (1) (c) states, “A courthouse or any other building *or portion of a building used for court proceedings.*” This “portion of a building” language needs to be included in many other places throughout the bill, including schools which may be attached to a church or other facility.

Please either fix or shelve this bill.

Sincerely,

Keith Emerson



Testimony of Liddy Ballard, State Policy Manager
Support for SB24-131
Before the House Judiciary Committee

April 17, 2024

Dear Chair Weissman, Vice Chair Bacon, and distinguished members of the House Judiciary Committee,

Founded in 1974, Brady works across Congress, courts, and communities, uniting gun owners and non-gun owners alike, to take action, not sides, and end America's gun violence epidemic. Brady today carries the name of Jim Brady, who was shot and severely injured in the assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan. Jim and his wife, Sarah, led the fight to pass federal legislation requiring background checks for gun sales. Brady continues to uphold Jim and Sarah's legacy by uniting Americans from coast to coast, red and blue, young and old, liberal and conservative, to combat the epidemic of gun violence. **In furtherance of our goal to reduce firearm violence across Colorado, the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence is proud to support the passage of SB24-131.**

Colorado leaders have persisted in prioritizing the safety and well-being of all Coloradans by enacting and implementing proactive, research-informed policy solutions that prevent gun violence, save lives, and spare entire communities from loss, trauma and cycles of violence. And still, every 10 hours, a Coloradan is shot and killed by a gun, with over 900 citizens dying each year.¹ One firearm death is one too many and Colorado can do more – like pass Bill SB24-131 to ensure the safety of its citizens.

Why This Bill is Necessary

Following trends seen across the country in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Colorado saw a 45 percent increase in firearms purchases during 2020 compared to 2019, and the state's Concealed Handgun Permit (CHP) application numbers followed suit: 63 percent more CHPs were awarded in 2020 than 2019.^{2,3} This dramatic increase in firearms in the State combined with a massive surge in CHP holders has resulted in more firearms being carried – concealed – in more places than ever

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), *WISQARS Injury Data*, <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/index.html>

² Schmelzer, E. (2021, July 10). *After 2020 surge, Colorado gun sales continue at record pace in 2021*. The Denver Post. <https://www.denverpost.com/2021/07/10/colorado-gun-sales-2021/>

³ Colorado General Assembly. (n.d.). *Concealed Handgun Permits Issued by Colorado Sheriffs*. Colorado Legislative Council. <https://www.leg.state.co.us/library/reports.nsf/ReportsDoc.xsp?documentId=D6727350F8E058DB87256E6600773612>; Calculations found from comparing 2019 and 2020 reports.

before. Colorado's current law regarding CHP standards is objectively weak: someone can apply for and receive a CHP having never fired a gun before, not to mention taking part in safety training courses.

It is therefore imperative that Colorado pass SB24-131 so that constituents and visitors can feel safe from the threat of gun violence in public spaces. The Supreme Court in *Bruen* left it up to State and local legislatures to restrict the use of firearms in certain "sensitive places," including but not limited to schools, government buildings, legislative assemblies, polling places, and courthouses. SB24-131 is consistent with SCOTUS case law, and will continue to make Colorado safer by ensuring that the State broadens its sensitive place restrictions.

What The Bill Does

SB24-131 outlines "sensitive places" where firearms cannot be carried, including schools, colleges, and university grounds, polling places or dropboxes, places where local and state governments conduct their business, or courthouses. Additionally, there are reasonable exceptions to these restrictions to ensure compliance is feasible.

These essential safety measures will pass constitutional muster. The Supreme Court in *Bruen* made it clear that its holding was "neither a regulatory straightjacket nor a regulatory blank check," and that restrictions on guns in sensitive places are still permissible, so long as they are objective.

Within this legislation, each sensitive place has been evaluated in terms of their individual characteristics. The nature of the activities taking place in each of these locations as well as the presence of certain vulnerable populations warrant each location's classification as a sensitive place. These are all areas where it will only benefit the health and safety of Coloradans to restrict the concealed carry of firearms.

Conclusion

The provisions of SB24-131 are consistent with *Bruen*, pass constitutional muster, and would ensure that Colorado protects its citizens from the threat of senseless firearm violence in places of peace. This bill does just that and for these reasons, Brady urges you to support SB24-131.

Sincerely,

Liddy Ballard
State Policy Manager
The Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence

House Judiciary

04/17/2024 01:30 PM

SB24-131 Prohibiting Carrying Firearms in Sensitive Spaces

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
Adam Wiley Against himself	Have we not had enough discussion over this? You have introduced so many gun control bills over the last few months. It is obvious that you have no understanding of the constitution's protections of our freedoms. The 2nd Amendment protects the people's right to the 1st Amendment from the government. These laws don't stop crime. Criminals are intent on breaking the law in worse ways than just carrying in "sensitive spaces" so the only people you are preventing from observing their constitutional right to carry and defend themselves are LAW ABIDING CITIZENS. Find real solutions. Stop infringing on our freedoms. Continue down this road and these law abiding, good, peaceful citizens will quickly turn into whatever entity is needed to re-establish our freedoms in this state and country.
Andrew Martinez Against himself	76 terror suspects caught at the border sense October last year, threats from ISIS, China, Russia, North Korea and Iran rise each year and this year has been more serious and has only gotten gradually worse sense the pandemic. Australia doesn't have guns but they were just attacked by a knife attack and we should not become "Soft Targets" like they are. Ukraine didn't have guns either and then when they were unarmed and attacked, it was a tragedy and we sent them guns and ammo. Not to mention the people who didn't have training to do something about it. Gun free zones could be looked at like "soft targets". Maybe teaching gun safety again would bring more responsible people around firearms. So while the southern border is being invaded by multiple countries why are you trying to restrict the people who are legal with their guns but in the same vote grant rights to illegals to carry when in the background check it clearly ask if you are an illegal...? who ever wrote this bill did not have the Americans safety at heart
Robert Glenn Against Weld County GOP	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed legislation that seeks to ban concealed carry in sensitive places. As a law-abiding citizen and advocate for Second Amendment rights, this bill represents an unwarranted infringement on our constitutional

	<p>freedoms and would undermine the ability of responsible individuals to protect themselves and their loved ones.</p> <p>While I share the desire to ensure public safety in certain locations, such as schools, government buildings, and polling places, it is essential to recognize that law-abiding citizens who undergo rigorous background checks and training should not be arbitrarily prohibited from exercising their right to self-defense. Banning concealed carry in sensitive places creates so-called "gun-free zones" that, tragically, have been shown to attract criminals and leave law-abiding citizens defenseless in the face of violence.</p> <p>It is important to note that individuals who obtain concealed carry permits have demonstrated a commitment to responsible firearm ownership and have undergone extensive training to ensure safe and lawful firearm use. Punishing these individuals by denying them the right to carry for self-defense in sensitive places not only undermines their constitutional rights but also fails to address the root causes of violence in our society.</p> <p>Additionally, the practical implications of implementing such a ban are deeply concerning. Law-abiding citizens who carry firearms for self-defense should not be unduly restricted from protecting themselves and their families in places where they may face heightened risks. Prohibiting concealed carry in sensitive places effectively denies individuals the ability to defend themselves in potentially dangerous situations, leaving them vulnerable to harm.</p> <p>I will emphasize that responsible concealed carry permit holders are NOT the problem when it comes to gun violence. The focus should instead be on addressing mental health issues, improving law enforcement efforts to combat illegal firearms trafficking, and strengthening background check systems to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and those who pose a danger to society, AS WELL AS STAUNCHLY ENFORCING VIOLATIONS AGAINST EXISTING LAWS!</p> <p>I urge you to oppose this misguided bill banning concealed carry in sensitive places. Follow your oath and uphold the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens and promote policies that enhance public safety without infringing on our fundamental freedoms.</p>
<p>Cynthia Dozier Against herself</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to give written testimony regarding SB24-131. This legislation will not make anyone safer and, in fact, helps criminals to know where unarmed individuals are. This puts citizens at risk. Please vote NO on 131.</p>
<p>Robert Slay</p>	<p>Senators,</p>

<p>For themselves</p>	<p>While I personally would have liked to see this bill pass in its original form, I understand the changes made to make sure that the bill as currently written will pass muster in the court system. That said, I urge you to pass SB 24-131 today.</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Slay</p>
<p>Sidney Patin Against themselves</p>	<p>Opposition to SB24-131 "Sensitive Spaces" bill</p> <p>I oppose this bill because it prohibits the current legal carry of firearms, whether loaded or not loaded, both concealed carry and open carry, in virtually every place in the state except the home of the gun owner. Under this bill, a gun owner would not be able to drive anywhere with his legally owned gun in his car because he could not pass on the street in front of a school, or some other "sensitive space", without breaking that law. SB24-131 effectively removes a citizens right to self-defense and to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment of the Constitution. With the crime issues we have in this state right now, taking away our right to carry our guns for defense of ourselves and others is illogical and dangerous. There is no logic or reason to prohibit the existing rule that a concealed carry permit holder may keep a firearm in the permittee's vehicle on school property, as currently allowed by law. The proponents' shopping list of prohibited places in 18-12-214, including the amendment to (1)(a) and repeal of (3)(a), (3)(b) and 3.5 are so broad and unreasonable that they cannot be considered as items of public safety. This bill is just designed to impede and prohibit the exercise of the 2nd Amendment by law abiding citizens and nothing else, and that is a violation of the Constitution. If anything, passage of SB24-131 would essentially make the whole state a "Gun Free Zone" and a soft target for would-be active shooters. Criminals would love it because only the law abiding would follow it. SB24-131 is a horrible bill and should be rejected.</p>
<p>Gary Fox Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose this bill as I believe it is too far reaching and lists too many "sensitive" places as well as can be a road map for anyone with ill intent.</p> <p>It is apparent that mentally ill individuals that mean harm will seek out gun free zones as they can be relatively certain a good person with a legally secure weapon will not be there to stop their carnage.</p> <p>I want to note that I do not carry a weapon and hope that I never feel the need to do so, but everyday it seems crime gets worse and very little to nothing is done to prevent it or punish criminals, it is</p>

	<p>important to me to be able to have that option to carry as a lifelong law abiding citizen.</p> <p>No intelligent person can actually believe a bad guy is going to follow the law as to "sensitive" areas, the concept is absurd.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Doug Wheeler For themselves</p>	<p>Dear Judiciary Committee,</p> <p>We have seen too many mass shootings in our state and nationwide, including in public places that should be safe for us to go to: schools, churches, grocery stores, and movie theaters. While this bill can't stop a shooter from entering those spaces with a gun, it does give us an extra layer of security and limits the risk of an altercation getting out of hand, for example. The Bruen decision doesn't stop us from passing laws that designate sensitive spaces, so let's do it to improve safety and wellbeing. Don't listen to the nonsense that a good guy with a gun can stop a bad guy with a gun. That % is ridiculously low and allowing guns everywhere just increases gun violence overall, as well as the risk of a mass shooting. The data is clear.</p> <p>I'm the father of a 4 year old boy. His life will be filled with lockdown drills because there are too many guns in our state and country, and our laws aren't strict enough. That is deeply unfair to him and all of our children. They shouldn't have to live in fear. None of us should. Giving us this extra protection is crucial. I work for a local grocery store chain and I worry about shootings and violence and what it might do to our communities. Let's do the right thing and pass this bill with key sensitive spaces not allowing firearms. Thank you.</p>
<p>Laura Jensen Against themselves</p>	<p>OPPOSE this bill! Nearly all mass shootings occur in "gun-free" zones - this strategy does not work! All this bill will accomplish is to create more victims, as law-abiding citizens are required to leave themselves defenseless.</p>
<p>Sheila Wheeler For themselves</p>	<p>Hi - my name is Sheila. I'm asking today that the committee vote yes on this bill. I'm a Mom, a commercial banker, and a volunteer in the community.</p> <p>While driving to a recent firearm surrender event, I was overcome with grief that I cannot protect my 4 year old, particularly from gun violence. With exponentially more guns in the community than when I was a kid, my kid's world is measurably more risky.</p> <p>As a Mom, I'm practicing socializing my kid: joining the library's preschool time, participating in rec center free events, doing SCFD</p>

	<p>free days at museums. I'm acutely disappointed in the legal framework of Bruen & Heller which is anchored in reality that has not been true for hundred-plus years.</p> <p>Nonetheless, legislators today have an opportunity to make preschools, universities, these spaces, and court offices less risky by prohibiting firearms. The benefits of voting yes on this measure are significantly higher than the perception of costs.</p> <p>Please vote yes.</p>
<p>Darrell Dinges Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose further restrictions on where firearms can be carried within Colorado. As violent crime as surge within the past few years, having personal protection is more important than ever. Currently, 29 US States have Constitutional Carty of firearms with limited restriction, Colorado should pass similar laws. This bill relays on the mistaken belief that criminals will follow any rules related to gun free zones. Other states have seen crime reduce when average citizens gain more Second Amendment rights.</p>
<p>Cody Glade Against themselves</p>	<p>Hi, Thank you for the opportunity to speak on bill 131. I am against this bill for many reasons. Many young women conceal carry to protect themselves from sexual assault/ rape. 1 in 5 women will be sexually assaulted in college. And less then 20% of female victims report their assault. People conceal carry to protect them self's and others around them. The simple fact is guns save lives. I believe that those who follow the law and have a conceal carry permit are not dangerous. There are many cases were someone with a conceal carry has stopped a mass shooting. John Hurley in Arvada CO being one of them. The research Ive done shows no one in Colorado with a conceal carry permit has ever committed a mass shooting. Furthermore 19 different places is too many and to wide of an area and doesn't seem reasonable. Its my belief that Colorado would be saver for everyone with law abiding citizens having the ability to conceal and open carry in all areas. Please consider the ramifications this bill would have and the negatively effects it would have on those who wish to defend themselves. Please ask yourself if this bill passes will there be less death, violence, sexual assault or would this bill create more and prevent people from defending themselves and those around them, while enabling criminals.</p>
<p>Christopher Budden Against themselves</p>	<p>SB 24-131 CONCERNING PROHIBITING CARRYING A FIREARM IN SENSITIVE SPACES</p> <p>The premise of this Bill is increasing safety of the public by limiting firearms in "Sensitive Spaces." In our society safety is a major concern, there are fewer police and larger populations in need of police</p>

	<p>protection. In recent years this concern for safety, fear for there safety and others, has been demonstrated by a substantial increase in the purchase of firearms, in many cases, by those that have never owned or felt the need to own a firearm.</p> <p>Due to the ambiguity of the identified "Sensitive Spaces" and the areas adjacent to these spaces it is highly likely that law abiding citizens will be in violation of the law by merely traveling through the community. The explanation for the Bill indicates that it applies to 19 specific locations, in reality hundreds of locations throughout the state are included in the "Sensitive Spaces." It may apply to 19 types of locations, but the explanation is extremely misleading.</p> <p>Limiting the availability of firearms by holders of concealed carry permits makes our community more dangerous as the community will have more "soft targets." Response time for police has increased due to fewer police per capita. This slower response could enable a criminal to kill or injure any number of people before the arrival of police. This Bill also limits off-duty law enforcement from carrying a firearm in these areas. This further increases the danger to the public.</p> <p>The Fiscal Note indicates there will be minimal violations of this law due to the assumption that most people will follow the law. This indicates a law-abiding population at the mercy of those not concerned about the laws limiting the carrying of firearms.</p> <p>The Department of Natural Resources indicates a loss of \$13 million per year if there is a reduction of hunting in these areas. Without hunting, an imbalance of wildlife populations will occur.</p>
<p>Brother Grimes Against themselves</p>	<p>Greetings and Blessings to you,</p> <p>There is a huge oversight in this bill, one it is very, very unconstitutional going against our most important amendment. Our 2nd amendment. The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall NOT be infringed.</p> <p>The extreme danger in this is, one the government is now forcing law abiding citizens to be unarmed during every day life of going to college and stripping the God given right of self defense. The idea that making it illegal for law abiding citizens to bring guns to campus to protect each other will make schools more safe is completely un logical. There is a reason why 94% of all mass shootings happen in "gun free zones" because a evil person knows he can kill many before being taken out. Why would we want to take guns out of the hands of good people to make our schools less safe. How does making it illegal for our law abiding college students to protect each</p>

	<p>other from a mass shooter make it more safe. Evil people will always find a way to bring guns into a "gun free zone". When good people have guns evil is defeated. When evil people have guns and good people are defenseless we have mass shootings. We have seen this time and time again. When we do not pay attention to history it will repeat itself. It is time to wake up and allow our good citizens have the right to carry guns as our constitution and law have given this right that shall not be infringed upon. Our 2nd amendment right is so important that our forefathers stated this shall not be infringed, basically a quadruple exclamation point. I do not believe there are any other rights that our fore fathers wrote with the importance of stating in addition to the right that this shall not be infringed upon. I pray you will make the right decision and to uphold our rights and to prevent mass shootings by keeping the good law abiding citizens with the ability to protect each other and our community. God Bless You</p>
<p>Reedy LASH Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose SB24-131, and strongly urge you to stop the further advancement of this bill. The lack of respect for the citizens of this state to defend themselves is appalling and seems to get worse every legislative session. A CCW holder should be able to carry in most places with few exceptions, ie. government buildings. GUN FREE ZONES only stop law abiding citizens, criminals don't care about the law or gun free zones, obviously. It seem that right now the CO Democrats are more concerned with infringing on the 2A Rights of the citizens and protecting wolves. Do something positive for CO, like getting the funeral industry under control, pass laws protecting homeowners from squatters like happened in FL, where that state looks after their citizens, give the police back some qualified immunity. Deal with problems don't make new ones, and will passage of any of these gun control laws deter or slow down crime, the answer is NO, but you all will gloat about how you took steps to protect us.</p>
<p>Katherine Czukas For themselves</p>	<p>Please pass this bill. VSPCs in large population counties exist in many county buildings like county fair, rodeo barns, and water utility buildings. We need election judges protected by having posting no conceal carry in the VSPCs.</p>
<p>Evie Hudak For Colorado PTA</p>	<p>Colorado PTA supports SB 131. We have testified several times this year and in past years about our history of advocacy for the safety of children and youth and our highest priority to protect them from gun violence. At PTA, we believe that no parent should fear for the safety of their child every time they leave home, but the reality is that over 6 in 10 parents today report worrying about school violence. Every</p>

	<p>year, an estimated 3 million American children witness gun violence, impacting their ability to learn and thrive. Beyond the deadly effects of gun violence, this exposure impacts our children’s mental and physical health throughout adulthood.</p> <p>We want our government leaders to acknowledge and address the ease of access to firearms. PTA supports regulations on the sale, purchase, and possession of firearms. We would like to see laws that restrict access to guns from persons who may endanger public safety.</p> <p>PTA believes that SB 131 will contribute to the reduction of gun violence and provide greater safety for all children and youth and their families.</p>
<p>Huey Laugesen Against Colorado State Shooting Association</p>	<p>My name is Huey Laugesen and I am the executive director of the Colorado State Shooting Association. I submit this testimony on behalf of our members across all 64 of Colorado’s counties in strong opposition to this bill. I will start by sharing an excerpt from an op-ed written by one of my colleagues.</p> <p>“On December 29th, 2019, 71-year-old Jack Wilson had a bad feeling about a conspicuous-looking man in a long coat who entered his church in Texas. As that man approached a communion server, pulled a shotgun out of his coat and began firing, Wilson was already reaching for his own firearm.</p> <p>Aiming at the attacker, Wilson waited for the moment that he had a clear line of fire absent of bystanders. When that moment came, Wilson fired one round and eliminated the threat.</p> <p>Two congregants were tragically killed in this senseless act of violence committed by the man in the coat. But thanks to Wilson’s heroism, it all ended before the culprit could claim more lives. How many more innocent people would have perished if Wilson wasn’t armed and ready to respond?</p> <p>A previous event similar to this one suggests that the death toll could’ve been far greater. In fact, Wilson was only permitted to carry the firearm that he used to take down the shooter because the State of Texas, in response to a 2017 Sutherland Springs church shooting</p>

	<p>which left 26 dead, had recently changed its laws to allow gun owners to carry handguns inside houses of worship.</p> <p>Texas did this to enable good people to defend innocent lives. Jack Wilson showed us that it was the right decision.”</p> <p>Gun-free zones are dangerous. A study by the Crime Prevention Research Center found that 96.2% of mass public shootings over a 17-year period occurred in gun-free zones.</p> <p>By revoking the right of college students to defend themselves on campus, you are putting their lives at risk.</p> <p>Vote NO on this bill.</p>
<p>Derek Adelman Against themselves</p>	<p>Please vote no on this bill! Our 2A rights are constricted enough as it is and this bill will only further that without making anyone safer. Increasing the number of gun free zones only increases the number of places that criminals and the deranged know that can assault law abiding citizens without resistance. Why is it that nearly all violent gun crime occurs in gun free zones? Because criminals know people are defenseless in these areas. Do not take away the people's right to defend themselves, vote no on this bill! Thank you.</p>
<p>Carol Callicotte For themselves</p>	<p>I don't sit with my back to the door in any restaurant or public place. I wear tennis shoes to the grocery store so I can run. I once left a movie theater because a young man came in alone with a large, bulky backpack.</p> <p>This is what it's like to live in this country, because we have so many guns and have allowed the gun industry to normalize the idea that guns belong everywhere. Guns in public places is not a civilized way to exist, and there is plenty of historical precedent for restricting guns in our shared spaces. I'm disappointed with what has been removed from this bill, but I continue to strongly support what remains. Approximately 84% of the top 500 university campuses restrict guns on campus, making Colorado universities a dangerous outlier. We will encourage our kids to leave the state for their university education unless this changes. We should be free to exercise our right to vote, and to enter government buildings, especially where discussions may run hot, without fear that guns are present. Without fear that someone will find a gun in the bathroom, or in a committee room, or</p>

	<p>anywhere, and decide to use it. There's a lot of criticism of those of us who exist with the very legitimate fear of someone we love dying by gun in a country where the leading cause of death for children is guns. This often comes from those who fear going anywhere without arming themselves, thus putting us all in danger. We've seen what happens with this guns everywhere culture. It's not serving us well. I</p> <p>The other side claims that all gun laws are unconstitutional. That mass shooters target gun-free zones. None of this is true. Mass shooters target places and people they know, and the large majority of mass shootings have taken place where guns are permitted. We have 25X the guns and 26X the gun homicides compared to our peer countries. Guns are not making us safer.</p> <p>Thank you for this bill. I urge a yes vote.</p>
<p>Missy Espinoza Against themselves</p>	<p>As a governing body in the USA, you are not allowed to infringe on Americans right KEEP AND BEAR ARMS. Violent threats can exist anywhere. It's immoral to tell American citizens their civil rights can't be exercised in these "sensitive spaces" (a made up term used to manipulate people.)</p> <p>VOTE NO. We, the citizens, are watching.</p>

Testimony in opposition to: SB24-131- Prohibiting Carrying a Firearm in Sensitive Places. House Judiciary Committee

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.

While we appreciate the efforts of the sponsors, I am writing in opposition to the measure under consideration. We believe the bill is unnecessary, unconstitutional, and dangerous to the people of Colorado.

We are not aware of any problems with the current concealed carry system. It does not seem prudent to add unnecessary complications to a policy that that is not broken.

Twenty-nine states have eliminated, or are eliminating, mandatory concealed carry permits entirely and are allowing their citizens to freely exercise their constitutionally-recognized right to armed self-defense. The *Bruen* Decision, itself cautions against the over-expansion of the sensitive places exception to the right to bear arms. From the decision:

“II. THE FOUNDING ERA IS THE RELEVANT TIME PERIOD FOR DETERMINING THE ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT. This Court need not wrestle with questions about “sensitive places”—which are nothing other than “gun-free zones,” where people are disarmed and prevented from exercising their fundamental right to self-defense—as they are beyond the scope of the matter before it. However, should this Court’s decision in the instant matter touch upon the times, places, and manners in which the right to bear arms may be restricted, such discussion must retain fidelity to the original public understanding of the scope of the right...”

IV. BECAUSE INDIVIDUALS HAVE A RIGHT TO CARRY ARMS IN PUBLIC, THE “SENSITIVE PLACES” DOCTRINE CANNOT SWALLOW THE RULE. History informs the understanding that the right and practice of bearing arms in public was the rule—not the exception. Moreover, this Court has repeatedly held that there is nothing that requires the “State to protect the life . . . of its citizens against invasion by private actors.” *Deshaney v. Winnebago Cty. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 489 U.S. 189, 195, (1989); see also *Town of Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, 545 U.S. 748 (2005)...

[Microsoft Word - 2021-07-20 Sensitive Places Brief final.docx \(supremecourt.gov\)](#)

The bill is dangerous, because limiting concealed carry reduces the deterrent effect of potentially armed citizens in areas that become “criminal safe free-fire zones,” where bad actors are assured that there will be no armed resistance from their potential victims. The most definitive research on the subject indicates that honest citizens use

firearms many thousands of times more in self-defense than perpetrators use guns to commit crimes.

(Please see the attachment on the research done by Wright and Rossi).

(Please see the attachment on the research done by Gary Kleck.)

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

I fully appreciate that SB24-131 sets out to respond to ongoing public outcry regarding numerous tragedies perpetrated by armed criminals in unforgettably horrific events that ought not be taken lightly. Being that I do not take these threats to innocent life and to our peaceful society lightly, I must strongly assert that though this bill is purported to be in the interest of public safety with the hopeful intent of A. reducing gun crime in sensitive areas and B. preventing further senseless killing, it is a misguided gesture that not only completely and utterly fails to address very real and increasingly prevalent mass-shooting incidence, but in practice it would in-fact betray each of these noble causes by attempting to make an exponentially greater number of criminals out of well-intentioned and upstanding private citizens carrying out absolutely benign and ordinary everyday tasks, while at the same time emboldening the type of malicious criminal that would actually seek to capitalize on an opportunity to commit such a horrific atrocity.

The uniquely troubled individual capable and willing to carry out such an act of barbarity upon unsuspecting total strangers is evidently undeterred by the nontrivial legal ramifications associated with committing mass murder. It stands to reason that they be equally undeterred by the presence of stickers near the entrances of locations deemed "sensitive", indicating the designation of "gun-free zone". Thus, unless there's a strong evidentiary basis indicating that a significant threat of gun-violence in these sensitive locations is reasonably attributed to otherwise law-abiding gun owners who have taken the training necessary to apply for and have met the legal criteria to be issued a concealed handgun permit from their local sheriffs office, SB24-131 will not make these areas safer.

Conversely, in many notable mass shootings in recent history that may or may not have ended in gunfights, it seems clear that the primary intention of the shooters was not to initiate a fight. The locations they tend to select seem to be consistent with a preference of simply incurring the greatest number of casualties possible, which sadly has been most effectively facilitated in scenarios where there were large groups of people who were unarmed that merely attempted to evade or hide and did not fight back. A prevailing characteristic of these types of mass attacks is that there is typically little to no evidence of a coherent escape plan. Which generally means the killing will continue until the attacker is confronted by force sufficient to stop them. This force most often necessitates the courage of other armed individuals.

These courageous individuals may be on-duty members of law-enforcement, or they may be one of well over a half-million Coloradans who are anonymously utilizing a concealed handgun permit at the present moment. The distinction between the two is far less important than the preservation of innocent life. This is not a fanciful theory. If you are unfamiliar with cases of private civilians using concealed handguns and no formal training to stop active shooters and save countless lives, it's because these cases rarely make national news. Regardless of whether or not such a scenario ever takes place again, the mere fact that private individuals of all demographics may be secretly concealing a firearm in a given public place is a deterrent to violent crime in that place. This deterrent is a resource that benefits all of us regardless of our feelings about guns. And the individuals that voluntarily assume the responsibility and personal liability accrued in facilitating that resource are not second class citizens.

It's also worth considering the logistics and implications of some-650,000 Coloradans who carry concealed handguns daily, being prohibited to do so in places which they cannot reasonably boycott. Some of them may choose to leave their gun at

home some days. Some of them may refer to the foundational documents of their country and those of their state, which have insured them as free citizens very clear and certain inalienable rights to which they grant zero concessions to what they deem as illegal legislation by those whom they deem as treasonous perjurers of the oath that they swore to uphold those very same documents in order to be granted the power that they now wield against their own countrymen in the self-interested pursuit of their political careers, as they consider themselves justified if not obligated as Americans to modify precisely none of their habits and continue to carry their weapon wherever they see fit. But the vast majority of this tremendous cohort of Coloradans will likely just park on nearby streets or wherever possible, whatever distance away from their errand that they're required to maintain, and leave their guns in their car. Which happens to be the number one place from which guns are stolen by criminals. Which happens to be the number one method in which criminals who are not allowed to own firearms, obtain firearms.

These issues seem to carry with them more weight and reach than even the political aspirations of individuals and their success in appeasing an ignorant polity which to some yet undiscovered extent has the capacity to be educated on objective cost versus benefit analyses of the most granular compromises , but to an even greater extent will continue to support or not support set individual based on the letter next to their name.

Thank you for your consideration,
Best regards