

John Wortman  
Public Written Testimony for HB24-1054

Mr. Chair Snyder, and members of the committee my name is John Wortman, I am in my final semester of a master's degree in public health and Total Worker Health graduate certificate programs at University of Colorado, Anschutz. Thank you for taking the time to read my statement in support for HB24-1045 regarding treatment for substance use disorders. I believe that the implementation of the measures put forth in this bill can be of extraordinary benefit to those suffering with substance use disorders, to society at large and will ultimately be a net financial benefit for the state. Colorado is experiencing over 900 fatal drug overdoses per year.<sup>1</sup> That is roughly the equivalent of the capacity of the Boulder, Summit, or Cervantes theaters.<sup>2</sup> On a personal note, in the last year alone, two acquaintances of mine have died from health complications due to substance use disorders. Exacerbating the impact of these tragedies is that there are tools that can help these victims. Research from the Colorado Department of Human Services shows that medically assisted treatment programs are 4 to 12 times as effective at treating substance misuse disorders compared to medical free treatments.<sup>3</sup>

Focusing on the rehabilitation of nonviolent substance misusers rather than their costly, ineffective and undeserved incarceration may lead to their increased success in the job force. Which can offer them brighter futures, and in turn increase their tax contributions, thus offsetting some of the cost of their treatment. Further offsetting the cost of the treatment may be reductions in the spread of infectious diseases and avoidance of costly accidents. As the population of Colorado has increased and will likely continue to do so, correctional facility populations will almost certainly grow. Each person we can save from incarceration saves the state between \$53 and \$224 per day.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, keeping those who do not deserve to be incarcerated out of correctional facilities inherently reduces the burden of those working in correctional facilities. Emergency medical workers are also affected. Rehabilitation can decrease the burden to them by reducing overdoses that they are obligated to respond to. The burden to society can also be seen in public areas where the open use of drugs is not only unsightly but can cause mental distress to those who have to witness it. Additionally, they may be the victims of secondhand drug inhalation or needle sticks, which can raise the financial burden on the state through medical expenses. Reducing the number of misusers inherently reduces these risks.

Those suffering from substance use disorders deserve help, Coloradans deserve the opportunity to help them. This bill is an excellent step in the right direction, I urge you all to support it. Again I would like to sincerely thank you for your time.

References:

1. Casey, C. & Wuller, R. (2023 August 30) *'It Will Save Lives': Students 'Keep the Party Safe' With Fentanyl Overdose Awareness Effort*. <https://news.cuanschutz.edu/news-stories/it-will-save-lives-students-keep-the-party-safe-with-fentanyl-overdose-awareness-effort> University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

2. Westword Staff. (2018 April 19) *Sixteen of Denver's Biggest Venues Ranked by Size*  
<https://www.westword.com/music/denvers-biggest-venues-red-rocks-fiddlers-green-and-more-10218122> Westword
3. Bates, C. (2018 July 20). *Medication-Assisted Treatment Expansion in Colorado*.  
Chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://leg.colorado.gov/sites/default/files/images/mat\_slide\_deck\_for\_interim\_study\_comiittee\_july\_20\_2018\_final\_.pdf  
Colorado Department of Human Services.
4. Zimmer, A. (2016 March 17). *The Cost of Corrections in Colorado*.  
<https://www.coloradovirtuallibrary.org/resource-sharing/state-pubs-blog/the-cost-of-corrections-in-colorado/#:~:text=Currently%2C%20the%20cost%20of%20housing,%2481%2C000%20per%20inmate%20per%20year>. Colorado Virtual Library

Testimony in opposition to: HB24-1174- House Finance 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. Any expenditure for the purpose of expanding the requirements to obtain a concealed carry permit in Colorado is beyond adequate.

We are not aware of any problems with the current system. It does not seem prudent to add unnecessary complexity to a program that that is not broken.

Twenty-seven, soon to be twenty-eight, states have eliminated mandatory concealed carry permits entirely and allowed their citizens to freely exercise their Constitutionally-recognized right to armed self-defense. Even considering the original committee amendment that eliminates the provision for the development of a state-wide test by contractors, this measure still costs the State of Colorado too much money. These funds would be better spent on midnight basketball programs.

In addition, the 50-round range requirement adds to an already burdensome system that creates barriers to legal concealed carry by the most economically-disadvantaged of our citizens. This bill will have a disparate impact on the ability of traditionally underserved populations to engage in the exercise of a natural right guaranteed by the US Constitution.

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

Members of the House Finance Committee,

As a certified firearms instructor and a citizen that responsibly carries a concealed handgun daily, I oppose HB24-1174.

Nothing in the summary or the text of the bill indicates any shortcomings with the current concealed handgun permit process; nor does the bill specify any desired outcomes or changes beyond the unjustified imposition of additional training requirements.

HB24-117 burdens CBI with the verification of instructors, a function it has not previously filled, but provides no statutory guidance, no additional funding, and no additional staffing to achieve instructor verification. CBI is allowed to charge instructors for the imposed mandatory verification, which will result in higher class prices. Curiously, HB24-1174 omits POST and military agencies from the instructor certification list but retains the training exemption for current and recently discharged military and law enforcement personnel.

HB24-1174 requires training in the federal and state laws pertaining to the safe storage of firearms, child safety around firearms, the laws regarding purchase, ownership, transportation, use, and ERPOs. All gun owners should know the laws that affect them, the requirements imposed are not germane to the specific act of carrying a concealed handgun and therefore not germane to concealed handgun specific training. A list of the various firearms laws in Colorado is already provided by CBI, so it would be far more effective to direct CBI to provide a summary on the same web page listing the laws.

There is no basis given for the 8 hours in-person training requirement for new permit seekers. When examination requirements are given at all, CBI is given broad authority to determine exam contents with no statutory guidance. Requiring in-person training but evaluating knowledge using an open-book exam indicates that the goal is to inconvenience rather than educate the permit seeker.

CBI is given broad authority via the rulemaking to determine the details and mechanics of implementation, meaning that the salient details affecting instructors and permit seekers will happen in a process devoid of any meaningful input from the public and controlled by a body that has no accountability to the people directly affected or voters in general.

HB24-1174 creates two training paths – new and refresher – that necessitate additional administrative burdens for everyone involved to ensure that the permit seeker has attended the correct training, without addressing how the various parties involved are to ensure the correct training is completed prior to permit issuance.

HB24-1174 adds misdemeanors from C.R.S. 24-33.5-424 (3)(b.3) (National Instant Criminal Background Check System) to the list of prohibited offenses in C.R.S. 18-12-203 (Criteria for Obtaining a Permit). Particularly concerning is the inclusion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Degree Assault (C.R.S. 18-3-204), Harassment (C.R.S. 18-9-111), and Bias-Motivated Crimes (C.R.S. 18-9-121). The Harassment and Bias-Motivated Crime statutes are exceedingly broad, to the point that they encompass behavior that would otherwise be considered protected speech or an ordinary disagreement. The inclusion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Degree Assault is particularly chilling C.R.S. 18-3.204 (1) “A person commits the crime of assault in the third degree if: (a) The person knowingly...causes bodily injury to another person...by means of

a deadly weapon.” HB24-1174 does not place a time limit on when these offenses would be prohibitive for a permit applicant. A person lawfully carrying a concealed handgun could justifiably use their firearm for lethal force, be convicted of 3<sup>rd</sup> Degree Assault anyway, have their concealed handgun permit revoked, and be prohibited from obtaining a new permit for the rest of their life.

In summary, HB24-1174 does nothing to provide additional capability to permit seekers; instead, it makes the process more onerous and restrictive. The requirements imposed on instructors will result in higher costs, which will result in higher training prices for permit seekers. The inescapable conclusion is that the goal of this bill is not to improve the permit process or better prepare citizens for concealed carry – the real goal of the bill is to discourage instructors from providing classes and citizens from seeking permits.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Kahn





March 2024

**TO:** House Finance Committee

**RE:** HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits & Training

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 being especially vulnerable to domestic violence involving firearms. Gun safety is a complex issue, one which we need to deal with on many different fronts. Strengthening the requirements for obtaining a concealed carry permit is an important step forward, and we believe HB 1174 will enhance the safety of both those who receive training before receiving their concealed carry permits and the community at large.

AAUW of Colorado strongly supports HB 1174 and requests your YES 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](mailto: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.*

**House Finance**

**03/04/2024 01:30 PM**

**HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits & Training**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
Wesley Scott Against themselves	To the Colorado General Assembly,  I testify against this bill for the following reasons:  1) Pursuant to Article VI, Section II of the United States Constitution, all states are bound to honor the Supreme Law of the Land. Current conceal carry "laws" do just the opposite. Please reference Marbury vs Madison (1803) for a detailed Supreme Court ruling on the "Supremacy Clause".  2) The Second Amendment of the United States Constitution forbids any infringement on the right (not privilege) to keep and bear arms. The State of Colorado has no authority to override the Constitution in the first place.  3) Further infringement of these RIGHTS do NOTHING to save lives among citizens who already obey the law. Nor will criminals obey these "laws" any more than the ones in place. Restricting someone's rights to self-defence will only raise death tolls.  4) Greater benefit would be derived by revisiting previously dismissed constitutional carry bills (I.e, HB 22-1033)
Aaron Graubert None themselves	I fully support this bill. As a registered gun owner with a valid concealed carry permit, I have to say it was TOO EASY to get. My class was full of a bunch of nuts interested in the conditions under which they could legally kill a person. There was no discussion of the safe handling, storage, or ownership of firearms which was utterly shocking. I really appreciate this bill as it feels like it implements all of the most important parts of the permitting process in Massachusetts (where I used to also hold a valid permit). Don't let the gun nuts intimidate you into believing that this "violates their rights", they always seem to forget that the 2nd amendment starts with "well regulated". This is a good bill which adds important restrictions to the permitting process which any responsible gun owner should be in favor of.

<p>Sara McCurley</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>To the members of the House Finance Committee:</p> <p>The NRA training, and other nationally training organizations that have training instruction-specifically on Concealed Carry is enough. I feel like we don't need to burden our state and local government with additional oversight. I also feel that without a clear detailed and defined requirements on what CBI would require, this Bill does not provide enough information to make a sound decision on. Lastly it is our right as Coloradoans and Americans to be able to choose who we receive our training from, and it's our job to make sure our instructors are adequate. Thank you for your time today, and the time and effort you put into making our state great for legal Coloradoans.</p>
<p>Tony Morris</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>This bill provides the state government with the authority to take away the constitutional rights of citizens to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the 2nd amendment.</p> <p>Additionally, there is no basis or evidence which supports that this bill would have a positive outcome. In 2022 the fatality rate caused by accidents involving firearms was .16/100,000 nationally, compared to auto accidents at 12.6/100,000. One is 173 times more likely to die from poisonings and 76 times more likely to die in a car accident than die due to an accidental firearm accident. This bill makes it more rigorous to obtain and keep a concealed carry permit than it does to obtain a drivers license, even though poisonings, car accidents and seven other accidental types of fatalities are 2 to 163 more times likely to occur. The fatal firearm accidental rate has decreased 94% since its all time high in 1904. This bill has apparently risen out of political motivation rather than a societal need.</p> <p>Colorado government has long been showing signs of tyrannical rule, and this bill is another step in that direction. The second amendment was put in place to help prevent the government from abusing its power and taking away the freedom of its citizens. The State of Colorado, along with many other states, have been abusing their authority under false pretenses as evidenced by the lockdowns and other restraints of freedoms mandated following the release of the COVID virus in 2020. This bill is another example of government overreach and should not be signed into law.</p>
<p>Mark Rinker</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I am opposed to this bill. It is unnecessary to implement these laws against citizens who are not the problem. Criminals will carry a gun no matter what law you pass. Maybe we should be focused on punishment for criminal actions instead of attacking the law abiding</p>

	<p>citizens with rules what criminals will not even be following. That alone shows how this bill will resolve nothing.</p>
<p>Laura Jensen Against themselves</p>	<p>This is another move by Democrats to make the right to carry nothing more than an earned privilege to be given and taken at the whims of Jared Polis and his CBI. Constitutional rights supersede any government special interest groups, and this bill MUST NOT PASS</p>
<p>Russell Dare Against themselves</p>	<p>Imposing stricter training requirements would unduly burden law-abiding citizens who wish to exercise their right to carry concealed firearms for self-defense purposes.</p> <p>Furthermore, increasing training requirements may disproportionately impact low-income individuals who may not have the financial means to afford expensive training courses. This could effectively infringe upon their right to bear arms, as it would create a barrier to accessing their constitutional rights.</p> <p>Concealed carry permit holders continue to be some of the most responsible people. This law is targeting innocent people who are not part of any problem whatsoever. More than half of states (27) are constitutional carry states. In those states you don't need a permit at all to carry a concealed firearm. There has been no increase in accidents or negligence in those states. We should be following the science and data and do the same, not double down on what does nothing.</p>
<p>Mark Kaiser Against themselves</p>	<p>A compelling state interest refers to a significant goal that a government aims to achieve, and its importance is so great that it justifies overriding certain individual rights. As attributed to attorney Kostax Moros, "a civil society needs "weapons of war" because tyrants (Hitler, Castro, Putin, Xi Chang,) have made societies quite uncivil. Additionally the state does not have the authority to overrule the 2nd amendment of the Constitution.</p> <p>"As long as politicians, such as yourself, (meaning in Colorado, Polis with his leftist legislature) and who are totally out of touch with crime statistics of this state, who are adamant on leveraging state violence against the peaceable exist, law abiding citizens should be armed accordingly"</p> <p>U.S. Rep Thomas Massie tweeted, " The reality is that you want every citizen disarmed." "Imagine a single mom from Aurora, in fear for her life because of a degenerate hoodlum who has threatened and stalked her for months. She owns a gun but doesn't carry it because</p>

	<p>she has no permit and is afraid of getting arrested, leaving her young child abandoned. Increased fees, a mandatory 8-hour class, and drastically less access to instructors would make obtaining a permit that could save her life nearly impossible.”</p> <p>Other commentators, (including me), are of the opinion that Harris, Polis, the Colorado leftist legislature are being true hypocrites while they enjoy the benefits of armed security with weapons that they want to take away from law abiding citizens while leaving criminals free to acquire (and keep) any weapons they desire.</p>
<p>Greg Trough Against themselves</p>	<p>This bill is only designed to restrict access to a conceal carry permit. Current law allows for full control of who might qualify. Law enforcement should be allowed to enforce current law. Restricting access will be challenged and this law will likely be found unconstitutional and reflect poorly on those voting for it.</p>
<p>Shanteal Bucholz Against themselves</p>	<p>I am against this absurdly heinous bill against our second amendment right! We are the United States of America and should always have the right to defend ourselves and this country. Open your eyes and look around. Today more than ever we should have the right to bear arms! I do NOT agree with this bill.</p>
<p>David Weaver Against themselves</p>	<p>I am very concerned about this bill for many reasons.</p> <p>First, adding these unnecessary and expensive steps to the process of obtaining a Conceal Carry Permit, is absolutely unconstitutional. It will limit the ability of law-abiding citizens to protect themselves, a basic right that our United States Constitution clearly demands. How can you allow these requirements and costs to be imposed onto the citizens of Colorado?</p> <p>Secondly, these restrictions will only be placed on law-abiding citizens, not those who use guns illegally. This bill will have zero impact on gun crimes. Criminals, who have obtained guns illegally, will not be impacted by these rules. Therefore, why impact the wrong people by these actions.</p> <p>Thirdly, this is simply another step being taken by those opposed to gun ownership against those citizens who live by our constitution. More restrictions, more illegal governmental actions, more oppressive control over citizens.</p>

	<p>I hope that my comments reach the consciences of our law makers, making them recognize how bad this bill is.</p> <p>Dave Weaver</p>
<p>Patrick Kelley Against themselves</p>	<p>I'M OPPOSED TO HOUSE FINANCE HB24-1174 (CONCEALED CARRY PERMITS &amp; TRAINING)</p> <p>THE COUNTY SHERIFF IS MORE THAN CAPABLE OF GRANTING CONCEALED CARRY PERMITS, THEY'RE THE CORRECT LAW ENFORCEMENT ENTITY TO ACCOMPLISH THIS TASK.</p> <p>MOVING THE "GRANT" RESPONSIBILITY TO A DIFFERENT AGENCY IS POLITICAL THEATER, IT DEVIATES FROM HISTORICAL PRECEDENCE.</p> <p>THE COUNTY SHERIFF IS HISTORICALLY A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THEY HAVE DEMONSTRATED A FINE RECORD.</p>
<p>Rebecca Gray Against themselves</p>	<p>The Concealed Carry Permit process and oversight should remain as is with the local Sheriff's departments. Please stop trying to micromanage existing programs that are already working well. I'm sure you are trying to improve some perceived problem, but this is an area in which most lawmakers have absolutely no expertise and it is potentially unconstitutional.</p> <p>I am a 74 year old grandmother living in Park County. I live alone, I travel cross country alone and I couldn't do either safely without a firearm. I currently have a cougar which circles my cabin two or three times a week after dark. Three years ago a bear pushed it's way into my house and stood within 3 ft of me. It was as tall as I was and was snarling and growling. Fortunately my dogs chased it out again, but those of us who live in Colorado are aware of the dangers. Sadly, those dangers don't exist only in the mountains. The cities are even more dangerous with gangs and thieves and drug addled vagrants.</p> <p>Your proposed changes to the existing concealed carry laws might not hurt the wealthy, but would be a genuine burden on those of us who have to live on less than a thousand dollars per month. Single mothers, the elderly, and sadly almost everyone is increasingly in danger in today's world. Your changes would place the most vulnerable at vastly increased risk because they couldn't afford to</p>

	<p>follow your complicated and pointless additional regulations and included fees..</p> <p>To quote my 80 year old neighbor "Why can't they just leave us alone".</p>
<p>Adrian Ramirez Against themselves</p>	<p>Please vote no on HB24-1174. Colorado already has proper firearms training for concealed carry permits, and sheriffs should be making the decision about who is approved for a permit, based on their background checks, not some distant bureaucrat. Attaching recurring insurance fees to conceal carriers puts financial barriers in the way of our 2nd amendment rights. There are already sufficient and severe consequences for misusing firearms, we don't need additional fees imposed on those who properly use firearms. Please vote no on HB24-1174.</p>
<p>Kory Bublitz Against themselves</p>	<p>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. Above is an excerpt out of the United States Constitution.</p> <p>Let's cue in on "Free State." If this bill were to be implemented then the constitution itself directly states we are no longer apart of a Free State. This does not mean the State has the choice, such as the example of Abortion, where the Supreme Court ruled to give the power to the individual States as no mention of abortion was in the Constitution.</p> <p>The act of requiring individuals to pass a written test and a live fire demonstration with a 70% shot accuracy of 50 rounds is an absurd over reach of the United States of America's Constitution blatant disregard of the precise wording of the 2nd Amendment; "Shall not be infringed." I'd like to start by stating the bill doesn't even outline what distance the shots need be take from. 10 yards? 100 yards? This bill just states a percentage to pass and makes no mention of a standardized distance.</p> <p>By passing this bill- those whom comprise for the necessary votes are violating each and every person's Constitutional rights. CO's current CC version is observed by thirty-four states within the domestic US. That means thirty-four other states you can legally CC.</p> <p>This bill also revokes the revenue away from local jurisdiction and places the authority in the hands of the CBI. Fortuitously, one of the</p>

	<p>CBI's Core Value's is "Integrity" stating, "We do the right thing. Acting with honesty, honor, and transparency; never compromising truth." The truth is this bill is another infringement upon the 2nd Amendment. We're here today in numbers showing our transparency, shining a light on the truth.</p> <p>What we don't need is stricter gun control laws. What we need is the Enforcement of current law. What this bill does beyond violating and infringing upon human constitutional rights, is punish and burden the already lawful citizens.</p> <p>What I, and all the other testimonies today ask is that you show your Integrity and act without transparency and Deny this bill on its infringement of basic human rights provided in the Constitution.</p> <p>I'll leave you with this question and thought; If you're willing to subdue human rights in this manner for our right to self-protection, and protecting someone who cannot defend themselves, then what other less transparent lines are you willing to cross regarding our other constitutional rights?</p>
<p>Steve Caldara Against themselves</p>	<p>No one is better able to issue Concealed Carry permits than the county sheriffs. They understand the needs of their residents. Having the CBI in charge is a move towards making it more difficult to obtain a concealed carry permit. As the state continues to experience soaring crime and illegal immigration, the citizens continue to struggle protecting themselves. This bill is exactly the wrong direction to take. This is particularly wrong for the women of Colorado - who are the most vulnerable.</p>
<p>Richard Mack Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Richard Mack, I live in Centennial, CO. Thank you for reading/hearing my testimony today. I ask that you withdraw your support for SB24-1174 and vote to no.</p> <p>This bill ultimately punishes the larger majority of lawful concealed handgun permit holders and future gun owners. This bill does not address the true issue which stems from the spiritual and mental health of the perpetrators.</p> <p>Those with ill intent will still find ways to obtain weapons through illegal means. Law-abiding citizens, however, will be left defenseless against potential threats to their safety and their families.</p>

	<p>Instead of infringing on constitutional rights, we should focus on enforcing existing gun laws. Swift and speedy trials with harsh punishments are true deterrents. Instead cases are drawn out and the general public often forgets what crime had been committed. Probably in some cases, the defendant probably has too. You should not punish responsible gun owners for the actions of a few bad actors.</p> <p>It is not the guns, it is the people behind them. Work on solutions that address the mental health of the criminals that are committing these crimes, not the law abiding citizens.</p> <p>Thank you, Richard Mack 153 E Panama Dr Centennial, CO 80121</p>
<p>Steven Lahvic Against themselves</p>	<p>Members,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose HB 24-1174. This misguided legislation is ineffective at preventing gun violence because of the very reason that concealed carry permit holders are not the cause of gun violence. Instead, legislation needs to be crafted to address the mental health crisis in this state. I am a licensed nurse in Colorado since 1985 and have seen clearly this problem. In the vast majority of school, supermarket, festival and theater shootings the perpetrator had been afflicted with major mental health issues. That is the problem. Mental health. Here in this state it can take up to two months to access mental health services. HB 24-1174 does nothing to enhance public safety. I ask that legislators go after the real culprit that is mental health and address the serious shortfalls that this state has in treating the problem. Legislating into extinction lawful firearm owners is not the solution, addressing mental health is.</p> <p>Regards, Steven Lahvic</p>

<p>Brent Hickmon Against themselves</p>	<p>I am against adding requirements for obtaining a concealed carry permit. I am a firearms instructor that has undergone numerous instructor certifications in the past 2 years. Including one that is a six month long program heavily involving adult learning theory. Not only are these requirements an infringement of self protection rights due to the heavy burden of the cost of the extra class time requirements as some folks may barely be able to afford the permit fees alone, adding fees, cost and taxes to anything related to self protection is an outright war on poor and impoverished individuals and families. Lastly, dumping this much required information into one class setting is a detriment to knowledge retention. This bill will lead to certification mills that do not further the individuals knowledge of firearms laws or their good, sane, moral and prudent use. It is my expert opinion that this bill this does not move forward.</p>
<p>Thad Smith Against themselves</p>	<p>Well, here we are again. The legislature of Colorado is chipping away at our rights. Only this is not chipping. What you are trying to pass is a HUGE violation of our rights. Although, not if you ask Jen Bacon who thinks that our rights end where the interests of the states begin. That's not the way it works Ms. Bacon.</p> <p>So, let's talk about the concealed carry bill. This is something that has been tried before. And failed. The Supreme Court has also ruled on this. Why do you insist on infringing on our rights? Currently, any person who wants to get a concealed carry permit has to be fingerprinted, photographed, pass a firearms course, and a background check. In the last several years, NO violent crimes have been perpetrated by a CCP holder with a concealed carry firearm. All this bill will do, is hinder more law abiding citizens from exercising their rights of owning a firearm. This will inhibit a single mother from owning a firearm to protect herself and her family. This will hinder your average citizen from being able to carry guns concealed while in public. Are you aware that Colorado has the highest car-jacking numbers in the US? All thanks to liberal policies. My ability to defend myself is infringed because of even more liberal policies.</p> <p>I hear liberal law makers saying they have to have courage and fight against what the people want, even if the rights of the people are infringed. How about you have courage to actually honor the oath you swore? You know that pesky one about honoring and protecting the Constitution? Please have the courage to stand up and do what's right by voting down this terrible bill.</p>
<p>Richard Wallin Against themselves</p>	<p>Given the current environment of precarious public safety, why is this one law-abiding sector of society (who is trying to protect itself)</p>

	<p>being singled out to fix a problem they did not cause or perpetuate? The likely result of this Bill is more, not less victims, of criminality.</p> <p>Colorado and specifically "Sanctuary City" Denver are rapidly losing quality of life because of legislative &amp; management decisions which have produced a large homeless population, rampant criminality, coddled felons, a demoralized, understaffed police force unable to recruit, 40,000 undocumented, unvetted illegal immigrants, panhandlers / car window washers everywhere (reminds me of Bogota; Buenos Aires), a cut back in city services and an imploding budget (funded by exploding property taxes and service charges). Moreover, I read that the CO House is a toxic environment where the order of the day are narrow extreme ideological bills. Is Denver trying to emulate San Francisco, LA, Portland, Tijuana?</p> <p>Why are law-abiding citizens constantly being targeted, particularly now in the current unpleasant and deteriorating environment? How does this bill, with the proposed onerous restrictions on CCW make us safer on the street, in our homes? Do you honestly believe that this constituency poses a danger to our society? Are you representing all your constituents?</p> <p>Focus on the real dangers; the law of cause-and-effect has not been repealed.</p>
<p>kevin massaro Against themselves</p>	<p>As a law student, I was one of the co-authors of the current Colorado concealed weapons bill. It took us years to pass it. And after it was passed, we were proven right. Concealed weapons permit holders are law abiding citizens, on average, more law abiding than police officers.</p> <p>Since the Supreme Court ruled in Bruen, crime has gone down, particularly in those states where concealed carry was prohibited. <a href="https://www.americanprogress.org/article/in-2023-gun-violence-trended-down-across-the-country/">https://www.americanprogress.org/article/in-2023-gun-violence-trended-down-across-the-country/</a></p> <p>This bill will do nothing to improve public safety. And it will do much to prohibit it. Gun free zones do not work. They simply give the bad</p>

	<p>actors a place to do harm to defenseless people. And people of limited means are just as valuable as others, while this bill would significantly increase the cost of a permit. The honest, hard working people living in the high crime areas would be hardest hit by these proposed changes.</p> <p>This bill will do nothing to promote public safety in Colorado and will do much to harm the progress made. Contrary to the claims we heard at the hearings on the current bill, this state did not become "the Wild West." Criminals don't care about the law and will be armed regardless of what you do. Honest people will just be more readily and easily victimized by this bill.</p> <p>Vote it down, please. The current concealed weapons bill works.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>kevin massaro Against themselves</p>	<p>Simply put, the current system, run by the local sheriffs, works. It's simple. Private companies are filling the void for training and training on the right things. Colorado has too many state employees as it is.</p> <p>Leaving things in the hands of the sheriffs is promoting local control, which is a good thing.</p> <p>Please leave the current bill alone.</p>
<p>Donna LaBelle Against themselves</p>	<p>I am against this bill because I believe that this issue has become emotionalized. I am not denying it is an emotional issue but that is has been co-opted to take away 2nd amendment rights. As many are testifying, there are so many laws already in place and having more is not going to help. Guns are inanimate objects. People are the variable in the equation. We already have a great conceal carry program in Colorado. Please vote NO. Thank you!</p>
<p>Amy O'Dair Against themselves</p>	<p>Dear Committee Members;</p> <p>I appreciate that this important matter is being discussed. Obviously, we have an urgent issue with too much crime and the causes take us in many directions.</p> <p>As we look at that huge piece, it FEELS better to just react quickly by making guns harder to carry....BY EVERYONE. However, it only takes a</p>

	<p>second to research that the law-abiding citizens trying to protect themselves and be safe from assault or robbery on the streets would be the ones this bill would hurt. Criminals, unfortunately, always find a way...and are not the ones to even BOTHER with registering, taking a class OF ANY LENGTH, much less worrying with passing an exam or learning the proper laws.</p> <p>Making it harder for already law-abiding citizens to responsibly carry concealed just makes major roadblocks for those peoples' safety. THE CRIMINAL is not going to worry if his weapon has a tougher concealed carry license that CBI has monitored!</p> <p>Firstly, let the local Sheriffs and Police teach and verify the trainers and run their programs. The multiple level of scheduling will create a backlog to get a license. Secondly, the idea SHOULD BE to make it a process that law-abiding citizens actually want to pursue to HELP them be more legally knowledgeable and better trained to carry their weapon; for the POSSIBILITY of protection.</p> <p>Addressing the MANY issues of a shooter does NOT involve taking away ASSISTANCE we should be giving to the legal residents trying to stay safe.</p> <p>Thank you, Amy Jo O'Dair</p>
<p>Jeany Rush Against themselves</p>	<p>To: Committees Crimes, Corrections/ &amp; Enforcement Sponsor: Duran March 4, 2024 Re: HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits &amp; Training From: Jeany Rush, Colorado Springs Concerned Constituent Vote: NO NO NO NO NO on this Bill</p> <p>May I remind you we have a 2nd Amendment! Many citizens have gone through existing protocols for gaining legally, licensing. Further, the training already exists, and auxiliary training, like Stop the Bleed, and more. Adding more layers of fees, hurdles, are certainly unconstitutional. Every bill, and every edict is to take away the right of law abiding citizens to properly bear arms. We already did do it. But the criminals will never adhere to any laws. The attempt by Colorado legislators to remove ammunition, methods, weapons, and proper ownership as per the 2nd Amendment is so outrageous, as to defy reality. I object to this. Over 580 bills submitted in a month, and like kind all over America, does</p>

	<p>not feel legal, nor right. I suspect AI made them for all. But something is desperately wrong in Colorado, and elsewhere in this nation. I agree some laws are needed, but I believe our government, you all, have exceeded grossly our legal constitutional rights. NO on all this!</p>
<p>John Henderson Against themselves</p>	<p>To the members of the House,</p> <p>Colorado is a "shall issue" state, that already has a common-sense training requirement for concealed carry licenses. Many, if not all, Concealed Carry classes hold themselves to a high standard of curriculum knowing full well that any deviation from a focus on safety and legality will draw the ire of legislators. This bill will add unnecessary hoops and expense for firearms instructors and law-abiding Coloradans who wish to exercise their constitutionally protected Second Amendment rights. It can be taken on its face the direct attack on a large subset of Coloradans, and ignores the fact that criminals do not follow the laws around concealed carry in the first place. The citizens who will feel the unnecessary weight of this bill are the law-abiding who have already prescribed to the training and license path in the first place. Bills such as these fly in the face of both the US and Colorado's Constitution and do nothing to increase public safety. If anything, they further drive a wedge between Coloradans of differing political views, and alienate more moderate voters from the any progressive party. I urge you to strike down this proposal and put your creative minds to legislation that affects criminals, instead of the peaceable citizen.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p>
<p>Joseph Wilkey Against themselves</p>	<p>You made an Oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. " the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."</p> <p>This is 100% an infringement. And NO one should be compelled to do this.</p> <p>It should be Constitutional carry. I am an advocate for training as an instructor myself. But not compulsive training.</p> <p>You are turning Colorado into an awful place! You should resign if you're not going to honor the Constitution of the United States of America.</p>

<p>Mike Stern Against themselves</p>	<p>I am writing to express my dire concern about increasing more regulation around Concealed and Carry in Colorado. Facts speak for themselves--those cities and states with the strictest gun laws have the highest crimes rates. Concealed and Carry absolutely reduces crime.</p> <p>To cite actual facts the Rand corporation shows the studies which shows that 15 to 5 concealed and carry decreases crime. (<a href="https://www.rand.org/research/gun-policy/analysis/concealed-carry/violent-crime.html">https://www.rand.org/research/gun-policy/analysis/concealed-carry/violent-crime.html</a>)</p> <p>Studies Exploring the Effects of Shall-Issue Concealed-Carry Laws on Violent Crime, 1997–2004:</p> <p>Study Significant Effect Reported (Main Specification):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;Lott and Mustard (1997)a Decrease in violent crime, murders, rapes, and assaults</li> <li>&gt;Bartley and Cohen (1998) Decrease in violent crime robust to alternate model specifications</li> <li>&gt;Black and Nagin (1998) Increase in assaults</li> <li>&gt;Bronars and Lott (1998) Decrease in murders and rapes, displacement of crime to other jurisdictions</li> <li>&gt;Lott (1998a)a Decrease in violent crime in most states implementing the law</li> <li>&gt;Lott (1998b)a Decrease in violent crime; increase in property crime</li> <li>&gt;Ludwig (1998) None detected</li> <li>&gt;Ayres and Donohue (1999)a Increase in property crime</li> <li>&gt;Lott and Landes (1999)A Decrease in murders and injuries from multiple-victim public shootings</li> <li>&gt;Lott (2000)A Decrease in all crime categories</li> <li>&gt;Benson and Mast (2001) Decrease in violent crime, murders, rapes, and robberies</li> <li>&gt;Duggan (2001) Decrease in assaults</li> <li>&gt;Moody (2001)A Decrease in violent crime</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>&gt;Olson and Maltz (2001) Decrease in firearm murders</p> <p>&gt;Plassmann and Tideman (2001) Decrease in murders and rapes; increase in robberies</p> <p>&gt;Lott and Whitley (2003)a Decrease in violent crime, murders, rapes, and robberies</p> <p>&gt;Plassmann and Whitley (2003)b Decrease in rapes and robberies</p> <p>&gt;Rubin and Dezhbakhsh (2003) Decrease in murders; increase in robberies</p> <p>&gt;Ayres and Donohue (2003a)a Increase in more crime categories than saw a decrease</p> <p>&gt;Ayres and Donohue (2003b)a Increase or no effect in all crime categories</p> <p>&gt;Donohue (2003)a Mixed; effects were sensitive to model specifications and data</p> <p>&gt;Helland and Tabarrok (2004) Increase in property crime, auto thefts, and larcenies</p> <p>Sources:</p> <p>A) These studies are treated in this report as being superseded by later studies by the same authors.</p> <p>B) This same paper was earlier circulated as Lott, Plassmann, and Whitley (2002).</p>
<p>Judy Jaster Against themselves</p>	<p>This bill does nothing more than make concealed carry more difficult for law abiding citizens. It would significantly hinder busy, working individuals from having the ability to protect themselves and their families. The Federal Government is intentionally flooding the county with people from all over the world with very little screening. Numerous citizens have been harmed or killed by this action alone. Our founders gave us the 2nd amendment to ensure the citizens have the ability to protect themselves. The Constitution was written to protect the citizen and to limit overreach by the government. This bill is the perfect example of overreach by the government. I strongly oppose it.</p>
<p>Marissa Hickmon Against themselves</p>	<p>I am against this bill due to the increase in regulation and possibly fees in order to be able to defend myself. The current system already is an infringement as all states should have constitutional carry and national reciprocity.</p>

<p>Maxwell Hayes Against Aim Small Firearm Training</p>	<p>My name is Maxwell Hayes I am the instructor at Aim Small Firearm Training, while I agree the state should set a Minimum Standard for training requirements. I believe the attempt at a tyrannical state that demands students of canceled carry classes achieve state standards is a bad idea. Based on the fact the minimum standards set forth in this bill are lack luster at best. The state should set a minimum and let the industry do what it does best set higher standards than a politician with no experience or knowledge could ever achieve. The methodology allowing capitalist companies compete for business in a capitalist society will make for more qualified and higher trained canceled carry permit holders.</p> <p>It is a false belief that law enforcement and government agencies have a higher knowledge than the civilian sector as to firearms abilities and training. It is a fact that most law enforcement and military personnel only use their weapons for qualifying and nothing more. The qualifying for military standard is 40 rds, plus 18 rds to zero. I was a 45 Bravo (small arms and artillery repair) while in the military I speak as the weapons specialist of the military. As compared to an individual such as myself that fires a minimum of 20 rds a week, more when finances permit. I can guarantee I have more Firearm experience than the individuals that composed this silly bill, and I can assure that government involvement in teaching standards will lessen the quality of education. Diversity, Equity, and inclusion may work in Washington DC politics, and corporate offices, but you want people that are handling firearms to be proficient, skilled and highly qualified for the task they undertake. The only way to achieve the highest quality canceled carry holders is to let me compete with my fellow instructors to provide the best, all around trying we can come up with. Capitalist competition trumps tyrannical government mandates anyway of the week.</p>
---	---

This bill is a transparent in goal to make gun ownership unaffordable for trained and licensed citizens. HB24-2177, like three other upcoming bills and many prior bills have a goal to make gun ownership unaffordable for law abiding citizens. In today's legislature agenda roadmap, I see no bills introduced to punish criminals or those using guns in criminal acts more decisively. Holding people accountable, has it's own impact on prevention. We seem to be getting softer on a higher percentage of adjudicated trial after another, especially post conviction. In fact, our courts are congested with offenders given/serving lenient sentencing of criminals who commit gun crimes.

I cannot support this bill until our legislature makes some kind of attempt to increase/enforce penalties on criminals using and owning guns until after their sentence is complete. Quite frankly I only see past legislation to apply weaken/non-binding sentencing on the existing violations. The victims are completely unprotected by the proposed legislation of HB24-1174, just like many of the newly introduced bills the past few years. You and I know we are ignoring gun criminal acts enforcement and stiffer legislation in an effort to control the unfortunate mass shootings that Colorado.

It is important for my legislators to focus on enforcement to the stiffest most possible perspective. As I have contributed solutions to my state congress, federal congress and senate representatives, the RMGO, the NGRA and NRA in writing the past year, I support:

- 1) 1 year mandatory jail time for 1<sup>st</sup> degree offenses when a gun is present in the commission of a crime.
- 2) 10 year mandatory jail time for st degree offenses when a gun (or object) is used in injuring a person in commission of crime
- 3) Life without parol jail time for 1<sup>st</sup> degree murder offenses when gun (or object) is used in death of a person in commission of a crime.

I have gun ownership and operation since cub-scouts in 1967, Eagle Scout in gun smithing, no AR, mostly single shot hunting, more than 10 safety classes, all NRA.

February 28, 2024

Dear Chair Snyder and esteemed members of the House Finance Committee,

I vehemently oppose HB24-1174 Concealed Carry Permits & Training Bill sponsored by Duran & Snyder. Having served as Mayor of Fountain for eight years, I prioritized common sense & thoughtful decisions, always respecting the concerns of my constituents. Regrettably, this bill is founded on the notion of paternalism, assuming citizens need protection from themselves. The sponsors' assertion that they are safeguarding the average citizen is misguided; in reality, it criminalizes law-abiding gun owners & advances an anti-gun agenda.

It is well-known that criminals disregard laws, rendering this bill ineffective in deterring crime. By patronizingly assuming that individuals like myself, who have dutifully served the community & upheld the law, need others to make decisions on our behalf, this bill undermines our fundamental rights. I have responsibly owned firearms my entire life, adhering to all regulations, as have countless other law-abiding gun owners across the state & nation. The covert aim to erode our constitutional rights is unacceptable, & this bill exacerbates obstacles to achieving the American dream by presuming others know better than us.

I urge you to carefully consider the detrimental implications & erroneous assumptions made by the bill's sponsors. Their agenda does not align with the best interests of the majority of citizens in our esteemed state, nor does it uphold the values enshrined in the United States Constitution.

Respectfully,  
Gabriel P. Ortega  
Fountain, CO

Ralph Goble  
NRA Certified Pistol Instructor

House Finance Committee HB24-1174

Should this bill be enacted it will have the following results on the ability of our citizens to provide for their self defense.

This bill will impact the low income the hardest as the cost for instruction to comply with this bill will increase by two or three fold at a minium.

The time required for an individual to comply with the education and training will create a hardship on those that wish to provide for their own defense and safety, again those primarily those in the lower income range and single mothers having to provide child care while at the necessary training.

What are the trainer requirements that the CBI will enact upon the existing trainers, and what kind of licensing will be required, and the related costs. How long will will the trainers license / certificate be good for?

How long will the CHP be good for and what will be the requirements for renewal?

I believe that this bill instills more restrictions on our individual rights and limits our Second amendment rights when we have increasing crime and violence and the need for individual right to provide for our own self defense.

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

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

**INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

11250 WAPLES MILL ROAD FAIRFAX,

VIRGINIA 22030



**NRA**

March 4, 2024

House Finance Committee  
200 E Colfax Avenue  
Denver, CO 80203

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.<sup>1,2</sup> 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>