

Senate State Affairs Committee

Wednesday, March 06, 2024 - 8:00 A.M.

TESTIMONY ON: All Subjects

Written Testimony

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Kathy Dawes	S 1374	W	Myself and my husband Dana Dawes	Moscow	Against	N	6

We are strongly opposed to bill S 1374. If this bill becomes law, it will make any armed group, like the one that planned to attack the Pride event in Coeur d'Alene, able to carry firearms and disrupt the event and intimidate participants. The more firearms there are at any event, the more likely innocent people will be intimidated and/or injured. We are assuming this bill would also allow armed groups to march in parades on public streets. This will not make Idaho a safer place to live. We do not understand the necessity of the Idaho legislature to promote such activity in our communities. Please vote NO on S 1374.

Lee Anne Earecksin	S 1374	W	Self	Viola	Against	N	6
--------------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	---

I am against this bill. I want myself and my children to feel safe in public spaces and at public events. Knowing that other event-goers may be armed does NOT make me feel safer.

Diane Prorak	S 1374	W	self	Moscow	Against	N	6
--------------	--------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I think we need the ability to restrict firearms in some settings. They could be use to intimidate and harm. We already have too many firearms allowed in public and I think we need more safety. Just like at the Superbowl parade, if people get angry or they are intoxicated, they will use firearms too easily and people can get killed. Please think of our children's safety.

Thank you for reading this.

Vickie Fadness	S 1374	W	self	Lewiston	Against	N	7
----------------	--------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

S1374 guns

"It's our party" and we can say wear clothing and no firearms and no alcohol. This is an overreach of legislative rule making.

We do need protection from those carrying firearms at private gatherings in rented or public places. Peaceful get-togethers should

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Vickie Fadness

cont.

7

not have to worry about invited or uninvited guests appearing with firearms. My family is already reluctant to come to Idaho because of the pro-gun environment.

Please do not support S1374.

Vickie Fadness

District 7

Margaret Dibble

S 1374

W

Self

Moscow

Against

N

6

Having more guns around doesn't make us safer; it just increases the chance of people getting shot. You know what they say, "if you only tool is a hammer, everything looks like a nail". With a lot of guns around, people tend to think they can solve problems by shooting. They can't

Rhoda Mack

S 1374

W

self

Viola

Against

N

6

This is a bill driven by ideology rather than common sense. In a time when too many people are angry, frightened, and being fed biased news, this unfortunate idea sets the scene for another public bloodbath.

Let's think about this:

Why would the NRA ban guns from their conventions?

Why would Mar-a-Lago ban guns on site?

If Trump comes to Idaho to hold a rally, will he be forced to change his no-guns policy and allow guns inside the rally space?

Why do these above examples all prohibit guns?

Please, let's have some common sense and table this foolish, dangerous bill.

Thank you.

Marilyn Beckett

S 1374

W

Self

Moscow

Against

N

6

I have testified numerous times dissenting the proposition normalizing firearms in community spaces. I will continue to do so, because it is a horrible idea for individuals to openly exhibit firearms in communities.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Marilyn Beckett

cont.

6

It is one thing for the National Guard or Army ROTC to carry unloaded weapons in a parade. It is totally different and antithetical to reason for anyone else to be carrying a loaded weapon in public. Again, everyone I know, regardless of affiliation, who is at venue where they see someone with a weapon immediately leaves the area because they are uncomfortable: with good reason given the trajectory of gun violence in our country. We should not be encouraging people to carry weapons in public. To the contrary, we should be encouraging people to keep their guns safely locked up until need of use. This structure would help reduce a variety of the social problems we face related to gun ownership that every gun owner should appreciate. Anarchists want open carry and open warfare. Patriots do not.

Diane Baumgart

S 1374

W

Self

Moscow

Against

N

6

Idaho wants gun safety not expansion. It is toime to stand up for responsible gun right not anything goes gun right.

Guns and gun carrying strangers do NOT make citizens safer nor do they make. Citizens feel safer.

I am against this bill it serves no purpose.

Kate Finley

S 1374

W

Self

Boise

Against

N

19

This is ridiculous and unnecessary. Vote no!

Molly Steele

S 1374

W

Self

Lewiston

Against

N

7

Please, vote NO on S 1374. Public places/events continue to need the ability to restrict firearms because we need to be safe. Without restriction, how can you discern who might be carrying a weapon, concealed or not, with criminal intention or simply to incite chaos? Our local Main Street businesses experienced the armed folks standing around during a public parade. The complaints were numerous and locals said they stayed away out of fear that these armed people were a problem, not a solution. In my experience, Idaho needs more gun safety, not gun rights expansion, and increased danger at public events.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Erin Anderson	S 1374	IP	Organization - Idaho Botanical Garden	Boise	Against	Y	19

Mr. Chairman and Committee Members,

My name is Erin Anderson and I serve as the Executive Director for the Idaho Botanical Garden. The Garden is a non-profit organization with thirty-two acres of grounds leased from the State of Idaho in the historic Old Penitentiary District in Boise. We are currently in the fourth year of our 50-year lease agreement with the state. The garden serves 150,000 visitors each year. Our mission is to grow our community by connecting people, plants, and nature.

I am here on behalf of the Idaho Botanical Garden to oppose and express concerns with Senate Bill 1374.

My primary concern is with the proposed amendment of the code in subsection 25(b) which seeks to eliminate the authority of private businesses or nonprofit organizations leasing public property to manage or regulate firearms and weapons brought into free and unticketed events.

The Idaho Botanical Garden organizes frequent free music and public education events each year. Senate Bill 1374 would make it impossible for the Garden to hold these free or unticketed events on our privately leased land and restrict firearm and weapon access.

This legislation raises concerns from a public safety perspective, particularly because many of our free events draw large crowds, exposing the Garden to considerable risk and liability in ensuring their safe execution. Most importantly, performing musical artists with substantial bargaining power refuse to perform at the Garden (and any other venue) unless the venue enforces restrictions on firearms and weapons as stipulated in their contracts.

As a private nonprofit organization and a lessee of our land, we should have the right to regulate conduct, admission requirements, and other safety protocols, including the prohibition of firearms inside our garden gates if we deem that to be in the best interest of our event, attendees, and is also required by individual artists performing in our space.

I urge committee members to consider amending this bill to allow organizations like the garden to restrict access to those carrying a firearm or weapon on public land by creating either or visual barriers like fencing and through invitation-only events. This is especially pertinent considering the precedent set by the Idaho Supreme Court in Herndon v. Sandpoint, where it affirmed that a private business, acting as a tenant, possesses full authority to govern and establish restrictions on event attendees.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Kevin Bailey	S 1374	IP	Idaho Nonprofit Center	Boise	Against	Y	16

MR CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME TODAY.

MY NAME IS KEVIN BAILEY AND I SERVE AS THE CEO FOR THE IDAHO NONPROFIT CENTER, A STATEWIDE NONPROFIT SERVING 800+ CHARITABLE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS ACROSS THE STATE WITH THE MISSION TO STRENGTHEN THE NONPROFIT SECTOR ACROSS IDAHO.

I AM HERE ON BEHALF OF THE IDAHO NONPROFIT CENTER AND OUR MEMBERS TO OPPOSE AND EXPRESS CONCERNS WITH SENATE BILL 1374.

MY PRIMARY CONCERN IS WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CODE IN SUBSECTION 25(B) WHICH ATTEMPTS TO REMOVE THE ABILITY OF A PRIVATE BUSINESS—OR NONPROFIT—THAT IS RENTING OR LEASING PUBLIC PROPERTY FROM GOVERNING WHAT IS BROUGHT INTO THEIR EVENT.

THIS LEGISLATION WOULD MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR NONPROFITS AND/OR PRIVATE BUSINESS ENTITIES WHO HOLD FREE OR UNTICKETED EVENTS ON PUBLIC PROPERTY FROM RESTRICTING FIREARM ACCESS.

THIS IS CONCERNING FROM A PUBLIC SAFETY POINT OF VIEW AS MANY OF THESE EVENTS ATTRACT THOUSANDS OF ATTENDEES AND THE BUSINESSES AND/OR NONPROFITS TAKE ON GREAT RISK AND LIABILITY TO PUT THESE EVENTS ON SAFELY. THIS BILL IS LIKELY TO INCREASE INSURANCE PREMIUMS FOR NONPROFITS' LIABILITY POLICIES.AND CREATES AN UNTENABLE CONTRADICTION BY PUTTING PRIVATE BUSINESSES AND NONPROFITS THAT ARE LEASING PUBLIC SPACE IN AN AMBIGUOUS POSITION.

PUBLIC PROPERTY – ESPECIALLY PARKS – ARE NATURAL SPACES FOR EVENTS THAT BRING CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC VITALITY TO CITIES AND TOWNS ACROSS IDAHO. THIS LEGISLATION CREATES A CHILLING EFFECT FOR EVENTS LIKE 'ART IN THE PARK', FREE CONCERTS, SUMMER READING KICKOFFS, CHILDRENS THEATER IN THE PARK, AND OTHER SIGNATURE EVENTS IN CITIES AND TOWNS ACROSS IDAHO THAT ARE CARRIED OUT ANNUALLY BY NONPROFIT, BUSINESSES, AND CIVIC GROUPS FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT.

GROUPS LEASING PUBLIC PROPERTY OUGHT TO CONTINUE TO HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO REGULATE CONDUCT, ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS, AND OTHER SAFETY PROTOCOLS, INCLUDING THE PROHIBITION OF FIREARMS IF THEY DEEM THAT TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THEIR EVENT AND ATTENDEES.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kevin Bailey	cont.						16
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

I URGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO HOLD THIS BILL IN COMMITTEE OR CONSIDER ADITIONAL AMMENDMENTS TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF PRIVATE BUSINESSES TO GOVERN THEIR OWN EVENTS, ESPECIALLY GIVEN THAT THE IDAHO SUPREME COURT HAS ALREADY UPHELD THIS RIGHT PREVIOUSLY IN HERNDON V. SANDPOINT WHEN IT RULED THAT A PRIVATE BUSINESS, AS A TENANT, HAD FULL AUTHORITY TO GOVERN AND SET LIMITS ON THOSE WHO ATTEND SUCH AN EVENT. THANK YOU.

Submitted 3/5/24 by:

Kevin Bailey

CEO, Idaho Nonprofit Center

Lindy Swartz	S 1374	W	Self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1
--------------	--------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	---

I am against this bill because of public safety issues as well as raising liability concerns. It supercedes local control. It is an unnecessary risk to our families.

J Thomas Tillisch	S 1374	W	Self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1
-------------------	--------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	---

I am opposed to S 1374. There is no logical reason why people have to bring guns to public events.

Michael Strollo	S 1374	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	18
-----------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I don't see why we need to allow open carry weapons in any more public places or outdoor spaces ! When individuals parade and proudly display these weapons they Intimidate all Idahoans ! Why do they need to do this? More weapons do not make folks safe, if that was the case the United States would be safest country in the world!!The Second Amendment is not sacrosanct, there are limits! So vote NO , thank you

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Nancy Gerth	S 1374	W	self I organize nonprofit events	Sagle	Against	N	1
-------------	--------	---	----------------------------------	-------	---------	---	---

I organized, planned, and helped run 350 Sandpoint's Earth Day celebration last held in 2019 and featuring more than 200 school children as performers, tablers and attendees. Nonprofit events—like free concerts, plays, and craft fairs—would be put in ambiguous situations by not allowing them to regulate what people can carry into their events. This legislation has public safety implications as well as raising liability concerns. (We had trained safety volunteers, and can rely on our local police for security.)

The bill supercedes local control, which is a bad idea--especially with guns!

It puts in place every conceivable rule to allow people to carry concealed weapons without addressing any of the actual causes of mass shootings in the US. Are there background checks? Are people determined to be mentally stable? Are people hosting events trained in what to do in an emergency?

Transparently an attempt to rile the public without addressing a problem important to voters. More likely it will create problems.

Dana Dawes	S 1374	W	Self	Moscow	Against	N	6
------------	--------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I am not opposed to guns. I am not opposed to concealed carry permits. What I am opposed to are people with concealed weapons who come to an event that they don't approve of, with the purpose of harming innocent people there who they hate. This bill would make it quite easy for such a person to carry a concealed weapon to an event like a Pride event on public property for the purpose of hurting people they don't approve of. Yes, they would be guilty if charged with a crime, but in the meantime, innocent victims are in danger of being hurt or killed.

This bill gives freedom to the weapon owner and takes freedom away from the innocent participants at an event. Please vote NO on bill S 1374.

Jean Gerth	S 1374	W	self	sagle	Against	N	1
------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	---

Over the years I have been involved in organizing many events that are open to the public for no fee and take place in city parks and buildings. As we have devolved into "camps" it has become increasingly hard to feel safe in public. I think citizens should have the right to attend events that DON'T HAVE GUNS, so we can all relax. Some argue that this violates their Second Amendment Rights and I am sorry that they feel like they have to have a gun when attending events. I ask you to table this bill and as a gesture towards rebuilding a civil society.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Dianna David	S 1374	IP	Self	Boise	Against	Y	15
--------------	--------	----	------	-------	---------	---	----

Will be provided at time of hearing.

Karen M. Hansen	S 1374	V	Self	Viola	Against	Y	6
-----------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	---

I am Karen Hansen from Viola ID.
Vote against SB~1374.

Local schools, towns, community organizations and private businesses in cooperation with local law enforcement have the right and responsibility to make decisions about how to manage public safety during public events such as parades, community ball games, art and craft shows, fairs, and other community events that are free to the public. Depending on the type of event and the nature of the local community it may be okay to allow firearms, or it may not be.

It is unjustified government intrusion for the state government take away the right to choose whether or not to allow firearms at local public events.

The last time I marched in a Christmas parade, as I was dressed up in lights and tinsel and bright Christmas colors, as I was smiling and waving at the people, especially the beautiful bright-eyed children, a thought kept intruding on the Christmas cheer. What if someone whose anger or despair was out of control started shooting up the place. It is a sign of the times.

I was reassured to see police officers on duty. I hope and pray that they don't have to deal with a shooting incident, just traffic management. Rights have to be balanced. The right to bear arms must be balanced with right to public safety.

This bill goes too far. Vote against SB~1374.

Helen Hawley	S 1374	W	self	Lewiston	Against	N	7
--------------	--------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

I am asking you to vote NO on S1374, allowing guns at public gatherings because this would endanger those participating at peaceful rallies, concerts, and other public functions. The presence of guns at these types of gatherings only heightens the threat that people could get hurt, especially if those carrying became upset or came intending harm. Further, to prohibit the venues and organizers of public events from prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons will mean that less public events will be offered due to the increased risk of such occurrences. Additionally, cities and towns, as well as private organizations would have to insure themselves against such occurrences, thus incurring a prohibitive cost of presenting and/or running events. Considering the potential costs, monetarily, many of our favorite gatherings may not happen. Please do not add to Idahoans' monetary burden or risk of injury at public gatherings. Vote NO on S1374. Thank you for your service.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Helen Hawley	<i>cont.</i>						7
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Sincerely,
Helen Hawley
314 15th Avenue
Lewiston, ID 83501
208-298-6881

nancy britton	S 1374	W	self	Ponderay	Against	N	1
---------------	--------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

I live in North Idaho and this issue has a long history up here. The Herndon v Sandpoint cost both the city and the county over \$200,000 in legal fees. The lawsuit filed (by this bill's sponsor) was about open carry at a non-profit public event on public city property whose organizers didn't want guns at their event. The Idaho Supreme Court ruled again Herndon.

This major music festival with a 40+ year history in Sandpoint and 4,000 person attendance brings in a huge amount of money for local businesses. Had the law suit gone the other way, Sandpoint would have lost this incredible resource. Businesses have a right to organize their event in an appropriate and responsible manner for the safety to their audiences.

Once again, the legislature is advocating for big government centralized control over local towns and cities decision-making for what is right for them.

Please vote NO on S 1374.

Thank you,
Nancy Britton

Marsha Bravo	S 1374	IP	self	Garden City	Against	Y	16
--------------	--------	----	------	-------------	---------	---	----

I greatly oppose Senate bill 1374 which would allow guns in all events on public property. This is a great safety concern for our citizens. Please vote no.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
LINDA LARSON	S 1374	W	Self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1

The City of Sandpoint puts on a 2 week music festival that brings \$3 million into our local economy. The summer season is make or break for many businesses. The Festival at Sandpoint leases a large Memorial Field with bleachers from the City of Sandpoint.

The performers put into their contracts requirements that guns not be allowed into the music venue. If this bill passes, concerts like ours would not be able to continue. This puts many jobs at risk. Our economy depends on tourism and this is a big part of the tourist draw.

Please do not pass this out of committee.
Thank you,
Linda Larson

Rosann Mathews	S 1374	W	Self	Rockland	Against	N	28
----------------	--------	---	------	----------	---------	---	----

I'm writing to ask you not to advance the concealed weapons bill. Citizens in Idaho need to feel safe when going to public events with their families and friends and this bill undermines that safety.

Event organizers who pay to use public spaces should have the authority to disallow guns, animals, and alcohol at their events if they choose to. This bill could impact their ability to book performers and reduce the number of attendees.

This bill creates unsafe environments for us all, so please vote no on S1374.

Thank you.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Carolyn Volk	S 1374	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	19
--------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am strongly opposed to S1374. As a parent and a citizen, this legislation scares me.

Please consider:

Nonprofit events—like free concerts, plays, and craft fairs—would be put in ambiguous situations by not allowing them to regulate what people can carry into their events. Guns have no place in these types of events.

This puts in place every conceivable rule to allow people to carry concealed weapons without addressing the basic issues that could make our communities safer like ensuring background checks for gun ownership, controlling the resale of guns to prevent them falling into the hands of unstable or unqualified owners, etc.

If any event in any public place is an ok event to carry a gun into, can we trust that the people hosting these events even know how to manage an emergency?

As a parent and future grandparent, I do not want to have to worry about my children attending public events for fear some crazy might be there with a gun.

Are you prepared to accept the responsibility? Please vote NO on S1374.

Carolyn Volk
808 W Ranch Rd, Boise, 83702

Stephanie Hoffman	S 1374	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	16
-------------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I am strongly against this bill! There is no rational reason that guns need to be at any event where people are simply enjoying themselves with family and friends. No one is taking anyone's gun rights away but you are taking my right to feel safe at Art in the Park or Treefort or any event in public if you allow this bill to pass. We haven't needed guns at these events yet and we don't now. I will not be attending any events if this bill passes. I am contemplating a move out of Idaho as bills like his continue to be proposed. Please vote NO!

Kylie Castellaw	S 1374	V	Self	EAGLE	Against	Y	14
-----------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Hello and thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Kylie Castellaw

cont.

14

I live in Eagle, and my family has been in the state at least 5 generations. I grew up around guns and am very pro hunting and home protection. But the data shows that more firearms in public spaces doesn't make the public more safe.

Aside from that, I have several questions about this bill based on reading and rereading the proposed verbiage. I'll try to go quickly through my 2 main concerns.

1) Page 8, lines 8-10: "Such limitation on the application of this subsection shall apply whether such property is leased, rented, licensed, loaned, permitted, or occupied" --> The word OCCUPIED is confusing to me, as the only item in the sentence that doesn't have to do with the state giving use of their property to a group for a specific period of time... but in vernacular, OCCUPIED simply means "to have people in it". This seems like it would then mean that ANY public space with ANY people in it would NEED to allow conceal carry of firearms. So that means NONE of the following may introduce any concealed carry firearm restrictions?: Courthouses? Libraries? Schools? All of those entities have elected officials that set rules currently. And WE THE PEOPLE elect those officials and trust them as the experts in their lines of work. Don't take away their ability to keep their spaces safe (or essentially force them to pay extra for added security, further diminishing our government's resources).

2) Page 8 lines 15-18: "Any restriction on the carrying of concealed weapons pursuant to this subsection may only be invoked for public property owned by the state or its political subdivisions when the use of such property is for a private event by invitation only, or for a commercial event that charges admission." --> I'm honestly confused about why 'invitation only' and events 'charging admission' are able to apply restrictions but other events aren't... and how blurry that line is. The public is "invited" to nearly every event (signs and commercials often say 'the public is invited'); do those count as 'by invitation'? That seems like it would open the state up to needless confusion. Events charging admission can set their own safety rules, but not others? It's girl scout cookie season now... Can a girl scout troupe ask for canned food donations as admission to an event at a school and therefore be able to get around this law? It's blurry, right?

The bottom line to me is that this bill doesn't seem clear, opens multiple cans of worms, and ALSO undercuts the way our elected officials can govern their own spaces (which goes against Idaho State Supreme Court precedent). Please vote no.

Leanne Parker

S 1374

W

self

Moscow

Against

N

6

I am worried about nonprofit events—like free concerts, plays, and craft fairs—would be put in ambiguous situations by not allowing them to regulate what people can carry into their events. This legislation has public safety implications as well as raising liability

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Leanne Parker	cont.						6
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

concerns. Businesses are also likely to suffer, as I will restrict my where and when I spend my time. I am more likely to go to Washington for day-to-day shopping and events.

It supercedes local control, where officials have the best knowledge about how to keep everyone safe.

daniel smith	S 1374	W	self	boise	Against	N	18
--------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

i am against this bill

Andrea Wilson	S 1374	W	Myself	Boise	Against	N	15
---------------	--------	---	--------	-------	---------	---	----

I am submitting my written testimony in opposition of S1374. This bill will allow firearm conceal carry into public property, even if the property is leased for a private event, or rented event such as Dairy Days, a concert at the county fairgrounds, Pride Festivals, Art in the Park and other private events that pay the city for a lease contract - where right now, they have the right to not allow guns, animals, etc. This bill overrides that preferred safety precaution by the organizers and event hosts. This bill makes events we attend less safe for attendees, participants, performers and vendors - and could interfere in booking talents to perform here, because they do not want to perform where alcohol and guns are present within large crowds.

I really cannot even imagine the confusion and chaos that could break out at a concert at the fair should a violent incident arise. More guns don't make us all safer. Sometimes it's best to let the professionals handle things. I can't imagine the harm vigilantes could do taking matters into their own hands at a large scale event at Julia Davis Park.

This obsession with bringing guns everywhere is downright dangerous and unhinged. We need to be able to function in society without thinking we might need to kill another human at any moment. This mentality is a hallmark of extremism.

Idaho is better than this. Please vote no.

David Britton	S 1374	W	self	Ponderay	Against	N	1
---------------	--------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

I am vehemently opposed to this bill. First off, as a Republican, it is clear to me that guns have no place in public events in any case,

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

David Britton	<i>cont.</i>						1
---------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

second, any organization that rents public space has the right to set the rules for participant behavior, including the right to ban weapons, or alcohol or whatever. Just because the space is rented from a government entity does not and should not confer any special privilege for privately owned guns. Third, this presents clear danger to the public when non-profit organizations are not allowed to prohibit guns in venues where the guns' presence would be inappropriate, threatening or unsafe. It leaves the public at risk of unscreened gun toting crazies, and inadequate security training or forcing nonprofits to waste money on increased security costs, just so insecure fools can pretend to be real men. Just say no to this bill.

Carol Johnston	S 1374	W	self	Boise	Against	N	15
----------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I urge the Legislature to defeat this bill. Private community activities should NOT be threatened by people carrying openly. The gun lobby may think Americans are safer if everyone is armed. I adamantly disagree. And the mass shooting deaths are proof that we are not safer when those around us are carrying. I prefer to attend shows such as Art in the Park each year without the threat of gunfire.

Please kill this bill!

Julie McCallan	S 1374	W	Self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1
----------------	--------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	---

I am strongly opposed to this bill. The organizers of nonprofit events, like educational activities, free concerts, plays, and craft fairs, should be allowed to regulate what people can carry into the event, in accordance with their values. Denying them the right to restrict guns would have public safety implications as well as raising liability concerns. It also restricts local control. This bill would automatically give people the right to carry guns into any event, in a time when we are dealing nationally with mass shootings.

Tracy Olson	S 1374	W	self	Boise	Against	N	19
-------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

In 2023 - the US experienced 627 mass shooting. As of 2/15/24, there have been 50 mass shootings in the US. 82 people have lost their lives thus far in 2024 due to mass shootings. This week alone there have been 279 deaths and 577 injuries due to gun violence.

DO THESE NUMBERS MAKE YOU PAUSE? DO THEY MAKE YOU THINK ABOUT THE TOLL THIS HAS ON FAMILIES, CHILDREN, COMMUNITIES???

IF NOT, WHY?????

It DOES NOT need to be this way.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Tracy Olson	<i>cont.</i>						19
-------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

There are uncountable stories never told about the reaching impact of gun violence on the people who survive mass shootings - lost limbs, long standing wounds that never heal, emotional toll, financial toll. The public rarely hears about this after the initial reports of have ended. Those deeply and permanently impacted by gun violence are forgotten, left to struggle with huge medical bills, lost wages, lost careers, lost family members; a life torn apart due to our leaders failing to address this issue head on.

We deserve the right to live our lives free of gun violence. Expansive gun rights have not made us safer. It has made living in the US more dangerous. S1374 puts in place every conceivable rule to allow people to carry concealed weapons without addressing any of the actual causes of mass shootings in the US. Are there background checks? Are people determined to be mentally stable? Are people hosting events trained in what to do in an emergency?

I firmly believe non-profits and localities have the right to determine what events and places can allow concealed carry. This bill is a bad idea. Our children deserve so much better. VOTE NO.

Laura Rogers	S 1374	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	17
--------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

This bill will not create safety events, it will open the door to shootings, mass or otherwise. Guns do not make people safer. That's a lie pushed by the NRA and GOP and we all know it. Guns do not make people in crowds more comfortable, they put people in edge.

Further, private entities should make their decisions about their events. They have the right to determine what vendors/performers/safety measures they use for their events. Taking that away is the government making decisions for citizens. No one wants that.

Brian Stutzman	H 574	V	Self	Ammon	For	Y	35
----------------	-------	---	------	-------	-----	---	----

HB 574 is a simple but important truth in advertising bill. If taxing districts reference state aid in a ballot question the description of such aid must be more clearer on the ballot, indicating when such referenced aid will expire. Please vote yes! Brian Stutzman

Quinn Perry	H 574	IP	Idaho School Boards Association	Boise	Against	Y	19
-------------	-------	----	---------------------------------	-------	---------	---	----

Senators, the ISBA is here today in opposition on HB 574, and would ask that you hold it in committee. First, I must ask you: what is the intent of the disclosure? This legislature is telling us that we don't need August (or March) election date because of all this facilities money that we are getting will make it easier to pass bonds.....but then, as a legislative body, create this awkward disclosure language if we want to show the "real cost" of the bond to the taxpayer and reference the State money as making the bond more affordable. No tax

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Quinn Perry	cont.						19
-------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

relief is ever "guaranteed" - the legislature can repeal these programs and even the relief provided under HB 292 can fluctuate based on conditions - such as Average Daily Attendance. Senators, in the last five years, we've added or changed roughly four new ballot disclosures that now span several chapters of Idaho Code. We also have a communication piece in a ballot disclosure law. It's creating hurdles for those at the local level to be able to do what they need to do to serve their students. For the record, we will be working on this over the summer to clean this up, and we would ask that you hold this bill in committee until the right people can come to the table with a clean, transparent, and workable solution to tax disclosures for levies. Thank you.

Scott Mensching	H 574	V	Self	Shelley	For	Y	30
-----------------	-------	---	------	---------	-----	---	----

Mr. Chairman, Committee,

My name is Scott Mensching and I stand today in support of HB 574. Last November the Shelley School District ran a bond, on the ballot was language that sounded like a fixed amount of funds would be provided by the state for the entire length of the bond.

This missing language seemd to be a deceptive omision in the bond language.

HB 574 makes bond wording more honest and transparent. I do not believe that you can't be too transparent when proposing bonds or tax changes.

Thank you.

Halli Stone	H 574	V	Self	Idaho Falls	For	Y	33
-------------	-------	---	------	-------------	-----	---	----

In order for tax payers to make an informed decision on such an important issue as increasing property tax, it is imperative that the included ballot language be completely accurate and honest. Currently, some school districts, such as a recent Pocatello/Chubbuck School District ballot, and a Shelley School District ballot, are including language that indicates state money will help offset the amount paid by taxpayers. While this may be true for a period of time, the ballot language does NOT include the fact that the state money is not guaranteed over the life of the bond, nor that the amount the state will pay could vary. Property taxpayers are fed up with dishonest ballot language that misleads them about the true cost of bonds. HB 574 will help resolve these problems. Thank you.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Heather Disselkoen	H 574	T	Self	Pocatello	For	Y	28

HB574 is a positive step toward providing voters with the full information and full transparency they need to make educated votes. I encourage you to pass HB574.