

House Government Oversight Committee  
Opposition Testimony HB 227  
Submitted by: Pat Krummrich  
Oct. 26, 2021

Chairman Wilkin, Vice Chair White, Ranking Member Hicks-Hudson, and Committee Members, thank you for allowing me to testify. I am a retired health care provider from Akron Children's and a bereaved mother. I have been a Republican for most of my adult life.

Jesus said. "No one can serve two masters." (Matthew 6:24). I ask you to think about who are you serving with this bill? The children and families of Ohio? Or the Gun Lobby?

More than 150 Opponents have submitted written testimony or spoken in person against this bill since its introduction last March. The majority spoke as concerned citizens or volunteers of Ohio chapters of grass roots non-profit groups dedicated to fighting gun violence groups. They were joined by Allies such as Ohioans Against Gun Violence, the Ohio Coalition Against Gun Violence, the League of Women Voters of Ohio, Ohio Domestic Violence Network and the Catholic Conference of Ohio.

A look back at opponent testimonies highlights a common thread of objections to this bill:

First, opponents are almost unanimous in objecting to the fact that this bill will enable convicted felons (including those who have assaulted a Police Officer), illegal drug users, domestic abusers and those with court adjudicated mental illness to concealed carry loaded deadly weapons. Lobbyists came from the NRA, Ohio, and Arizona (not sure why an out-of-state Lobbyist was allowed to speak when average Ohio Opponents were told there would be no testimony allowed). These paid lobbyists told you that this bill will "not" make it legal for prohibited persons to

concealed carry a loaded weapon. Although the bill initially acknowledges federal law pertaining to prohibited persons, it *effectively goes on to allow prohibited persons to concealed carry*. On page 2 of the Ohio Legislative Services Commission analysis, it explains that:

“The bill specifies that a person who does so (ie: carries a concealed weapon without a permit”) must be deemed to have a concealed weapons license, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.<sup>1</sup> **As a result, the bill allows the following categories of persons who are not eligible for a concealed weapons license to carry a concealed deadly weapon:**

- A person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor drug offense or misdemeanor assault of a peace officer.
- A person convicted of two or more counts of misdemeanor assault or negligent assault;
- A person who has not completed the required competency certification. “

...And three other classifications of individuals of which I am sure you are aware. No wonder the Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys have testified repeatedly against Permitless Carry Bills. “

Second, people are really upset that you would eliminate (or make entirely voluntary) background checks for concealed carry. Although they are not perfect since they only apply to federally licensed dealers in Ohio which excludes gun shows and virtually all online sellers (one of the largest marketplace for gun sales in Ohio), background checks have stopped more than 81,000 gun sales to prohibited users in Ohio. (FBI data)

Third, the folks who have sent you testimony can hardly believe that you are considering eliminating training requirements for concealed carry. Eight hours of training, 6 hours of which can be done online, is not too much to ask of you before you stand next to my child with a loaded concealed weapon. Come stand with me at the bedside of children who have been shot accidentally or

caught in crossfire and tell me that 8 hours is too big a burden for you. Who are you serving?

Fourth, citizens say they are “fed up” that you seem to value the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights of a small group of gun owners (the ones who object to permits) over everyone else’s rights to health and safety...you know “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness”. Many Ohioans who don’t own guns still acknowledge the second amendment. But the Ohio Supreme Court has already ruled that common sense gun laws, like background checks, do not interfere with 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights. Have your guns! But let us have a life not so burdened by fear, injury and death. If the gun industry thinks the \$60 dollar cost of a 5 year permit (\$12 a year) is too burdensome on top of the \$400-\$500 cost of a gun, why don’t they offer a 10% discount for low income buyers? Take a little less profit if you are so concerned about this issue. Compare the cost of a permit to the devastating costs to victims of gun violence.

Fifth, a number of small business owners have told you that HB 227 is bad for Ohio business. Research shows that gun violence stunts business growth. A study by the Urban Institute found that

“...neighborhood-level data reveal that **an increase in gun violence is accompanied by decreases in number of establishments, sales, and employment in local businesses**” (Urban Institute, Nov 3, 2016). One researcher found that “Businesses do not want to locate in areas of high crime, tourists do not want to go there, and people do not want to live there. This leads to fewer jobs and to flight from the neighborhood of higher-income people who can afford to leave (e.g., “white flight”). To avoid being shot, residents also change their behavior concerning recreation, shopping, leisure, and other activities. Cost of Gun Violence in our state is \$7.3 billion which is 1.1% of Ohio’s GDP.<sup>1</sup> My husband, who is a retired Timken Exec and who now mentors small business owners for a national non-profit organization, testified that banks are reluctant to approve loans to businesses in areas with high gun violence. I’d be happy to talk at more length with any of you on this subject if you wish.

The GOP is supposed to support business. This bill will especially make it harder for small businesses to thrive in areas where gun violence occurs. Who are you serving?

Sixth, a lot of Ohioans told you that HB 227 does not support police. Yes, you put the "Duty to Notify" back in In Sub Bill 227, I assume because you got a lot of "pushback" from citizens and Law Enforcement on that. But we're still left with a bill that defeats the very purpose of "duty to notify". I think I can safely say that the purpose is to protect police and help them do their job. It increases their ability to accurately and quickly assess a situation involving a weapon and react accordingly. But it only applies to those who have a CCW permit. In sub bill 227, the whole permit becomes totally voluntary. A lot of people will not be motivated to get the permit and will not, therefore, be required to notify police that they are carrying if stopped. One of the reasons to have permits and background checks is that it helps Law Enforcement tell the good guys from the bad guys. This is good for the good guys, too! It protects them from being shot or unnecessarily hassled by Police. It's like putting a white hat on the good guys so that police can better identify who the bad guys are. You should be supporting our Police and making their jobs easier and safer, not adding stress and danger to their job.

At this point, I can hear the gun lobbyists getting ready to say, as they did in previous testimony, "Yes, but in one or two states, permit purchases went Up after Permitless Carry passed. "Why"? Because many gun owners think permitting is a useful and good idea? A Quinnipiac poll found that 88% of Ohioans, including gun owners agree with permitting and background checks! Reciprocity? All of the states surrounding Ohio accept Ohio's permits and most of them also require CCW permits. As of October 2021, according to [USA Carry](#) You can travel to Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, most of New England or down the eastern seaboard through Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia to Florida and be in states where permits

are required. So yes, even gun owners recognize the value of a permit. The only neighboring states that don't require a permit are W. Virginia and Kentucky. Ohio's gun death rate is not great. It grew by 41% between 2008 and 2017 compared to a national average of 17% (Gifford's Law Center) but we're better than Kentucky and W. Virginia! Why would we want to follow in their footsteps?

Republicans have always claimed to be the party of law and order. We're tired of hearing "Criminals don't obey the law. Then why have ANY laws? Why have speed limits if criminals will exceed them? Why not make THEM voluntary? Why do we have laws about taxation? Because having laws makes it possible for Police to enforce them and saves lives.

But the biggest argument against this bill really comes down to numbers. With about 1,500 Ohioans dying every year from gun violence, there is no reason to pass this bill. Research shows us that the 10 states with the loosest gun laws have the highest gun death rates. Boston University found that states that have permits and background checks have a 15% lower gun death rate than states without these laws.

The overwhelming majority of Ohioans want common sense gun laws because they save lives. Please listen to the majority of Ohioans and decide who you will serve. Vote NO on HB 227.

Thank you for your attention,  
Pat Krummrich

1. A State-by-State Examination of the Economic Costs of Gun Violence U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee. Democratic Staff, September 18, 2019 (Uses Data by Giffords Law Center, US Bureau of Economic Analysis, CDC WISQARS, World Bank

2. The Impact of Violence Surges on Neighbourhood Business Activity. Robert T. Greenbaum, George E. Tita First Published December 1, 2004 Research Article <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098042000294538>