



NRA



CALIFORNIA LEGAL AFFAIRS

February 2018

Prepared by:



Environmental - Land Use - Firearms - Employment Law
Civil Litigation - Criminal Defense
562-216-4444 - www.michellawyers.com

This report provides an overview of just some of the efforts the National Rifle Association of America and the California Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc., are taking to protect the rights of California gun owners. Although litigation plays an extremely important role in the fight for the right to keep and bear arms, NRA and CRPA are heavily involved in many other tremendous and equally important endeavors throughout California and across the nation.

As has been and always will be the case, NRA and CRPA invest enormous amounts of resources to protect the Second Amendment at all levels of California's government, including all 58 counties, all 482 municipalities, and all state and local agencies tasked with enforcing the myriad of complex and ever expanding gun laws.

The digital version of this report, complete with links to relevant documents and additional information, can be found on NRA-ILA's California webpage at www.standandfightCalifornia.com and CRPA's webpage at www.crpa.org.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1
FIREARMS LITIGATION REPORT3
LOCAL ORDINANCE PROJECT REPORT9
FIREARMS REGULATORY MATTERS REPORT12
HUNTING REGULATORY MATTERS18
RANGE MATTERS REPORT20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FIREARMS LITIGATION REPORT

The litigation report provides a brief overview and update on NRA and CRPA's recent litigation efforts in California, including amicus and consulting support in other firearm related cases.

LOCAL ORDINANCE PROJECT REPORT

The Local Ordinance Project ("LOP") is a joint venture between the NRA and CRPA to research and actively monitor all of California's local jurisdictions to oppose any proposed ordinance, law, or policy that threatens Second Amendment Rights. LOP efforts include developing and working with a network of professionals, citizens, local government officials, and law enforcement professionals to effectively oppose local threats to California gun owners.

Opposition campaigns typically include the preparation of opposition or pre-litigation demand letters, grassroots coordination, public information campaigns, and, in some cases, appearances at city council hearings. In many instances, these efforts have prompted local governments to vote down proposals or pull them from consideration. LOP efforts also serve as the foundation for NRA and CRPA litigation efforts against municipalities that enact anti-gun legislation.

REGULATORY MATTERS REPORT

NRA and CRPA are also heavily invested in firearm law enforcement issues through their Regulatory Counsel efforts, which monitors the California DOJ and local law enforcement's interpretations of California firearm laws on a daily basis.

Ongoing efforts include drafting regulatory comment letters, providing legal support to NRA and CRPA lobbyists, drafting NRA and CRPA member alerts, and providing advice to NRA and CRPA members. Regulatory Counsel also collaborates with overlapping litigation, legislative, and regulatory matters to effectively oppose improper actions and incorrect interpretations of California law by state and local agencies.

Regulatory Counsel is responsible for many of the recently published webinars available on the CRPA's website which provide gun owners with a comprehensive analysis of recently enacted legislation and the recently proposed "assault weapon" regulations from the California DOJ.

HUNTING MATTERS REPORT

Closely related to Regulatory Counsel are NRA and CRPA's efforts to monitor and respond to issues impacting hunters throughout California. These efforts include developing strategies and taking action when necessary before the Legislature, the Fish & Game Commission, local municipalities, and other various regulatory agencies.

Hunting Regulatory efforts are also dedicated to pushing back against rabidly anti-hunting forces such as the United States Humane Society, and to improve policies impacting hunters in California to effectively promote and defend the right to hunt in California.

RANGE MATTERS REPORT

Last but not least, NRA and CRPA continually monitor environmental, land use, and design and safety issues that heavily affect shooting ranges and areas in California and throughout the nation.

NRA and CRPA's range assistance efforts include regular range evaluations and meeting with Club Boards to strategize and assist with coordination of defense campaigns against "not in my backyard" efforts from environmental non-governmental organizations, state and federal agencies, and municipal governments.

** In addition to the above mentioned efforts, NRA and CRPA both employ full time lobbyists in Sacramento to fight on behalf of gun owners in the California Legislature. NRA and CRPA regularly prepare and distribute [comprehensive legislative updates](#) and voting guides for [local](#), [state](#), and [national](#) elections, all of which are freely available online on the [NRA-ILA Stand and Fight California! Webpage](#) and www.carpa.org.*

FIREARMS LITIGATION REPORT



NRA/CRPA California and 9th Circuit Litigation Matters

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
<p>Challenge to California's "assault weapon" restrictions.</p>	<p>Rupp v. Becerra</p>	<p>The case was filed on April 24, 2017, in response to Senate Bill 880 and Assembly Bill 1135. It challenges California's entire "assault weapon" ban as violating the Second Amendment and Due Process and Takings clauses of the U.S. Constitution. Plaintiffs filed a preliminary injunction motion to prevent the State from requiring individuals to provide the date they acquired their firearms and the name and address of the person from whom they acquired them, as a condition of registration.</p>	<p>A decision on Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction is currently pending. Plaintiffs will soon be conducting discovery and will either file a motion for summary judgment or proceed to trial.</p>
<p>Challenge to California's ban on standard capacity magazines</p>	<p>Duncan v. Becerra</p>	<p>The case was filed on May 17, 2017, in response to Senate Bill 1446 and Proposition 63. It challenges California's current restrictions on magazine capacity. On June 29, the court granted CRPA's motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed enforcement of the magazine possession ban while the case is litigated, which was set to take effect on July 1.</p>	<p>On July 27, the California Attorney General appealed the court's decision to issue an injunction to the Ninth Circuit. Appellate briefing is underway. Meanwhile, the case is progressing on the merits in the district court.</p>
<p>Challenge to DOJ's recently enacted "assault weapon" registration regulations</p>	<p>Villanueva v. Becerra</p>	<p>The case was filed on September 8, 2017, in response to California DOJ adopting regulations concerning newly classified "assault weapons" under SB 880 and AB 1135. It challenges the regulations as violating California's Administrative Procedures Act because they were enacted without appropriate legislative authority and without any input from members of the public.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs filed a motion seeking a preliminary injunction to prevent the illegal regulations from being enforced while the lawsuit is pending. The State has filed a motion to dismiss the case, which plaintiffs are also opposing.</p>

NRA/CRPA California and 9th Circuit Litigation Matters

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
<p>Challenge to CA and Los Angeles Firearm Carry Restrictions that Prohibit Both Open and Concealed Carry</p>	<p><u>Flanagan v. Becerra</u> (Formerly <u>Flanagan v. Harris</u>)</p>	<p>The case was filed on August 17, 2016, as a direct response to <u>Peruta</u>. It seeks to force the court to decide whether it is willing to uphold a complete prohibition on the right of law-abiding citizens to carry a firearm for self-defense. The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment, which were argued on November 6, 2017. The court took the matter under submission and will be issuing a ruling any day.</p>	<p>Depending on the court's ruling on the cross motions for summary judgment, the next step is either a trial or an appeal to the Ninth Circuit.</p>
<p>Challenge to California DOJ's misuse of the DROS Fee</p>	<p><u>Bauer v. Becerra</u> (Formerly <u>Bauer v. Harris</u>)</p>	<p>In March 2015, the district court issued an opinion upholding California's use of DROS fees to fund APPS and other law enforcement activities. On June 1, 2017, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court opinion. And on July 12, it denied Plaintiffs' request for an "en banc" hearing. On November 9, 2017, Plaintiffs' filed a petition for review to the U.S. Supreme Court.</p>	<p>Wait to see if Supreme Court accepts review.</p>
<p>Challenges DOJ's Use of DROS surplus to fund APPS as an Illegal Tax</p>	<p><u>Gentry v. Becerra</u> (Formerly <u>Gentry v. Harris</u>)</p>	<p>Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint alleging that the DROS fee is an invalid tax. On August 9, 2017, the district court issued a ruling granting Plaintiffs' request to prohibit DOJ from using DROS fees to fund unrelated law enforcement efforts and requiring DOJ to perform its statutorily required review of the current \$19 fee to determine whether it is "no more than necessary to fund" DOJ's costs for processing DROS transactions.</p>	<p>Discovery is ongoing and a bench trial on Plaintiffs' remaining claims has been set for March 16, 2018.</p>
<p>Challenge to CA DOJ's underground regulations regarding the FSC Program</p>	<p><u>Belemjian v. Becerra</u> (Formerly <u>Belemjian v. Harris</u>)</p>	<p>This case forced DOJ to comply with the process for enacting regulations, which it sought to avoid when implementing the FSC program in February 2015. Plaintiffs appealed the lower court's denial of their request for attorneys' fees.</p>	<p>Briefing concerning attorneys' fees has been completed. Oral arguments are expected to be scheduled any day now.</p>

NRA/CRPA California and 9th Circuit Litigation Matters

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
<p>Vagueness challenge to (AB 962's "handgun ammunition" sales registration requirement and mail order ban</p>	<p>Parker v. California</p>	<p>In December 2016, because of Prop 63, the California Supreme Court dismissed its review of a Court of Appeal opinion affirming the trial court's order striking down AB 962. The Court of Appeal's decision is now the final opinion in the case, and Plaintiffs are seeking their attorneys' fees against the State.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs' motion for appellate attorneys' fees was heard on September 14, 2017. Separate litigation is being prepared to challenge the ammunition restrictions in Proposition 63.</p>
<p>Challenge to California's recently enacted ammunition sale restrictions</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA attorneys are in the final stages of preparing a lawsuit challenging California's recently enacted ammunition sales restrictions created by Proposition 63 and Senate Bill 1235.</p>	<p>Make sure you are subscribed to NRA and CRPA email alerts to stay informed on this and other important Second Amendment lawsuits.</p>

In addition to the previously mentioned cases, NRA and CRPA regularly provide consulting advice and prepare amicus curiae or “friend of the court” briefs in a number of other firearm related cases. NRA and CRPA have supported or will be supporting the following cases.

California and 9th Circuit Amicus and Consulting Support

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What’s Next
FFL Zoning Restrictions	<u>Teixeira v. Alameda County</u>	On October 10, 2017, an 11-judge “en banc” panel of the 9th Circuit issued an opinion which held that the Second Amendment does not protect a right to sell firearms, and that as a result, Alameda County’s ordinance does not unconstitutionally burden the right to keep and bear arms. Plaintiffs filed a petition for review in the United States Supreme Court on January 8, 2018.	Wait to see if Supreme Court accepts review.
California Handgun Roster	<u>Pena v. Lindley</u>	The federal district court upheld the Roster in 2015. Plaintiffs appealed, and oral arguments were held on March 16, 2017. NRA and CRPA filed <u>an amicus brief</u> in the case on July 27, 2015.	Awaiting a decision from the 9th Circuit.
10-Day Wait as applied to current firearm owners	<u>Silvester v. Harris</u>	In December 2016, the 9th Circuit issued its decision upholding the 10-day wait as applied to current gun owners. Chief Judge Sydney Thomas went even further and stated that the restriction is “presumptively lawful” and therefore falls “outside the scope of the Second Amendment.” Plaintiffs have petitioned the United States Supreme Court for review.	Wait to see if Supreme Court accepts review.
1st Amendment challenge to handgun ad prohibition	<u>Tracy Rifle and Pistol v. Becerra</u> (Formerly <u>Tracy Rifle and Pistol v. Harris</u>)	In July 2015, the district court denied a request to prohibit enforcement while the case proceeds. That decision was appealed, and in February 2016 the 9th Circuit upheld the lower court’s order within two weeks of oral arguments. Cross-motions for summary judgment have been filed in the district court.	Awaiting a decision from the District Court on the cross-motions for summary judgment.

California and 9th Circuit Amicus and Consulting Support

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
FFL zoning ordinance	<u>NSSF v. Pleasant Hill</u>	The case has been settled.	The City has agreed to pay NSSF over \$400,000 in legal fees.
Challenges DOJ regulation barring sale of more than one handgun in 30 days to COE holders	<u>Doe v. Becerra</u> (Formerly <u>Doe v. Harris</u>)	The California trial court upheld DOJ's regulation and the plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the California Court of Appeals.	The case has been fully briefed and will soon be scheduled for oral arguments.
Challenge to ban on possession and carriage of firearms on recreational Army Corps' lands	<u>Nesbitt v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineer</u>	At the request of both parties, oral arguments have been cancelled, and the case has been referred to the 9th Circuit's mediation program.	The Army Corps of Engineers is reconsidering its firearms policy, and will work with plaintiffs to settle the matter outside of court.
State Court challenge to California's micro-stamping requirements	<u>NSSF v. California</u>	On December 1, the California Court of Appeals issued a ruling in favor of NSSF, allowing the lawsuit to proceed in the lower court. But on March 22, 2017, the California Supreme Court agreed to rehear the case following a petition from the State of California.	The case has been fully briefed and will soon be scheduled for oral arguments before the California Supreme Court.

NRA and CRPA also litigate and provide assistance in a number of critical Second Amendment cases across the country that could set precedent for future challenges to California gun laws. The following are some of the more recent and significant examples of these cases.

National Cases with California Interest

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
<p style="text-align: center;">Challenges Maryland's ban on "assault weapons" and 10+ round magazines</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Kolbe v. Hogan</u></p>	<p>On February 21, 2017, an "en banc" panel of the 4th Circuit issued an opinion upholding Maryland's ban that referred to America's most popular types of rifles as "exceptionally lethal weapons of war." Plaintiffs petitioned the United States Supreme Court for review, but that petition was denied on November 27, 2017.</p>	<p>Although the "en banc" decision is now final, other lawsuits challenging similar restrictions (such as <u>Rupp</u>) are currently pending, and will provide another opportunity for the Supreme Court hear an "assault weapon" lawsuit.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Challenges Washington D.C.'s "good reason" requirement for the issuance of a CCW permit</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Grace v. District of Columbia</u></p>	<p>On July 25, the D.C. Circuit issued its decision declaring Washington D.C.'s "good reason" requirement for the issuance of a CCW as a violation of the Second Amendment. The Court also issued a permanent injunction prohibiting D.C. from enforcing the requirement.</p> <p>On September 28, the D.C. Circuit denied Washington D.C.'s request for rehearing.</p>	<p>On October 5, 2015, Washington D.C.'s Attorney General decided to not petition the case to the United States Supreme Court. As a result, Washington D.C. is now effectively a "shall-issue" jurisdiction.</p>

LOCAL ORDINANCE PROJECT REPORT



The Local Ordinance Project (LOP) is a joint venture between NRA and CRPA to research and actively monitor all of California’s 58 counties and 482 municipalities to oppose any proposed ordinance, law, or policy that threatens Second Amendment rights. LOP efforts include developing and working with a network of professionals, citizens, local government officials and law enforcement professionals to effectively oppose local threats to California gun owners. Opposition campaigns typically include the preparation of opposition letters or pre-litigation demand letters, grassroots coordination, public information campaigns, and, in some cases, appearances at city council hearings. In many instances, these efforts have prompted local governments to vote down proposals or pull them from consideration. LOP efforts also serve as the foundation for NRA and CRPA litigation efforts against municipalities that enact anti-gun legislation.

Jurisdiction and Issue	Description	LOP Response	Current Status
Statewide Local Elections	LOP works hard to inform California gun owners of political candidate's voting records on Second Amendment Issues.	Continually develop and maintain detailed voting histories of local politicians, including whether they proposed or supported any firearm-related legislation.	Ongoing.
LA City’s Ban on Sales of “Ultracompact” Handguns	For years, the Los Angeles Municipal Code prohibited the sale or transfer of “ultracompact firearms,” even if those firearms were listed on DOJ’s “Roster of Handguns Certified for Sale” in California.	On September 20, 2016, NRA and CRPA attorneys submitted a pre-litigation demand letter highlighting how the ordinance was preempted by state law.	As a result of NRA and CRPA’s pre-litigation demand, the LA City Council voted to repeal the ordinance. As of October 15, 2017, the ordinance has been officially repealed.
San Carlos Moratorium on Firearm Retailers	The City of San Carlos recently proposed and adopted a moratorium on firearm retail businesses as a result of several anti-gun residents complaining of a newly proposed Turner’s Outdoorsman which was set to open in mid-November.	NRA and CRPA alerted members to attend the City Council meeting, and submitted a letter of opposition to the proposed moratorium. But the City Council ultimately approved the temporary moratorium on a 4/5ths vote.	The City voted to extend the moratorium while it considers enacting a more restrictive FFL zoning ordinance.

<p><u>Moraga Locked Storage and FFL Zoning Ordinance</u></p>	<p>The Town Council has listed implementation of a “safe firearm storage” and “home based firearm dealer” ordinance as a proposed goal for 2017.</p>	<p>On November 8, 2017, the Town Council proposed a <u>mandatory locked-storage ordinance</u>. NRA and CRPA <u>alerted members</u> to the proposal, and submitted a <u>letter of opposition</u>.</p>	<p>As a result of NRA and CRPA’s opposition letter, Moraga <u>pulled the proposed ordinance</u> from consideration, but is expected to reconsider the proposal in 2018.</p>
<p><u>Sonoma County CCW Fees</u></p>	<p>In October 2016, Sonoma County Sheriff Steve Freitas sought approval from the County Board of Supervisors to impose a mandatory psychological test for all CCW applicants and raise the associated fee from \$150 to \$550.</p>	<p><u>Submitted opposition letter</u> warning of the proposal’s serious legal problems, such as how state law capped the psychological testing fee at \$150.</p>	<p>In November 2016, the County Board of Supervisors pulled the proposal from consideration and stated it has no plans for re-introduction at this time.</p>
<p><u>Belvedere Handgun Storage Ordinance</u></p>	<p>In September 2016, the City introduced an ordinance requiring all handguns kept at home to be stored in a locked container, providing an exception only for individuals who possessed a valid CCW.</p>	<p><u>Submitted opposition letter</u> warning of the ordinance’s serious legal problems, including state preemption issues.</p>	<p>In October 2016, the City agreed to amend the ordinance to include an exception for all law-abiding citizens when carrying the firearm, regardless of whether or not they possess a valid CCW.</p>
<p><u>El Cerrito CCW Fees</u></p>	<p>Under the City’s “Master Fee Schedule,” residents applying for a CCW must pay a local processing fee of \$961, well in excess of the \$100 statutory maximum for such fees.</p>	<p><u>Submitted pre-litigation demand letter</u> seeking repeal of the City’s excessive application fee.</p>	<p>In November, attorneys for the City agreed that the current fee violates the statutory \$100 cap. As a result, the City will soon introduce a resolution to amend the “Master Fee Schedule” accordingly.</p>
<p><u>San Jose Anti-Gun Ordinance Package</u></p>	<p>In September 2016, Councilmembers Ash Kalra and Raul Peralez introduced an anti-gun package for discussion and referral to the City Council.</p>	<p>On October 17, 2017, the City Council discussed a proposed mandatory locked-storage ordinance. NRA and CRPA <u>alerted members</u> to the proposal, and submitted a <u>letter of opposition</u>.</p>	<p>The City Council ultimately voted 6-5 in favor of adoption, but not before serious questions were raised about the precise language of the ordinance as highlighted by NRA and CRPA’s opposition letter.</p>

Orange County CCW Applications	<p>Many Orange County residents to this day are still confused as to the specific requirements for obtaining a CCW in Orange County.</p>	<p>Prepared a comprehensive guide discussing the entire application process for obtaining a CCW in Orange County, including what is required to satisfy the Sheriff’s “good cause” policy.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are working hard to bring "shall-issue" to California. In the meantime, CRPA will continue to provide gun owners with helpful guides on how they can apply for a CCW in their respective county of residence.</p>
Cupertino Anti-Gun Ordinance Package	<p>On January 12, the Cupertino Public Safety Commission held an open discussion on several proposed anti-gun measures.</p>	<p>Alerted members to attend the Public Safety Commission meeting. Submitted opposition letter informing the Commission of the proposal's serious legal problems not adequately discussed in staff reports.</p>	<p>The Commission ultimately failed to reach a consensus, but the proposal could still come before the City Council at any time.</p>
Buena Ventura FFL Zoning Ordinance	<p>On March 20, the City Council held an open discussion on a proposed ordinance requiring FFLs to install vehicle impact security devices in the form of “bollards” at all entrances to the store.</p>	<p>Alerted members to attend meeting and voice opposition. Submitted a letter of opposition informing the City of the ordinance’s serious legal problems.</p>	<p>The City Council discussed NRA and CRPA’s opposition prior to making its decision, but ultimately voted 6-1 in favor of the ordinance.</p>
<p>Statewide Public Record Requests</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA regularly seek and obtain public records in connection with any anti-gun efforts in California. Such efforts include proposed anti-gun ordinances, gun buyback programs, and other anti-gun regulatory enforcement issues.</p>	<p>Responses to these requests often yield valuable results, such as which members of a local government entity are working with anti-gun groups, sources of funding, and other important information.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>

FIREARMS REGULATORY MATTERS REPORT



Regulatory Counsel efforts involve the continual monitoring of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and local law enforcement interpretations of California firearm laws to protect gun owners and firearm dealers against unwarranted and unlawful regulatory and enforcement actions. Regulatory Counsel efforts include drafting regulatory comment letters, drafting NRA and CRPA member alerts, and providing advice to NRA and CRPA members. Regulatory Counsel also collaborates with overlapping litigation, legislative, and regulatory matters to effectively oppose improper actions and incorrect interpretations of California law by state and local agencies.

Issue	Description	Regulatory Counsel Response	Current Status
CA DOJ's "Bullet-Button Assault Weapon" Regulations July 2017	After several failed attempts, DOJ resubmitted "assault weapon" registration regulations without any substantive changes. OAL ultimately approved those regulations, which are now enforceable.	NRA and CRPA alerted members to the proposed regulations, but before NRA and CRPA attorneys could respond, California's Office of Administrative Law approved the regulations. Prior NRA and CRPA comment letters can be viewed here , here , and here .	NRA and CRPA attorneys filed the Villanueva lawsuit, which challenges the regulations as a violation of California's Administrative Procedures Act. That lawsuit is ongoing.
CA DOJ's Proposed Expansion of "Assault Weapon" Definitions	In November 2017, DOJ submitted proposed regulations expanding the "assault weapon" registration definitions to apply in all circumstances, including enforcement of CA law.	NRA and CRPA attorneys alerted members to the proposed regulation, and submitted a comprehensive opposition letter. A representative for NRA and CRPA also attended the public hearing to voice opposition.	DOJ must issue a Final Statement of Reasons responding to NRA and CRPA's comments, as well as comments from members of the public, before submitting the proposed regulations to OAL for approval.

<p>CA DOJ's Proposed "Ammunition Vendor Licensing" Regulations</p>	<p>In July, DOJ submitted its anticipated regulations for the issuance of ammunition vendor licenses.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA alerted members to the proposal and provided members with information on how to submit comments on the proposal.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA attorneys have submitted a letter of comment on the proposed regulations, and continue to monitor the proposal and provide analysis as DOJ fails to enact necessary regulations.</p>
<p>CA DOJ's Proposed Firearm Safety Device and Handgun Testing Regulations</p>	<p>In January 2018, DOJ proposed a number of regulations regarding the certification of laboratories for handgun and safety device testing, and additional regulations regarding minimum standards for gun safes.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA attorneys are currently reviewing the proposed regulations, and will be submitting a comment letter as necessary.</p>	<p>A public hearing on the proposal is currently scheduled for February 26, 2018, in Sacramento.</p>
<p>Public Record Requests</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA regularly seek and obtain public records from CA DOJ and local law enforcement relating to internal agency policies and interpretations of CA firearm laws.</p>	<p>Recently, responses to these requests provided key financial analysis reports from CA DOJ and other state agencies regarding proposed firearm legislation. These reports were subsequently used in drafting legislative opposition letters and veto requests to the governor.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>
<p>New California Gun Laws</p>	<p>Given California's continually evolving and complex firearm laws, many gun owners, manufacturers, and dealers are often left wondering how best to avoid being prosecuted for otherwise unintentional violations that can result in serious consequences.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA regularly work to provide Californians with up-to-date information on California laws, regulations, and policies regarding firearms to help gun owners avoid prosecution and retain their right to keep and bear arms.</p>	<p>Ongoing. In connection with these efforts, NRA and CRPA continue to produce several webinars on a variety of topics, including the loaning of firearms, the new "assault weapon" laws, the new ammunition sales laws, and the recently adopted "assault weapon" regulations.</p>

<p>Assistance for California Members</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA continually assist members with questions concerning California firearm laws.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA have a variety of resources available to members, including the ability to refer individuals to attorneys specializing in firearm laws.</p>	<p>In connection with these efforts, NRA and CRPA attorneys continue to provide analysis of parts and configurations of firearms, and provide lectures and general advice to members of the public and law enforcement regarding changes in California gun laws.</p>
<p>Implementation of Prop 63</p>	<p>Beginning January 1, 2018, courts will require those convicted of firearm prohibiting offenses to turn in/transfer firearms pursuant to Prop 63.</p>	<p>To better inform the courts and members of the public regarding this process, and in an effort to avoid confusion and inadvertent violations, NRA and CRPA prepared and submitted a letter of comment to the Judicial Council of California.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are continuing to monitor the implementation of Prop 63 in the courts and the problems associated with its requirements.</p>
<p>DOJ Website Errors</p>	<p>In January 2018, new laws regarding firearm warning labels that reference DOJ's website took effect. DOJ's website, however, is woefully out-of-date.</p>	<p>In January, NRA and CRPA attorneys submitted a letter to the Attorney General highlighting the many inaccurate legal statements on DOJ's website and the need for correction.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>
<p>Assistance to Gun Clubs and Youth Groups</p>	<p>California law substantially regulates and restricts the acquisition, transfer, and loan of firearms. Firearm clubs and youth groups are particularly affected by these restrictions</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are currently assisting these groups navigate CA's requirements and advising how best to avoid unintentional violations of CA law.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>
<p>California's Firearm Violence Research Center</p>	<p>California granted \$5 million to create the "California Firearm Violence Research Center." The individual chosen to head this center is a known anti-Second Amendment advocate.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are continuing to monitor the center's activities to ensure taxpayer money is not wasted on biased and unsubstantiated research.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>

HUNTING REGULATORY MATTERS



NRA and CRPA regularly monitor issues impacting hunters in California and continually develop strategies for taking action when necessary before the Legislature, the Fish & Game Commission, local municipalities, and various regulatory agencies. Hunting Regulatory efforts are also dedicated to pushing back against rabidly anti-hunting forces such as the United States Humane Society. Hunting Regulatory efforts seek to improve policies impacting hunters in California to effectively promote and defend the right to hunt in California.

Issue	Agency	Recent Action	Status
Coalition Building & Uniting Hunting Groups to Promote and Protect Hunting Rights	N/A	Prepared two full days of presentations developed by NRA and CRPA to California hunting groups laying out a plan for addressing attacks on hunting rights in California.	The groups unanimously agreed to form a coalition and develop a coordinated system to effectively and efficiently oppose and roll back anti-hunting regulations.
Potential Legal Challenges to Regulations Restricting Hunting Right	Fish & Game Commission , Municipalities, Regulatory Bodies	Prepare memoranda on viability of lawsuits challenging regulations; maintain ongoing list of potential legal challenges.	Ongoing efforts to closely monitor current and potential legal challenges to timely and effectively intervene or file litigation as appropriate.
Monitoring anti-hunting forces	Fish & Game Commission , Municipalities, Regulatory Bodies	Ongoing monitoring of lawsuits and activities of potential interest to hunting related matters in California. Regularly submit public records act requests for documents concerning efforts of anti-hunting groups. Analyze Fish & Game Commission meeting agendas and prepare lobbyists for addressing matters of interest at FGC & WRC meetings.	Ongoing efforts to closely monitor various hunting related issues to allow for timely and effective intervention as necessary.

Increasing Support for Hunting Rights Throughout California	N/A	Developed and distributed computer presentations for distribution by coalition of hunting groups that outline the attacks hunters are facing. Presented to Council to Advance Hunting and Shooting Sports regarding issues in California to garner support.	Ongoing efforts to grow hunting rights coalitions and spread awareness.
Membership Alerts	N/A	Prepare alerts regarding new hunting rules and regulations and advise of NRA and CRPA efforts to promote and defend hunting rights in California.	Ongoing.
Anti-hunting Regulations	Fish & Game Commission	Development of petitions to repeal or amend current regulations that negatively affect hunters and to promote adoption of regulations that benefit hunters.	The petition to allow big game archery hunters to carry side arms has been referred to the Department for possible implementation.
Opposing HSUS Predator Policies	Fish & Game Commission , Municipalities	Ongoing efforts to prepare representatives for attendance at Wildlife Resource Committee hearings on predators. Presented at coyote management symposium regarding negative impacts of HSUS on predator management policies. Drafted manuscript explaining HSUS lies for publication in predator management circles. Grassroots organization to mobilize and direct local residents of cities with HSUS coyote policies.	Ongoing efforts to challenge HSUS regarding non-lethal coyote policies in cities where pets and family members are being attacked. Working to broaden coalition of individuals opposed to HSUS policies in light of dangers to typical family households while informing industry members of predator management about opportunities to oppose.

RANGE MATTERS REPORT



Ongoing monitoring of legal issues and counsel assistance efforts for environmental, land use, design and safety litigation and representation nationwide involving shooting ranges/areas. Regularly perform range evaluations and meet with Club Board of Directors on behalf of NRA and CRPA to strategize and assist with coordination of defense campaigns against NIMBY, environmental NGOs, agency and/or municipality matters.

Issue	Recent Action	Status
Stormwater runoff	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Region 5R has been inspecting all shooting ranges in the region requiring sampling for potential lead contamination in stormwater runoff, utilizing drinking water standards. This has the potential to set extremely bad precedent for regulating ranges for stormwater runoff (using drinking water standards) and may potentially shut down numerous ranges.	Ongoing efforts to assist ranges and engage the RWQCB Region 5R representatives to contest the validity of RWQCB’s actions. Working to prevent RWQCB from using the drinking water standards (0.010 mg/L for lead) and invoke the proper stormwater standards (0.262 mg/L), if not stopping RWQCB’s actions entirely.
Non-conforming “Use Status” and “Use Intensification”	Counties are attempting to break shooting ranges’ grandfathering as a non-conforming use under County Ordinance. Once the grandfathered status of a range is broken through a use intensification argument or a subsequent County Ordinance requiring a Conditional Use Permit under the guise of health and safety concerns, compliance with current County Ordinance is effectively impossible and range closure is certain.	Ongoing efforts to assist ranges in defending their grandfathered status is crucial in keeping these ranges open and operating.