



CALIFORNIA LEGAL AFFAIRS

October 2018

Prepared by:



This report provides an overview of just some of the efforts being taken 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, there are many other tremendous and equally important endeavors throughout California and across the nation.

Protecting the Second Amendment requires an enormous amount of resources and involvement in 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

LITIGATION REPORT3
LOCAL ADVOCACY PROJECT.....7
REGULATORY MATTERS.....11
HUNTING REGULATIONS15
RANGE MATTERS17

California and 9th Circuit Litigation Matters

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
Challenge to California's Ammunition Sales Restrictions	Rhode v. Becerra	The case was filed on April 26, 2018, in response to Proposition 63 and Senate Bill 1235's restrictions regarding the sale and transfer of ammunition in California. The lawsuit challenges these restrictions as a violation of the Second Amendment, Commerce Clause, and Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution, as well as a violation of the Firearm Owner's Protection Act.	Plaintiffs have filed an amended complaint, to which the State has filed a motion to dismiss. If the motion is denied, the case will soon proceed to the discovery phase of litigation.
Challenge to California's "assault weapon" restrictions.	Rupp v. Becerra	The case was filed on April 24, 2017, in response to SB 880 and AB 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, but that motion was denied on May 9, 2018.	The case is currently in the discovery phase of litigation.
Challenge to California's ban on standard capacity magazines	Duncan v. Becerra	The case was filed in response to SB 1446 and Prop 63. It challenges California's ban on the acquisition and possession of magazines over ten rounds. On June 29, the district court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, halting enforcement of the newly enacted possession ban while the case is litigated. The State immediately appealed the injunction order. In July 2018, the Ninth circuit upheld the issuance of the injunction.	The case is currently pending a ruling on plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, which was argued in May 2018. If summary judgment is granted, the injunction will become permanent, but the State is likely to appeal.

California and 9th Circuit Litigation Matters

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
<p>Challenge to DOJ's recently enacted "assault weapon" registration regulations</p>	<p><u>Villanueva v. Becerra</u></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 under California's Administrative Procedure Act because they were enacted without legislative authority and without any input from members of the public.</p>	<p>On May 30, 2018, the court issued <u>an order</u> upholding the regulations as valid. Plaintiffs have filed an appeal in California's 5th District Court of Appeal.</p>
<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. In May 2018, the court issued <u>a decision</u> granting Defendant's motion for summary judgment.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs have filed an appeal in the Ninth Circuit.</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>A final trial in this case is currently scheduled for January 18, 2019.</p>
<p>Vagueness challenge to (AB 962's "handgun ammunition" sales registration requirement and mail order ban</p>	<p><u>Parker v. California</u></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, and plaintiffs are seeking their attorneys' fees against the State.</p>	<p>The trial court partially granted plaintiffs' motion for attorneys' fees for work in the trial court. As a result, the parties are currently negotiating a total fee award.</p>

NRA and CRPA also provide consulting advice and prepare amicus curiae or “friend of the court” briefs in firearm and Second Amendment related cases.

California and 9th Circuit Amicus or Consulting Support

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What’s Next
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. On August 3, 2018, the Ninth Circuit upheld the Roster.	Plaintiffs have requested additional time to file a petition with the United States Supreme Court to rehear the case, which is currently due December 31, 2018.
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.
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.
State Court challenge to California’s micro-stamping requirements	<u>NSSF v. California</u>	In December 2016, the California Court of Appeal issued a ruling in favor of NSSF, allowing the lawsuit to proceed in the lower court. But in June 2018, the California Supreme Court <u>reversed</u> , upholding the trial court’s judgment in favor of the State.	NSSF in July 2018 <u>petitioned</u> the California Supreme Court to rehear the case. A decision on that petition is currently pending.

NRA and CRPA also litigate and assist in critical Second Amendment cases across the country that could set precedent for future challenges to California gun laws.

National Cases with California Interest

Issue	Case Name	Case Status	What's Next
<p>Challenges Maryland's ban on "assault weapons" and 10+ round magazines</p>	<p>Kolbe v. Hogan</p>	<p>On February 21, 2017, an <i>en banc</i> 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 <i>en banc</i> decision is now final, other lawsuits challenging similar restrictions (such as Rupp) are currently pending and will provide another opportunity for the Supreme Court hear an "assault weapon" lawsuit.</p>
<p>Challenges Washington D.C.'s "good reason" requirement for the issuance of a CCW permit</p>	<p>Grace v. District of Columbia</p>	<p>On July 25, 2017, the D.C. Circuit declared Washington D.C.'s "good reason" requirement for the issuance of a CCW was 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 ADVOCACY PROJECT

The Local Advocacy Project actively monitors all of California’s 58 counties and 482 municipalities to support or oppose any proposed ordinance, law, or policy likely to impact Second Amendment rights. Local 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. These efforts also serve as the foundation for litigation efforts against municipalities that enact anti-gun-owner legislation.

Jurisdiction and Issue	Description	LOP Response	Status
Arcata City Council Mandatory Lock Storage and Reporting	In May 2018, the Arcata City Council considered new ordinance for gun safety which include mandatory lock storage and reporting of lost and stolen firearms.	NRA and CRPA drafted responses in opposition to the ordinance based on constitutional issues and an inability of law enforcement to enforce these types of laws.	There was no action for several months and on September 18 th the Council voted to adopt the new ordinance .
Santa Clara County Bans Gun Shows	In March 2018, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors directed County Counsel to draft an ordinance prohibiting gun shows on county-owned property. In May 2018 the Board proposed an ordinance on the agenda .	NRA and CRPA alerted members to the proposal. County Board of Supervisors is set to consider ordinance at June 5 th meeting. Adopted Ordinance No. NS-624.8-Regulation of Firearms and Ammunition on County Property .	NRA and CRPA are monitoring county agenda and further action.
Healdsburg FFL Zoning Ordinance	In March 2018, the Healdsburg Planning Commission held a public discussion regarding a comprehensive FFL zoning ordinance for the city.	NRA and CRPA alerted members to the proposed zoning ordinance. July 23, 2018 there was no action on agenda. Next meeting August 6, 2018.	NRA and CRPA are monitoring City Council agendas for any updates.
Del Mar Fairgrounds Moratorium on Gun Shows	For months the Del Mar gun show has been under siege from groups seeking to end the show. On September 11, 2018 the Del Mar Fair Board of Directors voted to institute an up to one year moratorium on gun shows beginning in 2019 while they “study the safety” of the gun show.	NRA and CRPA called on members and Second Amendment supporters to attend and have your voices heard. They wrote letters and provided testimony regarding the safe and lawful activity of the gun show for over 30 years.	With the passage of the moratorium, NRA, CRPA, and other groups are looking to challenge this unconstitutional attack on your rights.

<p>Ventura County Fair Board Considers Gun Shows</p>	<p>In May the Ventura County Fair Board considered contracts for upcoming gun shows in 2018 and 2018. They approved the remaining 2018 shows to move forward. At the September 25, 2018 Board meeting, in a room of more than 100 gun show supporters, they considered the future of gun shows at the Ventura Fair facility.</p>	<p>This is a concerted effort by anti-gun groups to end gun shows in California. They are working with the national groups to make a statement that “we just don’t need” gun shows. NRA and CRPA are fighting against these groups and the false narrative. Over 100 members and supporters of the Second Amendment flooded the Board room and provided testimony and written comments to the Board.</p>	<p>The Board set up an ad hoc committee of two members to look at the safety issues with gun shows even though there are none at the Ventura guns show. They will report back at their October Board meeting and consider further action. Contact the Board members and CEO and tell them you support keeping the gun show in Ventura.</p>
<p>Cow Palace Gun Shows</p>	<p>At the state level the California Legislature passed a bill that would ban gun shows at the Cow Palace state venue as part of the concerted effort by opposition groups.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA have drafted letters to Legislators and letters of opposition to the Governor encouraging a veto of such an ill-conceived piece of legislation that violates constitutional rights.</p>	<p>As of the date of the of this publication, the legislation still awaits action by Governor Brown.</p>
<p>El Cerrito CCW Fees</p>	<p>Under El Cerrito’s “Master Fee Schedule,” residents applying for a CCW must pay a local processing fee of \$961, greatly exceeding the \$100 statutory maximum for such fees.</p>	<p>Submitted pre-litigation demand letter seeking repeal of the city’s excessive application fee.</p>	<p>In November, attorneys for El Cerrito agreed with the NRA and CRPA that the current fee violates the statutory \$100 cap. On the April 17, 2018 meeting agenda the fee was adjusted to \$100.</p>
<p>San Jose Anti-Gun Ordinance Package</p>	<p>In September 2016, San Jose 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 San Jose City Council discussed a proposed mandatory locked-storage ordinance. NRA and CRPA alerted members to the proposal and submitted a letter of opposition.</p>	<p>The city council 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>

<p>Orange County CCW Applications</p>	<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>
<p>Cupertino Anti-Gun Ordinance Package</p>	<p>In January 2017, 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 Cupertino City Council at any time.</p>
<p>Orange County Fair Grounds</p>	<p>For months the Orange County Fair Board has considered the future of gun shows at the venue.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA alerted members to attend meeting and voice opposition. Submitted letters of opposition informing the Fair Board of the serious legal issues with discriminating against a segment of the population just because some do not like the legal activity.</p>	<p>The Orange County Fair Board has agreed to move forward with gun shows at the venue at this time. NRA and CRPA will continue to monitor.</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>
<p>City of Morgan Hill</p>	<p>City of Morgan Hill-recommend to draft ordinances on duty to report theft or lost firearms, safe storage ordinance while in home, prohibit possession of LCM, require permit to conduct retail sales</p>	<p>CRPA and NRA Attorneys submitted a letter in advance of actual ordinance language being introduced to inform city of the problems with the proposal. August 2018 there was no action on agenda. Next meeting is October 3, 2018.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are continuing to monitor.</p>

<p>City of Milpitas</p>	<p>Holding a safety summit for the community on June 2nd as a spin off from the one held by Santa Clara County.</p>	<p>Monitoring. June 19, 2018 meeting received a report on the safety summit which focused on mental health, safety in places of worship, firearms, and safety in the workplace.</p>	<p>Next meeting is August 7, 2018 and August 21, 2018.</p>
<p>City of Sunnyvale Age Restrictions on Purchasing a Firearm</p>	<p>In August 2018 the City of Sunnyvale passed an ordinance to prohibit anyone under the age of 21 from purchasing a semi-automatic firearm.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are monitoring the situation and reviewing the actions of the City Council as a possible violation of state law.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are monitoring.</p>
<p>County of Humboldt Shutting Down Public Lands for Shooting</p>	<p>In June a proposal from the County Sheriff was brought to the Board of Supervisors to consider shutting down access to shooting lands in a riverbed in the County.</p>	<p>CRPA drafted comments in opposition to shutting down access to these lands. At the July 24, 2018 meeting the ordinance was passed on second reading and has since been enacted.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA are monitoring.</p>
<p>City of Saratoga</p>	<p>Possible mandatory lock storage ordinance. Video of June 20th council meeting with comments from supporters and council members here. At the Jun meeting the Council approved the ordinance for a second reading at the next meeting.</p>	<p>CRPA and NRA submitted a letter to the City Council regarding the constitutional concerns with the proposed ordinance and the blatant errors by the City Attorney in certain advice and counsel provided to the City Council. Follow up letters were sent to the city.</p>	<p>The Council’s website states that they are currently re-considering the ordinance. As of the September 19, 2018 there is no action on the agenda. NRA and CRPA will continue to monitor.</p>

REGULATORY MATTERS

Regulatory Counsel efforts include 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 member alerts, and providing advice to gun owners. Regulatory Counsel opposes improper actions and incorrect interpretations of California law by state and local agencies.

Issue	Description	Regulatory Counsel Response	Status
<u>CA DOJ's "Bullet-Button Assault Weapon" Regulations July 2017</u>	<p>After several failed attempts, DOJ resubmitted "assault weapon" registration regulations without any substantive changes. OAL ultimately approved those regulations, which are now enforceable.</p>	<p><u>Alerted members</u> 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 <u>here</u>, <u>here</u>, and <u>here</u>.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA attorneys filed the <u>Villanueva</u> lawsuit, which challenges the regulations as a violation of California's Administrative Procedure Act. That lawsuit is ongoing.</p>
<u>CA DOJ's Rejected Expansion of "Assault Weapon" Definitions</u>	<p>In November 2017, DOJ submitted proposed regulations expanding the "assault weapon" registration definitions to apply in all circumstances, including enforcement of CA law.</p>	<p><u>Alerted members</u> to the proposed regulation and submitted a comprehensive opposition letter. A representative for NRA and CRPA also attended the public hearing to voice opposition.</p>	<p>Following <u>opposition</u> from NRA and CRPA attorneys, DOJ voluntarily withdrew their proposal. As a result, there are currently no regulations defining terms used to identify "assault weapons" that can be used for enforcement of California law.</p>
<u>CA DOJ's "Ammunition Vendor Licensing" Regulations</u>	<p>In July 2017, DOJ submitted its anticipated regulations for the issuance of ammunition vendor licenses.</p>	<p><u>Alerted members</u> to the proposal and provided members with information on how to submit comments on the proposal. NRA and CRPA also submitted a <u>letter of comment</u>.</p>	<p>These regulations have now been adopted and are currently being enforced. Additional regulations regarding the background check requirements have yet to be introduced.</p>

<p><u>CA DOJ's Proposed Firearm Safety Device and Handgun Testing Regulations</u></p>	<p>In January 2018, DOJ proposed several regulations regarding the certification of laboratories for handgun and safety device testing, and additional regulations regarding minimum standards for gun safes.</p>	<p><u>Submitted a letter of comment</u> during the public hearing in early March 2018.</p>	<p>In July 2018, DOJ <u>notified the public</u> of proposed modifications to the regulations, opening up a second public comment period. DOJ must still issue a Final Statement of Reasons before submitting the proposed regulations to OAL for approval.</p>
<p><u>CA DOJ's "Ghost Gun" Regulations</u></p>	<p>In January 2018, DOJ officially <u>proposed its anticipated regulations</u> regarding the serialization of home-built firearms pursuant to AB 857.</p>	<p><u>Alerted members</u> to the proposal and <u>submitted a letter of comment</u> during the public hearing in late March 2018. NRA and CRPA attorneys also hosted <u>a webinar</u> for gun owners on the new requirements in late June 2018.</p>	<p>The regulations are now final and are currently being enforced.</p>
<p><u>CA DOJ Proposed Certificate of Eligibility (COE) Regulations</u></p>	<p>In March 2018, DOJ <u>proposed a comprehensive set of regulatory changes</u> to the initial and renewal application process for COE, which are now required for all employees of California licensed firearm dealers.</p>	<p>Submitted a <u>letter of comment</u> during the public hearing in April 2018.</p>	<p>In July 2018, DOJ <u>notified the public</u> of proposed modifications to the regulations, opening up a second public comment period. DOJ must still issue a Final Statement of Reasons before submitting the proposed regulations to OAL for approval.</p>
<p><u>CA DOJ Proposed Dealer Record of Sale (DROS) Entry System Regulations</u></p>	<p>In March 2018, DOJ <u>proposed regulatory changes</u> to the process for transferring a firearm through DOJ's DROS Entry System.</p>	<p>Submitted a <u>letter of comment</u> during the public hearing in May 2018.</p>	<p>Awaiting further action by DOJ, who must still issue a Final Statement of Reasons before submitting the proposed regulations to OAL for approval.</p>

<p>Use of Non-REAL IDs for Firearm Purchases</p>	<p>In January 2018, the California DMV began issuing REAL IDs. But because non-REAL IDs have “FEDERAL LIMITS APPLY” language, ATF and DOJ determined they could not be used to purchase a firearm.</p>	<p>NRA and CRPA attorneys initially alerted members to the issue, and have since worked with ATF, DMV, and CA DOJ on a solution.</p>	<p>In March 2018, ATF officially revised its policy to allow California residents with non-REAL IDs to purchase firearms.</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 provide California gun owners with up-to-date information on laws, regulations, and policies regarding firearms to help them 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 webinars on a variety of topics, including the loaning of firearms, “assault weapon” laws, ammunition sales laws, and the recently adopted “assault weapon” regulations.</p>
<p>Assistance for California Members</p>	<p>NRA and CPRA 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>Ongoing. In connection with these efforts, NRA and CRPA attorneys provide analysis of parts and configurations of firearms, and they provide lectures and general advice to members of the public and law enforcement regarding changes in California gun laws.</p>

Implementation of Prop 63	Beginning January 1, 2018, courts will require those convicted of firearm prohibiting offenses to turn in/transfer firearms pursuant to Prop 63.	To better inform the courts and members of the public regarding this process, and to avoid confusion and inadvertent violations, NRA and CRPA prepared and submitted a letter of comment to the Judicial Council of California.	Continuing to monitor the implementation of Prop 63 in the courts and the problems associated with its requirements.
DOJ Website Errors	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.	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.	Ongoing.
Assistance to Gun Clubs and Youth Groups	California law substantially regulates and restricts the acquisition, transfer, and loan of firearms. Firearm clubs and youth groups are particularly affected by these restrictions	Currently assisting these groups navigate CA's requirements and advising how best to avoid unintentional violations of CA law.	Ongoing.
California's Firearm Violence Research Center	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.	Continuing to monitor the center's activities to ensure taxpayer money is not wasted on biased and unsubstantiated research.	Ongoing.

HUNTING REGULATIONS

Issues affecting California hunters require regular monitoring and action before the legislature, the Fish & Game Commission, local municipalities, and various regulatory agencies. These efforts push back against extremist anti-hunting advocacy groups such as Project Coyote and the Humane Society of the United States (as opposed to local humane societies).

Issue	Agency	Recent Action	Status
Coalition Building & Uniting Hunting Groups to Promote and Protect Hunting Rights	N/A	Developed two full days of presentations for 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	Prepared 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 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	Submitted petitions to allow archery hunters to carry side arms for self-defense.	The Commission has granted the petition and is expected to repeal the existing regulation prohibiting archery hunters from carrying sidearms with a valid CCW.
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 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 considering dangers to typical family households while informing industry members of predator management about opportunities to oppose.
Hunting Related Legislation	California Legislature and Governor's Office	Assist in developing pro-hunting legislation to preserve and promote the hunting sports in California, while also assisting in efforts to oppose anti-hunting measures.	In 2018, Governor Brown signed AB 2151 into law, thereby reducing the costs of hunting for California's youth. Governor Brown also vetoed SB 1487, an underhanded attempt to restrict African hunting by California residents.

RANGE MATTERS

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 to assist and coordinate responses to campaigns to close ranges brought by NIMBYs, environmental NGOs, agencies and/or municipalities.

Issue	Recent Action	Status
Storm-water runoff	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has been inspecting shooting ranges and requiring sampling for potential lead contamination in storm-water runoff, utilizing drinking water standards. This has the potential to set inappropriate precedent for regulating ranges for storm-water runoff.	Ongoing efforts to assist ranges and engage the RWQCB to contest the validity of RWQCB's actions.
Non-conforming "Use Status" and "Use Intensification"	Counties are attempting to break shooting ranges' grandfathering as a non-conforming use under county ordinances. Once the grandfathered status of a range is broken through a use intensification argument or a subsequent local law requiring a Conditional Use Permit under the guise of health and safety concerns, compliance with current local laws is effectively impossible.	Ongoing efforts to assist ranges in defending their grandfathered status is crucial in keeping these ranges open and operating.