



Meeting Agenda

October 24, 2023

Opening

Pledge of Allegiance

Chapter Officers Present:

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Committee Reports

Legislation Committee

CRPA is actively involved in this election campaign Known as Restore California 2024. We need volunteers.

- 1.Myth vs Fact. No group has actually been tracking the totality of the state's elections.**
- 2.The reason is in 2024 primary there are over 3550 open seats statewide.**
- 3.The average of 4.5 people running for each position means there are 14-16K candidates.**
- 4.No non-profit has a staff of over 1k people to accomplish this task.**
- 5.This is why Chapters are critical**
- 6.Staff is tracking the Federal (congressional) and state (Senate/Assembly races)**

7.The candidate questionnaire has been sent to all known candidates at the Federal/State Level.

8.Grading is done on the basis of the candidate questionnaire responses and voting records if an incumbent or previously held office.

9.Grades are not endorsements as that is done through the CRPA PAC by law.

UPDATE: I have sent a letter to the County council asking him to take action and stop, withdraw or repeal this ordinance before the second reading.

(See letter to Letter to Thomas L. Geiger County Counsel attachment last month's agenda) **He did not respond.**

How to Find Your California Representative

Go to <https://findyourrep.legislature.ca.gov/> and Enter your California address and click the locate button to find your State Senate and Assembly representatives.

Litigation Committee

More 9th Circuit Shenanigans.

CRPA President & General Counsel Chuck Michel checks in to discuss the case of [Baird v. Bonta](#), a challenge to California's laws relating to open carry. While the case is not led by CRPA, it does point up the ongoing battle over the methodology courts should use in applying the Bruen standard.

Duncan, Rhode, Miller and many other pending cases provide an opportunity for judges (or panels of judges) to clarify that methodology in a manner consistent with the Bruen decision. Progressive judges, however, seek to weaken Bruen by purposefully misconstruing the most basic elements of the decision.

"The first step in applying *Bruen* is determining whether the text of the Second Amendment covers the conduct being restricted," explains Michel. "In most of these cases it clearly does. To 'keep' means to 'possess', and 'bear' means to carry. From there, courts need to look for historical analogs to assess whether the Founding Fathers would have tolerated the kind of restriction being challenged."

Still, [as noted in the video](#), judges have made nonsensical claims such as declaring that magazines are not 'arms' and, therefore, are not even covered by the Second Amendment (and, hence, *Bruen*) in the first place.

In short, the methodology is the key battle nationwide right now.

SB2 – UPDATE: CCW Sensitive Places <https://crpa.org/news/blogs/sb-2-becomes-law-crpa-allies-already-challenging-it/>

Governor Gavin Newsom signed into law [SB 2 \(Portantino\)](#), a bill designed to make CCW's more difficult to obtain and virtually impossible to actually put in practice. As we noted in our recent alerts about the bill, CRPA has already pushed back on this vindictive legislative response to the *Bruen* decision.

The new law represents a blatant end run around *Bruen* by synthesizing a new approach to the now explicitly unconstitutional "good cause" requirement. It also declares huge swaths of the state as "sensitive places" where concealed carry would be outlawed, an approach called out directly by the *Bruen* majority opinion. The net effect is what anti-2A lawmakers intend: disarm the lawful.

As noted in our [coverage of the Governor's press conference earlier this week](#), CRPA didn't even let the Governor sign SB 2 before we took action to repeal it. Friday, [CRPA filed its motion for a preliminary injunction to stop the law from ever taking effect](#). (See "Sensitive Places" Alert attachment)

CRPA UPDATE: [Rhode v. Bonta](#) Still in progress no decision yet!

CRPA shares the frustration of our members and gun owners generally that no final rulings have yet to be issued in these cases. Judge Benitez (Fed District Court Judge in San Diego) has 4 2A cases. The State is also arguing whether CRPA has standing specifically regarding the ammunition purchase background check put in effect by Gavin Newsom's Prop 63. We are asking all members for help. To make sure we don't get sidetracked on this legal issue, **CRPA needs declarations from members and supporters evidencing any problems you have recently faced when trying to buy ammunition.** it is important that you reach out to CRPA's lawyers if you have a story of hardship under California's ammunition sales laws. Contact Attorney Kostas Moros at kmoros@michellawyers.com right away to share your story!

CRPA's UPDATE: [Boland v. Bonta](#) case

Misnamed the "Unsafe Handgun Act." (UHA) This law created the loathed "roster".... Supporters of CRPA's lawsuit filed amicus briefs in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal. The briefs are impressive, and the groups filing these briefs include most of California's law enforcement groups, national police groups, state associations, national associations, and even BioFire, the company now offering a "smart gun" in some markets. Most significantly, a brief supporting CRPA was filed by TWENTY-FOUR STATES that respect the Second Amendment!

CRPA's UPDATE: [Duncan v. Bonta](#) case

Hugh Win! But appealed

California gun owners got great news today when [Judge Roger Benitez announced he is upholding CRPA's challenge to the state's restrictions on standard-capacity magazines](#). CRPA and others have been fighting this ban since 2017, showing that "slow and steady" can indeed win the race.

Last week's [announcement of the decision in *Duncan v. Bonta*](#) represented a significant win for the 2A community, demonstrating an [appropriate and crystal-clear interpretation of the *Bruen* decision](#). Sure, the state has [already expressed its intent to appeal](#), but for a case that was remanded back to the Ninth Circuit in the wake of *Bruen*, it is important to see the new standard affirmed.

The disarmament movement won't just go away. Time and again, they simply double down, as [Governor Newsom did last week](#). Following the Constitution is now considered "radical". Statistics needn't have even a remote relationship to the truth. They want your guns...pure and simple.

[Richards v. Bonta. Firearms Policy Coalition, Inc. \(FPC\)](#)- UPDATE: challenging the state's 10-day waiting [period](#) for firearm purchases on Second Amendment grounds. Still in progress no decision yet!

The lawsuit was filed in U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California [federal lawsuit](#). SAF is joined by the North County Shooting Center, San Diego County Gun Owners PAC, California Gun Rights Foundation, Firearms Policy Coalition, (See challenging the state's 10-day waiting period alert attachment)

[Miller v. Bonta](#)

Hugh Win! [Firearms Policy Coalition, Inc. \(FPC\)](#)- Challenge to California's ban on so-called "assault weapons"

California's Assault Weapons Ban STRUCK DOWN. For the second time, a federal judge overturns California's assault weapon ban. [Decision](#)

Appealed on 10/19/2023 by the state. [Notice of Appeal](#)

Social Media and Website Committee

We have a new chapter website <https://crpa.org/chapter/contracostacountychapter-home/>

We need you help to build a strong online voice to protect the Second Amendment.

You can now get our monthly agends and meeting minutes on our Chapter website.

Youth Shooting Sports Committee

Big Win on AB 2571 Case

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals [issued a decision today](#) in the CRPA's challenge to AB 2571, the law that prohibited the marketing of firearms and related products by members of the firearm industry to minors in California. The law was signed last year as an "emergency" piece of legislation, and it completely stopped youth shooting sports, youth shooting publications, hunting, and shooting team recruitment in California. It affected thousands of kids and the safe and responsible youth shooting programs they participate in and benefit from. AB 2571 was quickly amended to try to mitigate some of the most obvious impacts on youth shooting sports programs, but that amendment did not make the law any less unconstitutional. And, in many ways, it made the law more confusing for those working with youth shooters.

CRPA, Second Amendment Foundation, Junior Sports Magazine, California Youth Shooting Sports Association, Redlands California Youth Clay Shooting Sports, Gun Owners of California, and The CRPA Foundation joined together to challenge the unconstitutional law in court. Plaintiffs quickly moved for an injunction against the law so that programs, sponsorships, and youth working on their marksmanship skills could continue while the case was litigated. The lower court denied our request for a preliminary injunction, so the plaintiffs appealed that decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Oral arguments were held before a three-judge panel in June of 2023. Today, the court ruled that the District Court's denial of plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction was wrong and reversed the lower court's decision

Speakers Committee

I am working on getting Matthew Cubeiro, Kevin Small and/or Rick Travis (CRPA).

Firearm Training Committee

- Note volunteers are needed for this committee

Gun Shows Committee

- Note volunteers are needed for this committee

Membership Committee

- Note volunteers are needed for this committee

Upcoming Events Committee

- Gun Owners of California Fundraiser Dinner October 28, 2023, at Ulatis Community Center in Vacaville. Doors 5:30, Dinner 7 pm.
<https://www.gunownersca.com/product/vacaville-fundraising-dinner-2023/>
- Brain Suggested we get a group of 8 (Table Sponsor \$500 includes extra goodies) No action was taken

Community Awards Committee

- Note volunteers are needed for this committee

CCW Issues Committee

Letter sent to the Sheriff regarding his *prohibition on laser sights, red dots, and flashlights and on single action only firearms.*

(See Letter **Sheriffs response to CRPA** attachment)

(See Letter CRPA to Sheriff we can help with this attachment)

Open Action Items

- Follow up with the three high school team schools, coaches, parents, and boards to see what this chapter can do to support them. And explain the benefits of joining CRPA and participation in the Contra Costa County chapter.
- Follow up with Jess Harris about training for the high school teams. He indicated he is willing to provide and coordinate training for coaches, parents, and youth.
- Follow up with CRPA about existing firearm instructors' business opportunities.
- Ask CRPA to help the chapter identify local politicians, law enforcement, and other community 2A supporters.
- Discussion of increasing attendance and membership in our chapter.
- Committee **volunteers** requested: Each city/town, county board of supervisors, other community organizations, gun shops/FFL's, etc.

Attachments

“Sensitive Places” Alert

As we've noted on many occasions, the anti-2A lobby is a coordinated effort that pushes many of the same ideas in various states and municipalities across the country. Get something passed in one state and that provides the validation for it to be tried somewhere else.

Declaring wide swaths of "sensitive places" where firearms are banned is just such an idea. California tried it last year with SB 918, but [CRPA and other like-minded groups beat it back](#). . Undeterred, Sacramento lawmakers introduced [S.B. 2](#), which will be a focus of CRPA's advocacy efforts when the Legislature reconvenes next week. We've launched a petition to gather support for defeating this odious bill. [Please sign and share it with others!](#)

The State of Hawaii tried a similar tactic with [SB 1230](#), a bill passed earlier this summer banning firearms in a wide variety of places they deemed "sensitive". CRPA and other 2A advocacy groups like Second Amendment Foundation, Gun Owners of America, and Gun Owners of California answered the call of the Second Amendment Law Center and submitted amicus briefs in the case, understanding full well that if this law is upheld in Hawaii, it will spread to other states.

This week, Judge Lesli Kobayashi, an Obama appointee, struck down significant portions of the new law, a HUGE win for gun owners in Hawaii. [In her ruling](#) , Judge Kobayashi quoted from the amicus briefs submitted in the case, validating the impact that such briefs can make. The Bruen standard's focus on "text, history, and tradition" demands extensive research to frame the issues in these cases in their proper context. More and more, amicus briefs play a critical role, just as they did in this case, and CRPA is proud to have been a part of this effort in Hawaii.

Judge Kobayashi's ruling provides hope that S.B. 2, even if it is passed by the Legislature, will not withstand legal challenge. This would seem self-evident anyway, particularly given Justice Clarence Thomas' explicit admonition in the Bruen opinion that this tactic would not be a cure-all for gun control advocates. But we've all come to realize that 2A opponents remain willfully ignorant of such hindrances.

Thank you, dear members, for your continued support of CRPA and our efforts on both the legislative and legal fronts. We know you are [ready to engage on S.B. 2](#) next week and it is YOUR voice that will carry the day!

Attachments

Challenging the state's 10-day waiting period

The Second Amendment Foundation (SAF) and several other plaintiffs filed a federal lawsuit challenging California's 10-day waiting period for firearm purchases. The Second Amendment Law Center (2ALC) is already preparing to provide assistance and support through an amicus brief (aka "friend of the court") campaign on behalf of the plaintiffs in the case. CRPA will be among the multiple amici filing briefs.

The lawsuit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, begins with the correct assertion that "a right delayed is a right denied" and goes on to invoke the Supreme Court's decisions in *Heller* and *Bruen* in making its case that the waiting period violates the Constitution. Right on.

"No other fundamental right is subject to a waiting period," notes CRPA President & General Counsel Chuck Michel. "Restrains like these degrade the very character of constitutionally-protected rights and must be opposed in court."

In California, firearm purchasers must wait ten days to pick up their purchased firearm even when a background check clears them to purchase almost immediately. Even Sarah Brady admitted that so-called "cooling off periods" have no effect. Waiting periods are a pointless delay imposed on a constitutional right. California's waiting period should be struck down.

Contribute today to help CRPA add weight to this righteous lawsuit! And subscribe to our email alerts to keep up to speed going forward!

<https://crpa.org/news/blogs/crpa-to-join-2alc-amicus-campaign-challenging-waiting-period/>

Attachments

Sheriffs response to CRPA letter



CONTRA COSTA COUNTY OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF
DAVID O. LIVINGSTON
SHERIFF - CORONER

July 18, 2023

VIA EMAIL & US MAIL

Mr. Konstandinos T.
Moros Michel &
Associates, P.C. 180 E.
Ocean Blvd, Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
[kmoros@michellawyers.co](mailto:kmoros@michellawyers.com)
m

Dear Mr. Moros:

Thank you for your correspondence dated June 2, 2023. Please see below for my responses to your concerns:

- The Office of the Sheriff will revise the permit denial letter to include additional specificity on the reason for denial;
- You referenced the example of an applicant who was denied a permit, but you did not provide his or her name. If you provide the applicant's name, I can better address the decision for that application;
- The Office of the Sheriff will explore authorizing laser sights, red dots, and flashlights for permittees' firearms; and
- The Office of the Sheriff does not plan to relax the prohibition on single action only firearms for permits. Our permittees have a wide variety of firearms experience and proficiency. The Office of the Sheriff established this prohibition because of the safety risks single action

only firearms present to range staff, as well as to the public. In addition, the Office of the Sheriff only requires applicants to satisfy the minimum hours of training required by statute. If the prohibition is relaxed, it may be appropriate to require additional training for applicants.

I assure you that my staff continues to work diligently on permit application processing and issuance. Sincerely,



DAVID O. LIVINGSTON
Sheriff + Coroner

DOL:sl

1850 MUIR ROAD • MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA 94553 • (925) 655-0000

Attachments

CRPA to Sheriff we can help with this

Daniel Rumsey

5000 Laurel Dr.

Concord CA 94521

dan@danrumsey.com

925-768-2884

September 29, 2023

Sheriff David O. Livingston

Contra Costa County, Office of the Sheriff

1850 Muir Road

Martinez, CA 94553

Dear Sheriff David O. Livingston,

I am writing on behalf of Contra Costa County Gun Owners Chapter CRPA. For almost 150 years, [The California Rifle and Pistol Association](#) has led educational and safe firearms training in California. [CRPA](#) strongly supports Contra Costa County and local governments and Law Enforcement. Contra Costa County Gun Owners Chapter CRPA wants to work with and help our Cities and County Law Enforcement and Municipal Departments when and where we can.

I am writing to you in response to a letter you sent to our attorney, Mr. Konstandinos Moros, with Michel & Associates on July 18, 2023. (see attached)

Sheriff Livingston, you stated, *"The Office of the Sheriff will explore authorizing laser sights, red dots, and flashlights for permittees' firearms;"*

Contra Costa County Gun Owners Chapter CRPA. Fully support your willingness to authorize laser sights, red dots, and flashlights for permittees' firearms. What are your concerns, if any, keeping you from doing so? Our chapter is available and willing to work with your department to address and satisfy any concerns you may have that are preventing you from immediately authorizing these for use on permittees' firearms.

And.

"The Office of the Sheriff does not plan to relax the prohibition on single action only firearms for permits. Our permittees have a wide variety of firearms experience and proficiency.

The office of the Sheriff established this prohibition because of the safety risks single action only firearms present to range staff, as well as to the public. In addition, the Office of the Sheriff only requires applicants to satisfy the minimum hours of training required by statute. If the prohibition is relaxed, it may be appropriate to require additional training for applicants."

Our CRPA chapter wants to address your legitimate safety concerns regarding single-action-only revolvers used for concealed carry, self-defense, and other lawful purposes by non-prohibited Citizens of Contra Costa County.

Our chapter respectfully proposes for your consideration the following.

As a community service, CRPA will develop a three-stage informational, educational, and firearm training program that deals with single-action-only revolvers for concealed carry firearms.

First, educational and training materials produced by CRPA will be available on your website explaining your concerns as our Sheriff about the safety issues to range staff and the public when single-action-only revolvers are chosen for concealed carry firearms. Along with similar opinions from well-known firearm experts back this up. **This document will be mandatory only for those who are choosing to qualify with single-action-only revolvers as their concealed carry firearm.**

This document will carry an acknowledgment that it has been read and understood.

The applicant will have to affirm that he or she will still train and qualify with a single-action-only revolver for concealed carry for self-defense and other lawful purposes.

Second. CRPA will produce a segment to be included in the 8 or 16-hour CCW course mandated by statute to include your safety concerns along with the inclusion of other factual documentation from well-known firearms experts stressing the many risks and safety concerns involved with single-action-only revolvers in general and specifically for use as a concealed carry firearm for self-defense and other lawful purposes. **This segment will be mandatory only for those who are choosing to qualify with single-action-only revolvers as their concealed carry firearm.**

Third. CRPA will provide detailed methods and procedures for use by your approved CCW training instructors for the safe handling and firing of a holstered single-action-only revolver.

And to further instruct applicants with the skills necessary to safely meet the CCW live fire qualification requirements. **This segment will be mandatory only for those who are choosing to qualify with single-action-only revolvers as their concealed carry firearm.**

Throughout California, CRPA is actively working with Law Enforcement agencies like yours to develop, produce, and implement comprehensive firearm safety training programs for the general public, competitive shooting sports, hunters, and recreational shooters, as well as the massive influx of CCW applicants and new licensees. CRPA is currently training staff in California K -12 schools to appropriately and effectively protect and save lives in active shooter scenarios.

CRPA looks forward to working with your office to help safely end the prohibition on single-action-only revolvers as a community service project with no cost to your department, the County, or CCW applicants.

I am available to provide any additional information or assistance that may be helpful in this matter. Please let me know if there is any further action I can take to support your efforts.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. Contra Costa County Gun Owners Chapter CRPA and CRPA.org appreciate the important work that you and your team of professional Law Enforcement Officers and support staff do to keep our community safe.

Sincerely,

Daniel Rumsey

Chair

Contra Costa County Gun Owners Chapter [CRPA](http://CRPA.org)

Sent by e-mail and USPS

Adjournment