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Greetings, I hope this article finds you all enjoying this beautiful spring and doing something you enjoy. As I write this article, I am looking forward to taking a well-deserving first time hunter out on Monday to hopefully harvest his first turkey and/or have a heck of a good time trying. I promise an update with photos either way in a future CRPA Firing Line magazine. I must say how refreshing it is for me to take a new hunter out afield and relive the excitement through their eyes like a double shot of much needed penicillin for me to battle the ‘bug’ I get most every day I enter the Big White Building.

Once again, the majority of your representatives have jumped on to the liberal media crazy train and are pushing forward unneeded legislation in response to isolated events of terror which only impact law abiding citizens. First and foremost, they have launched an assault on our ability to recruit the next generation of young hunters and recreational shooters to enjoy the pastimes we hold dear by depriving them the ability to exercise their Second Amendment rights to protect themselves. They have introduced two bills banning those under the age of 21 from purchasing long guns (AB 3 Bonta & SB 1100 Portantino). Other efforts aim to further tax YOU the law-abiding citizen (AB 2497 Cooper) to pay for the criminal acts of a fraction of one percent of society! This leads you to ask, what the heck are they doing with the millions of dollars they already receive each year from firearm and ammunition sales? Additionally, the never-ending assault on your ability to obtain and maintain a CCW continues. Assemblymember Gloria has created legislation (AB 2103) to tell the Sheriffs how they should be testing CCW applicants in their communities, despite testimony making it clear that the system in place is working and CCW holders are not breaking California law or shooting themselves in the foot. At the same time, no friend of you the lawful gun owner, Assemblyman Reggie Jones-Sawyer, Chairman of Assembly Public Safety Committee, is not letting any efforts to protect or expand your ability to purchase firearms, or obtain a CCW in California, out of his committee. Case in point, an important piece of legislation authored by Assemblyman Fong (AB 1931) to simply give sheriffs the ability to extend CCW’s from two years to five years, failed to pass Public Safety this week on a ‘No vote’ recommendation by the chair. This bill was a common sense bill to save time and resources and make things a little easier on law abiding CCW holders, but the Chairmen saw it otherwise. Though sponsored and supported by law enforcement, and solely opposed was by the Brady Foundation the chairmen killed it.

Luckily, it’s not all doom and gloom. If you have read my articles you know it’s the offensive game that keeps me going back into the building. We are working on some positive hunting bills, like AB 2151, which seeks to make big game hunting for all California’s youth more affordable, and AB 2670, which will hold California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s feet to the fire to implement two free Hunting days a year. Both of these efforts would be a huge step forward to help recruit the next generation of California’s hunter conservationists.

As we approach the elections, take them seriously and vote! Yes, we all fear the pending Governors race; but, your local representatives hold far more power and influence on our ability to accomplish good things in the building than the governor. The committees yield the power to crush our efforts to do good things and blindly pass bad legislation that easily passes the floor with the majority they hold, that is how these bills make their way to the governor’s desk!

Thank you for reading my article and taking the time out of your busy lives to be involved. Without your support, we would not have a chance.

For more information, updates on the bills I mentioned, and all bills we are tracking for you, refer the legislative update on our website at: https://www.crpa.org/programs/legislative-advocacy/legislative-affairs-report/

Roy Griffith
CRPA Legislative Advocate

Roy joins CRPA after 32 years in law enforcement. He started at a small town police department in Northern California and went on to spend 26 years at the California Department of Fish & Game. More than six of those years he spent in special operations. Roy’s final 12 years with the department were spent on Hunter Education - one of his biggest passions. Outside of work, Roy enjoys hunting, fishing, backpacking, and spending time with his wonderful wife, kids and grandkids. Roy is excited about his role at CRPA and the opportunity to help fight to protect our Second Amendment and hunting rights in California.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 710</td>
<td>(Anderson, R) Firearms: silencers</td>
<td>This bill aims to end the ban on suppressors in California. By doing so, this bill would make it legal to possess a suppressor so long as the proper federal regulations are followed. Additionally, SB 710 would allow anyone who is legally allowed to possess a suppressor to use it to hunt. 1/9/18 Failed to pass Senate Public Safety Committee. Bill is dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1092</td>
<td>(Anderson, R) Firearms: silencers</td>
<td>This bill would authorize hunting while using a lawfully possessed silencer that is attached to a firearm with a barrel measuring 16 inches or more in length. Failed Senate Public Safety 04/10/18. Reconsideration granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1311</td>
<td>(Berryhill, R) Fishing and Hunting: Annual Sportsman’s Licenses</td>
<td>This bill would create annual sportsman’s license that provides the same privileges as annual hunting and fishing licenses, but that is valid for a term of one year from July 1st to June 30th. SB 1311 would limit the issuance of these licenses to California residents. Final language pending (02/20/19) but will provide a savings compared to purchasing licenses individually. 04/16/18 Passed Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1394</td>
<td>(Allen, R) Firearms: licenses to carry concealed firearms</td>
<td>This bill would remove the good cause requirement for the issuance of a CCW in California. If passed, this would make California a “shall issue” state. This would enable thousands of Californians who are currently prevented from carrying by unconstitutional “good cause” requirements to exercise their constitutional right to self-protection. 04/16/18 Passed Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 986</td>
<td>(Gallagher, R) Hunting and Sport Fishing Licenses: Sport Fishing License Duration</td>
<td>This bill proposes a reduction in license fees for veterans. It would require a resident or nonresident, 16 years of age or older, upon payment of the fee, to be issued a sport fishing license for the period of 12 consecutive months beginning on the date of issuance. In Senate to committee on Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1931</td>
<td>(Fong, R) Firearms: licenses to carry concealed firearms</td>
<td>AB 1931 would authorize the sheriff of a county, or a chief or other head of a police department, to issue a CCW for a period of up to 5 years. 04/24/18 Failed Asm Public Safety. Bill is dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1932</td>
<td>(Fong, R) Firearms: licenses to carry concealed firearms</td>
<td>This bill will require DOJ to furnish a background check report to a concealed carry permit licensing authority within 60 days of receiving the fingerprints and fees. If passed, this bill will speed up the process of issuing CCWs to law abiding Californians. 04/24/18 Failed Asm Public Safety. Bill is dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1958</td>
<td>(Quirk-Silva, D) Firearms: silencers</td>
<td>AB 1958 will allow companies that produce suppressors in California to sell them out of state so long as the sale or transfer is in line with federal law. This bill will help California’s jobs and the right to manufacture firearms components. Public Safety 04/10/18; Postponed at request of author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2067</td>
<td>(Gallagher, R): School Safety: Armed security guards schools</td>
<td>Requires state to provide trained armed security for K-12, step forward in light of ground lost due to passage of AB 424 in 2017. 4/04/18 re-referred to Asm Committee on Appropriations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2697</td>
<td>(Gallagher, R) Wildlife, bird, waterfowl habitat: idled agricultural lands</td>
<td>This bill allows land owners to maintain non-irrigated cover crops on land when not in use. Creates and maintains critical nesting and cover vegetation for wildlife. Passed Asm Water Parks and Wildlife 04/24/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2151</td>
<td>(Gray, D) Hunting: apprentice tags</td>
<td>AB 2151 aims to make hunting opportunities affordable to all California children. By creating $20 apprentice tags for big game animals such as elk, pronghorns, bighorn sheep, and bears, AB 2151 will ensure that we can train a robust new generation of hunter conservationists. 04/11/18 Passed Asm Appropriations. On Assembly floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2318</td>
<td>(Flora, R) Gun-Free School Zone</td>
<td>This bill amends gun free zone statute to allow for concealed carry during religious services even if services are held in a school gun free zone. (An act to amend Section 626.9 of the penal code relating to firearms). 04/24/18: Failed Asm Public Safety. Bill is dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2670</td>
<td>(Kiley, R): Fish and Wildlife: Free Hunting Days</td>
<td>AB 2670 would require the Director of CADFW to declare which days would be Free Hunting Days by July 1st, 2019. The bill would require one of the days to be in the spring rather than winter. Passed Asm Water Parks &amp; Wildlife 04/10/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2733</td>
<td>(Harper, R) Firearms: unsafe handguns: imprinting</td>
<td>This bill removes microstamping requirement and will allow new generation handguns for sale in California. An Act to amend Penal Code section 31910 relating to sales of firearms in California. 04/24/18 Failed to pass Asm Public Safety. Bill is dead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BILL SUPPORT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 2805</td>
<td>(Bigelow, R) Wild pigs: Validations</td>
<td>Establishes new classification for wild pigs from big game to exotic big game. Replaces pig tag with pig stamp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2860</td>
<td>(Allen, R): Firearms: unsafe handguns</td>
<td>Repeal roster requirement for handguns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3064</td>
<td>(Baker, R) Firearms: Felons in possession. Penalty enhancement</td>
<td>AB 3064 would increase the severity of punishment for felons illegally possessing firearms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BILL OPPOSE STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>OPPOSE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 459</td>
<td>(Portantino, D) Firearms: dealer inspections</td>
<td>SB 459 would require DOJ to conduct inspections of firearm dealers at least every 3 years. This will only create more work for an already overburdened DOJ, and create unnecessary red tape for California FFLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1100</td>
<td>(Portantino, D): Firearms: Transfers</td>
<td>This bill would limit transfers to one long gun a month, no transfer to someone under the age of 21. Exemption for licensed hunter and non-profit fund raisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3</td>
<td>(Bonta, D) Firearms: age restrictions</td>
<td>Gutted and amended in assembly 03/97/18. As amended, this bill would prohibit the sale or transfer of any firearm (Not just handgun) by a licensed dealer to any person under 21 years of age. Additionally, changes to age restrictions on the purchase of ammunition and the issuance of a serial number by the Department of Justice for an assembled firearm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 736</td>
<td>(Gipson, D)</td>
<td>Authorizes DOJ to impose civil fines for violations of certain firearm licensing requirements and increased fine and suspension if occurring within specified time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1927</td>
<td>(Bonta, D): Firearms: California do not sell list firearms</td>
<td>Allows individual to add themselves to the &quot;DO NOT Sell List.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2103</td>
<td>(Gloria, D) Firearms: license to carry concealed firearms</td>
<td>AB 2103 aims to create mandatory firearms training and handling to receive a CCW. This bill is completely unnecessary since issuing authorities already require basic range qualification and safety classes to be issued a CCW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2497</td>
<td>(Cooper, D) Firearms: School gun violence prevention</td>
<td>This bill will impose tax on retailers for the sale of firearms and ammunition to pay for mandates school counselors and security officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3199</td>
<td>(Holden, D) Charitable raffles: Firearms</td>
<td>This bill would prohibit an authorized raffle from having a firearm as a prize. A violation would be a misdemeanor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did you know that as a youth in California must pay over $445.00 for a resident elk tag? Compare that to a youth in Montana who pays $10.75 for the same opportunity! Yes, that is correct. If a youth is fortunate to draw an elk tag in California, his or her parents will pay over $400 more than most western states for that privilege. In fact, that same youth can go to several other states as a NON-RESIDENT and purchase big game tags much cheaper! It’s no wonder why California is losing resident hunters at an average rate of 5,000 a year.

California has seen this steady decline of hunters over the past 20 years. Hunters are an essential component of wildlife management and hunting generates dollars vital to conservation efforts throughout California. It is critical that action is taken to recruit new hunters in California and retain those we already have. In 2016 California residents paid $445 for a resident elk tag and an additional $47 for a resident hunting license. That adds up to over $500 for a potential first time elk hunter. Our resident pronghorn (at $142), and bighorn sheep tags ($412) costs are equally inflated for first time hunters. These high costs have proven to be a barrier to many first-time hunters.

As a first step to combat the loss of California’s hunters, Assemblyman Adam Gray, a true friend of the Hunter Conservational, has authored Assembly Bill 2151 (AB 2151). This bill seeks to reduce California’s resident apprentice (youth) big game tags to a more affordable rate of $20 and get them in line with other western states.

The good news is in California state law mandates the dollars you spend on big game tags go into a special account. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CADFW) Big Game Management Fund (BGMA) these dollars can only be spent on big game management throughout California.

This proposal to reduce a resident apprentice pronghorn, elk, and bighorn tags only results in an annual revenue reduction to the BGMA account input of about $32,000. The BGMA, since created in 2011, has generated a 2017 reserve balance of $9,457,472, and averages an increase of 1.5/2 million a year going into a reserve CADFW has not been able to spend. When a ‘fee’ results in an ever-growing surplus on this scale, it is no longer a fee. It is in reality, an impropriate tax.

Please join Assemblyman Gray in his efforts to recruit the next generation of California’s hunters and contact your representatives urging them to vote yes on AB 2151.
On Thursday, March 15, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California issued an opinion regarding the County of Solano’s motion to dismiss in the case Twin Sisters Gun Club v. County of Solano. The case challenges the County’s refusal to issue a business licenses to the Twin Sisters Gun Club following the death of its prior manager.

For over six decades, the Twin Sisters Gun Club property has been used for various outdoor activities, including livestock grazing, camping, hunting, and target shooting. During that time, however, the County of Solano has grown in population, with an influx of suburban development into a largely rural area. As is often the case, the newer residents sought to change the character of the area they moved to, and complaints about the Club increased steadily. And in 2015, when the manager of the Club was killed in a tragic traffic accident, opponents of the Club saw this as an opportunity they could exploit.

Soon after the manager’s death, opponents increased their complaints to the County of Solano. But when the County investigated, it determined that the Club was a legal non-conforming use because it was “grandfathered” in; that is, it was not subject to zoning laws that went into effect after the Club was already in operation. Relying on this decision, the Club’s new manager applied for a business license to continue operating the range.

Instead of issuing a license, however, the County reversed its prior land use decision without any explanation. The County informed the Club that a business license would not be issued unless the applicant provided evidence that the range had been in continuous operation since the date the non-conforming use had commenced was provided. The County basically told the Club it had to prove that a non-conforming use existed even though the County had just months before determined that to be the case.

Presented with the same evidence that the County previously accepted, when the Club applied for its business license, the County formally denied the business license application and demanded that the range cease operations. Though the Club complied, the new operator of the Club appealed the denial to the County, which was also subsequently denied. As a result, the new operator of the Club filed a lawsuit in federal district court challenging the County’s decision.

Filed in July 2017, the case seeks to declare the County’s actions as a violation of the Plaintiffs’ Due Process rights under the United States Constitution, and to compel the County to reconsider the denial of the business license application and to follow its previous determination that the Club is a legal non-conforming use. The County filed a motion to dismiss the case, but the District Court has now formally denied that motion as to the County and its Director of Resource Management, Bill Emlen, who signed the letter denying the Club a business license.

In denying the County’s motion, the Court held that Plaintiffs had raised a “cognizable claim” and had “satisfactorily pled facts sufficient” to file suit. This decision marks the first hurdle cleared by the Plaintiffs, who may now engage in discovery—for example, taking the deposition of County employees—to solidify the facts supporting their claim that the County knowingly and illegally ignored the well-established range’s right to exist.

CRPA’s Range Protection Programs

Shooting ranges in California like Twin Sisters face many challenges. Since its founding in 1875, part of CRPA’s mission has been to promote the shooting sports and to defend the right to keep and bear arms. To participate in the shooting sports, people must have access to shooting ranges and training. Today, too many ranges like Twin Sisters are being forced to close due to issues that could have been avoided.

Accordingly, range operators must be aware of the many threats, and remain knowledgeable about resources and assistance available to proactively address predictable challenges. CRPA and NRA’s California Range Assistance Program helps ranges continue to operate and be successful. To learn more about CRPA and NRA’s programs, be sure to visit the NRA-ILA California website at www.StandAndFightCalifornia.com and the new CRPA website at www.crpa.org.

Matthew D. Cubeiro
Attorney
An attorney with Michel & Associates, P.C.’s firearm regulatory compliance and litigation team. A dedicated supporter of the right to keep and bear arms, he is also an NRA certified Range Safety Officer and certified instructor in Home Firearm Safety, Basic Pistol, Refuse to be a Victim, Basic Rifle, Metallic Cartridge Reloading, Personal Protection Inside the Home, and Personal Protection Outside the Home disciplines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Case Status</th>
<th>What's Next</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to California’s “assault weapon” restrictions</td>
<td>Rupp v. Becerra</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to California’s ban on standard capacity magazines</td>
<td>Duncan v. Becerra</td>
<td>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 CRPA’s 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, the but the case was ordered to continue in the trial court. The parties have completed discovery, and plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on March 5, 2018.</td>
<td>Oral argument in the State’s injunction appeal is scheduled for May 14, 2018, in San Francisco. Meanwhile, briefing on plaintiffs’ summary judgment motion is ongoing. And a hearing is scheduled for April 30, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to DOJ’s recently enacted “assault weapon” registration regulations</td>
<td>Villanueva v. Becerra</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>A hearing on the merits of the case is scheduled for April 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to CA and Los Angeles Firearm Carry Restrictions that Prohibit Both Open and Concealed Carry (Formerly Flanagan v. Harris)</td>
<td>Flanagan v. Becerra</td>
<td>The case was filed on August 17, 2016, as a direct response to Peruta. 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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to California DOJ’s misuse of the DROS Fee funds</td>
<td>Bauer v. Becerra</td>
<td>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. Plaintiffs’ filed a petition for review, but the United States Supreme Court declined to rehear the case.</td>
<td>Because the Supreme Court declined to rehear the case, the Ninth Circuit’s decision is final, and the case is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges DOJ’s Use of DROS surplus to fund APPS as an Illegal Tax</td>
<td>Gentry v. Becerra</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to amend their complaint to include claims developed through discovery will be heard on June 22, 2018. And a hearing on the case’s merits is scheduled for August 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to CA DOJ’s underground regulations regarding the FSC Program</td>
<td>Belemjian v. Becerra</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>On March 29, 2018, the Court of Appeal affirmed the denial of plaintiffs’ fee motion. Further action is being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagueness challenge to (AB 962’s “handgun ammunition” sales registration requirement and mail order ban)</td>
<td>Parker v. California</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Plaintiffs’ motion for attorneys’ fees on appeal was heard on September 14, 2017. A further hearing is scheduled for April 5, 2018, and a decision is expected soon. Meanwhile, the denial of fees for work in the trial court is currently on appeal. Separate litigation is being prepared to challenge the ammunition restrictions in Prop 63.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Case Status</th>
<th>What’s Next</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFL Zoning Restrictions</td>
<td><strong>Teixeira v. Alameda County</strong></td>
<td>On October 10, 2017, an 11-judge en banc panel of the Ninth Circuit issued an opinion holding that the Second Amendment does not protect a right to sell firearms. As a result, the court held, Alameda County’s FFL zoning restrictions do 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.</td>
<td>Waiting to see if Supreme Court accepts review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Handgun Roster</td>
<td><strong>Pena v. Lindley</strong></td>
<td>The federal district court upheld the Roster in 2015. Plaintiffs appealed, and oral arguments were held on March 16, 2017. NRA and CRPA filed an amicus brief in the case on July 27, 2015.</td>
<td>Awaiting a decision from the Ninth Circuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Day Wait as applied to current firearm owners</td>
<td><strong>Silvester v. Harris</strong></td>
<td>In December 2016, the Ninth 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.” The United States Supreme Court declined to re hear the case, but not without a strong dissenting opinion from Justice Thomas.</td>
<td>Because the Supreme Court declined to re hear the case, the Ninth Circuit's decision is final, and the case is now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Amendment challenge to handgun ad prohibition</td>
<td><strong>Tracy Rifle and Pistol v. Becerra</strong> (Formerly Tracy Rifle and Pistol v. Harris)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Awaiting a decision from the District Court on the cross-motions for summary judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFL zoning ordinance</td>
<td><strong>NSSF v. Pleasant Hill</strong></td>
<td>The case has been settled.</td>
<td>The City has agreed to pay NSSF over $400,000 in legal fees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action Reports
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Case Status</th>
<th>What’s Next</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges DOJ regulation barring sale of more than one handgun in 30 days to COE holders</td>
<td><strong>Doe v. Becerra</strong> (Formerly Doe v. Harris)</td>
<td>The state trial court upheld DOJ’s regulation and the plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the California Court of Appeal.</td>
<td>The case has been fully briefed and will soon be scheduled for oral arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to ban on possession and carriage of firearms on recreational Army Corps’ lands</td>
<td><strong>Nesbitt v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineer</strong></td>
<td>At the request of both parties, oral arguments have been cancelled, and the case has been referred to the Ninth Circuit’s mediation program.</td>
<td>The Army Corps of Engineers is reconsidering its firearms policy, and will work with plaintiffs to settle the matter outside of court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Court challenge to California’s micro-stamping requirements</td>
<td><strong>NSSF v. California</strong></td>
<td>On December 1, the California Court of Appeal 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.</td>
<td>The case has been scheduled for oral arguments before the California Supreme Court on April 4, 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

---

**C.D. Michel**  
**CRPA President & General Counsel**  
Civil rights attorney C.D. “Chuck” Michel is President & General Counsel for CRPA. He is a former prosecutor and currently runs the law firm Michel & Associates, P.C. in Long Beach. The firm’s clients include the NRA and CRPA, as well as firearm manufacturers, distributors, retailers and individual gun owners.
For quite some time, CRPA worked to develop ways to provide tools, up to date information, and materials for all clubs, firearms retailers, and other businesses. We have recently seen positive changes and improvements to the way CRPA works with each of these contacts in order to make them a more effective partner as we fight for the right to keep and bear arms (RKBA) in California.

In the past three years, CRPA has made tremendous progress in becoming a dominant and effective voice for the California gun owner. We have a full-time lobbying team in Sacramento, and now have 20 plus full-time staffers working from our Fullerton office, which now includes the CRPA Training Center and CRPA Studios. The new CRPA News team includes CRPATV and the reinvented CRPA Firing Line magazine. CRPA is sponsoring more events across the state than ever before in its 143-year history, and is also bringing more women, youth, and everyday Californians into the shooting sports. In conjunction with the NRA, we continue to be the unparalleled leader in challenging unconstitutional California gun laws and regulations in court.

Seeking to improve and expand CRPA’s reach and effectiveness, we have come to realize that business owners who support the right to keep and bear arms can be engaged to help CRPA with our efforts. To harness this untapped potential, we launched the CRPA Business Affiliate Program. The CRPA Business Affiliate Program provides an opportunity for Second Amendment friendly businesses to promote and protect the Second Amendment.

CRPA wants to partner with you! Clubs and business can reach the public like no other groups while building the trust of their members or customers. With our help you can make your business or club into a Second Amendment Action Center and provide timely information for your members or customers. This service will increase customer loyalty and help promote the efforts of CRPA just by doing what you do every day!

First, Build Trust with Your Customers- A Business Affiliate can become a Second Amendment Action Center where you can provide key information for your members or customers. This will allow you to be informed about what is going on in the state; your customers will begin to view your business or club as the “go to” place for information about their Second Amendment rights.

Second, Market Your Events - A Business Affiliate can have...
their event posted on the state-wide CRPA calendar on our website. This will increase the visibility of your events, as well as provide a place for potential customers to easily access information.

Build the Base of Informed Gun Owners - A Business Affiliate can participate as a Recruiter for CRPA by simply asking your members or customers to join CRPA. We make it easy for you by providing information for your employees to hand to customers. Your business gets a commission for each CRPA membership sold. (See the CRPA’s Recruiter Information for more details)

Point of Sale Giving- A Business Affiliate can actively promote the mission of the CRPA by participating in the CRPA “Round Up” Program. It’s easy to set up! Every time a customer spends money with your business, your employees ask if they would like to “round-up” their purchase to the next dollar to help fight for the Second Amendment. You would be amazed at how much can be raised by just adding a few cents to each transaction! (See CRPA’s “Round Up” Program information for more details)

Show Your Support for the Second Amendment - A Business Affiliate will receive CRPA signage and materials to proudly display your support of the Second Amendment to your customers, members, and the public.

Get Out the Vote - A Business Affiliate can be a source of information for voter registration information and engaging customers in local and state elections to make a difference in California.

We hope you will become a Business Affiliate of the CRPA and take advantage of the benefits this program has to offer your business. Our mission at CRPA is not only to preserve and protect the Second Amendment, but to provide education, training, and education to the public about CRPA’s efforts!

Sarah Barrett
CRPA Programs & Events Manager
Sarah joined CRPA in 2016 running the Events Department and currently runs all Programs as well. She is dedicated to defending and protecting the Second Amendment and strongly believes it is only her heritage to pass down this right to the future generations. Sarah enjoys planning all types of events and helping develop more and new programs for the public to utilize at CRPA. Outside of work, Sarah loves camping, practicing calligraphy, and being a foodie - “always trying new food!”
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Return to the California Rifle & Pistol Association
Attn: Business Affiliate Program
271 E. Imperial Highway, Suite #620, Fullerton, CA 92835
Phone: (800) 305-2772 | Email: sbarrett@crpa.org
With almost 15,000 concealed weapons permits issued in the county, for the moment the Orange County Sheriff’s Department (OCSD) has issued more CCWs than any county in California. (Our good friends at the Fresno County Sheriff’s Department are a close second, and closing in!)

How the OCSD got to this point is a lesson in the value of dialogue between elected sheriffs and the people they are elected to serve. But this story also illustrates the importance of persistence and informed activism by those who care about the Second Amendment.

When she assumed office in 2008, Sheriff Sandra Hutchens took the helm of an agency badly in need of positive leadership. The previous sheriff had been forced to resign under a cloud of scandal. Those of us who had spent our careers working for the OCSD had suffered under that unethical leader. Morale on the front line was low, and we were ready for a new leader whose ethics and integrity matched our own. We got what we wanted. In her ten years as sheriff, Sandra Hutchens has proven to be that leader -- and more.

In her initial months she successfully worked to right the ship. But she also sparked a few controversies. Most notable was her review of CCW licenses and applications. Approximately 1,100 permits had been issued by the previous Sheriff, and some appeared to have been issued based merely on support for his political campaign. Sheriff Hutchens was concerned that at least some CCWs had been issued in a manner inconsistent with the law. And after looking into it, some of those permits were found to be improperly issued and were revoked.

Perhaps more problematic from the perspective of those seeking a CCW, the new Sheriff was given some misleading legal advice about what discretion she had to determine what she would accept as “good cause” to be issued a CCW. She was advised that establishing “good cause” under the law required a showing of some specific threat, and that her discretion to interpret “good cause” was limited.

Understandably, many saw these CCW revocations and the relatively high good cause standard imposed by the Sheriff as an affront to their Second Amendment rights.

From 2008 to 2014 Orange County maintained on average 900 CCW permits. While OCSD policy was consistent with state law, our interpretation of the law, and the “good cause” policies adopted by OCSD were not consistent with the desire of most law abiding gun owners in Orange County.

Then in February 2014 came the Peruta v. San Diego decision by a three judge panel of the federal Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The panel ruled that a departmental policy requiring a special need to establish “good cause” was unconstitutional. By its ruling, the Court redefined what “good cause” as that term was used in the statute could be read to mean.

In keeping with her practice of following the law, Sheriff Hutchens abided by this wise decision. She directed that CCWs be issued without a “good cause” standard. This resulted in a flood of CCW applications, initially overwhelming the OCSD office responsible for processing applications and issuing permits. Wait times just for appointments took several months, so the Sheriff responded by increasing staffing of the CCW unit. As a result of her decisions, approximately 5,700 permits were issued under the Peruta standard.

In March 2015, a new decision from the Ninth Circuit “en banc” panel overruled the three judge panel, and held that there was no fundamental right to carry a concealed firearm. So, the Sheriff had to decide what OCSD should do in light of the new court ruling.

Would she keep the current standard? Or revert back to requiring a special need to establish good cause? She did what she does best. She decided to lead through innovation. The Sheriff knew she had to follow the law and require new CCW applicants to provide a good cause statement. But in contrast to previous years, she exercised her discretion to impose a standard for satisfying the “good cause” requirement that would be relatively easy for residents to meet. She also directed staff to work with applicants to help them be successful as they made their way through the CCW process. Although some were skeptical that a Sheriff previously labeled as a “gun grabber” would adopt a good cause standard that was easier to meet, CCW applicants soon learned that the change was real.
The Sheriff’s willingness to approve more applications under the lesser good cause requirement resulted from her experience during the period of time after the initial Peruta decision came out. The flood of applicants showed her that law abiding Orange County citizens could and should be allowed to provide for their personal safety with a CCW.

In short, the people spoke through their actions. Sheriff Hutchens listened.

The mass shootings that have occurred over the last few years, and the role CCW holders can play as a first line of defense was another factor. The fact that there were no issues or violations by CCW holders demonstrated how responsible gun owners are, and highlighted the value they bring to the safety of the Orange County community.

But that’s not all. Under Sheriff Hutchens’ leadership the OCSD has also worked to make the CCW application process better. One of my responsibilities as Undersheriff is to ensure our department’s protocols are efficient. To that end, I opened dialogue with Second Amendment advocates and learned what we could do better. Lessons learned included:

- I was asked at a shooting club why we limited our CCWs to five weapons on their license. Staff informed me that there isn’t any legal restriction on the number of weapons and was only limited by the number of spaces available on the page! Paper is in no short supply, so of course I eliminated the restriction on the number of firearms.
- Firearms trainers gave me feedback that the 72-round requirement to qualify each firearm on a CCW was financially costly and consumed range time. We now qualify the individual with the first 72 rounds. After the first firearm, they must qualify with 20 rounds for each subsequent firearm.
- We eliminated the requirement for mandatory home checks. Today, we accept proof of residency and only conduct a home check if county residence is in question. This allowed us to re-task personnel to conducting interviews and processing applications.
- Finally, we implemented the Permitium® application software that now enables applicants to apply for a CCW online.

These changes have resulted in application wait times being reduced from more than six months, to an average of just four weeks!

The change in Orange County is not a flash in the pan. Our efforts of the last few years and the subsequent partnership with gun owners have taught us that a robust CCW community is a tremendous value to the safety of our county.

Don Barnes
Undersheriff of Orange County
Chief Operating Officer for the nation’s 5th largest sheriff’s department serving a population of 3.1 million residents
Oversees the daily operations of the department’s 24 Divisions comprised of 3,900 sworn and professional employees, and more than 700 volunteers.
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**FRANKLIN ARMORY**

The DFM™ from Franklin Armory® is the fixed magazine solution for avoiding registration for your AR platform rifle in CA.

Approved by CADOJ Personnel

- Patented top load design
- Works in 5.56 NATO, 6.5 Grendel, 6.8 SPC, 308 Winchester, 7.62 x 39, and 450 Bushmaster
- Quick and easy installation
- Easily converts for out of state use
- Meets penal code 30515(8)(b) “Fixed Magazine”
- Safely clear malfunctions without creating an assault weapon
- Works with Bear Flag Defense stripper clips

Some of the proceeds from every DFM™ sold are donated to the CRPA Foundation earmarked for litigation.

Franklin Armory’s® DFM™ has already contributed over $15,000 to help fight for Californian’s firearms rights.

www.franklinarmory.com
The First “Assault Weapon”: Banning Guns Based on “Style” Rather than Function

Originally posted on www.reason.com
by David B. Kopel, Research Director at the Independence Institute, in Golden, Colorado

When five schoolchildren were murdered at an elementary school in Stockton, California, in January 1989, the public learned a new phrase: “assault weapon.” To most gun owners and non-owners alike, it was a brand new term.

It was also confusing. Whenever “assault weapon” laws have been enacted, they apply to guns that are not machine guns. Yet many people who support such laws think that the guns involved are machine guns.

We can trace the origin of the public confusion back to the Stockton crime. The criminal’s murder weapon was a Norinco AKM-56S semi-automatic rifle. Norinco is a large Chinese manufacturer of many products, including military arms and equipment for natural resources extraction. The group has close ties to the Chinese military. “Norinco” is an abbreviation for China North Industries Group Corporation.

Because the firearm is made abroad, the importation of the rifle into the United States was allowed only because federal regulators found it to be “particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes.” (18 U.S. Code sect. 925(d)) (Attorney General “shall authorize” imports of firearms that meet the definition.)

The initials “AKM” stand for “Avtomat Kalashnikova modernizirovanny.” Translated from Russian: “Modernized Automatic Kalashnikov.” In 1947, Russian inventor Mikhail Kalashnikov created one of the world’s best-known automatic rifles: the AK-47. The type 56 was a model that began production in China in 1956. Over the years, China has distributed this automatic military gun to many military allies, guerrillas, and terrorist groups.

Automatic weapons are generally not importable into the United States for sale to citizens. (18 U.S. Code sect. 925(d)). In an automatic weapon, when the user presses the trigger, bullets are fired continually. Popularity, automatics are called “machine guns,” and that is the term used by the federal statute that very strictly regulates them, the National Firearms Act of 1934 (26 U.S. Code sect. 5801 et seq.).

For the sporting purpose of hunting, machine guns are generally unsuitable. Humane taking of an animal is supposed to involve a single precisely aimed shot, and sometimes a quick second shot. Spraying bullets at the animal is forbidden.

To make the gun importable into the U.S. for civilian sale, Norinco had to change the gun’s internal operation. Instead of being an automatic, the gun had to be a semi-automatic. In a semiautomatic, pressing the trigger fires only one bullet. This is just like every other normal gun, such as revolvers, bolt actions, lever actions, or pump actions.

After a bullet is fired, the empty cartridge case is left behind in the firing chamber. (The case had contained the bullet, primer, and gunpowder.) In a semiautomatic, some of the energy from the gunpowder burning is used to: 1. eject the empty case from the firing chamber, and 2. load a fresh cartridge into the firing chamber. Then the user has to pull the trigger to fire a shot. One trigger pull, only one shot.

Semiautomatics were invented in 1885. Today, they constitute the very large majority of American handguns, and a large fraction of rifles and shotguns.

When Norinco altered its model 56 to be semiautomatic only, the new model was the 56S. Changing the automatic model 56 into the semiautomatic 56S made a huge difference in operation and in law.

The U.S. Supreme Court in the 1994 case Staples v. United States sharply distinguished automatics from semiautomatics. According to the Court, there are some weapons whose ownership has a “quasi-suspect character.” Examples, according to the court, are grenades or machine guns. In contrast, semi-automatics have always been “commonplace and generally available,” said the Court. The Staples case was about an AR-15 semiautomatic rifle, and the point applies to semiautomatics generally.

(By the way, “AR” stands for “ArmaLite,” the company that invented the rifle. The “AR-17” is a shotgun, and the “AR-24” is a handgun.)

Thus, when the automatic Norinco 56 was turned into the semiautomatic 56S, it had a very different legal status. The change also made practical difference. An automatic gun can fire much faster than a semiautomatic.

However, the internal mechanical changes to the 56S made almost no difference in the rifle’s outer appearance. On the outside, the Model 56 and the Model 56S looked exactly alike, except that the former has a selector switch, allowing the user to choose automatic fire.

So it was understandable that most people who saw an AKM-56S for the first time would immediately think it was an AK-47. The AK-47 is a very famous gun, and the AKM-56S looks the same, unless a person is looking very closely and knows what to look for. Because of internal parts, the AK-47 can fire much faster than the AKM-56S. But in outer appearance, there is essentially no difference between the two guns.

Most Americans thinks that machine guns should be banned or very strictly regulated. They distinguish machine guns from normal guns, which fire only one shot at a time. A gun with the appearance of the 56S was bound to cause confusion.

This confusion could help advance gun control. In 1988, gun prohibition strategist Josh Sugarmann wrote that the public and press had grown tired of the handgun ban issue. He urged a shift of “assault weapons,” and explained why “assault weapon” bans had a better chance of being enacted than handgun bans:

(continued on page 17)
The weapons’ menacing looks, coupled with the public’s confusion over fully automatic machine guns versus semi-automatic assault weapons—anything that looks like a machine gun is assumed to be a machine gun—can only increase the chance of public support for restrictions on these weapons.

Sugarmann was exactly right.

As soon as the media began covering the Stockton crime, the vast majority began calling the criminal’s gun an “AK-47.” Even today, this misinformation persists.

In 1989, most Americans were dependent on the mainstream media for all their news. So they believed media reports that AK-47 rifles were for sale over the counter in gun stores all over the United States. Understandably, they favored greater restrictions on whatever guns the media was talking about.

In 1989–’90, public opinion polls showed support for “assault weapon” bans at 3:1 or 4:1 in favor. In recent years, the issue has become closer to an even split, with ban support often under 50%, and sometimes lower than opposition to the ban.

The change is because a large number of Americans (perhaps about a quarter or a third) over the last three decades have learned what the “assault weapon” ban is about. It does not involve the AK-47, or any other machine gun. Instead, it involves guns that operate exactly the same as the predominant type of ordinary handgun.

Still, there are many Americans who have not learned the difference. People who have little or no personal experience in using firearms are especially vulnerable to deception. Some media figures, politicians, and commentators continue to perpetuate misinformation.

Confusion was inevitable in February 1989, when the “assault weapon” issue was brand new. Three decades later, some public officials and media continue to speak inaccurately. So-called “assault weapons” are not machine guns. Bans on guns that have a military “style” are based on the appearance of firearms, and not their function.

Concealed Carry Reciprocity - More Challenges?

by CRPA Firing Line Contributor

NRA's First Freedom magazine has spotlighted numerous cases where an upstanding citizen with a valid carry permit from their home state traveled to another state with their handgun and faced life-altering legal troubles without committing any malicious act whatsoever. My own tipping point came a number of years ago after a trip to Nevada. I have a Utah carry permit and my two reasons for obtaining that permit was its validity in Utah and also Nevada - two states I visit regularly. I am highly conscientious about researching the gun laws in every state I visit and have verified the validity of my permits by phone with the local law on several occasions prior to trips. However, once I'm satisfied that my permit is valid, I don't go through the same research before every subsequent trip. While further researching carry laws on www.gunlaw.us after my Nevada trip, I noticed that the Nevada legislature had rescinded their honoring of the Utah permit a month or two prior to my trip (they since changed it again). Fortunately, I was able to conclude my trip peacefully, but I realized then that had I interacted with Nevada law enforcement, I may have been arrested and criminally charged for illegally carrying a firearm. The implementation of federal reciprocity legislation would eliminate such pitfalls and anyone who supports concealed carry should support national carry reciprocity.

Unfortunately, I suspect that any federal legislation in support of reciprocity will be a mixed blessing for those living in anti-gun states like California. Undoubtedly, the California legislature has anticipated the dawn of national concealed carry reciprocity for sometime. They have the votes to turn California from a may-issue state into no-issue which would allow California to continue to dishonor out-of-state carry permits. However, it is doubtful that this will happen. The anti-gun politicians in Sacramento are not against concealed carry - they are just against ordinary citizens carrying. California’s current may-issue concealed carry provisions are designed for the well-connected elite and it has worked in their favor for a long time. Some pro-gun sheriffs have been using the current provisions to turn their jurisdictions into shall-issue which must be a bane under the anti-gun politicians’ saddle, but one they are willing to bear. Without changing the current may-issue provisions, these politicians have another tool in their shed to use against legal concealed carry and they’ve already started using it: With the signing of SB707 in 2015, they’ve banned concealed carry holders from carrying on any school campus without the slightest logical reason. When a few school administrators used a provision in the new law that gave them the authority to allow concealed carry in their schools, the anti-gun politicians quickly amended the law to remove that authority with the signing of AB424 last October. I’m afraid that this is just the beginning of a new era of concealed carry restrictions in California. I suspect that the anti-gun politicians will continue to slap prohibition after prohibition on concealed carry holders: restaurants, parks, shopping malls, movie theaters and the list goes on. The well-connected elite with carry permits won’t cause much opposition because the prohibitions likely won’t affect them much. After all, few of them frequent schools and other public places.

A number of anti-gun states could also file a suit in federal court against federal carry reciprocity legislation. A likely argument is that “forcing” one state to honor other states’ permits is a violation of states’ rights. Thus, the passage of HR38 may well be the catalyst of a US Supreme Court ruling on whether the Second Amendment protects the right to carry outside the home. The Supreme Court already declined to hear that case last year, but increased pressure from several states may change that. Of course, a ruling upholding the right to carry outside the home would be monumental advancement for the concealed carry movement as it would affirm the words “bear arms” in the Second Amendment. However, there is also a possibility that the court could rule the other way.

The point of this article is that even if/when HR38 is signed into law, it will open the door to more challenges for concealed carry. The pro-Second Amendment community must anticipate these challenges so that we can meet them head-on. Most importantly, we must ensure that we vote at every election and support politicians who share our views and support the Second Amendment, starting at the local level. The Second Amendment is under constant attack at all levels of government by its foes. Once it is heading down the slippery slope, it won’t come back.
**MYTH:**
Private ownership of guns is not effective in preventing crimes

**FACT:**
Every year, people in the United States use guns to defend themselves against criminals an estimated 2,500,000 times — more than 6,500 people a day, or once every 13 seconds.¹ Of these instances, 15.7% of the people using firearms defensively stated that they “almost certainly” saved their lives by doing so.

**FACT:**
Even the government’s estimate, which has a major methodology problem,² estimates people defend themselves 235,700 times each year with guns.³

**FACT:**
The number of times per year an American uses a firearm to deter a home invasion alone is 498,000.⁴

**FACT:**
In 83.5% (2,087,500) of these successful gun defenses, the attacker either threatened or used force first, proving that guns are very well suited for self-defense.

**FACT:**
The rate of defensive gun use (DGU) is six times that of criminal gun use.⁵

**FACT:**
Of the 2,500,000 times citizens use guns to defend themselves, 92% merely brandish their gun or fire a warning shot to scare off their attackers.⁶

**FACT:**
In most of the remaining 8% of defensive gun uses, a citizen never wounds his or her attacker (they fire warning shots), and in less than one in a thousand instances is the attacker killed.⁷

**FACT:**
In one local review of firearm homicide, more than 12% were civilian legal defensive homicides.⁸

**FACT:**
For every accidental death (802), suicide (16,869) or homicide (11,348)⁹ with a firearm (29,019), 13 lives (390,000)¹⁰ are preserved through defensive use.

**FACT:**
When using guns in self-defense, 91.1% of the time, not a single shot is fired.¹¹

**FACT:**
After the implementation of Canada’s 1977 gun controls prohibiting handgun possession for protection, the “breaking and entering” crime rate rose 25%, surpassing the American rate.¹²

**MYTH:**
Only police should have guns

**FACT:**
“Most criminals are more worried about meeting an armed victim than they are about running into the police.”¹³

**FACT:**
For kids in schools, police end such attacks only 27% of the time.¹⁴

**FACT:**
11% of police shootings kill an innocent person — about 2% of shootings by citizens kill an innocent person.¹⁵

**FACT:**
Police have trouble keeping their own guns. Hundreds of firearms are missing from the FBI and 449 of them have been involved in crimes.¹⁶

**FACT:**
People who saw the helplessness of the L.A. Police Department during the 1992 King Riots or the looting and violence in New Orleans after hurricane Katrina know that citizens need guns to defend themselves.

**FACT:**
“In actual shootings, citizens do far better than law enforcement on hit potential. They hit their targets and they don’t hit other people. I wish I could say the same for cops. We train more, they do better.”¹⁷

**MYTH:**
You are more likely to be injured or killed using a gun for self-defense

**FACT:**
You are far more likely to survive violent assault if you defend yourself with a gun.¹⁸
MYTH:
Guns are not effective in preventing crime against women

FACT:
Of the 2,500,000 annual self-defense cases using guns, more than 7.7% (192,500) are by women defending themselves against sexual abuse.

FACT:
When a woman was armed with a gun or knife, only 3% of rape attacks were completed, compared to 32% when the woman was unarmed.19

FACT:
The probability of serious injury from an attack is 2.5 times greater for women offering no resistance than for women resisting with guns. Men also benefit from using guns, but the benefits are smaller: Men are 1.4 times more likely to receive a serious injury.20

FACT:
28.5% of women have one or more guns in the house.21

FACT:
41.7% of women either own or have convenient access to guns.22

FACT:
In 1966, the city of Orlando responded to a wave of sexual assaults by offering firearms training classes to women. Rapes dropped by nearly 90% the following year.

FACT:
Firearm availability appears to be particularly useful in avoiding rape. The United Kingdom virtually banned handgun ownership. During the same period handgun ownership in the United States steadily rose. Yet the rate of rape decreased in the United States and skyrocketed in the other countries, as shown in the table.

FACT:
More Americans believe having a gun in the home makes them safer. This belief grows every year the survey is taken.23

FACT:
Arthur Kellerman, a researcher whose work is often cited by gun control groups, said “If you’ve got to resist, your chances of being hurt are less the more lethal your weapon. If that were my wife, would I want her to have a .38 Special in her hand? Yeah.”24

Reported Rape Rates 1995-2003 (per 100,000 pop.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>+26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>+59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>-13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:
2. This ongoing victimization survey involved people from the government randomly interviewing victims in person. Some criminologists believe this induces self-reporting biases (e.g., people aren’t likely to tell the government they own a gun). Thus, this data surface from the National Crime Victimization Survey is considered to be an under- and not reliable.
More attention is being paid to the role of mental illness in mass shootings the last several years, reasonably so since nearly all the perpetrators seem to have experienced significant reality distortion. Yet mental illness actually plays very little part in the incidence of “gun violence.” That phrase should mean “violence using guns,” but has come to imply, as its anti-gun originators intend, that guns are somehow the cause of the violence. Addressing this question as if the problem is mental illness vs. the availability of guns sets up a false choice. Some, like my fellow physician, Dr. Kimberly Yonkers, in a recent Washington Post opinion piece keep mistaking that one tree for the forest. But far more factors underlie violence, gun-related and otherwise. The problem is not mental illness … and it isn’t guns, either …

She’s quite right about the generally good availability of mental health treatment in our country compared to anywhere else in the world. She’s right that even if we could magically get everyone with any degree of mental illness treated, and if that somehow prevented all shootings in which the perpetrator exhibited mental illness, 96% of American “gun violence” would still occur.

We’re both 100% in favor of increasing entry to effective psychiatric treatment, especially for the most severely afflicted, and we know this would reduce some of their very rare violence. But this would make almost no difference in the overall amount of violence we experience in our society.

Jumping from this point to the conclusion that the only other way to reduce “gun violence” is to further restrict access to guns just isn’t logical. Most academic physicians follow the ossified, over 20-year-old anti-gun position of their leadership that “gun violence is a public health issue.” Notice how often we see that mantra? Dr. Yonkers gives a passing glance to the problems of “poverty, domestic violence and childhood exposure to bloodshed” as contributors to violence in America, but she doesn’t choose to explore them. Yet these and other socio-cultural issues are fundamental to the problem.

Physicians don’t read criminology research, so they entirely miss the value of gun use for self-defense (especially the great majority of instances in which no shots are fired). They don’t often address the tragic crime epidemic among undisciplined teens and young adults competing for gang and drug turf and money. Neither of these groups represents the mentally ill. They are, respectively, average citizens using guns for one of the purposes for which they’re intended, criminals misusing guns for their own antisocial reasons. And the mass shooters of the past 20 years, while likely mentally ill, neither availed themselves of adequate treatment options nor could have been stopped from acquiring their weapons by any existing or proposed law.

Like every anti-gun proponent, Dr. Yonkers presents skewed data. Yes, a number of developed countries have lower rates of gun homicide than ours. But the U.S.’s overall homicide rate is still low compared to worldwide rates and we have low (and decreasing) overall violent crime rates compared to nearly every where, despite so many other countries denying their citizens the right to gun ownership.

Suicide is very culturally influenced regardless of the availability of guns, and accidents are the clear responsibility of gun users. Consider all this in the context of the U.S.’s virtually unique protection of citizens’ right to keep and bear arms, with the greatest number of privately-owned firearms per person by far. That means we are already one of the safest populations of gun users in the world, even with the bad things that inevitably happen.

This is the bigger picture, one which biased observers like Dr. Yonkers can’t see or don’t want seen. But the American public is seeing it with a clearly positive view of the value of firearms to their lives.

There are so many more productive approaches than more limits on gun ownership, ones that would actually help decrease violence, gun-related and otherwise, such as:

• Enhancing legal firearm use with universal shall-issue laws, which give criminals pause and are associated with decreases in violent crime almost everywhere they’re introduced.
• Consistent prosecution and sentencing crimes committed with firearms and illegal gun purchases.
• Eliminating fantasy “gun-free zones” (simplest, by allowing concealed carry, or at least using armed guards) that are always the preference of madmen wanting to cause the most harm.
• Promoting real gun safety education, meaning how to use and manage firearms safely (via NRA and many other training resources) instead of quoting medical orthodoxy’s only advice: “Don’t keep them in your home but, if you must, lock guns and ammunition in separate places.”
• Teaching all our children that police are our friends when we need help, but to do what they say, and never threaten them.
• And yes, strengthening mental health commitment-to-treatment laws (especially for outpatient treatment) combined with very temporary removal of known weapons based on imminent clinical risk, with every step requiring due process as is currently followed for inpatient commitment.

I can’t wait for the real “conversation” to begin.

Is It Mental Illness, Guns Or...What?

by Dr. Robert Young, MD

Dr. Robert Young, MD
Board-Certified Psychiatrist
A board-certified psychiatrist practicing in upstate New York who enjoys guns and shooting. He is a Distinguished Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association and an Associate Clinical Professor at the University of Rochester School of Medicine who has been recognized for excellence in medical teaching. He is very pleased, through Doctors for Responsible Gun Ownership, to dispel the myth of guns being health issues and to promote the human rights of self-defense and autonomy that our Constitution confirms.

*Article was originally published on https://drgo.us/is-it-mental-illness-or-is-it-guns-or-what/"
According to those who have studied mass murders, we have talked ourselves into two anecdotal false-belief groups about their cause and the way to end them. One is that military style firearms are the culprit, and that banning them will do the trick. The other is that the killers are mentally ill and that their identification and removal from society is the answer. Problem is, those suppositions are untrue on even cursory examination. It’s the same for most proposed law change solutions. Most expert opinion holds, not only would they be ineffective, they would require an expansion of police powers to the point of quashing constitutional rights and fundamentally altering the relationship of the individual to the government.

The AR-15 made me do it. Are military style semi-auto rifles to blame?

If so, why didn’t we have mass shootings starting from around 1920 when real military semi-auto and fully automatic weaponry with 30 round or larger magazines was far more available than now and background check vetting was a promise to “be responsible for the gun’s resale only to those on the side of law and order,” according to an Auto-Ordinance Company ad?

Auto-Ordinance made the Thompson sub machine gun aka, the “Tommy Gun”, the “chopper”, the “Chicago typewriter” etc.

That was the sub machine gun used in the 1929 St. Valentine’s Day massacre, of rival gangsters by Al Capone gunmen.

Gangster Vincent Daniels (facing camera), alias Danielski, explained how easy they were to get to a Chicago Tribune reporter: “It is no trouble to buy machine guns. All I had to do was to send to New York for them and they were shipped to me.” Chicago’s then deputy police chief estimated gangs owned over 500 machine guns in Chicago alone. Almost 40 years later, not much had changed.

The gun in this famous 1967 photo has a 30 round magazine, was owned by hundreds of thousands if not millions of Americans and could be legally purchased for around $20 by mail, few if any questions asked, long before the AR-15 or the AK-47 (remember that previous bogeyman?) were invented. It’s an M1 carbine, an arm that was widely used by American and allied troops from W.W.II to the present day. Some that look just like this one are machine guns -- and plenty of those and other full auto war weapons were lying around people’s houses in addition to being rather easy to buy.

My friends and I knew of about 15 fully operational machine guns in my hometown of Chapel Hill, North Carolina during the 1950s, 60s and 70s as well as others in Durham, Raleigh and other towns. The same was true in major cities where I lived like Baltimore, Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Houston and those weapons are probably still around. Assuming the touted relationship between military style weapons and mass shootings - is true, why were they not used to do that until fairly recently?

The likely answer is that a collection of societal values and self controls that made such acts unthinkable were still in place and popular culture -- even in shoot ‘em up TV and movie westerns and crime shows --reinforced them. More on that down the page, but in the absence of those values, calls for more “gun control” follow every high profile murder incident with confiscation of all privately owned firearms being the ultimate goal. That is the known objective because the founder of the modern “gun control” movement, the late Nelson “Pete” Shields, said so and his successors continue to echo it. Not publicly, mind you. Such candor is reserved for people like me while on the board of the ACLU of Southern California.

Are Mass Killers “Crazy?”

by Dan Gifford, Film Producer and Reporter

Around 20% were say mental health professionals. But what about the rest? Why did they murder and what can be done to prevent others from doing the same thing?
The language for public consumption is guiled as “reasonable gun control.” Washington Post pundit Charles Krauthammer is an exception to that deception. He openly stated and justified the anti-Second Amendment lobby confiscation objective when the Clinton administration’s “assault weapons” law ban was up for repeal in 1996.

“Even a cynic must marvel at the all-round phoniness of the debate over repeal of the assault weapons ban. The claim of the advocates that banning these 19 types of ‘assault weapons’ will reduce the crime rate is laughable. In fact, the assault weapons ban will have no significant effect either on the crime rate or on personal security. Nonetheless, it is a good idea, though for reasons its proponents dare not enunciate. I am not up for reelection. So let me elaborate the real logic of the ban…. Its only real justification is not to reduce crime but to desensitize the public to the regulation of weapons in preparation for their ultimate confiscation. Yes, Sarah Brady is doing God’s work. Yes, in the end America must follow the way of other democracies and disarm.”

You may agree or disagree with Krauthammer but you must laud his candor. The ACLU frankness for public consumption is that it refuses to view the Second Amendment as an individual right despite two Supreme Court decisions ruled it is. So if the Second Amendment isn’t an individual right in the ACLU view and that of other like thinkers, it is open to unlimited restriction. That means game on for Shields’ plan.

That plan calls for Second Amendment death by a thousand accumulated “reasonable restrictions.” So, no matter what “gun control” laws are passed today for the sake of public safety, there will always be a demand for some other “reasonable restriction” tomorrow that must be enacted for the sake of public safety until both the right is meaningless and the legal property of individuals has been officially seized without compensation as advocated recently by NAACP President and CEO Derrick Johnson in a Black Press USA column.

Measures like that, used to be opposed by many of America’s prominent intellectuals like H.L. Mencken and major newspapers for reasons that are derided today. For instance, when legislation was proposed to ban machine guns from private possession during a time when Chicago’s deputy police chief said gangs there owned 500 or more of them, the 1934 Chicago Tribune editorial board opposed it:

“In the revolutionary war the people were able to gain their liberties because when they tried for them possession of firearms was common and many of the citizens knew how to use them. A disarmed population of people familiar with weapons would not have had much chance. In 1789 the weapons in general use would be long rifles, muskets, and clumsy pistols. The people were entitled to have the best weapons they could make or purchase. Now the best weapons for individuals are machine guns and automatic rifles. Use which can be made of these is indicated by law, but it is not the possession of which is properly an offense under the constitution.

It is notorious that when restrictions are put upon the possession of firearms or any particular kind of weapon they never are effective against the criminal classes but only put the peaceable man at a disadvantage or in a false position before the law. The prohibition does not bother the enemy of society but it makes a technical offender of the decent citizen. The man who would not misuse a weapon is the man who is injured. The drive for public security is thus given the wrong direction.”

Those who like the idea of bans, confiscations or “reasonable restriction” deception on Second Amendment rights should consider the current level of “reasonable restrictions” enacted by our current crop of speech Nazis at Google, newsrooms and universities great and small next to the question posed by University of Texas constitutional law professor Sanford Levinson in his 1989 Yale Law Review piece, The Embarrassing Second Amendment: “If the Second Amendment isn’t worth the paper it’s written on, what price the First?”

Or the rest?

LOCK UP THE CRAZIES

That’s the solution many have proposed even though those who have done the most research on mass killers say the vast majority of them are not mentally ill or insane in the legal or psychiatric sense that they do not know right from wrong and cannot distinguish fantasy from reality or have uncontrollable impulsive behavior.

But even if all mass killers were legally insane or suspected of being so, Dewey Cornell, director of the Virginia Youth Violence Project, notes that civil commitment laws can make it nearly impossible to hospitalize adults involuntarily. Even if those around them feel threatened. Liza Gold, a forensic psychiatrist at the Georgetown University School of Medicine in Washington says that civil commitment laws have been fashioned to protect civil liberties. For that, thank the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and their diagnosed schizophrenic paranoid client, Billie Boggs.

That was the nom du media of Joyce Brown, a self described “street woman” who viewed a New York City sidewalk ventilation grate as her home. She threw her feces at passersby, engaged in loud profane rants and appeared at times as if she would assault pedestrians. I know she was that bad, because I saw her and wrote stories about those antics. Then one day, New York City mayor Ed Koch sent police around during the late 1980s to take those living on the street, many of them clear psychotics like Boggs, to a shelter so they wouldn’t freeze in an approaching subzero storm; she refused to go.

Her removal by force to Bellevue mental hospital where she received involuntary medication that made her “sane” for a time became a cause celebre for NYCLU and ACLU lawyers who
filed a lawsuit against Boggs’ involuntary commitment. In a decision that had far reaching legal consequences for forced psychiatric care that have crippled involuntary psychiatric commitments of the mentally ill around the country ever since, the New York State Supreme Court ordered Boggs be released. In a USA Today article, Gold summed up our present predicament regarding the mentally ill: “In the past, you could just go to a magistrate and say, ‘My wife is crazy, you need to put her away’, “People could be held involuntarily for extended lengths of time, even without receiving treatment, just because they were perceived as ‘crazy.’” Now, Gold says, “All states generally require (someone) provide clear and convincing evidence that someone is imminently dangerous to themselves or others,” And “imminent” is typically interpreted to mean the past 24 to 72 hours. How did that happen? Blame the ‘60s which put the social foundation for the Boggs decision in place, says Washington, DC attorney Joseph Scalia: “Like most bad ideas sprouted in the 1960s, poor judgment coupled with the fever of the civil rights movement thought it would be a good idea to give crazy people ‘rights’ and let them live in the community.” It’s a position I often heard at The Johns Hopkins School of Epidemiology and Public Health, where my mother was a professor during that time. That idea would lead to the Boggs decision and spawn the oft repeated myth that a heartless President Ronald Reagan closed the mental hospitals and kicked the patients onto the streets. Scalia: “Now, 60 years later and ‘off their meds,’ they terrorize their families and hold entire communities hostage. In an earlier, ‘less enlightened’ time they would have been committed and cared for in a mental hospital at the taxpayers expense. People like the Parkland shooter, the Sandy Hook shooter, the Arizona Congresswoman shooter, the Denver theater shooter (dressed like the Joker no less) would have all been put away a long time ago. The homeless, who self-medicate with booze and illegal drugs, the machete killers, the subway pushers all would have been brooding from within the confines of their local mental institution.”

So if the majority of mass killers are not psychotic, why do they kill and what can be done to stop them? “It’s important to recognize there’s no one answer to that,” says Peter Langman, a psychologist who has done much research on mass killings and written two books on the subject. But the first step is to identify the profile of those who have killed. Langman’s research in addition to that of University of California, San Diego, psychiatry professor Reid Meloy and others show that the typical mass killer is a white male in his 20s to early 40s who has shown violent or antisocial behavior before, and who believes his life sucks.

It’s very typical for the killers to feel disempowered, notes Langman. They usually feel like rejected losers in that things are going badly for them at work or in personal relationships. Young males find that situation very tough to deal with and tend to blame others for whatever isn’t going right. “To that, add narcissism expressed as a desire to have notoriety lift them from obscurity,” says San Diego State University psychology professor Jean Twenge.

Narcissism among young boys has increased, her research found. Likely suspects mentioned for that include helicopter-parenting, unearned praise and or reality television. The millennial and snowflake generations are much more sensitive to rejection than their predecessors. Some 40 or 50 years ago, children wanted to be astronauts or doctors or lawyers. Now, fame is at the top of the desire list Twenge found.

Chris Harper-Mercer, the 26-year-old student at Oregon’s Umpqua Community College, who murdered a professor and eight students in 2015 is a typical example of that desire. He posted online his admiration for the notoriety a former television station employee received when he shot and killed two former coworkers. “A man who was known by no one, is now known by everyone,” Harper-Mercer wrote. “His face splashed across every screen, his name across the lips of every person on the planet, all in the course of one day. Seems the more people you kill, the more you’re in the limelight.”

The New Yorker’s Malcolm Gladwell, nicely described how such acts have become accepted behavior in the minds of potential murderers. “The riot has now engulfed the boys who were once content to play with chemistry sets in the basement. The problem is not that there is an endless supply of deeply disturbed young men who are willing to contemplate horrific acts. It’s worse. It’s that young men no longer need to be deeply disturbed to contemplate horrific acts.”

If Gladwell is right -- and I fear he is -- “if you see something, say something” may save lives -- assuming police take action when warned and don’t just sit on their butts as has been the case in many mass murders. But “see something, say something” may also have a downside. It may condition citizens to become informants and portend an overzealous American Stasi SWAT state of secret dossiers and preventive detention gulags supported by snitches.

Dan Gifford
Film Producer and Reporter
J ust two months ago, CRPA’s Firing Line ran an article by C.D. Michel highlighting how the murderers in Texas and Tehama ignored existing laws and managed to slip through the cracks in the background check system. Multiple gun-control laws and government agencies failed to stop the killers from obtaining their firearms. And while hardened security helped, it took good guys with guns to ultimately end the murderous acts.

In the wake of the Parkland school shooting, calls for stricter gun laws were immediate and strident. The usual suspects demanded government to enact “common sense” bans that will purportedly “make us safer” and prevent these types of tragedies from happening in the future. But then we started to learn the facts.

We learned that the FBI failed to act on a tip concerning the shooter the month before the shooting. We learned that the local authorities received dozens of calls regarding the potential threat the shooter was to himself and others. We learned the shooter had previously been expelled for bringing knives onto campus. We learned that the shooter did not use so-called “large-capacity” magazines. And we also learned the school’s armed resource officer, along with three other sheriff’s deputies, waited outside the school while the shooting unfolded.

There is no other way to put it—the Parkland school shooting represents a gun control failure of monumental proportions. And the anti-gun advocates know it.

So they changed their strategy. This time, anti-gun forces enlisted the help of like-minded students who survived the shooting. They did so under the guise of a CNN “town hall” to hold a “fair” and “honest” discussion regarding the Second Amendment. But it was nothing of the sort. Lacking factual support, anti-gun advocates resorted to a level of vitriol and hostility rarely seen on mainstream television. Some audience members went as far as labeling NRA’s Dana Loesch a “murderer” and called to “burn her.”

But she maintained her composure. And when Broward County Sheriff Scott Israel argued that police need more power to take away people’s firearms, and more power to detain individuals and have them committed to mental institutions, Loesch pointed out that the shooter had been contacted by law enforcement over 39 times, had taken weapons to school, and had assaulted others (including his parents and other students)—yet his department did nothing. Instead of addressing these failures head on, he responded by accusing Loesch of being “completely wrong” regarding the facts. So much for a “fair” and “honest” discussion.

What’s more, California law enforcement already have this kind of power, yet even that wasn’t enough to stop the Tehama County shooter from killing 5 people.

Anti-gun hostility isn’t just aimed at the NRA. Gun control advocates have also taken to publicly shaming companies that support the NRA or other pro-gun causes. Several NRA-affiliated businesses responded by ending their promotional programs with the organization. But rejecting constitutional rights for the sake of appeasement is not without costs.

After Delta Airlines rescinded their travel discount for NRA members—which has only been used 13 times—Georgia lawmakers repealed a tax exemption that would have saved the airline over $40 million. Clearly, NRA members didn’t join for the travel discount.

There is little doubt that the anti-gun media is doing everything in its power to portray the NRA as an evil organization. Whatever their reasons for doing so, such animosity appears to be backfiring, and in a big way. Searches in Google for “NRA membership” have risen over 4,900% since the CNN town hall. And searches for “NRA” continue to out-pace searches for “gun control” in the wake of the Florida shooting by a wide margin.

A Stark Contrast—Maryland School Resource Officer Stops School Shooter

Less than a week after students across the country participated in a well-funded and well-organized anti-gun “walk out,” another shooting at a school unfolded in southeastern Maryland. This time, however, the school’s armed resource officer did exactly what he was trained to do and responded by engaging the shooter in less than a minute.

While the exact details remain unclear, Deputy First Class Blaine Gaskill, a SWAT team officer who also serves as Great Mills
High School’s resource officer, was alerted to the shooting and responded immediately. Even Maryland’s Governor Larry Hogan stated that it “sure sounds like this is exactly the way it should have been handled.”

As NRA’s Wayne LaPierre has repeatedly said, armed security is “the only security solution that is proven to work” against these types of threats, which is why NRA “called repeatedly for trained armed security in every American school.” Deputy Gaskill’s heroic actions prove that point without question. But is this story getting the same amount of attention from the media? Of course not. Why? Because it was a “good guy with a gun” that stopped the killing.

Are You Prepared to Make Your Safety Your Personal Responsibility?

Taking away the rights of law-abiding citizens will do nothing to stop evil. NRA and CRPA have, and always will, advocate for a person’s right to choose how they can defend themselves. You can either take responsibility for your own safety or place your trust in the government—the same government which has repeatedly failed to enforce its own laws, failed to act on a legitimate threat, and failed to intervene during an active shooter incident.

The choice is yours.

But to CRPA, the choice is obvious. Right now, CRPA is working to bring “shall-issue” to California and is partnering with pro-gun California sheriffs to issue CCW’s to California residents as part of NRA-CRPA’s joint “Carry On!” initiative. Make sure to subscribe to CRPA bulletins at www.crpa.org for more information on how you can obtain a CCW and take responsibility for your own safety.
Although the sale or transfer of an “assault weapon” under California law is generally prohibited, California firearm dealers with a valid Dangerous Weapon Permit (“DWP”) are provided a limited exception for the purposes of sales or transfers to law enforcement. Such permits are necessary for California licensed firearm dealers to provide California law enforcement with equipment necessary for the performance of their duties.

Obtaining a DWP from the California Department of Justice (“DOJ”) is extremely difficult and time consuming. The process, which usually takes over a year to complete, is so difficult in fact that many firearm dealers don’t even bother applying. And to the extent a dealer does obtain a DWP, their difficulties don’t end there. Permit holders must follow special record keeping, storage, and transportation requirements in addition to those already imposed on California firearm dealers. What’s more, DWP holders must pay up to $1,500 to “cover” the costs of DOJ’s annual inspections.

And unlike other types of licenses or permits relating to the sale or transfer of firearms, a DWP is only issued to an individual, not the business entity for which it is being used. This means that only the permit holder can have access to any firearm classified as a “dangerous weapon” and must oversee handling by non-licensed individuals. Any other employee of the business is strictly prohibited from having unfettered access, thereby requiring a DWP holder to store the firearms separately from other inventory and be physically present for all sales or transfers.

Given these restrictions, it is no surprise that less than 7% of California licensed firearm dealers (207 in total) have a valid DWP. What is surprising, however, is how DOJ often treats DWP holders during its annual inspections.

DOJ continues to arrest and seize property for otherwise innocuous violations. Instead, DOJ “inspectors” employ wildly varying interpretations of California firearms law, making it difficult and often impossible for a DWP holder to avoid violations. DOJ previously took a more lenient approach to these affairs by typically issuing a warning or citation for a first offense. Lately, however, DOJ is much more aggressive and will not hesitate to make an arrest for otherwise trivial violations.

There is no question that DOJ has a legitimate interest in ensuring firearms are stored and handled properly by a DWP holder. But the extremes to which DOJ is taking its enforcement is nothing short of detrimental to public safety and serves no purpose other than to make owning a legitimate firearms business as difficult as possible and waste what little judicial resources are available—all so DOJ can bolster its statistics concerning enforcement of California firearms law.

DOJ would be wise to remember that such dealers are necessary to adequately equip California law enforcement in the performance of their duties. Continuing excessive enforcement practices will only cause the number of DWP holders to continue plummeting—a dangerous proposition for all of California.
Indoctrination Starts Early
Spotlight on Anti-Gun Bias in California Schools
by Heather Allen, CRPA Volunteer Coordinator

“Sorry, Mrs. Allen, we cannot accept the donations your daughter submitted for the Jog-A-Thon”

That was the phone call I received on February 14th around 8:30am. You see, the CRPA and NRA graciously donated $100 each to my daughter’s First Annual Jog-A-Thon (Thank You Rick Travis and Glen Caroline!). After receiving approval from both the school secretary and PTA Jog-A-Thon Mom that donations from both organizations would be accepted, the Principal ultimately shot them down.

Clearly this was very upsetting. Working for the CRPA I am well aware of all the hard work both CRPA and NRA do in defending all American citizen’s Second Amendment rights. I immediately requested a meeting which was granted by the school’s Operations Director, who was one of the staff members to deny the checks. There, I simply asked for a logical explanation as to why the donations from the CRPA and NRA would not be accepted. I was told that it wasn’t necessarily the school that was against it, but more that some parents “may” associate school shootings with the organization. I told him it was unfortunate they would be giving all the power to the misinformed and uneducated. I made a point to emphasize that both CRPA’s and NRA’s mission is to promote safety and responsibility for those who exercise their Constitutional Rights to keep and bear arms.

Any time he brought up the word “political” I stopped him and said both organizations have Republican, Democratic and Independent members and simply back candidates who are pro-2A. He said they did not want to give the perception that the school was endorsing the organizations, to which I made the point that it was the CRPA and NRA that was sponsoring the school. At one point, he stated that guns only have one purpose—to kill people. I replied that I didn’t think one of our members, Kim Rhode, a six-time Olympic medalist would agree with his statement. What I regret not asking was whether the school would accept donations from both organizations would be accepted, the Principal ultimately shot them down.

Then I got home. I turned on the television. The Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School Shooting was all over the news. Little did I know, my defense of the CRPA, NRA and firearms minutes prior was literally a FRACTION of what was to come.

Fast forward to March 14th. It was 10:45am and I was meeting my 9-year-old at her weekly school Chapel.

“Mom, we almost had to do it.”

“Do what?”

“Go outside and write letters.”

“To WHOM?”

“To the Government.”

I could literally hear the record screeching in my brain. “Are you KIDDING me??”

I calmly walked into the office and asked what type of anti-gun demonstration had been done that day because clearly no form of communication had gone out to parents. This was strange considering we get what feels like hundreds of emails weekly regarding Sees Candy sales, PTA meetings, Picture Day, etc. But a “Walk Out”? Nope. Not one word about it. The secretary said nothing was mandatory, but students had the option to leave at 10AM and go outside to the flagpole where they could pray and write letters to the government. The funny part is—I KNOWN this was going to happen I would have LOVED for my daughter to write a letter to the “Government”. Only her letter would have said something more like this:

Dear Governor Brown,

Since the 1950s 98.4% of mass shootings occur in “Gun Free Zones”. I’m sure my teachers would appreciate having a firearm to protect themselves and their students instead of using their bodies as shields. I would love to see my school receive the same protection that celebrities receive at the Oscars.

Also, can you please stop releasing violent felons from our jails and prisons back onto my streets, while at the same time restricting my families’ rights to protect themselves from these precise individuals?

Signed,
A Concerned 4th Grader

How many parents would have been upset if the school had NOT allowed for there to be a walk out? That honestly was the last straw for my Veteran, LEO husband and myself. We just cannot in good conscience send our daughter to a private school that would facilitate a walk out in protest of her God given, Constitutional Right as an American. I actually told the office staff right then and there that I felt like I needed to sign a form indicating I did not want my fourth grader participating in political activism at school. Hopefully this is a wakeup call for them to keep politics out of schools, as other families are also contemplating on leaving.

This experience has left me feeling prouder to be a part of this fight. I come to work everyday with a renewed energy and drive to do what I can to preserve all Californian’s Second Amendment rights, whether they wish to exercise them or not.

Oh, and about that Jog-A-Thon. She got 1st Place!
Ever since I was little, I loved guns. My favorite toy was a plastic gun and growing up, I wanted to play army and go against my friends, pretending to be soldiers. That carried with me for years to come. I was infatuated with westerns and war movies. I shot my first gun at the age of 7, a snub-nosed .38 revolver that almost flew out of my hand.

When I joined the Marine Corps, I thought it was going to be a quick 4 year enlistment and then off to better things. It was the year 2000 and of course, nothing was really going on so why not. I would have joined out of high school but my mom said to finish college or she’d disown me. I signed up for infantry even though the recruiter told me I should go intelligence because he said infantry was dumb. I couldn’t understand how anyone who signed up for the military could want anything other than infantry. I told him to give me infantry or I’ll go to the Army recruiter.

In 2001, 9/11 happened and that changed my life forever... especially since it was my birthday that day. I deployed to the Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003 and after my first firefight, I was pretty much hooked. I deployed again in 2004 to Operation Phantom Fury in Fallujah. They called it the biggest urban assault since Hue City, Vietnam. I was a Squad Leader and in charge of 13 Marines and 1 Navy Corpsman. It was quite possibly the best and worst deployment I’ve ever been on. It definitely shaped who I am today and my outlook on life.

Most of the guys I knew got out of the Marine Corps after that deployment, it was that bad. A few stayed in and I was torn between staying in or doing something better. I couldn’t imagine that any other deployment could top Fallujah so I left the Marine Corps in 2005 to try out to become a Green Beret with the Army. Most people ask me why not join the Navy SEALs and especially since we had a SEAL team with us during Fallujah but by then, I had done all the research I needed to and knew what I wanted. I knew it wasn’t going to be easy but I had to try.

In 2007, after two years of brutal testing I graduated from the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School with my Green Beret and an assignment to 5th Special Forces Group at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. I made sure that I choose the job of 18B, Weapons Sergeant. All I wanted was to learn weapons and be the best 18B I could be. I studied American weapons, Russian weapons, Chinese and other Asian weapons, Italian, German, Austrian and countless others. I made sure I knew how to break them down, put them back together again as well as troubleshoot if they didn’t work properly.

I spent the next 8 years deploying to Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, UAE and almost every other Middle Eastern country in that region. I gained a deep understanding of Middle Eastern culture and their society. I learned to speak Afghan Dari & Persian Farsi fluently and became proficient in Arabic and Spanish. I trained with the British SAS, Australian SAS, French GIGN and some other foreign agencies. I deployed to countless schools in the states as well as overseas and worked with other Special Operations units as well as FBI, CIA, DIA, NSA and other U.S. government agencies. In those 8 years I was trained in many different skillsets including shooting proficiently with a pistol and rifle.

My few years at 5th Special Forces Group I had the honor and privilege of teaching Green Berets at one of Army Special Forces’ top shooting schools called SFAUC (Special Forces Advanced Urban Combat). There we taught 40 Green Berets every 6 weeks. Each man shot about 1000-1500 rounds a day and learned everything from advanced pistol & rifle marksmanship, shooting & moving, mechanical and explosive breaching, CQB (close quarters battle), Vehicle CQB, urban patrolling & assaults and full mission planning.

I used that time to work on myself as well and become the best SFAUC cadre I could be. I started recording myself to watch my form and see where I could speed up, slow down and just improve. I was quickly running out of room on my phone so I started a private Instagram page and loaded all my video there. It was the single best self assessment tool I could have used for improvement. It showed me everything I did right and wrong. When I decided to get out of the military, I made my Instagram page public in hopes of people being able to watch me, read my captions and learn something from it. A year and a half later, I have well over 110,000 followers and am a sponsored shooter & instructor by numerous companies.

Now, I am the Chief Operations Officer and a partner at Musa Media.
which include four companies: Musa Productions, Musa Military Entertainment Consulting, The All Warrior Network and we just launched The Musa Store in November 2017. The Musa Store is an e-commerce store and an exciting project that keeps me busy. I wanted to create a one stop shop of all the best tactical gear and apparel for the shooter community. It will include all the best brand names that I deployed with and test in combat. Every product on The Musa Store has been curated by myself with one question as the criteria, would I depend on this piece of gear with my life?

Outside of those four companies, I continue to teach everything from fundamental to advanced marksmanship & tactics to civilians, law enforcement units, government agencies and even around the world. I continue to work with several companies on product development and enhancement as well as help test & evaluate new gear and equipment. My passion is to continue to educate as many people as I can in firearms and I will dedicate the rest of my life to protecting our rights under the Second Amendment through all my social media platforms, teaching our citizens and working with key figures in our communities to help make sure we put the right people in office that will relay our message, as our voice.

For more on Kawa’s opportunities for educating and where to find products follow him on Instagram: @2alpha2quit. Visit The Musa Store at www.musa-store.com and Musa Consulting at www.musaconsulting.com.

It’s my firm conviction that when Uncle Sam calls, by God we go, and we do the best that we can.

- R. Lee Ermey

Traveling to war torn Al-Kut, Iraq, Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan, he reprises his role as Gunny Sergeant Hartman in a comedy routine. It brought joy to the troops in attendance. He took the show onto Qatar and Kuwait to encourage troops who were supporting the mission.

Telling the truth was at the core of how he lived his life without compromise. Ermey stood up at countless Shot Show events, gun shows, made various public appearances, and attended competitive shooting matches, standing side by side with the public and encouraging them to stand up and fight for the Second Amendment. He supported the CRPA in being both a member and competitor in Service Rifle matches on the local level while serving on the NRA Board at the National level.

Ermey stood up to the Obama Administration after voting for President Obama in 2008. He publicly criticized the path Obama was taking with the nation at a cost to his professional career losing contracts with auto insurance giant, GEICO, who fired him for his remarks in 2010. Hollywood would according to Ermey himself soon blackball him from many roles. He didn’t compromise, nor did he claim he continued to fight for the constitution of the United States to the day he left us.

General George S. Patton said, “It is foolish and wrong to mourn the men who died. Rather we should thank God that such men lived.” Thank God for R. Lee Ermey’s example of a life well lived.

Written by Rick Travis, CRPA Executive Director (Twitter: @CRPA_Exec)
Do more gun control laws mean fewer firearm deaths? Gun control advocates typically provide graphs looking across states that show more gun control laws related to fewer firearm deaths, but there are real problems with this approach. A Boston University School of Public Health project is one of the latest to make the rounds in various news outlets.

Few academics look at such purely cross-sectional data, simply because it is impossible in that case to accurately account for differences across different places. One of the classic comparisons is the homicide rates between the US and the UK. People will point out that the UK has strict gun control laws, few legally owned guns, and a low homicide rate. But the homicide rate in the UK has always been low, even before they had any gun control law. Indeed, when they banned handguns in January 1997 their homicide rates rose dramatically, up 45% over the next eight years and only came back down after a large increase in the number of police.

One other caution should also be raised. Lumping all the different gun control numbers into one number is pretty arbitrary. Not only is there the issue of what gun control laws to include, there is also the issue of how to weight them. Is a three day waiting period on buying guns the same as background checks on private transfers or a ban on open carrying of guns? Just adding up the number of laws in a state assumes that all the laws have the same importance. There is also the question of how many different ways that one divides up an existing law. For example, the Boston University dataset separately counts whether there is a background required to get a concealed handgun permit and also separately whether a background check is needed to renew the permit, but not whether training is required to get a permit (or the varying lengths of training) or the large differences in permit fees.

This discretion allows a lot of possible data manipulation. You can exclude or include what laws to use in constructing your score based on how it is correlated with homicides or suicides. The Brady Campaign index that we will use has a correlation coefficient of .86 with the Boston University index. Brady Campaign’s listing of gun control laws is a credible source from the perspective of gun control groups and because they would be less likely to be aware of how the index might be used by future statisticians they would be less likely to manipulate it to get their desired results at least when panel data is used (the bias would still be likely with purely cross-sectional data).

The typical academic approach for dealing with many different gun control laws is actually quite different. Rather than lumping all the laws together the normal approach is to simultaneously account for each law separately in a regression. For example, Dr. Lott’s book, More Guns, Less Crime (University of Chicago Press, 2010, 3rd edition), examines 13 different types of gun control laws and also accounts for differences in things such as the length of waiting periods, the number of hours of training required to get a permit, and the yearly cost of a concealed handgun permit.

However, before we get into the problems with purely cross-sectional data, we will discuss how sensitive these claims are to even slight variations in how things are set up.

Below is a graph showing each state’s number of gun control laws in 2016 from the Boston University School of Public Health. The horizontal axis shows firearm deaths (firearm suicides and homicides) per 100,000 people. Click on the figure to enlarge. The Brady Campaign has been collecting information on the number of gun control laws by state from 2001 to 2013. We use the Brady Campaign dataset separately counts whether there is a background required to get a concealed handgun permit and also separately whether a background check is needed to renew the permit, but not whether training is required to get a permit (or the varying lengths of training) or the large differences in permit fees.

This discretion allows a lot of possible data manipulation. You can exclude or include what laws to use in constructing your score based on how it is correlated with homicides or suicides. The Brady Campaign index that we will use has a correlation coefficient of .86 with the Boston University index. Brady Campaign’s listing of gun control laws is a credible source from the perspective of gun control groups and because they would be less likely to be aware of how the index might be used by future statisticians they would be less likely to manipulate it to get their desired results at least when panel data is used (the bias would still be likely with purely cross-sectional data).

The typical academic approach for dealing with many different gun control laws is actually quite different. Rather than lumping all the laws together the normal approach is to simultaneously account for each law separately in a regression. For example, Dr. Lott’s book, More Guns, Less Crime (University of Chicago Press, 2010, 3rd edition), examines 13 different types of gun control laws and also accounts for differences in things such as the length of waiting periods, the number of hours of training required to get a permit, and the yearly cost of a concealed handgun permit.

However, before we get into the problems with purely cross-sectional data, we will discuss how sensitive these claims are to even slight variations in how things are set up.

Below is a graph showing each state’s number of gun control laws in 2016 from the Boston University School of Public Health. The horizontal axis shows firearm deaths (firearm suicides and homicides) per 100,000 people. Click on the figure to enlarge. The Brady Campaign has been collecting information on the number of gun control laws by state from 2001 to 2013. We use the Brady Campaign because our later discussions depend on using the difference in state laws over many different years.

The Brady Campaign didn’t release a report for 2005 and while the also have information for 2014, they used a different scale so it is hard to include that last year in the data that we will be showing you. The average state Brady Index score over this period of time is 24.1 with state rating ranging from 0 to 95 (standard deviation of 22.5). In any case, putting together graphs for the Brady Campaign’s collection of state laws and graphing that for total firearm deaths produces similar results to those shown by Boston University.
We now break down firearm deaths into two categories: firearm homicides and firearm suicides. While more gun laws mean fewer of both kinds of deaths, only the relationship for firearm suicides is statistically significant.
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The relationship between the number of gun laws and firearm homicides in this estimate is very small. The effect of the number of gun laws explains about 3% of the variation in firearm homicides (this is from comparing the adjusted R2 with and without the index for the number of gun laws).

So even given this simple correlation that gun control advocates prefer, the result is driven by the supposed relationship between stricter gun laws and firearm suicides.

Stricter gun laws are also statistically significantly related to fewer non-firearm suicides, while the negative relationship is not as pronounced as for firearm suicides, it is still not exactly what gun control advocates would predict. It is kind of hard to explain why stricter gun laws mean fewer non-firearm suicides.

More likely, stricter gun control laws happen to be associated with other factors, that in turn leads to a less suicide-prone environment. In a relatively famous economics paper on suicide, Cutler, Glaeser, and Norberg found that rural areas have both a large male-female population imbalance and also more gun ownership. But they argue that it is the high number of partnerless older men that causes more suicides in rural areas.
There is a real problem in simply comparing different places at a specific moment in time. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that high-crime states are the ones that most frequently adopt the most stringent gun control laws. What if gun control actually lowered crime, but not by enough to reduce rates to the same low levels prevailing in the majority of states that did not adopt the laws? With a simple comparison across countries, it would then falsely appear that stricter gun control resulted in higher crime. Economists refer to this as an “endogeneity” problem. The adoption of the policy is a reaction to other “endogenous” events — in this case, crime. To resolve this, one must examine how the high-crime areas that chose to adopt the controls changed over time — not only relative to their own past levels, but also relative to areas that did not adopt the law. Below is part of a long discussion in The Bias Against Guns, Chp. 5 (More Guns, Less Crime also has a long discussion in Chp. 2).

“Unfortunately, many contemporary discussions rely on misinterpretations of cross-sectional data. The New York Times recently conducted a cross-sectional study of murder rates in states with and without the death penalty, and found that “Indeed, 10 of the 12 states without capital punishment have homicide rates below the national average, Federal Bureau of Investigation data shows, while half the states with the death penalty have homicide rates above the national average” (Raymond Bonner and Ford Fossen, “States With No Death Penalty Share Lower Homicide Rates,” New York Times, September 22, 2000, p. A1). However, they erroneously concluded that the death penalty did not deter murder. The problem is that the states without the death penalty (Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Vermont) have long enjoyed relatively low murder rates, something that might well have more to do with other factors than the death penalty. Instead one must compare, over time, how murder rates change in the two groups — those adopting the death penalty and those that did not.”

To solve this problem academics look at what is called panel data, where we follow different states over time to see how the murder rates change after a state adopts a law such as the death penalty and how their murder rate changes relative to the states that aren’t changing their law. In this case, rather than looking at the death penalty, we are looking at the impact of all these different gun control laws in the Brady index. We don’t want to falsely attribute changes in gun control laws to national trends in crime rates. The issue isn’t whether crime rates are falling nationally when states change their gun control laws, but whether the ones that are changing their laws have a bigger or smaller drop in crime relative to the states that aren’t changing their laws. We also want to see whether a state’s crime rates go up or down after they change their gun laws.

The way to measure whether a state’s homicide and suicide rates are changing not only relative to their own past levels, but also relative to areas that did not adopt so many gun control laws is through fixed year and state effects, which account for the average national changes in crime or suicides rates from year to year and the average crime rates for each state to see how crime rates change over time relative to that average.

Next are the regressions for all firearm deaths, firearm homicides and firearm suicides that account for these fixed year and state effects. In each case, the impact of the Brady Campaign’s measure of gun control laws goes from being negative (implying that more gun control laws mean fewer deaths) to positive (implying that more gun control laws mean more deaths), though in none of these cases is the effect statistically significant. Not all the results for state and year fixed effects are shown below because we are focusing on the coefficient for the Brady law index.

The effect of the number of gun laws explains about 3% of the variation in total deaths from homicides plus suicides (this is from comparing the adjusted R2 with and without the index for the number of gun laws).

The ultimate question is really whether total deaths go up or down with more gun control. Total homicides and total suicides are actually more important than firearm homicides and suicides because of the possibility of substitutability between different ways of killing people or committing suicide. For example, if all guns were eliminated and people still committed suicide at the same rate that they did previously, there would have been no benefit in terms of suicides from eliminating guns. To examine this, we ran these last three regressions for total deaths (homicides and suicides), total homicides, and total suicides. These continue to show that more gun control is associated with more deaths — both homicides and suicides. While there is a statistically significant relationship between more gun control laws and more total suicides, the effect is not statistically significant for total homicides.

This graph illustrates the results shown in the first regression showing the relationship between homicides and suicides with the number of gun control laws. The effect of the number of gun laws explains about 4% of the variation in total deaths from homicides plus suicides (this is from comparing the adjusted R2 with and without the index for the number of gun laws).

To put it differently, increasing the index of the gun laws in a state by 20 percentage points (about one standard deviation) is associated with an increase in the total death rate (homicides plus suicides) of 0.4 per 100,000 people.
Conclusion

Once one accounts for the average pre-existing differences in homicide and suicide rates across states and the average annual changes in those deaths from year-to-year, stricter gun laws are associated with more total deaths from homicides and suicides. Increasing the index of the gun laws in a state by 20 percentage points (about one standard deviation) is associated with an increase in the total death rate (homicides plus suicides) of 0.4 per 100,000 people. While we might disagree with how the Brady Campaign rates state gun control laws from year-to-year, this relationship is found using their ratings.

Letters to the editor: My lazy gun didn’t even load itself

Guns … really …

Today I swung my front door wide open and placed my Marlin .30-30 right in the doorway. I gave it five shells and noticing that it had no legs, even placed it in my wheelchair to help it get around. I then left it alone and went about my business.

While I was gone, the mailman delivered my mail, the neighbor boy across the street mowed the yard, a girl walked her dog down the street and quite a few cars stopped at the stop sign right in front of our house.

After about an hour, I checked on the gun. It was still sitting there in the wheelchair, right where I had left it. It hadn’t rolled itself outside. It certainly hadn’t killed anyone, even with the numerous opportunities it had been presented to do so. In fact, it hadn’t even loaded itself. Well you can imagine my surprise with all the media hype about how dangerous guns are and how they kill people. Either the media is wrong and it’s the misuse of guns by people that kills people, or I’m in possession of the laziest gun in the world.

Alright, well I’m off to check on my spoons. I hear they’re making people fat.

This is so true. If people really think about it, anything is a weapon. They need to stop harping on the guns and worry about other things going on in this country.

Bob and Pat Taylor,

Ottawa

*Originally posted on http://www.newstrib.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor-my-lazy-gun-didn-t-even/article_5a3337e9-2873-5c5a-a619-0165863ce8a2.html*
RIVERSIDE SHERIFF TO EXPEDITE CCW ISSUANCE

Riverside Sheriff Stan Sniff Is Working To Expedite CCW Issuance!

As many of you know, the wait time for a CCW in Riverside County is now two years. Despite having a pro-CCW sheriff, years of budget cuts combined with an ever-growing demand for CCWs has resulted in a backlog of CCW applications.

Sheriff Sniff, a longtime supporter of 2nd Amendment rights, has been working hard to address this problem. The sheriff has partnered with CRPA and NRA to help address the backlog of CCWs; through careful financial management, he has found a workable solution.

Making use of freed-up surplus funds, Sheriff Sniff intends to temporarily double the size of the county’s CCW unit to tackle the backlog. In doing so, the department will dramatically reduce wait times for a CCW, making the right to bear arms more accessible to all of the law-abiding citizens of Riverside County.

CRPA proudly supports this effort and would like to thank Sheriff Sniff for his dedication to the 2nd Amendment, and to the law-abiding gun owners of Riverside County.

*For full press release, please visit https://www.crpa.org/uncategorized/sheriff-to-use-surplus-funds-to-reduce-ccw-backlog/*
Hugh is originally from Australia and moved to Marin County, CA when he was 5 years old. He became a CRPA member in 2016 after coming across our booth at a local gun show. I had a few questions for Hugh, a volunteer who has been a huge asset to CRPA:

Heather Allen: How did you become involved with firearms?
Hugh Cruickshank: When I was in grade school my buddy and I used to take his 22 rifle wrapped in brown paper bags across town into the hills to target shoot. His dad had taught him gun safety and he shared that with me. We had a great time and never screwed around, always being very respectful of the power we held in our hands. In my late teens I borrowed a rifle to hunt deer several times, and that was really it. I became a lot more of a gun enthusiast while living in rural Washington State, hunting deer and elk, target shooting, and fulfilling the need for personal protection with a concealed carry permit.

HA: What was your first firearm purchase and now your favorite gun to shoot?
HC: My first gun was a single shot 12 gauge. After moving to Washington several years later I shot my first deer with it in the last hour of daylight on the last day of hunting season with about 18” of snow on the ground. My favorite gun to shoot now is my Glock 22.

HA: Can you say a little bit of WHY you think volunteering is an important part of preserving our Second Amendment Rights?
HC: I believe NOW is the time for action if we want to preserve the rights granted to us in the Bill of Rights. There are many ill-intentioned people and groups working diligently day and night to make laws that re-interpret, re-write, or just plain eradicate the Second Amendment. I just can’t let that happen without doing all I can do. For me volunteering with the CRPA is a way to reach out and educate others about what is going on and how they can play an active role in preserving their gun rights. I also love meeting all the CRPA members at the shows and chatting with like-minded souls. When I volunteer I feel I am carrying my part of the load in getting the job done.

I have been an NRA member for years, but feel a real familial connection with the CRPA staff and members that is very unique. CRPA is fighting the good fight, which I personally believe we will win, and win big, although we may have to follow the process right up to the Supreme Court to finally have our full Second Amendment rights restored.

The truth is we need more members to help spread the word and to share the financial burden of the expensive legal battle we are engaged in. What if every CRPA member committed to signing one new member before the end of the year, and preferably before the November election? It could be a family member, friend, neighbor, work colleague, or someone from your church or shooting range. That would give us so much more political clout and the added revenue would go a long way in fighting the good fight. So there’s your challenge…
I was impressed when I met 18-year-old David Bloedow at the Bakersfield Gun Show. He had so much energy and reached out to every single patron that walked by our CRPA booth. He was an easy choice to become one of our Spotlights. David is extremely refreshing in a time where kids seem to be marching against their own rights.

by Heather Allen, CRPA Volunteer Coordinator

David was nice enough to answer a few of my questions:

Heather Allen: How did you become interested in the California Rifle and Pistol Association?

David Bloedow: I had been searching for something to be passionate about and, as a Christian, I believe that God gave me a passion for telling others about self-defense and how it relates to the bible and our walk with God. When I heard about CRPA and that I could get together locally with other people who were as passionate about gun rights as I was, I applied to become a volunteer.

HA: How long have you been shooting and what was the first firearm you shot?

DB: I have been shooting off and on since 2008 when I took a hunter education course. The first firearm I shot was a .22 caliber bolt action rifle.

HA: What does the Second Amendment mean to you?

DB: To me, the Second Amendment is the legal embodiment of our God given right to self-defense. Whether the threat be a violent home intruder or an oppressive, violent, and overbearing government; defense of ourselves, our loved ones, and our country is at the heart of the Second Amendment.

HA: People your age seem to have very different outlooks on firearms these days, especially voicing their opinions in the past few months. Would you say your friends have similar views when it comes to guns or has it been frustrating expressing your support of our Constitutional Rights?

DB: I would say my friends have similar views on guns, so it hasn’t been particularly frustrating expressing my support for the Second Amendment.

HA: What would you say to potential new volunteers?

DB: The Second Amendment affects you regardless of whether you own a gun or not. In the context of the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms and form a militia is about the right to fight a tyrannical government should one arise. That being said, freedom has always had to be fought for. The slow fade of the Second Amendment, I believe, is a very real possibility if people like you and me don’t choose to exercise our rights and make our voices heard. In a democratic republic, you and I have a unique opportunity as volunteers to help solve this problem by becoming politically active. One way to do that is to participate as a volunteer at a CRPA event. CRPA and the NRA are organizations meant to make the voices of gun owners in America heard and respected, which is exactly what we need if we want to stop and reverse the slow fade of the Second Amendment.

Well said, Mr. Bloedow! You are an inspiration to both young and old and the CRPA is EXTREMELY lucky to have you as a volunteer!
As a CRPA employee that does a lot of work in the field I have encountered more and more individuals asking me personal questions. While it is my mission to spread as much information as possible by informing clubs, groups, and the general public what it is that CRPA does, and why our organization and the Second Amendment cause is worth investing in, and fighting for, I guess it is not out of the question for someone to want to know what it is that fuels the individuals spreading this information. It is because of these questions that I feel it is time to give my testimonial.

**Grassroots Outreach - Outreach, Mobilize, Engage**

by Kevin Small, CRPA Grassroots Specialist

**VOLUNTEERS ARE OUR MOST POWERFUL WEAPON**

The CRPA Grassroots Outreach and Volunteer Corps needs passionate volunteers in every California county to advance the CRPA’s mission to protect and defend the right to keep and bear arms.

CRPA has built and is expanding its team of grassroots activists and volunteers who serve, educate, and engage gun owners and shooters in the political process, help get out the pro-gun vote, and help put on shooting and hunting events.

Thousands of CRPA members who are dedicated to supporting Second Amendment rights are taking charge in their communities! These CRPA grassroots activist leaders help us make this volunteer army more powerful and effective!

**GO Meeting**

Please look out for dates, time, and location on www.crpa.org.

*If you would like to host a private GO Meeting with your local club, please contact Kevin Small, CRPA Grassroots Specialist at ksmall@crpa.org.

**A Cause Becomes A Fight When You Are Personally Attacked**

Growing up going to private school allowed me the freedom to express my opinions and beliefs with minimal resistance. These self-expressions were actually encouraged. As you can imagine, the majority of the people I was surrounded by, along with their parents, held many similar viewpoints.

It wasn’t until college that I started to experience that resistance but that didn’t necessarily change my habits, it allowed me the opportunity to express myself and my viewpoints to those who now disagreed, opening the door of opportunity to hear new ideas, and have meaningful conversations that Universities in America were built to house.

But what happens when a teacher uses their platform in a classroom to try and negate those conversations and leverage a student’s ability to pass a class in order to further their ideologies? This goes against everything that universities in America are supposed to stand for, and this is what happened to me.

On two separate occasions in my collegiate career I was given substandard grades on my final project due to the fact that I was outspoken about my religious and political beliefs. This was not done in a passive manor, one of the two occasions was as blatant as a teacher asking those in the class who belonged to a specific religion to raise their hands and followed the demonstration by stating that those students should drop the class immediately because there was a high likelihood that they would not get a passing grade. I did not drop the class, and to be frank, I took the proposition to drop the class as a challenge. As I have already stated, I was given failing grades, and on both occasions promptly took my work to appeal those failing grades to the dean of the department. I used my voice. I described to him the situation, he took my work, and upon reviewing it, he overturned my grade and on both occasions I passed.
Are Negative Experiences Worth Learning From?

I share this story because it leads to the passion that I have today for our Constitutional Rights in this state. I carry it with me to every event that I attend, and every conversation that I have. The answer is yes. This is an experience that is absolutely worth learning from. Upon reflecting I attempted to identify the problem and quickly found that while people can be kind to each other, when closed minded ideologies collide, there is little sympathy for one another, and in this case, it seemed extremely easy for an individual to use their “power” to punish me by attempting to strip me of my First Amendment rights.

What protection do I have? It is my opinion that the First Amendment is worth protecting, it seemed to be our Founding Father’s opinion as well because right after the First Amendment comes the Second Amendment. This, to me, is worth fighting for because freedom is worth fighting for. If we allow our safeguards of freedom to be destroyed, it won’t be long before the freedoms that those safeguards protect themselves will be destroyed.

How Can We All Use Our Voices

As mentioned prior, the course correction did not come on its own. For my freedom’s to be secured, and the injustice of a substandard grade to be corrected, I had to use my voice. This is why I believe in CRPA. This is why people all across the state of California volunteer for CRPA, and this is why I love and am so passionate about my job. CRPA provides that voice. I cannot think of anything more important to invest in than our freedoms secured for us in the US Constitution.

How loud is your voice? It is time for everyone to start investing more time and effort into this cause. Our republic allows us to elect the individuals that represent us in front of the nation. As a community of 8 million gun owners in this state, it is fully within our power to elect those that will properly represent us and our interest in freedom. It is time for us as a community, to more effectively utilize that power.

---

Kevin Small
CRPA Grassroots Specialist

As a recent graduate from the University of La Verne, Kevin is focused on serving a mission that he believes in. Assisting others with their transformation as they educate themselves to take action in supporting the 2A community. Kevin enjoys shooting and is developing a passion for hunting.

---

With a little planning, you can
DEFEND FREEDOM FOREVER

It’s easy. CRPA can show you how.

Protecting RKBA through carefully planned estate strategy isn’t that complicated.

CRPA’s expert consultants can help with tips and strategies you can use to maximize charitable gifts while minimizing estate taxes and meeting you long-term financial goals.

In easy-to-read, no-nonsense language,

CRPA’s complimentary guide is the perfect tool to craft the estate strategy that’s right for you.

To receive your complimentary estate planning guide call 1-800-305-2772 today.
Or go email Rick Travis at rtravis@crpa.org.
The NRA / CRPA Range Assistance Program assists California ranges facing environmental, noise, safety, and other issues; they also advise ranges on best management practices.

If your range needs assistance, proactive information that could help your range avoid problems in the future, or wants to help CRPA fight for the RKBA by turning your range into a CRPA / NRA activist center, contact CRPA at contact@CRPA.org.

LET CRPA HELP YOU

PROTECT YOUR RANGE!

STAY CURRENT ON BEST RANGE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

The NRA / CRPA Range Assistance Program assists California ranges facing environmental, noise, safety, and other issues; they also advise ranges on best management practices.

If your range needs assistance, proactive information that could help your range avoid problems in the future, or wants to help CRPA fight for the RKBA by turning your range into a CRPA / NRA activist center, contact CRPA at contact@CRPA.org.
PLACES TO SHOOT

To find more ranges in your area, visit www.wheretoshoot.org

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Hangtown Range
1540 Broadway
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 497-5443
www.hangtownrange.com
Open to Public, Membership Available
Indoor
Handgun, Rifle, Archery, Virtual Lanes

Birds Landing Hunting Preserve
2099 Collinsville Road
Birds Landing, CA 95612
(707) 374-5092
www.birdslanding.net
Open to Public
Outdoor
Shotgun

ASP Shooting Range
27 Commerce
Vacaville, CA 95687
(707) 448-8662
www.aspsolano.com
Open to Public
Indoor
Handgun, Smallbore Rifle

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA

Merced Fish and Game Club
2040 Yosemite Parkway
Merced, CA 95340
(209) 723-3006
www.merced-gunrunner.com
Open to Public
Indoor
Handguns, Smallbore Rifle

Santa Lucia Sportsmans Assoc.
10400 Santa Clara Road
Atascadero, CA 93423
(805) 466-9995
www.santaluciasportsmen.org
Private, Membership Available
Outdoor
Shotguns, Handgun, Rifle

Rankin Field Weapons Range
5136 Wiknich Road
Ridgecrest, CA 93555
(760) 375-1004
www.rgra.org
Open to Public
Memberships Available
Outdoor
Shotguns, Handguns, Rifles

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

South Bay Rod & Gun Club, Inc.
1020 Marron Valley Road
Dulzura, CA 91917
(619) 468-3070
www.sbrgc.org
Open to Public
Outdoor
Handgun, Rifle, Shotgun

Addax Tactical
13550 Danielson Street
Poway, CA 92064
(858) 206-5057
www.phelangun.com
Open to Public
Indoor
Handgun, Rifle, Shotgun

FT3 Tactical
8230 Electric Avenue
Stanton, CA 90680
(714) 677-2481
www.fieldtimetargetandtraining.com
Open to Public, Memberships Available
Indoor
Handgun, Rifle, Shotgun

CIVILIAN MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAM

CRPA works with and supports the Civilian Marksmanship Program (CMP), a national organization created by federal law that, like CRPA, provides training and education to citizens who own a firearm or airgun for hunting, sport or to defend themselves or their loved ones.

The CMP’s highest priority is serving youth through gun safety training and marksmanship events that encourage personal growth and build life skills. CRPA whole-heartedly joins in and supports these efforts!

CMP has also developed excellent match management systems and procedures for putting on competitive and recreational shooting events that are being incorporated into CRPA’s event and match management processes. CMP also sells surplus .30 and .22 military rifles to qualified U.S. citizens at a great price! Check them out at www.thecmp.org.

TO LEARN MORE, COME VISIT:
CRPA.ORG/CIVILIAN-MARKSMANSHIP-PROGRAM
## Master Events Calendar

### May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5-6**    | **Central California**  
Visalia Sportsmen 100 Gun Dinner  
Tulare County Fair  
620 S K Street  
Tulare, CA 93274  
May 5th |
| **12-15** | **Central California**  
Central Coast Paso Robles Gun Show  
Paso Robles Event Center  
2198 Riverside Ave  
Paso Robles, CA 93446  
May 12th - 13th |
| **18-20** | **Northern California**  
Auburn Home Show  
Gold Country Fairgrounds & Event Center  
1273 High Street  
Auburn, CA 95603  
May 18th - 20th  
Lake County 2018 Steel Challenge  
Highland Springs Range  
255 N. Forbes Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453  
May 19th |
| **23-26** | **Northern California**  
Mountain Aire Sacramento Gun Expo  
McClellan Conference Center  
5411 Luce Avenue  
McClellan Park, CA 95652  
May 26th |
| **5-6**    | **Southern California**  
Crossroads Ontario Gun Show  
Ontario Convention Center  
2000 E Convention Center Way  
Ontario, CA 91764  
May 5th - 6th |
| **12-15** | **Southern California**  
CRPA Membership Drive  
Artemis Defense Institute  
11 Spectrum Pointe Drive  
Lake Forest, CA 92630  
May 12th |
| **18-20** | **Southern California**  
Women on Target  
Angeles Shooting Ranges  
12651 North Little Tujunga Canyon Road  
Lake View Terrace, CA 91342  
May 13th |
| **23-26** | **Southern California**  
CRPA Membership Drive  
Real World Shooting  
15617 Graham Street  
Huntington Beach, CA 92649  
May 20th  
Crossroads Del Mar Gun Show  
Del Mar Fairgrounds  
2260 Jimmy Durante Blvd  
Del Mar, CA 92014  
May 19th - 20th |

List your events on CRPA’s Master Events Calendar!  
Send an email to EVENTS@CRPA.ORG with your event’s NAME, DATE, TIME, LOCATION & ANY OTHER FUN DETAILS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>9-10</th>
<th>12-17</th>
<th>20-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NORTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>CENTRAL CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kings Giving Back Event</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nevada City Gun Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>Central Coast Fresno Gun Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>Free Youth Outdoor Expo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Gun Center</td>
<td>Elks Lodge</td>
<td>Fresno County Fairgrounds</td>
<td>Compton Hunting &amp; Fishing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426 Park Avenue</td>
<td>518 N. Highway 49</td>
<td>1121 S. Chance Avenue</td>
<td>1625 S Sportsman Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford, CA 93230</td>
<td>Nevada City, CA 95959</td>
<td>Fresno, CA 93702</td>
<td>Compton, California 90221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2nd</td>
<td>June 9th - 10th</td>
<td>June 16th - 17th</td>
<td>June 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Crossroads Daly City Gun Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Temecula Valley Balloon &amp; Wine Festival</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raahuges Sports Fair</strong></td>
<td>Cow Palace</td>
<td><strong>Youth Hunter Education &amp; Shooting Sports Camp with Santa Clarita Valley Chapter of Quail &amp; Upland Wildlife Federation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lake Skinner Campgrounds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Raahauge Shooting Enterprises</td>
<td>2600 Geneva Avenue</td>
<td>Camp Three Falls</td>
<td>37701 Warren Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14995 River Road</td>
<td>Daly City, CA 94014</td>
<td>12260 Boy Scout Camp Road</td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona, CA 92880</td>
<td>June 9th - 10th</td>
<td>Frazier Park, CA 93225</td>
<td>June 1st - 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1st - 3rd</td>
<td><strong>Crossroads Costa Mesa Gun Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>Women on Target</strong></td>
<td>**CRPA FIRING LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temecula Valley Balloon &amp; Wine Festival</strong></td>
<td><strong>Angeles Shooting Ranges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Angels on Target</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lake Skinner Campgrounds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Skinner Campgrounds</td>
<td>12651 North Little Tujunga Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>37701 Warren Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37701 Warren Road</td>
<td>Lake View Terrace, CA 91342</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
<td>June 16th</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 12th - 16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1st - 3rd</td>
<td>**CRPA FIRING LINE</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td><strong>Women on Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crossroads Costa Mesa Gun Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>Angeles Shooting Ranges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Women on Target</strong></td>
<td><strong>37701 Warren Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Fair &amp; Event Center</td>
<td>12651 North Little Tujunga Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Fair Drive</td>
<td>Lake View Terrace, CA 91342</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa, CA 92626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2nd - 3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERNSHIP OPPORTUNITY!!!**

- Part-time position, ideal for college students looking for a career in event planning
- Get event experience with an organization that executes more 300 events a year
- Please send resume to events@crpa.org
- Starting as soon as possible

For more information visit: www.crpa.org/events

We’re Social | FOLLOW US

TAG US

@CRPANEWS | @CRPAORG | #CRPA
CRPA will be hosting Southern California’s 5th Annual Crawfish Boil and Shooting Sports event at Raahauge’s Shooting Enterprises in Corona, CA on August 11, 2018. This is an annual fund-raiser event that promotes safe shooting sports for all members of the family and community.

In addition to good food featuring the 5 major Cajun food groups (Boiled Crawfish, Gumbo, Etouffee, Boudin and BBQ), the event hosts a fun suite of activities including helicopter rides, horse rides, mechanical bull rides, bounce houses, archery, SWAT team demonstrations, shooting team demonstrations, dog-hunting demonstrations, safety and educational seminars, face painting, chili and BBQ cook-off competitions, raffles, and of course, shooting sports.

The event started in 2013 when several boy scouts in Troop 54, Whittier, CA asked for more shooting sport activities beyond the standard rifle/shotgun merit badge shooting requirements. The troop had over 100 scouts and not all parents were on-board with starting a shooting sport program. A few adult-leaders in the troop surmised this was due a lack of familiarity with shooting sports and firearms in general.

Troop 54 purposefully launched two annual events to bring safe-shooting education and positive shooting experiences to the troop: a mother-son shooting sports event and a Louisiana-style Crawfish Boil. The mother-son event was limited to just the mom and scout and was held near Mother’s Day. The Crawfish Boil was open to all members of the scout’s family and was held during Louisiana’s crawfish season.

The first Crawfish Boil had 173 attendees most of whom were families that never shot a firearm. Many sat on the sidelines to watch as only 68 shooting tickets were purchased. The feedback after the event was very positive with many enjoying their first shooting experience as a family, however this annual event was just scratching the surface.

Troop 54 purposefully launched two annual events to bring safe-shooting education and positive shooting experiences to the troop: a mother-son shooting sports event and a Louisiana-style Crawfish Boil. The mother-son event was limited to just the mom and scout and was held near Mother’s Day. The Crawfish Boil was open to all members of the scout’s family and was held during Louisiana’s crawfish season.

The first Crawfish Boil had 173 attendees most of whom were families that never shot a firearm. Many sat on the sidelines to watch as only 68 shooting tickets were purchased. The feedback after the event was very positive with many enjoying their first shooting experience as a family, however this annual event was just scratching the surface.

The troop realized the Crawfish Boil could provide the same family-fun experience and safe-shooting education to the broader community. As a result, all subsequent Crawfish Boils were opened to the community.

Over the next 3 years, attendance grew, many whom were returning families bringing neighbors and friends for their first shooting experience. Several groups were company owners using this event as an annual company picnic for employees and key customers.

While the attendee count grew by 179%, shooting tickets swelled to 491%, clearly demonstrating that returning families were becoming more comfortable shooting.

In total, Troop 54 raised over $20K over the first 4 years. $20K was donated to CRPA to be used toward building a youth shooting range and fund youth shooting sport programs. Other smaller amounts were donated to participating scout troops and high school clubs who volunteered their time to support the event.

The growing popularity and size of the event required a new location and organizational support that would carry out Troop 54’s original purpose, but on a much larger scale.

As a result, the 5th annual Southern California Crawfish Boil and Shooting Sports event has transitioned to CRPA and will be held at Raahauge’s Shooting range in Corona, CA.

This year’s event will be the best-ever! What was once held in a field is now held at a location with 25 shotgun stations, and multiple pistol and rifle ranges. Raahauge’s is providing space for overnight Boy Scout Troop camping and a landing pad for the helicopter rides. All the family-fun aspects of the past events will carry over and grow. Corporate groups hosting their annual picnic here will receive catered support so they can enjoy spending time with their employees and customers.

Beneficiaries of the event this year are CRPA and Nux4Life, a non-profit established in the memory of Marine Corporal Claudio Patiño IV, that provides financial support to Marine Scout Snipers, Warfighter Made, American Gold Star Mothers and 11th Marine expeditionary unit (www.nux4life.org).

This year’s date, August 11, 2018, aligns with California’s crawfish season. Be sure to mark your calendar to attend this event and purchase your tickets early at www.crpa.org.

**If there is an item you would like to donate for raffle, please contact Eva Padilla at (714) 992-2772.

**HELP WANTED!**

- Passionate Californians who are sick of infringements on their Second Amendment Rights by those in office who are protected by armed security
- Enthusiasts that enjoy getting into Gun Shows and Special Events Free
- RSOs, Instructors, Trainers, Photographers
- Those who vote in favor of our Gun Rights
- Constitution Lovers
- People that can explain how becoming a member of the CRPA will HELP keep their gun rights, here in the great state of California

Contact Heather at volunteer@crpa.org now to inquire how YOU can volunteer and become PART OF THIS FIGHT!
About forty competitors attended the Fullbore Rifle championship the last weekend in February. This match starts out our CRPA championships each year and is the first of three prone championships held through the end of March this year.

The course of fire was 20 shots prone at each of four distances, 300, 600, 900, and 1,000 yards on Saturday. The course was repeated on Sunday with 10 shots at each distance, for a two-day aggregate of 1,200 points possible.

Curtis Gordon lead after the first day with a 792-37X. Bob Gill was only two points behind, 790-37X. And Jim OConnell and Justin George were right there with 789s. Many competitors fired 200s at the 300 and 600 yard lines. The best anyone could do by 900 yards was a 199-12X, fired by both Matt Early and Jared Perry. At 1,000 yards 195 was the best anyone could do, fired by Bob Gill (7X), John Giles (6X) and Paul Schultz (4X).

Sunday there were again many clean scores at 300 and 600 yards. Only Lane Buxton and Boris Batkin cleaned the 900 yard line with 8Xs and 5Xs, respectively. As with Saturday, the conditions prevented any clean scores at 1,000 yards. The best anyone could do was a 94-4X by Dennis Vanlier and a 94-2X from Stacey Bowman firing in the F-Class Open category.

Lane Buxton fired the high score on Sunday, 390-32X, beating Curtis Gordon by 5 Xs. Dennis Vanlier was close behind at 389-12X. But Gordon took the two-day total by four points, 1182-55X, to win the Fullbore Championship and the Bear Trophy. Buxton finished second at 1178-60X and Bob Gill took third at 1176-58X.

Jim OConnell was the high grand senior at 1166-60X. John Giles was high senior, 1151-36X. And Justin George was high junior at 1162-38X.

Class winners were Lane Buxton, High Master; Paul Schultz, Master; Ken Doll, Expert; and Amber Kingshill, Sharpshooter.

Leading the nine F-Class shooters was Peter White with an 1171-48X. The high F-Class Target Rifle shooter was Niklas Montin, 1157-44X.

Sunday afternoon featured a four-person team match firing 15 shots at 300, 600, and 900 yards, for a possible score of 1,800 points. The team of Jared Perry, Curtis Gordon, Jim OConnell, and Bob Gill lead with a 1764-71X.

Thanks, as usual, to Jim OConnell for running this match and to the others who helped manage the firing line and targets and did the many other jobs that resulted in a well-run CRPA championship.
The California Rifle & Pistol Association opened a Training Center located in Fullerton, CA in 2016. CRPA's Training Center stands for, and amongst, California's concerned citizens, families, active duty, hunters and conservationists, and reputable training providers. This stance holds firm throughout this great state of California. In a state as ever-changing as California, the learning and improvement never ends. Laws are passed, stakes are raised, and as responsible citizens, we are expected, nay, required, to stay up-to-date and not fall behind the curve.

Training providers fight every day to keep their courses available so that you have access to the tools necessary to be a safe and responsible gun owner. Utilize these services offered to make you a better YOU. There is passion to be shared, concern and knowledge to be gained, and there is serious emphasis on safety, responsibility and education in the 2A community.

I encourage you to be active in seeking reputable training providers in your area. Don't just ask instructors on the cost of their classes; ask them about their experience and what they offer and what they teach. Ask them questions regarding what you are looking for. Great training goes such an incredibly long way and acts as the foundation for continual knowledge and mastering of skills.

Get your kids involved, invite your husband or wife out to take a course. Get your friends excited to take a refresher course or learn something new. I invite everyone to purchase California Gun Laws 5th Edition. This is a great tool to own and to be familiar with. It is distinctively written to bring you to a well rounded understanding of our laws - NOT TO TRICK YOU!!!

For only $29.95, grab a copy of the 5th Edition of California Gun Laws! Call (714) 992-2772

Digital Photography Class

FEE: $50 / per class or 3-class bundle at $120

THE FUNDAMENTALS
• Age: 14 +
• Location: CRPA Training Center
• Instructor: Keith Durflinger
• Date: (option 1) Thursdays, June 14-28, 2018
  (option 2) Thursdays, August 9-23, 2018
• Time: 6:00PM - 8:30PM
BEYOND BASIC PHOTOGRAPHY
• Age: 14 +
• Location: CRPA Training Center
• Instructor: Keith Durflinger
• Date: (option 1) Thursdays, July 12-26, 2018
  (option 2) Thursdays, September 13-27, 2018
• Time: 6:00PM - 8:30PM

*Register online at www.crpa.org or call (714) 992-2772. CRPA enforces a 48-hour cancellation policy.

CRPA's Training Facilities feature state of the art classrooms, equipped to teach all different skill set classes.
Offering informational seminars, NRA and Firearms safety courses, weapons disarming classes, state mandated Hunter Education courses, Wilderness Survival technique classes, and First Aid courses.

Tarryn Binnings
CRPA Training Coordinator
Tarryn is a recent graduate of Cal State Monterey Bay and holds a Bachelors in Psychology. She is fascinated in understanding the criminal mindset and utilizes that knowledge to live a safer life. At a very young age, Tarryn learned the importance of being street wise and is thankful for her background in self-defense and mental preparedness.
Throughout life we are confronted with questions that cause us to reflect to where a part of our life started. Recently during a hunter education class, a student of mine inquired to what made me decide to hunt pigs. I answered that pig hunting allowed me the opportunity to fill the freezer with a major source of protein for the growing family.
Upon reflection the idea of pig hunting came to me during the 1982 film “Rambo”. In the movie there is a scene where the former Green Beret John Rambo portrayed by Sylvester Stallone jumps from above a boulder with his legendary survival knife made by knifemaker Jimmy Lile. That scene captured my attention that there was an off-season mammal that could provide food year around.

I researched the animal and approved hunting techniques (Rambo’s method not recommended nor legal in many areas of the country). The quarry of Wild Pig has a variety of names stemming from the Old World to the New World. Names like Razorback, Russian Boar, Pigzella, Hogzella, Hog, Wild Boar, are all summed up by the scientific name of Sus Scrufa. That’s right at the DNA level pig whether Feral (Wild) or Domesticated is just a pig.

Pigs were brought to North America by European explorers initially in the 1500’s and after. Some of these clever guys got loose, some were let loose and they returned to their feral nature. No one contemplated that this would become problematic five centuries later.

Texas A&M University has done some of the most exhaustive research on feral pigs and reports that the average sow will have her first litter of 5-6 piglets at the age of 13 months. She will have 1-2 litters a year and live 4-8 years on average. It should be noted that under various conditions they can reproduce as young as six months and have larger litters. Conservatively a single sow will produce a minimum of 20-48 pigs in just 4 years and more than 100 in 8 years.

Wild pigs typically weigh 200 pounds for males and 175 for females. 300 pounds is big for a wild pig and 500+ pounds is rare in the wild. These wild animals are not to be trifled with as their jaws can break bones, nuts, tree branches with ease. Their sense of smell allows them to track some odors from up to five miles away and 25 feet underground. They will eat 3-5 % of their body weight daily. A fully-grown pig at 200 lbs. will eat 6-10 pounds of food per day.

Successful hunting of wild pig provides a wholesome meat source that will feed a family for months. A 200 lb. pig will yield typically 100-120 lbs. of meat minus the bones and if you cook it whole with the head on. Hunters are actively trying to hunt and are being bombarded with misinformation stemming from the politics of Sacramento.

Pigs can be found in 56 of California’s 58 counties. The Department of Fish and Wildlife does not have an official count of the wild pig population but estimates the statewide population at hundreds of thousands. That population under ideal conditions could double or triple each year. Therefore, almost every year legislation is introduced to foster the hunting of pigs. That legislation is challenged by some in our community with incorrect or emotional appeals. The California Rifle & Pistol Association uses science to make logical choices.

Assemblyman Frank Bigelow who represents the 5th district communities of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Madera, Mariposa, Mono, Placer, Tuolumne counties including Lake Tahoe and Yosemite National Park introduced legislation ????.

The following six assertions are being used to oppose the bill.

**Assertion 1: Bigelow Bill Could destroy wild pig populations in California.**

This assertion is ludicrous when any logical person examines the Texas Pig Model. Texas has declared an all-out war on pigs due to their economic and habitat loss. The impact of their population has been minimal at best.

If passed AB 2805 would make it more affordable for hunters to help reduce the spread of wild pig populations and the tremendous ecological and economic damage they do daily in California. The proposed policy is not intended to destroy wild pig populations but rather to reduce and contain them. The fact is the wild pig population is firmly established in California and continues to grow annually. Humans as an Apex predator need to engage this nonnative species for the survival of other species that are native to the state.

**Assertion 2: Loss of game mammal status/depredation process**

This assertion leads anyone to believe that there is a change as the result of the proposed legislation. The fact that a species is listed as a “game” animal does not prevent it from being taken for other purposes. Species designated as game may be taken for causing economic damage to a property owner or their agent through the depredation permit process.

In the status quo, there is an ever-increasing work-load regarding wild pig depredation permit requests, and in recognition of the ecological damage wild pigs cause (including their direct and indirect impacts to native game species), the Department of Fish and Wildlife (then Fish and Game) developed a different approach when dealing with wild pigs. The full process can be found at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Mammals/Wild-Pig/Depredation.

In short, landowners have and are currently experiencing problems with pigs damaging their property. They have had in the past and currently have the following three options to choose from.

1. They can open their lands to licensed hunters. This can be viewed statewide often with a very pricey guide or access fee.
2. They can request a depredation permit to take a set number of animals during a specific period with other conditions regarding method of take and disposition of the carcass imposed.
3. They can shoot them on sight. Without the need for a hunting license or tags and they can do whatever they want with the carcass, including leaving it in the field.

The proposed change does nothing to impact the depredation process regarding wild pigs; rather, it makes pig hunting more affordable to the average hunting citizen of California which hopefully will lead to a lessening of the problems these non-native species cause and a reduced need for depredation permits.

**Assertion 3: Method of take**

Some are asserting that the "Method of Take" will be affected by the proposed legislation. The fact is the only change concerns switching from a tag (currently at $22.42/tag) to a validation which is a one-time fee to take as many pigs as the hunter can take throughout the license year.

AB 2805 has nothing at all to do with changing methods of take for hunters or for those engaged in the depredation process (commonly done through baiting and trapping in corral-type traps). In fact, the new classification identified as “exotic game animal” into which this species will be placed was identified as such precisely to keep the methods of take identified for big game species (Section 353, Title 14, California Code of Regulations) in place for the take of wild pigs.

It is true that poison is not a method of take allowed under Section 353. However, simply changing the classification will not result in the use of any poisons as that is specifically prohibited under the Methods of Take for Nongame Birds and Nongame Mammals (Section 472, T14, CCR). The use of poison is also prohibited under Section 401, T14, CCR – Issuances of Permits to Take Animals Causing Damage.

**Assertion 4: Managed under scientific principles**

The assertion is designed to confuse the average person about Native versus nonnative, invasive or introduced animals. Wild pigs in California aren’t managed on a scientific basis designed to sustain or enhance their populations like other big-game animals. The reason is wild pigs are introduced and thus nonnative.

Big Game animals such as the ungulates (Deer, Elk and Antelope) are native species and are managed scientifically. This concept is found under what is known as the seventh sister of the North American Wildlife Conservation Model which reads, “Sound science is essential to managing and sustaining North America’s wildlife and habitats.” Pigs are introduced to North America from primarily Europe and are not covered by this concept.

Wild pigs cause tremendous damage to a wide variety of habitats and native wildlife, and the over-riding management principle for them in 21st century California is to control their populations and reduce them over time to a level where that kind of damage is minimized or even tolerated. They are literally contributing to the loss of habitat for our native species.

Hunters are conservationists and need to realize that action to reduce pig populations now need to be implemented before we end up with a Texas sized pig population in California. The day pigs are declared a public nuisance or public health threat in California (both topics of discussion) how we hunt them will be the least of our problems.

**Assertion 5: Use of funds**

Some non-hunters are making the claim to hunters that passage of this legislation is going to lead to a loss or misuse of funds. The first concern any of us in the hunting community should have is why are we taking the words of non-hunters as if there the truth.

Section 3953 of the Fish and Game Code identifies the appropriate uses of these funds. The funds are mingled in a pool of all big-game tag revenues which are then distributed according to the direction given in Code. There is nothing proposed in this change which would eliminate the Department’s discretionary authority to direct this money where it is needed most...and that is in the protection and enhancement of California’s native species, including those designated as game. It very well may be that the best action that can be taken in specific locations to benefit California’s deer populations would be to reduce local populations of pigs that compete with them for resources. This proposal does absolutely nothing to restrict the Department’s ability to use the funds for their original intended purposes.

**Assertion 6: Property owner notification repeal**

This inane assertion claims that in the status quo that private property owners are required by law to allow hunters to hunt on their property. Anyone who either teaches hunter education in California or has taken a class to get their hunting license knows this is false. You must get permission to hunt on private property at the sole discretion of the property owner.

There is no property owner notification (regarding the option to use licensed hunters to take pigs instead of doing it through the depredation permit process) regarding pigs in Section 401, T14, CCR (Issuance of Permit to Take Animals Causing Damage). Section 400, T14, CCR (Deer Depredation Hunts) allows (not requires) the department to inform landowners of public hunt options in situations involving the potential issuance of 25+ deer depredation permits. Following such notification there is no provision REQUIRING landowners to allow hunters on their property to take problem causing deer. There can be no repeal of this provision as claimed in the Alert as it currently does not exist in regulation to repeal.

Pigs are here to stay in California. Hunters as conservationists need to opt in to provide valuable fresh meat for their families and to preserve vital habitat for our native species. Do not be fooled by those who seek to confuse you. Support this vital piece of legislation and preserve your ability to preserve our native species as a food source but add some pork to your freezer and not the troughs of political discontent designed to end hunting in California.

**Rick Travis**

CRPA Executive Director

Rick Travis serves as CRPA’s Executive Director. In addition to his prior work as CRPA’s Programs Director, Rick has over 30 years of public service experience working with various organizations, businesses, and government agencies.
CRPA and the California Hunter’s Conservation Coalition have stopped a major anti-gun offensive. As many of you know, Assemblyman Holden’s (D) AB 3199 was introduced earlier this session as an attack against pro-Second Amendment and pro-hunting organizations.

AB 3199 originally aimed to outlaw firearms raffles, which was a direct attack on pro-Second Amendment groups, like CRPA and NRA; as well as on and conservation groups like California Waterfowl, Ducks Unlimited, and National Wild Turkey Federation, who use firearm raffles to fundraise in opposition to unconstitutional anti-gun and anti-hunting measures.

Having been directly targeted, we knew we had to fight back. Working with the California Hunter’s Conservation Coalition, we were able to stop this bill before it ever reached the Assembly floor.

This is a victory for the pro-gun and pro-hunting community. By ensuring our right to raffle firearms, we have secured the ability to fund the fight for hunting and the Second Amendment.

Like anything in the capitol, it isn’t over till it’s over. We will continue to closely monitor this bill and make sure that it, or another gut and amend, does not rear its ugly head. Thank you for your support.

April 19, 2018 – The California Fish and Game Commission voted to approve a petition submitted by NRA and CRPA attorneys seeking to allow big game archery hunters to carry a firearm for the purposes of self-defense while in the field. Current regulations only allow small game archery hunters with a valid CCW to possess self-defense firearms while in the field, which was also prohibited until the Commission approved a similar petition by NRA and CRPA attorneys a couple years ago.

While the petition raised legal issues with the regulation, its main purpose was to show that restricting law-abiding archery hunters from carrying arms to defend themselves is simply dangerous public policy. Hunters often find themselves alone and isolated. Not having an adequate means to protect themselves from predators and criminals puts them in danger. This is especially true with the increase of illegal marijuana grows in popular hunting areas, which are often patrolled by armed gang members willing to violently defend their crops.

NRA and CRPA would like to thank the Commission for taking this important step in hunter safety and protecting the rights of law-abiding citizens by changing this restriction. It is welcome news for all California archery hunters and their families who want them to come home safely from doing what they love.

Be aware, however, that the Commission’s decision does not change the restriction as applied to deer hunting. A state statute outside of the Commission’s control prohibits any person other than specified law enforcement from carrying a firearm of any kind while archery hunting for deer. NRA and CRPA are working together to change that statute so that all archery hunters can exercise their Second Amendment rights.
Anybody worth their salt in modern day deer management circles would concede that the term “Deer factory” is a by gone term for the northern remote mountains of California, called the B-Zones. In days of old these areas used to produce a robust harvest of Columbian Black Tailed Bucks. In Mendocino County alone in 1954, it is recorded, an astounding estimated 5,232 bucks were harvested. In 2016, 6,573 bucks total in all the 6 B-Zones combined. Most would say with sadness today “We remember the old days when we took our families to the winter ranges to see the ‘Big Old Bucks’ who made it through the season.” Today, few bucks are seen. The sheer greater numbers of deer we would see, have vanished largely in our public lands.

We reflect on the works and the cherished names of renown past deer biologists, Dale R. McCullough, Richard D. Taber, Raymond F. Dasmann, William Longhurst, and A. Starker Leopold. Reading like a hall of fame roster for me, these authors created for us the most comprehensive, yet readable and detailed analysis of Black Tailed Deer management ever written.

I fear we have moved as a culture away from the simplicity and the proven model of management for the majestic Black Tail Deer. To a substandard political model, which has destroyed this resource in less than 40 years.

Perhaps, the truthful answer to the problem is “we the people” of the State of California have just lost the desire or passion for these creatures. Or Perhaps, we don’t care anymore, or have been worn out by the machine of the complicated management practices of the new age. Shakespeare, once penned, “WHAT A COUNTRY CHOOSES TO SAVE, IS WHAT A COUNTRY CHOOSES TO SAY ABOUT ITSELF.” We must ask ourselves this question? Are these creatures worth saving? I believe the answer is yes. It certainly was for The Mendocino County Black Tail Association. Which is why we have fought long and hard for the name Black Tail.

So, to dive right in we say, “Where are all the deer?” In days gone by, deer were more relevant to the culture, and I mean the culture of the general population of Californians. They hunted, and they loved deer. What about the culture of the modern wildlife managers in 2018? Are deer important to you? We don’t have a deer plan yet for the deer? The last plan was 1978-83.

In 2008 I was contacted by DFW wildlife program manager Craig Stowers. Craig asked me where I would consider it to be a good area, to conduct a good deer study, to find out what limiting factors could be suspect for the continued decline of Black Tailed deer in Mendocino County. I said to Craig, whom I consider one of the last premier Mohicans of Deer authorities, “Why don’t we study the Mendocino National Forest?” It was suggested by scientists that Hopland Research Station should be considered. I said, “The forest would be a better study, that way we can provide the public with a real time analysis of what is going on in public lands, not a private site.” Thus, the Mendocino Deer study was born. When all the smoke cleared from the study, we determined many interesting things in the environment of the Mendocino National Forest. I say, the environment of the Forest, because all deer management begins and ends with the exact eco system you are studying!!!! What does that mean? It means you can’t say there are no deer in one area and make that absolute statement about the whole state, when you haven’t studied the whole state.

In a nutshell, without citing the numerous yet thorough 62 pages of the scientific analysis in whole, in the Mendocino National Forest study performed, we have a handful of reasons the deer have all but disappeared in comparison to the 1970’s. I quote several key statements from paragraphs from the study.

“Our results show that deer in the Mendocino National Forest are currently declining in abundance. We found evidence that the decline is caused by high mortalities due to predation in all age classes.”

“Predation was the primary cause of fawn mortality, and black bear predation was the largest single source of mortality. Mountain lion predation was the primary cause of mortality of adult females equal to or greater than 1 year old.”
“Deer with larger amounts of forage within their identified home ranges were less likely to die of any cause, including predation.”

It really boils down to this. Deer are not as important or culturally relevant to most government managers above the worker bee pay grade. We all know why deer are gone. They can’t eat fir trees, they don’t eat noxious weeds, predators are given carte blanche access to them, logging is gone, fire suppression is very popular now in drought conditions, and the harvest success rate for the California hunter is 15.6%. The Mendocino Study proved everything we savvy conservation NGO’s have been saying all along and we spent close to a million dollars to prove to ourselves we were right.

A decadent old growth habitat will kill all the early successional wildlife off given enough time. Unfettered predation is tantamount to the death sentence for deer. The lack of true wildlife management in our lands, is like going to the local Safeway store, buying a 40-year-old box of cornflakes, filling our stomachs, and dying at the same time of malnutrition. And then we exit the store (feeding grounds) to be robbed and killed by a predator in the parking lot (outside the feeding grounds).

In the study, we determined that the available food quality for the deer in our public lands is old and non-nutritious in whole. Deer are in search daily for palatable nutritious food of which is in serious short supply. In their efforts to feed themselves they move about their home ranges and beyond, so they are discovered more easily moving about by high densities of predators, thus our decline. Managing this problem is our challenge with federal and state regulatory agencies. The answer? Like always, is the sensible honest approach to the problem. Good science, coupled with common sense management, for the benefit of the public who pay for it. Which is why the California Rifle and pistol organization fights to promote these very things.

Our many thanks to Rick Travis and staff for their tireless efforts.

Sincerely,

Paul Trouette
President
Mendocino County Black Tail Association

---

**HUNTER’S CODE OF ETHICS**

The scientifically well-established North American Model (NAM) of wildlife conservation has been used to manage and maintain population levels of game and predator species for centuries. Consistent with that traditional approach, the vast majority of hunters obey hunting conservation regulations and adhere to the hunter’s code of ethics which prohibits waste of game and unsporting or inhumane hunting methods.

Licensing fees paid by hunters provide the vast majority of the funding for natural resource conservation efforts in California. Hunting, trapping, and strategic depredation efforts are critical components contributing to the historical success of NAM.

CRPA opposes the ongoing duplicitous efforts by animal rights extremist groups (see humanewatch.org, huntfortruth.org) to abandon NAM in favor of an unbalanced and unscientific approach to species management that would ban hunting and encourage unchecked populations of predators species to explode, decimate game herds, and terrorize suburban neighborhoods.

These are the core principles of NAM:

- **In the Public Trust** – Wildlife belongs to the people. It is managed in trust for the people by government agencies.
- **Prohibition on Commerce of Dead Wildlife** – It will be illegal to sell the meat of any wild animal in North America.
- **Allocation of Wildlife** – Laws developed by the people and enforced by government agencies will regulate the proper use and conservation of wildlife resources.
- **Opportunity for All** – Every citizen has the freedom to hunt and fish.
- **Non-frivolous Use** – We can legally kill certain wildlife for legitimate purposes under strict guidelines for food and fur, in self-defense, or property protection. Laws are in place to restrict casual killing, killing for commercial purposes, wasting of game, and mistreating wildlife.
- **International Resources** – Because wildlife and fish freely migrate across boundaries between state, provinces, and countries they are considered an international resource.
- **Managed by Science** – The best science available will be used as a basis for informed decision making in wildlife management.
WHY MANAGE WILDLIFE?
by Craig Stowers, Scientific Consultant

I’m willing to bet that a majority (and by a large margin) of California’s current residents have no idea of the diversity of wildlife resources that exist in this State. Of course, by no means do our current resources compare with what existed prior to the “civilization” which began to occur in the 1700’s (prior to that is was mostly exploration which appeared to have little impact on the flora and fauna), with species of note including the California grizzly bear, huge herds of Tule elk and pronghorn antelope in the Central Valley, and bighorn sheep sprinkled up and down the mountain ranges of the State. In these days it is difficult to imagine those sights, as all most of us see in our travels are the farmlands and cities that now monopolize the environment.

Not very many years after the Gold Rush started to fade other “industries” based on the seemingly limitless resources of the State, including timber and agriculture. The water upon which those industries depended was plentiful in the North but not so much in the South so huge water diversion and storage projects were completed to supply the demand. These activities all served to modify the habitats upon which the wildlife depended for existence, often with negative consequences.

Gone were the wetlands of the Central Valley, and along with it the huge herds of Tule elk and pronghorn antelope (market hunting to provide food for the influx of settlers starting with the Gold Rush pretty much eliminated them). The California grizzly bear hung on a bit longer, but there was no room left for a large, predatory animal like that with all the people and livestock infesting their range so they had to go too. Large herds of livestock were brought into the State, competing with the native wildlife for food and other resources, as well as bringing in diseases and parasites for which the natives had little or no defense.

People did this. People shot/trapped out the wildlife for food, killed predators indiscriminately to protect their livestock, and altered the environment to suit their purposes. No one group of people can be singled out as the culprit, rather it was just the logical result of the “settlement” of the State. Fortunately, a group of forward thinking people recognized that something needed to be done, and done quick, to protect those resources so future generations could also enjoy them.

California was one of the first states in the Nation to implement Fish and Wildlife laws/regulations. It started in 1851 with, of all things, regulations concerning the take and planting of oysters. The Fish and Game Commission (later evolving to the Department of Fish and Game [now Fish and Wildlife]) was created in 1872. Regulations regarding hunting seasons, bag limits, and method of take were implemented in 1901. In the hopes they weren’t too late, some people realized the impact they were having on these resources and began to take steps to conserve them.

Fast forward to a Fish and Game Commission meeting of the 21st Century. It’s obvious from the public testimony that California’s wildlife resources are still a matter of much importance to many people. However, much of the discussion I was present for seemed to be critical of “wildlife management” activities in favor of the thought that “nature should just be allowed to take its course and things will balance out”. Up until recently, people with decision-making authority who should have known better bought into that philosophy, creating controversy and opposition to wildlife management techniques that have proven to be sound and overall beneficial to the populations of various wildlife species. I imagine that discussion is going to take place until there is no reason to have a Fish and Game Commission or Department of Fish and Wildlife anymore.

Why we need to manage wildlife is a no brainer to me. The ultimate goal of wildlife management has never been to produce they largest buck deer or bull elk ever killed by a hunter; rather, the goal is to provide sustainability of the wildlife resource so future generations can also enjoy them (same as it was when the whole effort got started). It begins with an understanding of the basic biology and habitat requirements of the species in question. It requires an understanding of population dynamics and an ability to collect and crunch large amounts of data. These factors come-together in recommendations made to the Fish and Game Commission for regulations guiding the management of the species in question, whether it be for hunting deer or trying to save tricolored blackbirds from extinction.

California’s deer resource is a shining example of why we need to/how we can manage wildlife with beneficial results to all concerned. Prior to civilization (the exploration phase referenced above), early explorers documented that deer were not found in great numbers and mostly existed on the Valley floor. Undoubtedly deer were shot by market hunters for food to feed the new residents, but that particular industry seems to have had a larger impact on elk (almost driving Tule elk into extinction) and pronghorn antelope (who now occupy less productive habitats in the northeastern part of the State in significantly reduced numbers), than deer. Be that as it may, it was enough of a concern that “real” regulations (those that had legal consequences for those who broke them) were imposed on the take of deer 1901.

Fire management and land conversion had much greater impacts on deer populations than any hunting regulations ever did (or will). Early accounts from the residents of Sacramento consistently describe the smoky summers caused by the wildfires that burned pretty much out of control every year. Timber was cut in great quantities and using techniques which promoted the growth of brush (now called “fuel” by fire and forest managers) which in turn got burned back every few years by the fires. The creation of new deer habitat in the form of the brush-fields left...
behind by timber operations and fire in conjunction with restrictive laws regarding the take of deer led to a population explosion which people today can only imagine.

Of course, the then Department of Fish and Game was happy about that but realizing that too much of a good thing can end up being a bad thing led to intensive surveys of deer populations and range conditions up and down the State. Range conditions (quality/quantity of vegetation available for forage primarily) indicated that deer were becoming over-populated and if something wasn’t done then “Nature would take its course” and we would experience a massive die off which could take many years to recover from.

Department biologists proposed a hunt in 1956 that allowed hunters to take any deer (except spotted fawns and spike bucks) they saw during the last 3 days of the season. I wasn’t around to document it, but the reports I saw were that many, many deer were taken that wouldn’t have been taken during a normal deer season. In the eyes of the deer managers the hunt was a complete success; the goal was to reduce the population to allow the range to recover and there was no doubt the population was reduced!

That hunt led to two significant things. The first was the highest buck kills California ever experienced in the early 1960’s. The results from those seasons are available for you to see for yourself on CDFW’s website. The overall population of deer was smaller in number, but the vegetation could easily support it, the remaining deer were in very good physical condition with high quality vegetation in great quantities available for consumption, and there was a 50% chance that each new animal added to that population would be a buck – so we had the best deer seasons in the early 1960’s, and those results are directly attributable to the success of the infamous 1956 “doe” hunt.

The second result was that doe hunting in California has been a very difficult management option to this day. People in 1956 were so outraged by the number of deer killed that a law was passed in 1958 to require “permission” from County Boards of Supervisors (in 38 of our counties) before any doe hunting can occur. The meetings I attended to address that issue were largely ruled by emotion and usually fruitless. So now California has a deer population which consists primarily of older-age does and young age class bucks, many of which are killed during the first deer season they become legal bucks. The deer population is stagnant and declining every year as attempts to address the issue using accepted and proven wildlife management techniques are delayed or frustrated by a well-meaning but woefully ignorant public. Hunting as a tradition and a tool to benefit wildlife is under attack by people who think nothing ever dies unless a human causes it and the best way to address a problem is to turn our back on it and ignore it.

Why do we manage wildlife?? It’s simple...because if we don’t they will be gone. Hunting provides the basis for all wildlife management activities, be they for hunted species or not. Hunters and the organizations they fund to promote the welfare of things like deer, elk, bighorn sheep, waterfowl, upland birds, etc. are the reason we still have wildlife (and can tell some really fantastic success stories – it’s amazing that sound management can produce so many ducks and geese with only 5% or less of California’s original wetland remaining). Hunters put their money where their mouth is and should take some pride in the fact that if it weren’t for them, their critics would have to find some other cause to promote because the wildlife would be gone.
Wild Boar Ragu with Cheezy Polenta

**Ingredients**
- 1 lb wild boar stew meat, cut into 2 inch pieces
- 1 medium Spanish onion, diced
- 2 carrots, peeled and diced
- 2 celery stalks, diced
- 5 cloves of garlic, minced
- 1 tablespoon anchovy paste (alternatively- 4-5 whole anchovy fillets, minced and mashed with side of chef’s knife)
- 4 thyme sprigs
- 2 dried bay leaves
- 28 oz can diced tomatoes, with juices
- 1 cup beef stock
- 1 cup dry red wine (I used Toscana)
- ½ teaspoon nutmeg
- 2 tablespoons tomato paste
- Salt and pepper, to taste
- For the Cheezy Polenta
  - 1 cup polenta (also called corn grits, or yellow cornmeal)
  - 5 cups water
  - 1 ½ cups freshly grated pecorino romano cheese
  - 2 teaspoons minced fresh thyme (optional)
  - Salt and pepper, to taste

**Directions**
1. Preheat oven to 350 degrees.
2. In a cast iron, or non-reactive oven-safe stock pot, heat olive oil over high heat.
3. Add boar pieces, and sear on all sides, until browned. Remove from pot and set aside.
4. Reduce heat to medium and add a little extra oil to pot as needed. Add onion, carrot, and celery. Season with salt and pepper. Saute until vegetables begin to soften and onion is translucent.
5. Add garlic, anchovy, thyme, and bay leaves. Saute for 1-2 minutes more.
6. Next add tomatoes, beef stock, red wine, and nutmeg. Stir well, scraping up any browned bits from bottom of the pan.
7. Cover, and bake in oven for 4 hours, or until meat is very tender and easily falls apart. Check periodically to monitor liquid level; if ragu is getting too dry, add extra wine, water, or beef stock.
8. After ragu is out of the oven, remove thyme stems (leaves should have all fallen off), and bay leaves. Using spoon or fork mash and shred the meat until no large pieces remain.
9. Stir in tomato paste. Add water if mixture appears too thick.
10. Taste and season with additional salt and pepper as needed.
11. To make the Cheezy Polenta
12. In a medium saucepan bring polenta and water to a boil. When mixture begins to spit, turn down to medium low heat and continue to cook, stirring often, until mixture thickens. This will take about 45-50 minutes.
13. Stir in cheese and thyme (or using). Season with salt and pepper, to taste.

**Prep Time:** 20 minutes
**Cook Time:** 4 hours
**Serving Size:** 4-6 people

**SHARE YOUR RECIPE**
Here are some recipes from our readers. You could be featured here too!
Send your recipes and a picture (preferable an image of the dish).

Email TFL@crpa.org for a chance to be featured.
Fresno Rifle and Pistol Club is an outdoor recreational shooting facility open to the public. We are located 15 minutes from Fresno and Clovis on 220 acres at the base of the Sierra foothills. Incorporated in 1934, FRPC provides a safe and comfortable environment to enjoy the sport of shooting.

Visit www.fresnorifleandpistolclub.com

Sacramento Valley Shooting Center is owned and operated by Folsom Shooting Club INC. SVSC is the premier outdoor shooting range on the West Coast and the largest and best privately held range West of the Mississippi. 2012 marks the third consecutive year that we have attained NRA Gold Medal Range status that shows our ongoing commitment to excellent range services and support of our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms.

Our ranges provide something for everyone. We provide facilities for shotgun, handgun and rifle shooters. Our multi-million dollar 860+ acre facility has well over 400 firing positions and is home to many different sub disciplines. Our ranges are sought out by many world class shooters and we host several regional, national and international events every year.

Sacramento Valley Shooting Center is a world class facility with many private member only ranges. We also permit public access to our 100 and 300 yard rifle ranges, as well as our 50 yard pistol and .22 rim fire steel silhouette range.

Visit www.sacvalley.org/index.html

Fresno Rifle and Pistol Club

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Sacramento Valley Shooting Center

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA

Smokin’ Barrel Firearms

Smokin’ Barrel Firearms is your local gun store in NorthWest Visalia. SBF is located on the corner of Demaree and Riggen Avenue in the same shopping center as Lowes. There is ample parking and we are open Monday through Saturday. Come in and take a look at our inventory of handguns, rifles, and shotguns whether for personal protection, hunting, or the pure enjoyment of target shooting. We also have ammunition and a wide variety of accessories for you to choose from. If we do not have what you are looking for, we will do our best to get it for you. Whatever the reason for stopping in, we would like the chance to earn your friendship and your business.

Bob Gaalswyk, owner and operator of SBF, opened the store in 2014 with the belief that citizens of the United States have the constitutional right to own firearms. His goal in opening Smokin’ Barrel Firearms is to provide quality guns and ammo with great customer service to the citizens of Visalia and surrounding areas.

We look forward to seeing you soon. And as always, “We AIM to please”.

Visit smokinbarrelvisalia.com

Phelan Gun Range

Smokin’ Barrel Firearms

PHOENIX RIFLE & GUN CLUB

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Phelan Gun Range

At PGR, we are committed to our customers’ satisfaction and we aim to provide individualized services. We treat everyone with respect, listen to what you are looking for, and educate people about the responsible use of firearms.

Around here, you won’t be waiting for someone to help you. From the moment that you step through our doors until you leave, we treat you like family and will give you our full attention.

Whether you need ammunition or a new firearm, our staff is always on hand to answer a question or showcase anything you have an interest in.

Plus, who doesn’t like to get a great deal? This is why we offer our products at fair prices, and some firearms in our inventory also come with a manufacturer warranty so you can leave having peace of mind for both you, and your firearm.

Our shop was established in 2015, and we’ve had the privilege to earn the business of many loyal customers since then.

But in order to better serve the Tri-Community area, we are in the beginning stages of building new facilities and planning to offer more services.

Visit www.phelangun.com

Addax Tactical

Addax Tactical is a family operated business that takes pride in offering Quality firearms, parts and accessories at reasonable prices, and we always make sure that we only use quality parts in all of our Addax Tactical Custom Shop AR15 Uppers and Rifles.

We are Integrity driven and we always do our best to help support our customer’s reasonable expectations and needs, and we are always honest, courteous, and respectful.

We are Strong in our market diversity in the products we offer to our customers from our own Addax Tactical ARTS Lower Receivers, to various Tactical Firearms, Accessories and Gear from (but not limited to) Glock, FN, SIG, CZ, Colt, S&W, Ruger, IWI, H&K, LWRC, Daniel Defense, Colt, Remington, Voodoo Tactical, Addax Tactical Customs, and many others.

We have a showroom location in the City of San Fernando, California, where we offer and sell a wide variety of California Compliant Firearms. We also sell Firearms to customers nationwide and we ship these firearms only to a verified FFL (Federal Firearms License) Dealer. It is the customers responsibility to inform us of any special needs and requirements to meet your local laws and regulations.

We sell directly to Law Enforcement Departments, and we can custom build Addax AR15 Rifles, Carbines and SBR’s to meet your department’s needs & requirements. Please contact us via email at sales@addaxtactical.com for more details.

Addax Tactical is Proud to be a Glock Blue Label Law Enforcement / Military Dealer.

Visit www.addaxtactical.com

Addax Tactical

Contact us via email at sales@addaxtactical.com

Business Affiliates:

To support CRPA and get listed here, email tfl@crpa.org.

Check out Business Affiliate programs at www.crpa.org
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