



GAINES & ASSOCIATES

SPECIAL REPORT

CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

2015/2016 LEGISLATIVE SESSION FINAL REPORT

NOVEMBER 2016 ELECTION MINI-BRIEF

OCTOBER 7, 2016

The 2015/2016 Session of the California State Legislature formally came to a close on Friday, September 30th – the final day Governor Jerry Brown could take action on legislation that had made it all the way to his desk.

This *Gaines & Associates* “*California State Legislature – 2015-2016 Session Final Report/Election Brief*” will provide our clients with quick glance at the outlook for the upcoming November 8th election, as well as the final status of *all* legislation of concern to the conservation and shooting community considered during the 2016 Legislative Session – the final year of the two-year 2015/2016 Session.

Following next month’s general election, the California State Legislature’s 2017/2018 Regular Session will first convene for an Organizational Session at noon on Monday, December 5th.

Due to the unprecedented number of gun-control bills in play this Session, firearms-related bills of greatest interest to the sporting community are grouped into their own section for the convenience of the reader. To view the final text of any of the bills below, simply click on the bill number and author in **blue text**. The final status of all bills is shown in italics. Any change in the status of any bill since our last *Special Report* is highlighted in **red text**.

As always, for complete detail on any bill of interest, please contact *Gaines & Associates* at info@gainesandassociates.net

This “*California State Legislature – 2015-2016 Session Final Report/Election Brief*” is provided as a service to clients of *Gaines & Associates*.

November 2016 State Election – What’s The Outlook?

Under Proposition 14 – which passed on the June 2010 ballot – statewide and congressional candidates in California, regardless of party preference, participate in the nonpartisan “blanket primary”. After the June primary election, the top two candidates – regardless of party affiliation – advance to the November general election.

Below is a brief overview of what changes in the balance of political power in our State we can expect to see come out of next month’s election. In short, don’t expect much. It appears that California state government is pretty well set for two more years of the status quo.

State Senate

On the Senate side, California’s State Senators serve staggered, four year terms – with half (20) of the Senate’s total of 40 seats up for election every two years. Heading into the election, the Democratic Party holds 26 seats, while the Republican Party holds 13, with one seat becoming vacant when Senator Sharon Runner (R/21-Lancaster) sadly passed away on July 14, 2016. Nine incumbent Senators are not running for re-election. Of these nine total seats, seven are held by Democrats and two are held by Republicans.

As a result of the “blanket primary” now in play in California, of the 20 total Senate seats up for grabs, six will not even have a Republican in the race – guaranteeing the Democratic Party a victory. Of the remaining 14 Senate seats up, eight have incumbent Democrats running for re-election, and three have Republican incumbents running for re-election. Based on the districts of the seats that are up for grabs, some races may be more interesting than others – but no notable changes in the balance of power in the State Senate are expected to come out of the upcoming November 8th election.

State Assembly

On the Assembly side, Assembly Members serve two year terms – with all of the Assembly’s 80 seats up for election every two years. Heading into next month’s election, the Democratic Party holds 52 seats, while the Republican Party holds 28. Seventeen incumbents – nine Democrats and eight Republicans – are not running for re-election.

As a result of California’s “blanket primary”, 21 races will not have representatives from both political parties competing on the ballot. In five districts, Democrats will not have a candidate on the ballot, while in 16 races there will not be a Republican challenger. Of the remaining 59 Assembly seats up for election, 43 have incumbent Democrats running for re-election, and 20 have Republican incumbents running for re-election. Based on the

districts of these 59 seats, little – if any – change in the political balance of the Assembly is expected to come from next month’s election.

Please note that next month’s ballot will also include Proposition 63, the “Safety for All Act of 2016”. A breakdown of this highly aggressive gun-control proposal is provided far below.

2016 State Legislative Session

- **AB 499 (Cooley)** – Archery Hunting: Concealed Firearms

As introduced in February 2015, AB 499 by Assembly Member Ken Cooley (D/08-Rancho Cordova) would have authorized a person with a conceal carry permit to carry a firearm while archery hunting deer, as long as they did not attempt to take deer with the firearm.

AB 499 moved quickly through the Assembly last year, passing off of the Assembly Floor by May 2015. Once on the Senate side, AB 499 was referred to the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee where it was set for hearing twice, but pulled from agenda both times at the request of the author in an effort to allow time to build more support for the legislation.

Having already passed out of its “house of origin”, the bill had until July 1st of this year to be heard in Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee. In June, with the bill having met all of the necessary legislative deadlines, Assembly Member Cooley choose to gut the bill’s original text and replace it with language which dealt with earthquake insurance.

- **AB 665 (Frazier)** – Local Regulation of Hunting and Fishing

AB 665 by Assembly Member Jim Frazier (D/11-Oakley) would have provided that the California Fish and Game Commission and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) were the only entities that could adopt regulations regarding the taking or possession of fish and game on any land or water within the state. This legislation would *not* have precluded public or private landowners from prohibiting hunting or fishing on their own land.

AB 665 moved quickly during the 2015 Session, rapidly passing through the Assembly and off of the Assembly Floor by late April 2015 without a single “no” vote. Once on the Senate side, the bill continued to move – passing out of Senate Policy Committee on a unanimous vote, then out of Senate Appropriations Committee without a hearing. On the final day of the 2015 Session, AB 665 passed off of the Senate Floor – seemingly just a few short steps from the Governor’s desk. But all that changed in early 2016 when AB 665 – now squarely in the crosshairs of animal-rights interests – was brought to a sudden standstill when it was sent back to the Assembly for concurrence of amendments taken on the Senate side.

Failing to meet the January 22nd legislative deadline for passing out of Assembly Appropriations Committee, AB 665 died.

To view the Senate Floor analysis of AB 665, click [AB 665 - Senate Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Floor analysis of AB 665, click [AB 665 - Assembly Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 665, click [AB 665 - Assembly Appropriations Committee Analysis](#)

- **[AB 1792 \(Wood\)](#) – Elk Tags: Federally Recognized Tribes**
As amended in late March, AB 1792 by Assembly Member Jim Wood (D/02-Healdsburg) would have required the California Fish and Game Commission, if requested, to engage in consultation with individual federally recognized Indian tribes in California regarding elk management issues. The bill would have also authorized the Commission to allocate elk tags to tribes to harvest elk for purposes of subsistence, cultural or religious ceremonies, or tribal celebrations.

Due to our serious concerns with the bill, *Gaines & Associates* and representatives of the *Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF)* had numerous meetings with the author's office and committee staff, and testified in committee hearing regarding the substantial time and investment RMEF, DFW and others have put towards the continuing recovery of elk in our state; the highly conservative and limited number of tags currently released to the public for hunting; the impact the bill would have had on the recovery effort; the impact the bill would have had on public hunting opportunity; and our serious concerns regarding the bill's authorization of tags without appropriate scientific backing and without consideration of the Elk Management Plan.

After much effort, in late May, AB 1792 was substantially amended to, among other things, delete the language which authorized the Commission to allocate tags to the tribes. As amended, the bill would have only directed DFW to meet with individual tribes, if requested, to discuss elk-related issues for elk located within the territory of that tribe, and to work with the tribes to identify possible science-based solutions.

With our concerns addressed, the bill, as amended, passed off of the Assembly Floor in early June, and over to the Senate where it passed out of Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee just a couple of weeks later. AB 1792 was brought up briefly in Senate Appropriations on August 8th and quickly placed in the suspense file due to the estimated impact of \$260,000 annually to DFW. The bill had its last shot at passing out of Senate Appropriations Committee on August 11th, but was held in the suspense file.

AB 1792 died when it failed to meet the August 12th legislative deadline for passing out of fiscal committee.

To view the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee analysis of AB 1792, click [AB 1792 – AWPW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 1792, click [AB 1792 – Assy Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1792, click [AB 1792 – Assy Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee analysis of AB 1792, click [AB 1792 – SNRW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 1792, click [AB 1792 - Senate Approps Committee Analysis](#)

- **[AB 1844 \(Gallagher\)](#) – Reduced Veterans Hunting/Fishing License Fees**
As amended in May, AB 1844 by Assembly Member James Gallagher (R/03-Yuba City) would have required DFW to reduce the fee to obtain an annual or lifetime hunting, fishing or sportsman’s license by 25% for a person who is a veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States, was honorably discharged, and is a resident of California.

AB 1844 was “double-referred” to the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee and the Assembly Veterans Affairs Committee. The measure was first heard in Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee in late March, passing out on a bipartisan vote. The bill then passed out of the Assembly Veterans Affairs Committee on a unanimous vote in April. The bill kept up its momentum by passing out of the Assembly Appropriations Committee in late May by another unanimous vote, and off of the Assembly Floor by a nearly unanimous 78-2 vote just days later.

Once on the Senate side, *Gaines & Associates* was pleased to testify in support of AB 1844 as it passed out of the Senate Natural Resources Committee in late June by yet another unanimous vote. But then the road suddenly got rough.

AB 1844 was heard briefly in Senate Appropriations Committee on August 1st, and promptly placed in the suspense file due to the “unknown, but significant revenue loss to DFW from discount sales of hunting and fishing licenses...”. The bill was on agenda to be possibly heard and passed out of committee on August 11th, but was held on suspense.

AB 1844 died when it failed to meet the August 12th legislative deadline for passing out of fiscal committee.

To view the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee analysis of AB 1844, click [AB 1844 – AWPW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Veterans Affairs Committee analysis of AB 1844, click [AB 1844 – Assy VA Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 1844, click [AB 1844 – Assy Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1844, click [AB 1844 Assy Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee analysis of AB 1844, click [AB 1844 –SNRW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 1844, click [AB 1844 - Senate Approps Committee Analysis](#)

- **[AB 2148 \(Holden\)](#) – Drone Regulation**

AB 2148, legislation by Assembly Member Chris Holden (D/41-Pasadena), was amended again in early August, largely to ensure the language of the proposal fully cooperated with the Federal Aviation Administration and assumed the appropriate division of responsibility for the regulation of drones between the federal and state governments. The amendments maintained the bill’s original intent to prohibit the launching, landing, or operating of a drone from DFW and/or California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) managed lands or their airspace. The bill also would have banned the use of drones for scouting, taking, or assisting in the taking, pursuing, driving, or herding of any mammal or bird – unless done on private property by a landowner or tenant for the purpose of hazing birds and mammals to prevent property damage. The bill did, however, proposed to expressly allow the use of drones for appropriate and necessary wildlife conservation and research purposes.

Recognizing the possible benefits of this legislation to the promotion and protection of wildlife, *Gaines & Associates* worked with the bill’s sponsor in an effort to help insert language which allows agency use of drones for wildlife research and conservation, while ensuring protections remain in place which fully prohibit their use by others for scouting, herding or other purposes which do not embrace the fair chase ethic.

AB 2148 was “double-referred” to the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee and the Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection. The bill quickly passed through both committees in April. Keeping its momentum up, AB 2148 then passed out of Assembly Appropriations Committee and off of the Assembly Floor in May and was sent to the Senate.

Once on the Senate side, the bill passed out of the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee in late June and was sent to Senate Appropriations Committee. The bill was heard in Senate Appropriations Committee in early August, passing out and sent to the Senate Floor. AB 2148 passed off the Senate Floor in mid-August and ordered to the Assembly for concurrence of amendments taken on the Senate side. In late August, the Assembly concurred with the Senate amendments and the measure was sent to the Governor's desk for his consideration.

On the evening of September 29th the Governor vetoed AB 2148. His veto message stated that DFW and DPR already have the authority to promulgate regulations regarding drone use within their respective jurisdictions. The Governor closed out his veto message by directing both departments to explore how best to address the concerns raised by the bill.

In close coordination with our clients, *Gaines & Associates* will be pleased and prepared to work with DFW in 2017 on the development of regulations which provide necessary prohibitions on the use of drones for scouting, herding or other purposes which violate the fair chase ethic.

To view the Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee analysis, click [AB 2148 – Assembly PCP Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee analysis of AB 2148, click [AB 2148 – Assembly WPW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 2148, click [AB 2148 – Assy Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Floor analysis of AB 2148, click [AB 2148 – Assembly Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee analysis of AB 2148, click [AB 2148 – SNRW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 2148, click [AB 2148 - Senate Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Floor analysis of AB 2148, click [AB 2148 – Senate Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Floor analysis of AB 2148 for concurrence in Senate amendments, click [AB 2148 – Assembly Floor Concurrence Analysis](#)

- **[SB 345 \(Berryhill\)](#) – **The Sport Fishing Stimulus Act of 2015**
Coined the “Sport Fishing Stimulus Act of 2015”, the intent of SB 345 by Senator Tom Berryhill (R/08-Oakdale) was to encourage more individuals to get involved in sport fishing in California. As originally amended in April 2015, this measure included four objectives:
 - 1) Transition from a calendar year annual sport fishing license to a license valid for twelve months from the date of purchase.
 - 2) Create a “junior sport fishing license” at a reduced rate to any resident or non-resident that is either sixteen or seventeen years of age at the time of purchase. The license would also be good for twelve consecutive months from the date of purchase, as long as the purchaser was under 18 at time of purchase.
 - 3) Direct the Fish and Game Commission to develop regulations clarifying when fish that had been lawfully taken and then processed (e.g., filleted, frozen, smoked) no longer violated the possession limit.
 - 4) Exempt charitable organizations and donor intermediaries from the possession limit for fish taken under a sports fishing license, as long as those organizations or individuals had a record of who lawfully caught and donated the fish.**

The bill was heard in Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee in April 2015, passing out on a unanimous vote. SB 345 was then heard in Senate Appropriations Committee in May 2015, passing out on another unanimous vote – but only after the author had to agree to strip out the most important component of the bill: the provision that would have transitioned fishing licenses from calendar-based to an annual license valid for twelve months from the date of purchase. In June 2015, the bill, as amended, passed off the Senate Floor on a unanimous vote and over to the Assembly.

After sitting idle for over a year – but having met all the necessary legislative deadlines – SB 345 was brought up for hearing on the Assembly side, passing out of the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee on a unanimous vote this past June and sent to Assembly Appropriations. The bill was brought up briefly in Assembly Appropriations Committee in early August and quickly placed in the suspense file due to “annual DFW revenue losses of approximately \$660,000 for five years resulting from reduced fishing license fees for 16 and 17 year olds”.

Failing to meet the August 12th legislative deadline for passing out of fiscal committee, SB 345 died.

To view the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee analysis of SB 345, click [SB 345 - SNRW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Appropriations Committee analysis of SB 345, click [SB 345 - Senate Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Floor analysis of SB 345, click [SB 345 - Senate Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee analysis of SB 345, click [SB 345 – Assembly WPW Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of SB 345, click [SB 345 – Assembly Approps Committee Analysis](#)

- **[SB 868 \(Jackson\)](#) – Drones**

SB 868, legislation by Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson (D/19-Santa Barbara), would enact the State Remote Piloted Aircraft Act, and establish conditions for operating remote piloted aircraft. The bill would authorize the Department of Transportation to adopt rules and regulations governing the conditions under which remote piloted aircraft may be operated for the purpose of protecting and ensuring the general public interest and safety. Among other things, AB 868 would prohibit the operation of a drone within the airspace overlying a state park, or land or waters managed by DFW without a permit, or regulations authorizing the use.

SB 868 was “double referred” to the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee and the Senate Public Safety Committee. Similar to AB 2148, the bill moved swiftly, passing out of both Senate Committees in April.

SB 868 passed out of Senate Appropriations Committee in late May, and off of the Senate Floor in early June. Once on the Assembly side, the bill was heard in Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee in late June, failing passage, but granted reconsideration. However, the bill was never brought back up for hearing in that Committee.

SB 868 died when it failed to meet the July 1st legislative deadline for passing out of Policy Committee.

To view the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee analysis of SB 868, click [SB 868 – Senate TH Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Public Safety Committee analysis of SB 868, click [SB 868 – Senate PS Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Appropriations Committee analysis of SB 868, click [SB 868 – Senate Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Floor analysis of the bill, click [SB 868 –Senate Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee analysis, click [SB 868 – Assy APCP Committee Analysis](#)

- **[SB 1191 \(Berryhill\)](#) – Fish and Wildlife Management Plans**
SB 1191 by Senator Berryhill (R/08-Oakdale) would have required DFW to submit a wildlife resources master plan to the Fish and Game Commission for their approval, and provide for the preparation and approval of science-based wildlife management plans that would form the primary foundation for managing California’s wildlife resources. The bill would have required DFW to submit the master plan to the Commission on or before September 1, 2018.

SB 1191 was scheduled to be heard in Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee in early April, but the bill was pulled by the author. Failing to meet legislative deadline, SB 1191 died.

- **[SB 1243 \(Berryhill\)](#) – Sport Fishing Licenses**
SB 1243 was a “spot bill” introduced by Senator Tom Berryhill (R/08-Oakdale) which proposed to tap into the portion of the Fish and Game Code which deals with sport fishing licenses. Among other things, this bill could have possibly served as a vehicle for picking up where Senator Berryhill’s SB 345 (see above) left off in regards to a transitioning from a calendar year annual sport fishing license to a license valid for twelve months from the date of purchase.

SB 1243 would have been first heard in Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee, but the bill was held and never assigned to the Committee. Failing to meet legislative deadline, SB 1243 died.

Firearms-Related State Legislation

Following the San Bernardino shooting late last year, the 2016 Session of the California State Legislature was dominated by firearms-related bills.

In late June – with the 2016/17 State Budget passed and lawmakers scheduled to soon break for their July summer recess – anti-gun Legislators pushed hard to move their gun control package to the Governor’s desk before the break. The fast and furious activity concluded on June 30th with several gun bills being delivered to the Governor for his consideration. With the Governor slated to leave for his own vacation in Europe the afternoon of July 1st, all indications were that he would act quickly. As reported in our “*Gaines & Associates Special Report – Governor Takes Action on Gun Bills - July 1, 2016*”, the Governor did act quickly – taking action on the bills the morning of July 1st.

To view the Governor’s press release on all his July 1st action on firearms-related legislation, click [Governor Brown Legislative Update – 7/1/16](#)

In an all-out effort to slow the anti-gun onslaught, *Gaines & Associates* actively worked the State Capitol up to the last minute, alongside the *California Rifle and Pistol Association*, *California Waterfowl Association* and a small handful of other united

interests. The afternoon of June 30th, just moments after the gun bills were passed to his desk, we also met with the Governor's Office to discuss our very serious concerns. That meeting was followed up later that evening with the delivery to the Governor of five coalition letters coordinated and written by *Gaines & Associates* and signed by twelve different conservation organizations requesting his veto. Copies of the coalition letters can be viewed via links provided below.

Although we all know it will be a major uphill battle, *Gaines & Associates* is committed to working with all our partners in conservation on possible follow-up legislation during the 2017 Session to address some of the many serious concerns the law-abiding hunting and shooting community has with the many gun bills signed into law during the 2016 Session.

Although *all* of the firearms bills signed this year are certainly of serious concern, below is a recap on those gun bills acted upon which we believe will have the most significant impact to the hunting and shooting community.

- **[AB 1135 \(Levine/Ting\)](#) – Assault Weapons – **SIGNED****
AB 1135, legislation by Assembly Members Marc Levine (D/10-San Rafael) and Philip Y. Ting (D/19-San Francisco), reclassifies some common semiautomatic hunting and target shooting rifles as assault weapons. Specifically, AB 1135 revises the definition of assault weapon to include many common semiautomatic centerfire rifles and pistols that are equipped with a magazine locking device, or “bullet button”, which prevents the removal of the magazine without a tool. The bill exempts those firearms legally possessed prior to January 1, 2017, but does require those possessed from January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2016 to be registered before January 1, 2018.

To view the conservation coalition letter urging a veto on AB 1135 and SB 880, click [AB 1135 & SB 880 Coalition Veto Letter](#)

- **[AB 1511 \(Sanitago/Chiu\)](#) – Firearms: Lending – **SIGNED****
AB 1511 by Assembly Members Miguel Santiago (D/53-Los Angeles) and David Chiu (D/17-San Francisco) will require the loan of a firearm to anyone – except a spouse or registered domestic partner, or to a parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or grandchild – to be conducted through a licensed firearms dealer. The bill will also require any handgun loaned to be registered to the person loaning the handgun.

Prior to passage of this bill, the law allowed for the loan of a firearm between persons who are personally known to each other, if the loan was infrequent and did not exceed 30 days in duration. SB 1511 *does not* delete an exemption previously placed into law which allows hunters to loan a firearm to someone they know who has a hunting license for the duration of the hunting season.

To view the conservation coalition letter urging a veto on AB 1511, click

[AB 1511 Coalition Veto Letter](#)

- **[AB 1664 \(Levine/Ting\)](#) – Assault Weapons - **DIED****
AB 1664, introduced by Assembly Members Marc Levine (D/10-San Rafael) and Philip Y. Ting (D/19-San Francisco), would close the “bullet button” loop hole by expanding the legal definition of “detachable magazine” to mean an ammunition feeding device that can be easily removed from the firearm without disassembly of the firearm action, or with the use of a tool. AB 1664 would leave the current requirement in the code that, to qualify as an assault weapon, a centerfire rifle must have the capacity to accept a detachable magazine and any one of several other specified attributes – including a thumbhole stock or forward pistol grip. AB 1664 would also require those who lawfully possessed an assault weapon (as newly defined) that does not have a fixed magazine between January 1, 2001, and December 31, 2016, inclusive, to register the firearm by July 1, 2018.

AB 1664 was first heard in Assembly Public Safety Committee in early March, passing out on a party-line vote. The bill then passed out of Assembly Appropriations Committee in late May and off of the Assembly Floor on June 1st.

Once on the Senate side, AB 1664 quickly passed out of Senate Public Safety Committee on a party-line vote in mid-June, and out of Senate Appropriations just days later by another party-line vote.

Cooling on the Senate Floor since June, AB 1664’s fate was finally determined when ordered to the Inactive File on August 30th.

To view the Assembly Public Safety Committee analysis of AB 1664, click [AB 1664 - Assy PS Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 1664, click [AB 1664 – Assy Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Assembly Floor analysis of AB 1664, click [AB 1664 - Assy Floor Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Public Safety Committee analysis of AB 1664, click [AB 1664 - Senate PS Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Appropriations Committee analysis of AB 1664, click [AB 1664 – Senate Approps Committee Analysis](#)

To view the Senate Floor analysis of AB 1664, click [AB 1664 – Senate Floor Analysis](#)

- **[AB 1674 \(Santiago\)](#) – Firearm Transfers – **VETOED****

AB 1674 by Assembly Member Miguel Santiago (D/53-Los Angeles) would have prohibited the purchase of more than one long gun (e.g. shotgun or rifle) within any 30-day period. Recent amendments taken to the bill would have exempted those who have a valid hunting license, as well as those who obtain a long gun(s) at an auction or event conducted by a nonprofit for fundraising purposes.

However, even as amended, AB 1674 would have had a substantial impact on many of those who participate in our shooting sports and who legally collect firearms. Further, reducing long gun sales to these law-abiding citizens would have also had a significant impact on federal Pittman-Robertson (PR) funding annually made available to our state to manage our wildlife resources and the habitats they depend upon.

To view the conservation coalition letter urging a veto on AB 1511, click [AB 1674 Coalition Veto Letter](#)

To view the Governor's Veto Message on AB 1674, click [AB 1674 Veto Message](#)

- **[SB 880 \(Hall/Glazer\)](#) – Assault Weapons – **SIGNED****
SB 880 by Senators Isadore Hall (D/35-San Pedro) and Steven Glazer (D/07-Walnut Creek) would revise the definition of assault weapon to mean a semiautomatic centerfire rifle, or a semiautomatic pistol that does not have a fixed magazine, but has any one of several specified military type features. Further, the bill closes the “bullet button” loop hole by redefining “fixed magazine” as “an ammunition feeding device contained in, or permanently attached to, the firearm in such a manner that the device cannot be removed without disassembly of the firearm action”.

The bill will require any person who lawfully has possessed an assault weapon from January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2016 that does not have a fixed magazine, as defined – including those with a "bullet button" magazine release – to register the firearm before January 1, 2018.

To view the conservation coalition letter urging a veto on AB 1135 and SB 880, click [AB 1135 & SB 880 Coalition Veto Letter](#)

- **[SB 894 \(Jackson\)](#) – Lost or Stolen Firearm: Reporting – **VETOED****
SB 894 by Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson (D/19-Santa Barbara) would have required every person to report the theft or loss of a firearm they own or possess to a local law enforcement agency within 5 days of the time they knew or reasonably should have known that the firearm had been stolen or lost. The bill would have also required every person who has reported a firearm lost or stolen to notify the local law enforcement agency within 48 hours if the firearm was subsequently recovered.

Law-abiding hunters and shooters already readily report any theft of a firearm they own or possess, as soon as they become aware. SB 894 would have placed them in jeopardy of criminal prosecution – regardless of whether they knew or not that their firearm was stolen – if law enforcement believed “they should have known” it was stolen.

To view the conservation coalition letter urging a veto on SB 894, click [SB 894 Coalition Veto Letter](#)

To view the Governor’s Veto Message on AB 1674, click [SB 894 Veto Message](#)

- **[SB 1235 \(de Leon\)](#) – Ammunition – **SIGNED****
SB 1235 by Senator Kevin de Leon (D/24-Los Angeles) will, among many other things, require all ammunition vendors to obtain an ammunition vendor license and require the Department of Justice (DOJ) to maintain a detailed database on vendors; require DOJ to establish a database on those who purchase ammunition including their name; date of birth; address; driver’s license number; and brand, type, amount and date of sale of ammunition purchased; require DOJ to electronically approve the purchase or transfer of ammunition to the buyer by cross-referencing their information with data maintained in the Automated Firearms System; and require ammunition to be purchased “face-to-face” with few exceptions – thus prohibiting all internet and mail order purchases unless done through a licensed dealer.

As amended in late June, SB 1235 would make some changes to the language of Newsom’s “Safety for All Act”, should the Act pass in November – including delaying implementation of some of the Act’s provisions until July 1, 2019, and charging ammunition purchasers and transferees a per transaction fee not to exceed \$1.

For a detailed breakdown of the bill’s many provisions – and when they go into effect – contact *Gaines & Associates* at info@gainesandassociates.net

To view the conservation coalition letter urging a veto on SB 1235, click [SB 1235 Coalition Veto Letter](#)

To view the Governor’s signing message on those bills he signed into law, click [Governor’s Signing Message](#)

Proposition 63 – the “Safety for All Act of 2016”

Not all the very serious threats to our Second Amendment rights and our sporting arms and munitions are taking place inside the walls of our State Capitol. Lt. Governor Gavin Newsom’s “Safety for All Act of 2016” – a.k.a. “The Newsom Initiative” – is easily the most aggressive single gun control package ever brought forward in California or beyond. Among other things, this vicious initiative, which will be on the November 8th ballot as Proposition 63, would:

- ✓ Ban all on-line and mail order sales of ammunition;
- ✓ Require all who purchase ammo to apply for a “firearms purchaser certificate” which would cost up to \$50, take up to a month to obtain, and have to be renewed every 2 years;
- ✓ Require the tracking of what type of ammunition you buy;
- ✓ Require all who sell more than 500 rounds in a year to register with the CA Department of Justice (DOJ);
- ✓ Ban possession of, and confiscate lawfully purchased magazines capable of holding more than 10 rounds - regardless of when you purchased them;
- ✓ Ban all private transfer of ammunition - including, for example, giving youth any ammunition in the field, during hunter education courses or at the range;
- ✓ Prohibit bringing ammunition purchased out of state back into CA;
- ✓ Prohibit any ammunition purchased at a range from leaving the range; and
- ✓ Require ammunition buyers to undergo a background check before they purchase any ammunition.

Although each of the above “gun control” tactics have been proposed, and some even now passed into law in some form or another in the California State Legislature – *never* have they all been rolled up into one omnibus proposal, *nor* put to a statewide vote. In fact, Newsom’s proposal is *so aggressive* that it ignited a feud with anti-gun Legislators at our State Capitol, resulting in the massive last minute push to push gun bills to the desk of the Governor before Summer Recess. Although much of the steam in this unprecedented anti-gun package has now been hijacked by the plethora of gun bills already signed by the Governor this Session, this initiative must be stopped. *Please be sure to get out and vote this November and help to defeat this proposal. We must send the message to the decision-makers statewide that we simply won’t allow any more attacks to our Second Amendment rights!*

To view the entire text of this massive attack on our Second Amendment rights, click ["Safety for All Act of 2016"](#)

For more information on why you should vote “NO” on Proposition 63 on November 8th, click [Prop 63 - Why Vote "NO"?](#)

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE OUTDOOR SPORTING CAUCUS

Gaines & Associates continues to work closely with our clients/partners in conservation to help strengthen the positive role at our State Capitol of the *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus* – a bipartisan, bicameral assemblage of State Legislators who support policy decisions which embrace and promote California’s outdoor traditions.

In close coordination with, and with the financial support of our client/partner organizations, *Gaines & Associates* is working with Caucus members to hold events and forums which educate, focus and coordinate the State Legislature’s support of

California's sporting arms, and wildlife and fishery resources and the outdoor-related activities that depend upon them.

In 2016, *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus* included the following annual events:

- **State Capitol Hunter Education Course**

Each year, *Gaines & Associates* is pleased to coordinate with Caucus leadership on hosting our annual *State Capitol Hunter Education Course – “Under the Capitol Dome”* for State Legislators and their staff. This year, the course was held on Friday, August 5th. In addition to providing attendees with their Hunter Education Certificate, the intent of this course is to serve as a powerful educational tool regarding the conservation ethic of the hunting community and the integral role hunting plays in our North American Wildlife Conservation Model. The positive message about hunters and hunting that decision-makers receive from taking the course pays dividends on tough anti-hunting legislation we often see introduced at our State Capitol. The 2016 State Capitol Hunter Education Course was hosted by *Gaines & Associates*, and sponsored by the *Black Brant Group*. An additional thank you must be given to DFW for loaning us two of their best Hunter Safety Instructors to teach the course.

- **California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus Trap Shoot**

The annual *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus Trap Shoot* is intended to safely introduce California lawmakers to our time-honored shooting and archery traditions, while helping to build the size and breadth of the *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus*. Under the close guidance of experienced shooting and archery instructors, this important and highly popular event puts firearms safely in the hands of those who are tasked with defining firearm policy for the state – often for the first time. This critical annual event has proven to make a positive difference on the outcome of gun control legislation brought forward for consideration at our State Capitol. The *2016 Caucus Shoot* was held on June 22nd at the Cordova Shooting Center in Rancho Cordova. This year's event boasted a “full house” on the range, with the largest turnout ever for this always popular annual affair. Sponsors of this year's Shoot included the *National Wild Turkey Federation, California Waterfowl Association, Ducks Unlimited, Gaines & Associates, California Bowmen Hunters/State Archery Association, California Deer Association, Butte County Fish and Game Commission, Monterey County Fish and Game Commission, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Tulare Basin Wetlands Association, California Houndsmen for Conservation, Bay Area Chapter of Safari Club International, and the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation National Assembly of Sportsmen's Caucuses.*

- **Annual California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus Social**

Fully sponsored by the *California Waterfowl Association*, the *Annual California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus Social* provides a fun and low-key forum for conservation organizations and interests to meet with State Legislators and other policy-makers to discuss issues of importance to the future of hunting and wildlife

conservation in California. The *2016 Caucus Social* was held the evening of April 26th in Sacramento.

The *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus* was created by *California Waterfowl Association* and *Gaines & Associates* staff over ten years ago. The *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus* currently consists of 33 members of California's State Legislature – making it one of the largest caucuses at our State Capitol.

For more information on the *California Legislature Outdoor Sporting Caucus*, visit the Senate website by clicking [Outdoor Sporting Caucus](#)

This Gaines & Association “Special Report” provides the final status of bills of greatest interest to our clients during the 2015/2016 Legislative Session. For full detail on any of the bills noted above, or any other piece of legislation or issue of concern, please contact us at info@gainesandassociates.net

If you would like to unsubscribe to Gaines & Associates “Special Reports”, just let us know at info@gainesandassociates.net