



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

SACHI A. HAMAI
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

JANICE HAHN
Fourth District

KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

April 13, 2018

To: Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Sachi A. Hamai
Chief Executive Officer

REPORT ON STATE LEGISLATION RELATED TO ADDRESSING THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE IN OUR COMMUNITIES (ITEM NO. 3, BOARD MEETING OF MARCH 13, 2018)

On March 13, 2018, the Board approved a motion by Supervisors Kuehl and Ridley-Thomas to direct the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), County Counsel, and the Department of Public Health to work on various recommendations related to the development of a countywide violence prevention strategic planning process (Attachment I). This report is in response to recommendation number two of that motion:

- Instruct the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in consultation with County Counsel, to report back in 30 days with an overview of currently pending State gun control legislation, including any recommendations for support by the County of proposed legislation that would enhance the County's efforts to protect its residents and further strengthen gun control regulations.

In addition, the March 13, 2018 motion, under recommendation number one, instructed County Counsel to provide a confidential legal analysis within 60 days of regulatory options available to the County, including, but not limited to, an analysis of the potential to withstand legal challenges of various ordinances that would allow the County to locally impose specified firearm control and safety measures. Because pending State legislation has the potential to impact these considerations, this office will additionally provide the Board an updated analysis and recommendations on legislation related to preventing gun violence as part of County Counsel's 60-day report back.

Overview of Pending State Legislation

Attachments II, III, and IV contain an overview of currently pending legislation related to: 1) gun control and safety; 2) school safety; and 3) fostering socially healthy school environments, including measures that relate to mental health awareness and domestic violence prevention.

Specifically:

- Attachment II contains Pursuits of County-Advocacy position to support measures which are consistent with existing Board-approved policies; and therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support; and
- Attachment III contains recommendations for your Board to consider to take County support positions on bills currently being considered by the Legislature.

The Chief Executive Office worked closely with County Counsel and the Departments of Public Health, Children and Family Services, and Mental Health to analyze these measures and develop recommendations. This office additionally consulted with the Sheriff's Department. This interdepartmental group took into consideration the Board's March 13, 2018 motion, and the County's current Board-approved legislative policies on matters related to: 1) gun control, access and availability; 2) child safety; 3) fostering socially and emotionally health school environments; 4) mental health awareness; and 6) violence prevention.

These recommendations are highlighted below.

Finally, Attachment IV contains an analysis of other pending legislation for which no position is recommended.

Pursuits of County-Advocacy Position

Support of the following measures is consistent with existing, Board-approved policies; therefore, **unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support the following measures.**

GUN CONTROL AND SAFETY

AB 2103 (Gloria) – Firearms: License to Carry Concealed: Safety Training: would require that the training for applicants for a license to carry a concealed firearm be at minimum 8 hours in length and include safe handling and shooting proficiency requirements.

SB 1346 (Jackson) – Firearms: Multi-burst Trigger Activators: would provide that the existing prohibition on multi-burst trigger activators includes a bump fire stock or bump fire stock attachment.

PROHIBITED PERSONS

AB 1927 (Bonta) – Firearms: California Do Not Sell List: Suicide Prevention: would provide those battling suicidal thoughts an option to protect themselves by temporarily limiting their access to purchase firearms during a time of crisis. *(Support in Concept)*

AB 2817 (Santiago) – Firearms: Emergency Transfers: Suicide Prevention: would exempt specified requirements for the transfer of a firearm for the temporary transfer of a firearm that is voluntarily made for the purpose of preventing a suicide attempt.

AB 3129 (Rubio) – Firearms: Prohibited Persons: Domestic Violence: would prohibit a person who is convicted on or after January 1, 2019, of specified misdemeanors relating to domestic violence that currently result in a ten-year prohibition against possessing a firearm, from ever possessing a firearm.

SCHOOL SAFETY

AB 2686 (Jones-Sawyer) – Pupil Mental Health: School Administrator and Staff Training: would require local schools that serve pupils in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, before the beginning of the 2019–20 school year, to adopt a training policy on pupil mental health for its school administrators and staff.

FOSTERING SOCIALLY HEALTHY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

AB 2070 (Reyes) – Postsecondary Education: Sexual Assault/Sexual Violence: would require that student outreach programming for public universities, colleges, and community colleges include information to domestic and dating violence.

AB 2291 (Chiu) – School Safety: Bullying: would require that school safety plans additionally include policies and procedures relating to bullying and the prevention of bullying under the Safe Place to Learn Act.

Attachment II contains a more complete analysis of these measures.

Recommendations of Legislation for Potential County Support

Support of the following measures is consistent with the Board's March 13, 2018, motion related to preventing gun violence through improved gun controls and a comprehensive public health response. Currently, there are no existing Board-approved policies to

directly support these measures; **therefore, support of the following bills would be a matter of Board policy determination.**

GUN CONTROL AND SAFETY

AB 3 (Bonta) – Firearms: Age Restrictions: would prohibit the sale or transfer of any firearm or ammunition by a licensed dealer to any person under 21 years of age.

AB 2222 (Quirk) – Crime Prevention Investigation: Informational Databases: would extend to all law enforcement agencies in the State the requirement to submit the description of firearms which have been reported stolen, lost, found, recovered, or under observation, directly to an automated State Department of Justice system.

AB 2382 (Gipson) – Firearms: Frames and Receivers: would require a State background check for individuals seeking to purchase firearm precursor parts by requiring the California Department of Justice to electronically approve the purchase or transfer of firearm precursor parts through a vendor. In addition, this bill would prohibit selling or giving firearm precursor parts to a person under 21 years of age.

SB 1100 (Portantino) – Firearms: Transfers and Age Restrictions: would: 1) make the 30-day prohibition on purchasing more than one handgun applicable to all types of firearms; and 2) prohibit the sale or transfer of any firearm by a licensed dealer, except as specifically exempted, to any person below the age of 21 years.

PROHIBITED PERSONS

SB 746 (Portantino) – Firearms and Ammunition: Prohibited Possession: Dealer: would authorize an individual with an outstanding warrant for a felony or a misdemeanor to transfer his or her firearms or ammunition to a licensed firearms dealer for the duration of the period of prohibition.

SB 1200 (Skinner) – Firearms: Gun Violence Restraining Orders: would expand the definition of a firearm for these purposes of a gun violence restraining order to include firearms parts and components, and would expand the definition of ammunition to include a magazine.

SCHOOL SAFETY

AB 1747 (Rodriguez) – School Safety Plans: would expand the required elements of school safety plans, including procedures to respond to active shooter situations, require schools to conduct annual active shooter drills, and require the CDE to provide additional guidance and oversight of safety plans.

Each Supervisor
April 13, 2018
Page 5

Attachment III contains a more complete analysis of these measures.

No Positions Recommended

Finally, Attachment IV contains an analysis of other pending legislation for which no position is recommended.

Legislative Schedule

The State Legislature is currently in the process of hearing bills in their respective policy and fiscal committees. June 1, 2018, is the last day for each house to pass bills introduced in that house. Following committee hearings in the second house, the Legislature has until August 31, 2018, to pass bills.

We will continue to keep you advised.

SH:JJ:MR
OR:PC:lm

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
All Department Heads

AGN. NO. _____

MOTION BY SUPERVISORS SHEILA KUEHL AND
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

March 13, 2018

Addressing the Epidemic of Gun Violence in Our Communities

Over the past several years we have witnessed an escalating number of tragic mass shootings across the country. As these horrific events have become more commonplace we may begin to blur the details, but we certainly remember the names – Parkland, Florida; Aurora, Colorado; Newton, Connecticut; Las Vegas, Nevada; San Bernardino, California and so many others. While these mass shootings often capture our attention and break our hearts, they represent only a small fraction of the true devastation that gun violence wreaks on our nation. Every year we lose 33,000 of our loved ones to gun violence in America, including 1500 children. And another 85,000 of our community members sustain injuries due to gun violence annually.

The statistics for Los Angeles County are no less distressing. On average, at least three people die every day in the County due to firearms. Data from our Department of Public Health indicates that between 2004 and 2013, homicide was a leading cause of premature death for the entire County population. Only heart disease took more of our County neighbors at an early age. Gun violence takes an especially

MOTION

Solis _____

Ridley-Thomas _____

Hahn _____

Barger _____

Kuehl _____

heavy toll on our children and young adults, particularly among minorities and males in the county's most underserved communities. It is also important to recognize that gun violence is not only directed at others but is the leading method of suicide, too. In fact, nearly one-third of all firearm deaths in the county are suicides.

Although many attempt to portray gun violence as inevitable, it is, in fact, preventable. However, effectively combatting the epidemic of gun violence that is plaguing our communities will require a multi-prong approach.

In December 2015, just days after the attack on county public health department staff in San Bernardino, Supervisor Ridley-Thomas introduced a motion asking for a report with recommendations to prevent violence, including recommendations to adopt new gun violence prevention regulations. The Board received the report back to this motion in June of 2017. The report highlights that other counties and cities across California have successfully adopted constitutional gun control regulations that are stronger than our current County regulations. The County should examine the feasibility of adopting these regulations in order to better protect our residents. In addition to strengthening our local regulations, we must also support and seek legislation in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. that will maintain the health and safety of our communities.

The June 2017 report also notes that, although several County departments are engaged in a variety of violence prevention efforts, these initiatives are not organized or coordinated in a holistic manner. As the report notes, the County currently does not have the proper infrastructure to coordinate our own programs. Our Department of Mental Health has the START (School Threat Assessment and Response Teams) program, which endeavors to prevent violence in our schools. Our Department of Public

Health implements the Trauma Prevention Initiative and supports the Department of Parks and Recreation's Parks After Dark program, which has proven effective in increasing social cohesion and reducing gang violence by creating opportunities for residents to engage in health and recreation activities at the County's parks in the evenings. Our Sheriff's Department operates an effective gun buy-back program and also works with our Department of Mental Health and the District Attorney to provide training to law enforcement members so they are better equipped to work with mentally ill residents in a non-violent manner. However, too often these programs are disjointed and the County misses opportunities to better leverage the work that we are already doing in vulnerable communities. Establishing a single office of violence prevention that is responsible for coordinating the County's myriad violence prevention programs can be a first step towards the County's adoption of a more strategic approach to preventing gun violence in our County. Such an office will also be able to help the County identify the gaps in our current array of violence prevention programs.

The Department of Public Health currently has an Injury & Violence Prevention Program (IVPP), housed within the Division of Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, that may be able to take on this role. The IVPP is currently tasked with surveillance of violence impacting County residents, providing technical assistance to county departments and initiatives, including Parks After Dark and Violence Against Women, and coordinating the Trauma Prevention Initiative, a place-based comprehensive violence prevention and intervention strategy. While IVPP may have the expertise to assume the responsibility of coordinating countywide violence prevention efforts, it currently lacks the resources and staffing to do so effectively. The County should consider expanding the scope and resources dedicated to IVPP, or creating a new

Office of Violence Prevention, so that it can lead the County in the development of a countywide violence prevention strategic planning process.

Gun violence destroys lives, families and communities. Youth have spoken up in Florida and here at home. Thoughts and prayers are not enough and Los Angeles County must do better.

WE, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) Instruct County Counsel to provide a confidential legal analysis within 60 days of regulatory options available to the County, including, but not limited to, an analysis of the potential to withstand legal challenges of ordinances that would allow the County to:
 - a) Impose additional restrictions on the sale or possession of firearms by minors or individuals under 21 years of age;
 - b) Ban 50 caliber handguns;
 - c) Strengthen safe storage requirements; and
 - d) Adopt zoning regulations that would create a buffer zone between gun vendors and sensitive areas (e.g., schools and daycare centers).
- 2) Instruct the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in consultation with County Counsel, to report back in 30 days with an overview of currently pending state gun control legislation, including any recommendations for support by the County of proposed legislation that would enhance the County's efforts to protect its residents and further strengthen gun control regulations.
- 3) Instruct the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the CEO to propose the infrastructure needed within the County in order to create and support a robust and integrated Countywide Violence Prevention Initiative. DPH and the CEO shall work

together to create an Office of Violence Prevention within the Department of Public Health that will initially be tasked with coordinating the County's various violence prevention efforts, and lead the County in a violence prevention strategic planning process:

- a) DPH and the CEO shall report back in 60 days with a plan outlining the staffing and resources needed to create the new Office of Violence Prevention. The report back shall consider the possibility of expanding the scope and responsibility of the Injury & Violence Prevention Program and transitioning that unit into a countywide Office of Violence Prevention. The report back shall also identify possible funding sources to support the ongoing costs associated with the staffing and operations of the new Office; and
- b) DPH shall report back in 90 days with an overview of how the Office of Violence Prevention, working with partner agencies, will develop and roll out a Countywide violence prevention strategic plan. This report back shall provide a strategic planning process timeline, identify resources needed to complete the strategic plan, and identify possible funding sources;
 - i) DPH shall work with a wide variety of partner agencies while developing their strategic plan, including internal County partner agencies such as the Department of Health Services, Department of Mental Health, Probation Department, Sheriff's Department, District Attorney, Public Defender, Alternate Public Defender, LA County Office of Education, Department of Children and Family Services, Office of Child Protection, Office of Diversion and Re-entry, County Counsel, Coroner, and the Parks and Recreation Department. DPH shall also work with countywide initiatives, outside partner

agencies, and consortia, as well as community stakeholder groups and cities;
and

ii) The report back shall also include:

(1) An assessment of the County's current violence prevention programs as well as some of the violence prevention initiatives that have been successfully adopted in other jurisdictions, such as Cure Violence;

(2) A discussion of the value in developing violence prevention strategies that are specific to certain areas or neighborhoods in the County and the unique dynamics and issues, such as gang violence, that impact those areas; and

(3) An analysis of gaps in the County's current array of violence prevention programs.

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR JANICE HAHN

March 13, 2018

AMENDMENT TO ITEM 2

I, **THEREFORE MOVE** that the Board of Supervisors instruct County Counsel to look at the following:

1. If we can limit the sale or possession of assault weapons in LA County;
2. If we can limit the ability of people who are deemed too dangerous to fly on the FBI terror watch list from purchasing firearms; and
3. If we can prevent domestic abusers from purchasing and owning firearms or from taking their guns away in situations of imminent danger.

#

JH:dg

MOTION

SOLIS _____

RIDLEY-THOMAS _____

HAHN _____

BARGER _____

KUEHL _____

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR KATHRYN BARGER

March 13, 2018

AMENDMENT TO ITEM # 2

I, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors instruct County Counsel to work with pertinent County departments to include the following in their confidential legal analysis:

1. A list of all gun stores in the county unincorporated areas within close proximity to sensitive areas; and
2. A comprehensive report of all existing state gun control and gun violence prevention laws.

#

KB:ems

MOTION

SOLIS _____

RIDLEY-THOMAS _____

HAHN _____

BARGER _____

KUEHL _____

**REPORT ON STATE LEGISLATION RELATED TO
ADDRESSING THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE**

PURSUIITS OF COUNTY POSITION

GUN CONTROL AND SAFETY

<p>AB 2103 (Gloria) – Firearms: License to Carry Concealed: Safety Training</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 14, 2018, would require that the training for applicants for a license to carry a concealed firearm be at minimum 8 hours in length and include safe handling and shooting proficiency requirements.</p> <p>Current law requires that the course of training for an applicant be no more than 16 hours, but does not establish a minimum.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 2103, reporting that it would impose across-the-board standards for the entire State, strengthening measures to ensure that concealed carry permit holders have appropriate training to handle and fire a gun.</p> <p>AB 2103 is supported by: California Chapter of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence; California State Sheriff's Association; and Gifford's Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. It is opposed by the Gun Owners of California and National Rifle Association.</p> <p>Bill Status: his measure is currently on the Assembly Floor.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting AB 2103. Support of this measure would be consistent with the Board's March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with existing, Board-approved policy to support measures which establish, enhance, or fund policies, programs, research, standards, educational curriculum, and public awareness campaigns that encourage health promotion, health protection, disease and infection control, and injury and violence prevention efforts. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 2103.</u></p>
<p>SB 1346 (Jackson) – Firearms: Multi- burst Trigger Activators</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 16, 2018, would state that the existing definition of a multi-burst trigger activator includes a bump fire stock or bump fire stock attachment.</p> <p>Current law prohibits the manufacture, importation, sale, transfer, or possession of any multi-burst trigger activator, defined as either a device designed or redesigned to be attached to a semiautomatic firearm, which</p>

	<p>allows the firearm to discharge two or more shots in a burst by activating the device, or a manual or power-driven trigger activating device constructed and designed so that when attached to a semiautomatic firearm it increases the rate of fire of that firearm.</p> <p>The Sheriff’s Department supports SB 1346, reporting that a bump stock, or other similar device, increases a semi-automatic rifle's rate of fire between 400 and 800 rounds per minute. According to a recent report by George Mason University and noted by the Los Angeles Times, these types of weapons are showing up more often not only in mass shootings, but in ordinary crimes of violence and attacks on law enforcement. SB 1346 would ban the manufacture, importation, sale, transfer, or possession of a bump fire stock or bump fire stock attachment, by adding them to current definition of multi-burst trigger activator.</p> <p>SB 1346 is supported by the Los Angeles County Sheriff. Currently, there is no opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Public Safety Committee on April 24, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office recommends supporting this measure. Support of SB 1346 is consistent with existing Board-approved policy to support proposals to ban the sale, manufacture, transfer and importation of semiautomatic assault weapons and related devices that allow semiautomatic weapons to function as assault weapons or automatic weapons. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento Advocates will support SB 1346.</u></p>

PROHIBITED PERSONS

<p>AB 1927 (Bonta) – Firearms: California Do Not Sell List: Suicide Prevention</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 14, 2018, would: 1) require the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to implement an online platform to allow residents to voluntarily add their own name to the California Do Not Sell List for firearms, which prohibits an individual from purchasing a firearm; and 2) would allow the individual to request to have his or her name removed from the list at any time after one year has passed. In addition, AB 1927 would make it a crime, punishable as misdemeanor or a felony, to transfer a firearm to a person who is validly registered on the California Do Not Sell List.</p> <p>According to the author, AB 1927 provides those battling suicidal thoughts an option to protect themselves by temporarily limiting their access to purchase firearms during a time of crisis. According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee analysis, creating a Do Not Sell list as would be costly and the benefit and extent to which such a system will be used by individuals in unclear. The committee recommends that the</p>
---	--

	<p>author explore ways of allowing people to notify DOJ of their desire to be prohibited from purchasing a gun due to mental health or other concerns using existing systems and databases. The Department of Public Health (DPH) concurs, noting that they while they support the concept, DPH would have concerns regarding: 1) the logistics of keeping information confidential; and 2) that the creation of a new system may not be the most effective use of resources for this subset of the population.</p> <p>The Department and Children and Family Services (DCFS) recommends supporting AB 1927, reporting that DCFS’s Multi-Agency Response Team (MART) jointly responds with every jurisdictional level of the law enforcement community during warrant service, probation and parole compliance checks and sensitive matters that have a child endangerment nexus. Prior to response, background checks are conducted to determine history and access to firearms. DCFS notes that direct and/or indirect access through law enforcement to the platform information and new criteria will enhance the safety of responding personnel, and will help in the development of safety plans that mitigate potential and/or known risk by those having access to children inside the home.</p> <p>This measure is supported by: Brady Campaign Against Gun Violence; California Chapters; Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence; Physicians for Social Responsibility; San Francisco Bay Area Chapter; and Frederick Vars; Professor of Law. It is opposed by the National Rifle Association of America.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 1927 is currently pending the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support in Concept</p>	<p>This office, Department of Public Health and Department of Children and Family Services recommend supporting AB 1927 in concept. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with existing, Board-approved policy to support measures which enhance injury and violence prevention efforts, including suicide prevention, behavioral health awareness, and anti-bullying and sexual exploitation of minors. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 1927 in concept.</u></p>
<p>AB 2817 (Santiago) – Firearms: Emergency</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 23, 2018, would exempt specified requirements for the transfer of a firearm for the temporary transfer of a firearm that is voluntarily made for the purpose of preventing a suicide attempt.</p> <p>Under current law, the transfer of a firearm must be conducted through a licensed dealer; and requires the dealer to, among other requirements</p>

<p>Transfers: Suicide Prevention</p>	<p>hold the firearm for a specified period of time before transfer, obtain a background check of the person receiving the firearm, and report the transfer to the Department of Justice.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 2817, reporting that it would increase options for those who may be temporarily at risk for harming themselves or others.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2817 is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting AB 2817. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with existing, Board-approved policy to support measures which enhance injury and violence prevention efforts, including suicide prevention, behavioral health awareness, and anti-bullying and sexual exploration of minors. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 2817.</u></p>

<p>AB 3129 (Rubio) – Firearms: Prohibited Persons: Domestic Violence</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 19, 2018, would prohibit a person who is convicted on or after January 1, 2019, of specified misdemeanors relating to domestic violence that currently result in a ten-year prohibition against possessing a firearm, from ever possessing a firearm.</p> <p>Current law prohibits individuals that have been convicted of specified misdemeanors from possessing a firearm for a period of 10 years.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 3129, reporting that abused women are five times more likely to be killed if their abuser owns a firearm, and domestic violence assaults involving a gun are 12 times more likely to end in death than assaults with other weapons or physical harm. DPH notes that it is essential that Federal and State gun laws keep deadly weapons out of domestic abusers’ hands.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 3129 is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting AB 3129. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a</p>

	<p>public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with Board-approved policy to support efforts to promote domestic violence prevention and intervention through public awareness, education, counseling, increased data collection and research, and through comprehensive approaches to violence prevention. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 3129.</u></p>
--	--

SCHOOL SAFETY

<p>AB 2686 (Jones-Sawyer) – Pupil Mental Health: School Administrator and Staff Training</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 20, 2018, would require local schools that serve pupils in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, before the beginning of the 2019–20 school year, to adopt a training policy on pupil mental health for its school administrators and staff.</p> <p>Current law requires schools to give diligent care to the health and physical development of pupils and authorizes the school district to employ properly certified persons for the work.</p> <p>The Department of Mental Health recommends supporting AB 2686, noting that the bill would enhance the knowledge base on mental health related to students grades 1 - 12 among school personnel, and would enhance mental health literacy.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2686 is pending hearing in the Assembly Health Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Mental Health recommend supporting AB 2686. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with Board-approved policy to support measures which establish, enhance, or fund policies, programs, research, standards, educational curriculum, and public awareness campaigns that encourage health promotion, health protection, disease and infection control, and injury and violence prevention efforts, including suicide prevention, behavior health awareness, and anti-bullying and sexual exploitation of minors. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 2070.</u></p>

FOSTERING SOCIALLY HEALTHY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

<p>AB 2070 (Reyes) – Postsecondary Education: Sexual Assault/Sexual Violence</p>	<p>This measure, as amended April 9, 2018, would require that student outreach programming for public universities, colleges, and community colleges include information to domestic and dating violence, including: 1) warning signs of domestic and dating violence; 2) campus policies and resources relating to domestic and dating violence; and 3) off-campus resources and centers relating to domestic and dating violence.</p> <p>Under current law, public universities, colleges, and community colleges are required to provide students outreach programming on various matters, including domestic violence; however, current law does not specify any requirements for domestic violence programming. According to the author’s office, this mandated programming is currently not required to include key aspects to the conversations centered around dating and domestic violence, which often leads to greater forms of physical and sexual assault. This omission leads to a greater misunderstanding of what constitutes dating violence and can discourage victims from seeking assistance.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 2070, reporting that focus on prevention is important, and that more resources are needed to educate students about domestic violence, sexual violence, stalking and dating violence.</p> <p>The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) recommends supporting AB 2070, indicating that schools are a critical partner to DCFS. DCFS families who have access to preventative services and education can help to support safety plans and compliance with court orders. MART and CSEC investigations and continuing services would also benefit. The programs jointly investigate with law enforcement incidents of dating violence from partner-turned-exploiter and dating violence turned into cyber bullying or in some cases revenge porn.</p> <p>This measure is supported by the California Partnership to End Domestic Violence and California State Student Association. Currently, there is no opposition on file.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2070 is scheduled to be heard by the Assembly Higher Education Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office, Department of Public Health, and Department of Children and Family Services recommend supporting AB 2070. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with Board-approved policy to support efforts to promote domestic violence prevention and intervention through public awareness, education, counseling, increased data collection and research, and through</p>

	<p>comprehensive approaches to violence prevention. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 2070.</u></p>
--	---

<p>AB 2291 (Chiu) – School Safety: Bullying</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 13, 2018, would require that school safety plans additionally include policies and procedures relating to bullying and the prevention of bullying under the Safe Place to Learn Act. AB 2291 would require: 1) the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop, post on-line, and annually update online training modules relating to bullying or bullying prevention; and 2) schools to annually provide the online training to certificated school site employees.</p> <p>The Safe Place to Learn Act requires CDE to assess whether local educational agencies have taken actions related to educational equity, including adopting a policy that prohibits discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and bullying based on protected characteristics. School policies include, among other requirements, that if school personnel witness an act of discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying, they shall take immediate steps to intervene when safe to do so.</p> <p>This measure is cosponsored by: Advancement Project; Asian Americans Advancing Justice – California; Council on American-Islamic Relations-California Chapter; and Equality California. It is supported by over 20 human rights and child organizations, including American Civil Liberties Union of California; American Academy of Pediatrics; and Disability Rights California. Currently, there is no opposition on file.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2291 is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support</p>	<p>This office recommends supporting AB 2291. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response. In addition, support of this measure would be consistent with Board-approved policy to support measures which enhance injury and violence prevention efforts, including suicide prevention, behavioral health awareness, and anti-bullying and sexual exploration of minors. <u>Therefore, unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Sacramento advocates will support AB 2291.</u></p>

**REPORT ON STATE LEGISLATION RELATED TO
ADDRESSING THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE**

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POTENTIAL BOARD SUPPORT

GUN CONTROL AND SAFETY

<p>AB 3 (Bonta) – Firearms: Age Restrictions</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 7, 2018, would prohibit the sale or transfer of any firearm or ammunition by a licensed dealer to any person under 21 years of age.</p> <p>Current law prohibits the sale or transfer of a handgun, except as specifically exempted, to any person below the age of 21 years. AB 3 would expand that prohibition to any firearm.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 3, reporting that it is common practice to set legal ages for activities that require maturity such as voting, driving, and drinking alcohol. DPH notes that purchasing and possessing a firearm necessitates the same, or greater, ability to act responsibly, and data shows that young adults account for a disproportionate number of gun homicides and suicides. By strengthening minimum age laws for purchasing and possessing firearms, AB 3 would help protect young people and the public at large from all too common tragedies.</p> <p>The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) recommends supporting AB 3, noting that the population DCFS serves includes gang impacted minors and non-minor dependents. Many of these youths continue to struggle with substance abuse and mental health concerns, including suicide. DCFS indicates that early age access to firearms for an unstable youth elevates the risk to their health and safety.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 3 is pending hearing in the Senate Public Safety Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting AB 3. Support of this measure is consistent with the Board's March 13, 2018, motion instructing County Counsel to consider local legislation to impose additional restrictions on the sale or possession of firearms by individuals under 21 years of age.</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to imposing age restrictions on the sale or possession of firearms; therefore, support of AB 3 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>

<p>AB 2222 (Quirk) – Crime Prevention Investigation: Informational Databases</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on April 2, 2018, would extend to all law enforcement agencies in the State the requirement to submit the description of firearms which have been reported stolen, lost, found, recovered, or under observation, directly to an automated California Department of Justice system (DOJ).</p> <p>Current law requires police and sheriffs’ departments to conduct this reporting. AB 2222 would extend this requirement to other law enforcement agencies, including the police department of any school district, transit district, airport, and harbor, port, or housing authority.</p> <p>According to the author, AB 2222 will ensure data on every firearm used in a crime and recovered by any law enforcement agency is logged into the DOJ’s Automated Firearm System. This will help law enforcement and the DOJ better recognize patterns in gun trafficking, figure out where guns used in crimes are coming from, and stop criminals from possessing them.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) strongly recommends supporting AB 2222, reporting that gun tracing has been a critical tool for law enforcement to identify gun trafficking, illegal sales or suspicious patterns of lost firearms. DPH notes that gun tracing provides law enforcement with critical sets of information regarding recovered firearms that were used to commit crimes. AB 2222 requires all law enforcement agencies to report recovered gun data into an AFS database within three days of recovery. Furthermore, this measure requires the DOJ to issue a report to the Legislature on law enforcement’s compliance with logging the information.</p> <p>AB 2222 is sponsored by the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence and supported by the Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. It is opposed by the California Law Enforcement Association of Record Supervisors, Inc.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is currently pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting AB 2222. Support of this measure would be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018 motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response.</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to requiring all law enforcement agencies to report firearms reported lost, stolen, or recovered to the State DOJ; therefore, support of AB 2222 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>

<p>AB 2382 (Gipson) – Firearms: Frames and Receivers</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on April 10, 2018, would require: 1) commencing July 1, 2020, the sale of firearm precursor parts to be conducted a licensed firearm precursor part vendor; 2) commencing January 1, 2020, a person or business to have a valid firearm precursor part vendor license to sell more than one firearm precursor part in any 30-day period; and 3) commencing July 1, 2020, the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to electronically approve the purchase or transfer of firearm precursor parts through a vendor. In addition, AB 2382 would add to the list of firearm possession misdemeanors, the possession of ammunition and firearm precursor parts by an individual who is prohibited from possessing ammunition or firearm precursor parts. Finally, this bill would make it a misdemeanor to sell or give possession of a firearm precursor part to a person under 21 years of age.</p> <p>Current law generally requires the sale or transfer of firearms to be conducted through a licensed firearms dealer. Under current law, a person who has been convicted of certain misdemeanors is prohibited from possessing a firearm within 10 years of the conviction. A violation of this prohibition is a misdemeanor.</p> <p>According to the author’s office, some firearms in California are made from parts-kits that can be legally assembled into a functional weapon without the individual ever having to undergo a background check. Guns made at home without any serialized parts are called a ghost gun because they are untraceable to law enforcement. As an example, the author notes that although the sale of a fully automatic AK-47 is illegal in California, building a compliant version by purchasing separate parts at home is not.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 2382, reporting that it creates create a parallel track of State regulations for firearm precursor parts (that could then be assembled into a weapon) that corresponds to legislation being proposed for firearms. DPH indicates that the measure would likely tighten loopholes and seek processes such as face-to-face sales, background checks and a DOJ database of sales that could potentially improve public safety. Finally, DPH notes that overall, the added restrictions make sense, particularly restrictions that would prohibit selling firearm precursor parts to a person under 21 years of age and, those related to banning the possession of firearm precursor parts by prohibited persons, which corresponds with other legislation the County is considering supporting.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2382 is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommends supporting AB 2382. Support of this measure is consistent with: 1) the Board’s</p>

<p>Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>March 13, 2018, motion instructing County Counsel to consider local legislation to impose additional restrictions on the sale or possession of firearms by individuals under 21 years of age; and 2) the motion's larger exploration of gun control.</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to the restriction of firearm precursor parts; therefore, support of AB 2382 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>
--	--

<p>SB 1100 (Portantino) – Firearms: Transfers and Age Restrictions</p>	<p>Current law, subject to exceptions, prohibits a person from making more than one application to purchase a handgun within any 30-day period. SB 1100, as amended on March 19, 2018, would make the 30-day prohibition described above applicable to all types of firearms. In addition, this measure would prohibit the sale or transfer of any firearm by a licensed dealer, except as specifically exempted, to any person below the age of 21 years.</p> <p>The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) recommends supporting SB 1100, noting that the weapons being utilized in the recent traumatic events have been high powered weapons to maximize human loss. DCFS indicates that preventing the access to dangerous weapons beyond a hand-gun to transitional age youth, increases their safety and that of first responders, or that of DCFS personnel needing to make contact with these youth in sometimes concerning Supervised Independent Living Plan approved locations.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 1100 is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
---	---

<p>Recommendation: Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Children and Family Services recommend supporting SB 1100. Support of this measure is consistent with: 1) the Board's March 13, 2018, motion instructing County Counsel to consider local legislation to impose additional restrictions on the sale or possession of firearms by individuals under 21 years of age; 2) the motion's larger exploration of gun control; and 3) the recommendation to limit the frequency of gun purchases as recommended in the County's June 2017 "Report Back on recommendations to Prevent Violence..."</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to imposing age restrictions or timed restrictions on the sale or possession of firearms; therefore, support of SB 1100 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>
--	--

PROHIBITED PERSONS

<p>SB 746 (Portantino) – Firearms and Ammunition: Prohibited Possession: Dealer</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on January 3, 2018, would authorize an individual with an outstanding warrant for a felony or a misdemeanor to transfer his or her firearms or ammunition to a licensed firearms dealer for the duration of the period of prohibition.</p> <p>Current law prohibits an individual convicted of, or has an outstanding warrant for, a felony, or who is addicted to any narcotic drug, from possessing a firearm. Under current law, the individual must surrender their firearms to a local law enforcement agency, sell the firearms to a licensed firearms dealer, or transfer the firearms for storage to a firearms dealer. According to the author, SB 746 clarifies that persons who are prohibited from possessing firearms and ammunition due to all temporary prohibitions, such as an active warrant, may temporarily surrender their firearms and ammunitions to a licensed dealer.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting SB 746, indicating that this bill would provide nonpunitive options for those with an outstanding warrant to voluntarily transfer firearms or ammunition during the length of a prohibition. DPH notes SB 746 has the potential to enhance safety.</p> <p>Currently there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 746 is currently in the Assembly pending assignment to committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting SB 746. Support of this measure would be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence in part through reinforced gun control measure, and as a public health response.</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to the voluntary transfer of firearms by prohibited persons; therefore, support of SB 746 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>
<p>SB 1200 (Skinner) – Firearms: Gun Violence Restraining Orders</p>	<p>Current law allows a court to issue a gun violence restraining order prohibiting an individual person from possessing any firearms or ammunition if he or she poses a significant danger of causing personal injury to himself, herself, or another.</p> <p>SB 1200, as amended on March 21, 2018, would expand the definition of a firearm for these purposes to include firearms parts and components, and would expand the definition of ammunition to include a magazine. In addition, this measure would require the court to hold a</p>

	<p>hearing within 21 days of the issuance of a temporary emergency gun violence restraining order to determine if a gun violence temporary restraining order valid for one year should be issued. Under current law, restraining orders is only valid for is valid 21 days.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health recommends supporting SB 1200, indicating that SB 1200 eliminates any fees for requesting a gun violence restraining order (GVRO), and adds ammunition, magazines and firearm components to the list of items which must be surrendered. DPH notes that the bill requires law enforcement personnel that serve the order to verbally ask the recipient if they have firearms or accessories and also requires GVROs that are issued for a 21-day period to have a hearing held within that time period to allow for that GVRO to be extended for a year. SB 1200 will strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of California's GVRO law.</p> <p>This measure is sponsored by the Brady Campaign and Gifford's Law Center. Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 1200 is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting SB 1200. Support of this measure could be consistent with the Board's March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence in part through reinforced gun control measure, and as a public health response.</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to expanding the definition of firearms for the purpose of gun restraining orders; therefore, support of SB 1200 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>

SCHOOL SAFETY

<p>AB 1747 (Rodriguez) – School Safety Plans</p>	<p>AB 1747, as amended on April 3, 2018, would: 1) expand the required elements of school safety plans, including procedures to respond to active shooter situations, requires schools to conduct annual active shooter drills; and 2) requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to provide additional guidance and oversight of safety plans</p> <p>Current law requires schools to develop comprehensive school safety plans, including by consulting with a representative from a law enforcement agency. AB 1747 would additionally require schools to consult with other first responders, in addition to law enforcement agencies, in developing a comprehensive school safety plan.</p>
---	--

	<p>In addition, the measure would require: 1) school districts and county offices of education to conduct drills, at least once per year, on their tactical responses to criminal incidents; and 2) school resource officers and school-employed mental health professionals to be integrally involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of active shooter drills.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends supporting AB 1747, reporting that it would expand the required elements of school safety plans, including procedures to respond to active shooter situations, require schools to conduct annual active shooter drills, and require the CDE to provide additional guidance and oversight of safety plans.</p> <p>AB 1747 is supported by the American Red Cross and Common Sense Kids Action. Currently there is no opposition on file.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Support, per Board Determination</p>	<p>This office and the Department of Public Health recommend supporting AB 1747. Support of this measure would be consistent with the Board’s March 13, 2018, motion to address the prevention of gun violence as a public health response.</p> <p><u>Currently there is no Board-approved policy related to school safety plans; therefore, support of AB 1747 would be a matter of Board policy determination.</u></p>

**REPORT ON STATE LEGISLATION RELATED TO
ADDRESSING THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE**

NO POSITIONS RECOMMENDED

GUN CONTROL AND SAFETY

<p>AB 1903 (Gonzalez) – Firearms: Buyback Programs: Gift Cards</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on February 27, 2018, would prohibit a city, county, or the state from providing a gift card for a business that sells guns or ammunition, in exchange for a gun, when operating a voluntary gun buyback program.</p> <p>Current law allows for the transfer of a firearm, without either party holding a dealer’s license, when the transfer of the firearm is to an authorized government entity as part of an authorized, voluntary program to buy or receive weapons from private individuals.</p> <p>AB 1903 is supported by San Diegans for Gun Violence Prevention. It is opposed by Firearms Policy Coalition.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 1903 is pending assignment to a Senate policy committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>
<p>AB 1931 (Fong) – Licenses to Carry Concealed Firearms</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on January 24, 2018, would make a license issued to carry a concealed firearm valid for any period of time not to exceed 5 years.</p> <p>Under current law, a license to carry a concealed firearm is generally valid for any period of time not to exceed 2 years.</p> <p>AB 1931 is supported by the: California Rifle and Pistol Association; California State Sheriffs' Association; Gun Owners of California; National Rifle Association of America; and Riverside Sheriffs' Association. It is opposed by the: American Academy of Pediatrics, California; Americans Against Gun Violence; California Chapters of the Brady campaign to Prevent Gun Violence; and Giffords Law Center.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure failed passage in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 3, 2018. AB 1931 was granted reconsideration.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 1932 (Fong) – Licenses to Carry Concealed Firearms: Background Report Issuance</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on January 24, 2018, would require the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to issue background check reports, requested by local officials for licenses to carry concealed firearms, within 60 days.</p> <p>Under current law, the California DOJ must issue these background check reports “promptly,” with no fixed number of days.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 1932 is pending hearing in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 1958 (Quirk-Silva) – Firearms: Silencers</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on January 28, 2018, would make legal to sell or transfer silencers in interstate or foreign commerce to a person or entity outside of this state, if the sale or other transfer is in accordance with federal law.</p> <p>Under current law, it is a felony for any person, firm, or corporation to possess a silencer; however, the law exempts the sale or transfer of silencers to specified law enforcement agencies and military forces by dealers or manufacturers registered under federal law.</p> <p>AB 1958 is sponsored by Surefire, LLC, and supported by the Union of American Physicians and Dentists. It is opposed by California Chapters of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, and Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is pending hearing in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 2176 (Jones-Sawyer) – Firearms: Receipt of Possession</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 12, 2018, would require that when an officer takes temporary custody of a firearm or other deadly weapon at the scene of a domestic violence incident, the receipt to weapon’s owner include their name and residential mailing address.</p> <p>Under current law, these receipts must indicate where weapon can be recovered and the date after which the owner can recover their weapon.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2176 is currently pending on the Assembly Floor.</p>
--	--

Recommendation:	No position recommended.
------------------------	--------------------------

<p>AB 2733 (Harper) – Firearms: Unsafe Handguns: Imprinting</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 15, 2018, would delete the requirement that a firearm be designed and equipped with imprinting technology to be listed on the roster of handguns that have been determined not to be unsafe.</p> <p>Under current law, a semiautomatic pistol is considered unsafe under various conditions, including that it is not imprinted characters that identify the make, model, and serial number of the pistol in two or more places on the interior and that are transferred by imprinting on each cartridge case when the firearm is fired.</p> <p>AB 2733 is supported by the: Gun Owners of California; National Rifle Association; and National Shooting Sports Foundation. It is opposed by the: American Academy of Pediatrics; California Chapters of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence; and Giffords Law Center.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure failed passage in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 3, 2018. AB 2733 was granted reconsideration.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 2781 (Low) – Forensic Ballistic and Firearms Procedures</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 14, 2018, would require law enforcement agencies, when seizing unlawfully possessed or used firearms, to obtain ballistic images of the firearms, cartridge cases, and bullets and submit those images to the National Integrated Ballistic Identification Network.</p> <p>Current law authorizes local law enforcement agencies to have specified information related to firearms entered into the United States Department of Justice, National Integrated Ballistic Information Network to ensure that representative samples of fired bullets and cartridge cases from crime scenes are recorded, as specified.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2781 is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 2860 (Allen) – Firearms: Unsafe Handguns</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced February 16, 2018, would repeal current provisions which: 1) establish criteria for determining if a handgun is unsafe; 2) makes it an offense to manufacture or sell a handgun that is not safe; and 3) require the California Department of Justice to compile a roster listing all of the handguns that have been tested and determined not to be unsafe.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2860 is scheduled to be heard by the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 3026 (Melendez) – License to Carry a Handgun</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 22, 2018, would revise current provisions that authorize a county sheriff, or the chief or other head of a municipal police department, to issue a license to carry a handgun, if the applicant is of good moral character and satisfies certain criteria, including whether good cause exists.</p> <p>AB 3026 would spell out the criteria for good cause, including self-defense, defending the life of another, or preventing crime. The measure also provides similar criteria for residents of other States wishing to apply for a California license.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 3026 is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>SB 459 (Portantino) – Firearms: Dealer Inspections</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on January 23, 2018, would require the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to conduct inspections of licensed firearms dealers at least every three years to ensure compliance with State with firearms laws. Under current law, the State DOJ may inspect dealers to ensure compliance, but are not mandated to do so under specific time frames.</p> <p>SB 459 is supported by the California Chapters of the Brady Campaign. It is opposed by the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is currently in the Assembly pending assignment to committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>SB 1092 (Anderson) – Firearms: Silencers</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 22, 2018, would, for the purposes of hunting, allow for the use of a lawfully possessed silencer, if it is attached to a firearm measuring 16 inches or more in length.</p> <p>Current law makes it a felony to possess a silencer for a firearm.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 1092 failed to pass the Senate Public Safety Committee on April 10, 2018, and was granted reconsideration.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>SB 1185 (Hill) – Firearms: Law Enforcement: Agency Firearm Accounting</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 15, 2018, would require law enforcement agencies to adopt written procedures to account for firearms that are owned, acquired, sold, loaned, lost, stolen, or in any way possessed by that agency if used or carried for purposes of carrying out the official duties of his or her employment. SB 1185 would additionally require that firearms that are lost, stolen, or otherwise disposed of be entered into the Automated Firearms System (AFS).</p> <p>Current law requires that a transaction involving a firearm be conducted through a licensed firearms dealer; however, this requirement does not apply to the sale or transfer of firearms to authorized law enforcement representatives for their exclusive use.</p> <p>This measure is supported by: California Chapters of the Brady Campaign; California Public Defenders Association; and San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District. There is no opposition currently on file.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 1185 is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 16, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>SB 1382 (Vidak) – Firearms: Vehicle Storage</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 16, 2018, would authorize locking the handgun in a toolbox or utility box, defined as a fully enclosed container that is permanently affixed to the bed of a pickup truck or vehicle that does not contain a trunk, and is locked by a locking device.</p> <p>Current law requires a person, when leaving a handgun in an unattended vehicle, to lock the handgun in the vehicle's trunk, lock the handgun in a locked container and place the container out of plain view, or lock the handgun in a locked container that is permanently affixed to the vehicle's interior and not in plain view.</p>
---	---

	<p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 1382 is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.</p>
Recommendation:	No position recommended.

PROHIBITED PERSONS

<p>AB 1968 (Low) – Mental Health: Firearms</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on February 28, 2018, would require that an individual who has been taken into custody, assessed, and admitted to a mental health facility because he or she is a danger to himself, herself, or others, as a result of a mental health disorder more than once within a one-year period be prohibited from owning a firearm for the remainder of his or her life, subject to the right to challenge the prohibition at periodic hearings.</p> <p>Under current law, a person who has been taken into custody, assessed, and admitted to a mental health facility because he or she is a danger to himself, herself, or others, as a result of a mental health disorder is prohibited from owning a firearm for a period of 5 years after the person is released from the facility.</p> <p>The Department of Mental Health reports concerns that AB 1968 unfortunately plays into some of the uninformed rhetoric that people with mental illness kill when they have access to firearms. DMH notes that the bill would prohibit a person who has been hospitalized more than once in a year to possess a firearm for the remainder of his/her life, and they cannot offer a clinical rationale for supporting this prohibition.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) notes that AB 1968 would give prosecutors more time to access and review information that is critical to the ability to thoroughly vet and defend against petitions submitted by individuals who may pose such a risk. However, current practice is not consistent regarding who gets put on a 5150 hold. DPH indicates that practices vary and could lead to inequities and unintended consequences. More research and mechanisms are needed to standardize practices implemented based on research.</p> <p>AB 1968 is sponsored by the California District Attorneys Association, and supported by: California Association of Psychiatric Technicians; California Federation of Teachers; California Psychological Association; California State Sheriffs’ Association; and Peace Officers Research Association. It is opposed by the American Civil Liberties Union of California; California Psychiatric Association; and Disability Rights California.</p>
---	---

	Bill Status: This measure is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
Recommendation:	No position recommended.

AB 2526 (Rubio) – Temporary Emergency Gun Violence Restraining Orders	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 14, 2018, would allow law enforcement officers to orally obtain temporary emergency gun violence restraining orders provided they sign a declaration under oath attesting to the facts supporting the request.</p> <p>Under current law, the court can issue a temporary emergency gun violence restraining order on an ex parte basis, if the possession of a firearm by the subject of the petition poses an immediate and present danger. Existing law requires the law enforcement officer who requests the temporary emergency gun violence restraining order to memorialize the order of the court on the form approved by the Judicial Council if the order is obtained orally. AB 2526 would require that to be signed as a declaration under penalty of perjury.</p> <p>According to the sponsor of the bill, the Judicial Council, AB 2526 clarifies the process for issuance of temporary emergency gun violence restraining orders and furthers the court’s ability to efficiently process and issue emergency orders by making oral requests for temporary restraining orders requested by law enforcement the default procedure rather than written petitions.</p> <p>AB 2526 is sponsored by the Judicial Council of California, and supported by the California State Sheriffs’ Association and Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. Currently there is no opposition on file.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.</p>
Recommendation:	No position recommended.

AB 3064 (Baker) – Firearms: Felons in Possession	<p>Current law makes a person convicted of, or who has an outstanding warrant for, a felony and who has in possession any firearm is guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment for a term of 16 months, or 2 or 3 years in State prison. This measure, as introduced on February 16, 2018, would make the punishment for a second or subsequent conviction of that felony punishable by imprisonment for a term of 4, 5, or 6 years in State prison.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p>
---	---

	Bill Status: AB 3064 is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 17, 2018.
Recommendation:	No position recommended.

SCHOOL SAFETY

AB 1983 (Waldron) – School Safety: Security Assessment	<p>This measure, as amended on March 15, 2018, would require school districts, before the commencement of the 2019–20 school year, to contract with a local law enforcement agency to provide a full security assessment of the school district's facilities and emergency practices.</p> <p>Current law requires schools to develop comprehensive school safety plans, including by consulting with a representative from a law enforcement agency.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) notes that the focus of AB 1983 is on law enforcement assessment of a school district's facilities and emergency practices. A public health approach would focus more upstream on providing supports and resources for identifying and responding to children who need access to services. DPH notes that this measure would create more police/law enforcement presence and tone which at the very least should be balanced by a partnership with mental health professionals and agencies.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 1983 is pending hearing in the Assembly Education Committee.</p>
Recommendation:	No position recommended.

AB 2067 (Reyes) – School Safety: Armed Security Guards	<p>This measure, as amended on March 14, 2018, would require school districts to ensure that there is at least one armed security guard or school resource officer (SRO) present at the school at all times when children are on campus.</p> <p>Current law authorizes school districts to establish a school police department under the supervision of a school chief of police and to employ peace officers.</p> <p>AB 2067 is supported by the California Rifle and Pistol Association. It is opposed by the: American Civil Liberties Union of California; California Association of School Business Officials; and Public Counsel.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee's Suspense File.</p>
---	---

Recommendation:	No position recommended.

<p>AB 2318 (Flora) – Gun-Free School Zone</p>	<p>Current law makes it a crime to possess a firearm in a place that the person knows, or reasonably should know, is a school zone.</p> <p>This measure, as amended on March 15, 2018, would exempt from that crime a person who holds a valid concealed carry license who is carrying the firearm described in the license to, from, or in a church, synagogue, or building used as a place of worship on the grounds of a public or private school providing instruction in kindergarten or grades 1 to 12, inclusive, if the person has the written permission of the school authority.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2318 failed to pass the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 10, 2018, and was granted reconsideration.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 2497 (Cooper) – Firearms: School Gun Violence Prevention</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 19, 2018, would impose a tax upon retailers for the privilege of selling firearms and ammunition, at a rate still to be determined of the gross receipts from the sale of firearms and ammunition sold in this state on or after January 1, 2019. AB 2497 would require these revenues to be deposited in the School Gun Violence Protection Fund, which would fund grants to schools to help fund the placement of police officers on high school campuses.</p> <p>Current law authorizes school districts to establish a school police department under the supervision of a school chief of police and to employ peace officers.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2497 is scheduled to be heard in the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee on April 16, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>AB 2768 (Melendez) – Criminal Threats:</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 22, 2018, would make it a crime to willfully threaten to commit a crime that will result in death or great bodily injury to persons at any school or place of religious worship, with the specific intent that the statement, made verbally, in writing, or by means of an electronic communication device, is to be taken as a threat, even if</p>
--	--

<p>Schools and Places of Religious Worship</p>	<p>there is no intent of actually carrying it out but which under the circumstances in which it is made, is so unequivocal and immediate, causes the administration of that school or place of religious worship reasonably to be in sustained fear for its safety or the safety of its immediate membership.</p> <p>Under current law, similar threats to individuals are a crime punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed one year, or by imprisonment in State prison.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2768 is pending hearing in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

FOSTERING SOCIALLY HEALTHY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

<p>AB 2673 (Reyes) – Educational Equity: Severe Bullying Complaints</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on March 20, 2018, would require the California Department of Education (CDE), on or before May 31, 2019, to develop and issue mandatory protocol to advise local schools on how to proceed in the case of a severe bullying complaint, defined as including both: 1) a parent or guardian has filed a complaint regarding an instance of harassment or bullying of his or her child by another pupil; and 2) a school has reasonable suspicion that a pupil has done either used threatening words or behavior or engaged in disorderly behavior, or displayed any writing, sign, or other visible representation that is threatening, abusive, or insulting.</p> <p>Under current law, the Safe Place to Learn Act, CDE is required to assess whether local educational agencies have taken actions related to educational equity, including adopting a policy that prohibits discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and bullying based on protected characteristics.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: AB 2673 is scheduled to be heard by the Assembly Higher Education Committee on April 25, 2018.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>

<p>SB 1019 (Beall) – Youth Mental Health and</p>	<p>This measure, as amended on April 2, 2018, would authorize a county or a qualified provider and a local educational agency to enter into a partnership to create a program that targets pupils with mental health and substance use disorders.</p>
---	---

<p>Substance Use Disorder Services</p>	<p>Current law, the Mental Health Wellness Act of 2013, provides that funds appropriated by the Legislature to the California Health Facilities Financing Authority and the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission for the purposes of the act be made available to selected counties and used to provide, among other things, a complete continuum of crisis services for children and youth 21 years of age and under regardless of where they live in the State.</p> <p>The Department of Mental Health (DMH) reports that there are two major pieces to this legislation: 1) it would fund crisis related services for kids; and 2) would fund largely school based services for kids. DMH notes that funds would come from SB 82 leftover funds, currently estimated at close to \$30.0 million, originally intended for triage and crisis related services for all ages; allegations by critics when this rolled out was that kids were neglected, but not in Los Angeles County. This crisis piece would be administered by state agency, CHFFA, which administered the original funds. Additional funding for the other chunk of services would come from PEI/Innovation Funds; this would be administered by the California Department of Education (CDE) with guidelines developed by OAC. All grants to counties for both pieces; however, would be competitive (which is an anathema to many counties) and so some counties would be left out. DMH notes that SB 1019 is a rather an ambitious bill which largely supports the County’s existing Board-approved policies. However, DMH reports concerns that the implementation is questionable. DMH suggests supporting the bill if amended, with amendments possibly relating to eliminating “competitive” piece and having another state agency, possibly DHCS, other than CDE administering the second component of services.</p> <p>The Department of Public Health (DPH) recommends watching SB 1019, reporting that similar to last year’s SB 191 (Beall), which was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee, this measure provides additional support and resources to identify problems early and increase access to resources for those in need particularly young children. However, DPH notes that it declares legislative intent to allocate funds from Proposition 64, the Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA) to support the partnerships created pursuant to the bill. DPH indicates that more consideration needs to be given as to whether this is the best use of those funds which are dedicated for programs for youth that are designed to educate about and to prevent substance use disorders and to prevent harm from substance abuse.</p> <p>SB 1019 is sponsored by the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission. It is supported by the Disability Rights California and Western Center on Law and Poverty. Currently, there is no opposition on file.</p> <p>Bill Status: This measure is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Education Committee on April 18, 2018.</p>
---	--

Recommendation:	No position recommended.
------------------------	--------------------------

<p>SB 1385 (Hueso) – School Safety: Policies, Procedures: Pupil Harassment</p>	<p>This measure, as introduced on February 16, 2018, is currently a spot bill. It states the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would require school districts to implement policies and procedures to effectively address pupil harassment and bias-based bullying in California schools.</p> <p>Currently, there is no support or opposition on file for this measure.</p> <p>Bill Status: SB 1385 is currently in the Senate pending assignment to committee.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>No position recommended.</p>