



**GAINES & ASSOCIATES**  
**GOVERNMENT RELATIONS**

***“GAINES REPORT”***

**CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE**  
***2020 SESSION UPDATE***

**JULY 17, 2020**

As of mid-July, COVID’s grip on our state and nation is not letting up. Last week, in an effort to minimize the potential exposure and spread of COVID-19 at our State Capitol, Senate President pro Tempore [Toni G. Atkins](#) (D/39-San Diego) and Assembly Speaker [Anthony Rendon](#) (D/63-Lakewood) announced that the date the State Legislature would return from Summer Recess has been backed up from July 13<sup>th</sup> to Monday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

With the “current” deadline for moving fiscal bills out of policy committee technically still being July 31<sup>st</sup>, legislative calendar and deadlines will have to be adjusted to accommodate the extended recess. Further – with COVID-19 still raging and the legislative calendar now shortened by an additional two weeks – leadership is likely to once again ask bill authors to pull legislation which is not of critical urgency to California’s public at this time.

This *Gaines & Associates “Gaines Report”* will provide you with the latest status of all bills of interest, as well as a wrap on the recently approved FY 2020/2021 State Budget. Note that, in the interest of brevity, legislation that was noted as having been pulled from consideration due to the shortened legislative calendar in our last *Gaines Report* is not listed below.

*Bills are placed in numerical order, not in order of priority or interest. Any new action taken on a bill since the most recent Gaines Report is depicted in italics.*

*This Gaines & Associates “Gaines Report” is client privileged and provided as a service to Gaines & Associates clients.*

*For more information on any of the below bills, please contact Gaines & Associates at [info@gainesandassociates.net](mailto:info@gainesandassociates.net)*

**2020 State Legislative Session**

**AB 1387 (Wood) – Sport Fishing: 12 Consecutive Month Licenses**

As amended May 20, 2019, AB 1387 – legislation by Assembly Member [Jim Wood](#) (D/02-Eureka) – is a “two-year” bill which would, as currently written, offer California residents a traditional calendar year

fishing license, require DFW to offer a license that is valid for 12 consecutive months beginning on the date of purchase upon payment of a fee that is equal to 130% of the cost of the traditional calendar-year sport fishing license. AB 1387 would also require the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) to provide applicants for these licenses the option of signing up for automatic renewal of the license by electronic payment and would set the fee for licenses issued upon automatic renewal at the same price as a calendar-year sport fishing license.

The plan is, and has been, to amend AB 1387 to include new language which will support our collective hunter and angler Recruitment, Retention and Reactivation (R3) effort. Throughout 2019, the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), other government agencies, numerous non-governmental organizations (NGOs), clubs, media, industry and others have been working to develop a multi-component R3 strategy to promote a stronger future for hunting, fishing and the shooting sports in California and beyond. In late February 2020, DFW released the results of this extensive effort in California's "Statewide R3 Implementation Strategy". The plan is to address the components of this strategy that require a change in Fish and Game Code to implement in AB 1387, when amended. To review the DFW report, click [R3 Statewide Strategy](#)

AB 1387 passed through the Assembly, off the Assembly Floor via unanimous vote and over to the Senate in May 2019. Once on the Senate side, AB 1387 was referred to the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee in June 2019. However, the bill has yet to be heard.

Regardless of the latest slip in calendar, word is that the author still wants to move this bill out of policy committee this year. When, or even if, the new calendar will allow for the bill to take on the greater R3 amendments remains to be seen.

*Under the "current" legislative calendar, AB 1387 only has until July 31, 2020 to meet legislative deadline for being heard and passed out of Senate policy committee.*

To view the coalition letter in support of AB 1387, click [AB 1387 Coalition Support Ltr](#)

To view all the available Assembly analyses of AB 1387, click [AB 1387 Analyses](#)

To view all the information currently available on AB 1387, click [AB 1387 Detail](#)

### **[AB 2106 \(Aguiar-Curry\)](#) –Nesting Bird Habitat Incentive Program: Upland Game Bird Stamp/State Duck Stamp**

Legislation passed in 2018 required DFW to establish the "Nesting Bird Habitat Incentive Program" and authorized DFW to make payments or provide other incentives to encourage landowners to voluntarily cultivate or retain upland cover crops or other upland vegetation on their idled lands to provide habitat and nesting cover for waterfowl, upland game birds, and other species.

As amended July 14, 2020, AB 2106 by Assembly Member [Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry](#) (D/4-Davis) would help generate the funding necessary to implement the Nesting Bird Habitat Incentive Program (NBHIP) by raising the California upland game bird stamp and the state duck stamp by \$5 each. AB 2106 would also create the Nesting Bird Habitat Incentive Subaccount within the California Waterfowl Habitat Preservation Account and require the incremental revenue to be deposited in that Subaccount and available upon appropriation to DFW for the NBHIP. Further, new amendments placed in the bill will allow DFW use NBHIP funds to make grants to, reimburse, or enter into contracts or other agreements with nonprofit organizations to further the Program.

AB 2106 passed out of the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee in mid-May on a unanimous bipartisan vote. *Gaines and Associates* was pleased to partner with the bill's sponsor, California Waterfowl Association, in providing lead testimony on the bill in committee.

*In early June, AB 2106 quickly passed out of the Assembly Appropriations Committee and then off the Assembly Floor – both via unanimous votes. Now in the Senate, AB 2106 has been referred to the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee where, under the “current” legislative calendar, it must be heard by July 31, 2020 to meet legislative deadline.*

To view the Assembly analyses of AB 2106, click [AB 2106 Analyses](#)

To view the wildlife conservation coalition letter in support of AB 2106, click [AB 2106 Coalition Ltr - SUPPORT](#)

To view all the information currently available on AB 2106, click [AB 2106 Detail](#)

**[AB 2523 \(Gray\)](#) – Fish and Game Commission: Youth Hunting Program: Special Hunting Permits**

As amended May 6, 2020, AB 2523 by Assembly Member [Adam C. Gray](#) (D/21-Merced) would have required the California Fish and Game Commission to establish a program to increase opportunities to hunt big game, upland game birds and migratory game birds for youth under the age of 18 with terminal illnesses or who lost a parent in service to the state or country. AB 2523 defined “in service to the state or country” as a person who died while actively serving in the Armed Forces or in local, state, or federal law enforcement or fire service. The legislation defined “terminal illness” as an incurable or irreversible condition with a corresponding life expectancy that does not exceed 60 months.

The bill would have required the Commission to report any findings to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2022, on the progress of the program.

AB 2523 passed out of the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee and on to the Assembly Appropriations Committee in mid-May on consent.

*Once in Assembly Appropriations Committee, AB 2523 was placed in the suspense file, held, and never heard. Having not been passed out of committee by the June 5<sup>th</sup> deadline for fiscal bills to be passed to the Floor, AB 2523 is dead.*

To view the Assembly committee analyses of AB 2523, click [AB 2523 Analyses](#)

To view all the information currently available on AB 2523, click [AB 2523 Detail](#)

**[AB 3022 \(Oberholte\)](#) – Junior Hunting Licenses: Age Eligibility**

Legislation passed in 2014 increased junior hunting license age eligibility from 15 to 17 years of age. However, that bill included a “sunset” provision which required the age eligibility to revert to 15 years on July 1, 2020 – the beginning of the current 2020/2021 hunting license year – unless the provision was extended by subsequent legislation.

As introduced, AB 3022 by Assembly Member [Jay Oberholte](#) (R/33-Hesperia) proposed to extend the “sunset” for one year to July 1, 2021. With the intent being to have the bill take effect before the

2020/2021 license year began on July 1, 2020, AB 3022 also included an urgency statute which stated that the bill would take effect immediately upon enactment.

Introduced in mid-February 2020 and sponsored by *California Waterfowl Association* and *Gaines & Associates*, the original strategy was to rapidly push AB 3022 through the legislative process, have it approved prior to July 1, 2020, and have it in place for the upcoming 2020/2021 license year. With that one-year extension in place, we would have the additional time necessary to introduce and pass subsequent legislation which would extend the junior hunting license eligibility of 17 years of age indefinitely.

However, when COVID-19 forced the Legislature into its initial 6+ week unscheduled recess, we lost any opportunity to pass the bill quickly enough to seamlessly extend the junior hunting license age eligibility of 17 years of age into the current 2020/2021 license year. Further, with the 2020 big game drawing deadline scheduled to be held June 2<sup>nd</sup>, DFW placed 2020/2021 hunting licenses on sale in mid-April, while making the determination that they would not sell a 2020/2021 junior license to anyone over 15 years of age.

AB 3022 passed out of the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee and on to the Assembly Appropriations Committee in mid-May on consent.

*Once in Assembly Appropriations Committee, AB 3022 was placed in the suspense file, held, and never heard. Having not been passed out of committee by the June 5<sup>th</sup> deadline for fiscal bills to be passed to the Floor, AB 3022 is dead.*

*Recognizing the critical importance to our R3 efforts of increasing the junior hunting license age eligibility to 17 years, Gaines & Associates will be prepared to help sponsor new legislation to address this concern in the 2021 Legislative Session.*

To view the Assembly committee analyses of AB 3022, click [AB 3022 Analyses](#)

To view the coalition letter to Assembly policy committee in support of AB 3022, click [AB 3022 Coalition Support Ltr - Policy](#)

To view the coalition letter to Assembly fiscal committee in support of AB 3022, click [AB 3022 Coalition Support Ltr - Fiscal](#)

To view all the information currently available on AB 3022, click [AB 3022 Detail](#)

### **AB 3030 (Kalra) – Resource Conservation: Land and Ocean Conservation Goals**

As amended June 4, 2020, AB 3030 by Assembly Member [Ash Kalra](#) (D/27-San Jose) would declare it to be goals of the state to, by the year 2030, protect at least 30% of California's land areas and waters; to help advance the protection of 30% of the nation's oceans; and to support regional, national, and international efforts to protect at least 30% of the world's land areas and waters and 30% of the world's ocean.

Although, on the surface, the goals of this legislation may be embraced by many in the hunting and angling community, a careful read of the bill – along with a look at the make-up of measure's long list of proponents – brings great pause.

AB 3030 is dangerously poorly written and ambiguous. Among many other things, although the bill calls out goals for the percentage of our lands and waters that should be protected, it fails to recognize the extent of existing protections already in place. Further, the bill fails to define what the legislation means by the word “protect”. Interpreted and implemented wrongly, the land, water and ocean “protections” called for in AB 3030 could result in unnecessary sweeping public closures to access of our state’s lands and waters and the hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities they provide.

To address these concerns with the legislation, *Gaines & Associates* and our partners in wildlife and fishery conservation have taken an “oppose unless amended” position on the bill, have been actively meeting with the author’s office, other legislative offices and the bill’s sponsors regarding our concerns. To address our very serious concerns, we are seeking amendments which, among other things, would:

- Acknowledge California’s role as a leader in wildlife and fishery conservation and recognize the tremendous protections already in place throughout our lands, waters and oceans;
- Clarify ambiguous findings in the bill that state that existing protections are insufficient without identifying any specifics;
- Acknowledge DFW’s [R3 Statewide Strategy](#) to promote increased participation in hunting and recreational angling;
- Expressly define the word “protect” to ensure future interpretation of the purpose of this bill *will not* be to restrict access or deny legal recreational take of our fishery and/or wildlife resources, and;
- Recognize the important role of hunters and recreational anglers in promoting the health of California’s lands and waters in terms of the dollars and volunteer hours our conservation community invests on public and private lands in partnership with private and state/federally funded programs, and the voluntary habitat restoration efforts of private landowners on their lands.

Working in partnership with the state and federal governments, hunters, anglers and other conservation NGOs have worked to establish and best manage a massive network of state wildlife areas, National Wildlife Refuges, National Monuments, State Parks, ecological preserves, other public “protected” lands and private lands placed under conservation easements which arguably already far exceed the 30% land area protection goal called out in the bill. In fact, the *California Protected Areas Database* estimates the total area of protected land in California to be 49,294,000 acres, or 47.05% of the state’s landmass (not including easements).

In our meetings with the bill’s author, sponsors and others, we have pointed out the lead role hunters and anglers have historically played in California’s wildlife and fishery conservation efforts – noting that should AB 3030 result in any future restrictions to hunting and fishing access and opportunity it would not only reduce the hunting and angling community’s incentive to continue to partner in these efforts, but also the significant annual revenue we generate to help manage these resources.

Although some of the bill sponsors have indicated a willingness to work with our community in addressing our issues, as of mid-July, none of our proposed amendments have been fully agreed to and placed in the bill. Meanwhile, the bill remains alive and well.

*AB 3030 passed out of the Assembly Natural Resources Committee and on to the Assembly Appropriations Committee in mid-May via a party-line vote. In early June, regardless of a price-tag being “in the range of several hundreds of millions of dollars or more”, AB 3030 surprisingly passed out of the Assembly Appropriations Committee, and off the Assembly Floor less than a week later, via more party-line votes. Now in the Senate, AB 3030 has been referred to the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee where it has been tentatively set to be heard on Wednesday, July 29<sup>th</sup>.*

To view the Assembly analyses of AB 3030, click [AB 3030 Analyses](#)

To view the coalition letter of “oppose unless amended” to the bill’s author, click [AB 3030 Coalition Oppose Ltr - Kalra](#)

To view the coalition letter of “oppose unless amended” to Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee, click [AB 3030 Coalition Oppose Ltr - SNRW](#)

While AB 3030 continues to move, if discussions with the author and sponsors of the bill continue without rendering meaningful results, we will soon move to a straight “oppose” position on this dangerous bill. Meanwhile, our coalition is growing with many new conservation organizations joining our efforts in opposition to this bill. As things evolve, and more organizations come on board, our letters will be updated.

To view all the information currently available on AB 3022, click [AB 3030 Detail](#)

### **[SB 217 \(Portantino\)](#) – Recreational and Organizational Camps**

Existing law defines an “organized camp” as a site with a program and facilities established for the primary purposes of providing an outdoor group living experience with social, spiritual, educational, or recreational objectives, for 5 days or more during one or more seasons of the year.

As gutted and amended on June 23, 2020, SB 217 by Senator [Anthony J. Portantino](#) (D/25-Glendale) would additionally define “recreational camp” as a camp that operates for profit or nonprofit purposes, serves 5 or more children, and operates for at least 5 days during any season. SB 217 would exempt licensed daycare facilities from the definition of “recreational camp”.

To begin, SB 217 would require “organized” and “recreational” camps to obtain a license from the local agency of the jurisdiction where the camp is located before operating a camp. The bill would also require the local agency to charge an application fee for new camps and an annual licensing fee for existing camps in an amount not to exceed the reasonable costs to the local agency for issuing licenses, or \$1,250, whichever is less. Further, SB 217 would require the local agency to inspect a camp for compliance before issuing a license to operate. Among many other things, the bill would also require each camp to employ both a camp director and a health director and set a minimum ratio of counselors to campers. In addition, SB 217 would require the State Public Health Officer and State Fire Marshall to adopt additional rules and regulations governing the operation of recreational camps above and beyond what is already provided for in state law.

Many wildlife conservation and other nonprofit organizations run camps in California to educate youth about the outdoors, wildlife conservation and hunting. These organizations often minimize the fees they charge camp participants to ensure that youth from middle and lower-income families can also afford to attend. These camps currently go to great lengths to ensure the safety and well-being of their campers by

taking every precaution and using trained staff and volunteers, while also typically requiring background checks.

The sweeping requirements which would be put in place by SB 217 would substantially increase the work and expense associated with running these important recreational camps – leaving nonprofits no choice but to pass the additional costs on to the participants, or to absorb the increase in their own budget. The result being fewer organizations offering recreational camps, and few, if any, middle to lower-income youth being able to attend the few camps which remain.

*Gaines & Associates* is working closely with the *California Waterfowl Association* and others to defeat SB 217. A coalition letter of opposition is currently in process.

*SB 271 passed through the Senate while written to deal with the field of special education. Having been just recently gutted and amended in late June to focus on recreational and organizational camps, the bill has been referred to the Assembly Committee on Health but has yet to be set for hearing.*

No committee analysis is available currently for SB 217, as currently written.

To view all the information currently available on SB 217, click [SB 217 Detail](#)

#### **SB 914 (Portantino) – Firearms: Hunting Exemptions**

Existing law prohibits the sale or transfer of a firearm by a licensed firearm dealer to a person under 21 years of age, but exempts from those provisions the sale or transfer of a firearm – other than a handgun or semiautomatic centerfire rifle – to a person 18 years of age or older who possesses a valid, unexpired hunting license.

As amended May 11, 2020, SB 914 by Senator [Anthony J. Portantino](#) (D/25-Glendale) would require that, for the sale or transfer of a firearm to a person under 21 years of age, the salesperson must visually inspect the hunting license to confirm that it is valid and unexpired, and record the license number, GO ID, and dates valid. The bill would also require the Department of Justice (DOJ) to verify the validity of the purchaser’s hunting license with DFW as part of the background check.

As most know, as of July 1, 2019, the law requires that DOJ electronically approve the purchase or transfer of ammunition through a vendor. However, existing law also limits the fee charged for DOJ approval of an ammunition purchase to \$1.00, with that fee only allowed to be increased at a rate not to exceed any increase in the California Consumer Price Index. As amended, SB 914 would also remove the \$1.00 fee limitation – effectively allowing the fee charged for approval of ammunition transaction to substantially increase.

SB 914 was heard in Senate Public Safety Committee in mid-May, passing out and to the Senate Appropriations Committee on a party-line vote.

*SB 914 passed out of the Senate Appropriations Committee in mid-June on off the Senate Floor less than a week later via party-line votes. Now in the Assembly, SB 914 has referred to the Assembly Public Safety Committee but has yet to be set for hearing.*

To view the Senate analyses of SB 914, click [SB 914 Analyses](#)

To view all the information currently available on SB 914, click [SB 914 Detail](#)

**SB 1175 (Stern) – “Iconic African Species Protection Act”/Live Animal Markets**

As amended June 18, 2020, SB 1175 by Senator [Henry I. Stern](#) (D/27-Calabasas) would enact the “Iconic African Species Protection Act” and would prohibit the possession of any part, product, or the dead body of African elephant, African lion, leopard, black rhinoceros, white rhinoceros, giraffe, Jentink’s duiker, plains zebra, mountain zebra, hippopotamus, and striped hyena. Among other things, SB 1175 would exempt articles possessed for noncommercial purposes that the owner can demonstrate were in their possession within California before January 1, 2021.

Among other things, as recently amended, SB 1175 would also ban importation of a wild animal species into the state when the evidence suggests zoonotic transmission from the species, or a closely related species, could be responsible for a novel, readily transmissible human disease.

SB 1487, introduced by Senator Stern during the 2018 Session, proposed nearly the exact same prohibition on possession of the same list of African species. SB 1487, which did not dive into live animal markets, made it all the way to the Governor Brown’s desk, but was vetoed. In his veto message, Governor Brown stated “This bill establishes the Iconic African Species Protection Act, prohibiting the possession of dead specimens of several African animal species within California. SB 1487 imposes a state civil penalty for activities expressly authorized by the U.S. Endangered Species Act. Even though I share the sentiments of the author, this bill, if enacted, would be unenforceable.”

Throughout this unprecedented Legislative Session, *Gaines & Associates* has been intensely working with our close partners in conservation to kill SB 1175. These efforts most recently include numerous telephonic meetings with the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee consultants and the offices of Assembly Members seated on the committee.

*SB 1175 passed out of the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee and to the Senate Appropriations Committee in late May on a party-line. In mid-June, the bill passed out of Senate Appropriations Committee on another party-line vote – despite the bill analysis calling out costs to DFW of enforcing just the African Species component of \$3.6 million in 2021-22 and ongoing cost pressure of \$2.7 million annually from the already over depleted General Fund, or special fund. SB 1175 then easily passed off the Senate Floor in late June.*

*Now in the Assembly, SB 1175 has been set to be heard in the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee on Tuesday August 4<sup>th</sup>. That hearing will begin at 10:00 AM PDT and will cover only two bills. Information regarding Remote Testimony locations and phone lines will be made available on the [committee website](#) before the hearing date. The hearing will be livestreamed on the [Assembly’s website](#)*

To view all the analyses available for SB 1175, click [SB 1175 Analyses](#)

To view the wildlife conservation coalition letter to Senator Henry I. Stern (bill author) in strong opposition to SB 1175, click [SB 1175 Coalition Ltr - OPPOSE](#)

To view the wildlife conservation coalition opposition letter to Senate Appropriations Committee to SB 1175, click [SB 1175 Coalition Ltr - Senate Approps - OPPOSE](#)

To view the Senate Floor Alert for SB 1175, click [SB 1175 – Senate Floor Alert](#)

To view the most current wildlife conservation coalition opposition letter to the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee, click [SB 1175 Coalition Ltr – AWPW - OPPOSE](#)

To view all the information currently available on SB 1175, click [SB 1175 Detail](#)

## **CALIFORNIA STATE BUDGET – FY 2020/2021**

Since Governor Newsom’s release of his initial FY 2020/2021 State Budget proposal in early January, *Gaines & Associates* has been actively working closely with an unprecedented suite of conservation, environmental and other interested organizations to secure maximum funding approval for DFW’s important programs and efforts. It was been a very long and difficult road, but I am pleased to say that, in late June, Governor Newsom signed a FY 2020/2021 State Budget which, in terms of DFW funding, must be considered a victory – given the state’s current fiscal situation. Although DFW’s FY 2020/2021 funding package is far from ideal, it *does* include a \$5 million increase in General Fund allocation to DFW relative to what was allocated the Department in the FY 2019/2020 budget, *does not* include elimination of the Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF), and *avoids* a proposed \$18.9M shift of HCF “project” monies from Wildlife Conservation Board to fund new staff at DFW. Make no mistake about it – the relatively reasonable approved budget for DFW’s programs and activities in our new fiscal year would not have happened without the exceptional unique partnership of differing NGOs who worked together to make it happen.

To provide some brief background on this extensive effort, when the Governor released his initial proposal budget in early January 2020 (pre-COVID) we already had two serious primary concerns: 1) the Governor’s initial proposal would have reinstated the July 2020 sunset date for the HCF that we successfully fought very hard to extend for ten more years during last year’s Legislative Session, and; 2) it included a DFW Budget Change Proposal which would have shifted \$18.9 million of HCF “project” funds from the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) to fund new staff at DFW without consideration of their on-going Service Based Budgeting exercise or any other substantiation of their need. To address these initial concerns, in early March, our NGO partnership sent a coalition letter to the Senate and Assembly Budget Subcommittee chairs to let them know of our concerns.

Fast-forward two months to early May, and just prior to the release of the Governor’s “May Revise” budget proposal and the onset of serious budget negotiations at our State Capitol. COVID had now hit and the financial situation of our state had substantially changed due to the need for significant unanticipated emergency expenditures to address public health concerns. Our NGO partnership sent off another letter to the Senate and Assembly Budget Committee and Subcommittee chairs reiterating our concerns.

Less than one week later, on May 14<sup>th</sup>, Governor Newsom released his “May Revise” budget proposal which proposed to cut deeply into DFW’s FY 2020/2021 funding allocation, while also mandating new program work for DFW without providing new staffing. In response, our coalition sent a third letter to Senate and Assembly leadership pointing out the many concerns we had with the Governor’s “May Revise” budget proposal.

In early June, our letters – *combined with our testimony in front of Budget committees* – was rewarded with the Legislature approving and sending to the Governor a budget package which, among other things,

rejected elimination of HCF and the fund shift of \$18.9M in important WCB monies to DFW to cover staff. In mid-June, with the Legislature having positively addressed many of our primary concerns in their approved FY 2020/2021 Budget package, we sent a final letter to the Governor strongly urging him to embrace these revisions. Our collective efforts were rewarded in late June with the Governor approving the FY 2020/2021 State budget with the reasonable DFW funding package noted above.

To view our initial coalition letter of concern to the Senate and Assembly Budget Subcommittees, click [Budget Ltr - 3 2 2020](#)

To view our coalition letter of concern to the Senate and Assembly Budget Committees and Subcommittees, click [Budget Ltr - 5 8 2020](#)

To view our coalition letter of concern addressing the “May Revise” proposal, click [Budget Ltr – May Revise - 5 21 2020](#)

To view our final letter to the Governor regarding our concerns, click [Budget Ltr – Governor – 6 10 2020](#)

To view a full summary of California’s FY 2020/2021 State Budget, as approved, click [CA FY 2020-2021 Budget Summary](#)

*If you would like to unsubscribe to Gaines & Associates “Special Reports” just let us know at [info@gainesandassociates.net](mailto:info@gainesandassociates.net)*