



Via Electronic Copy

April 13, 2021

The Honorable Cottie Petrie-Norris
State Capitol, Room 4144
Sacramento, CA 95814



Re: AB 564 (Gonzalez) - OPPOSE

Dear Assemblywoman Petrie-Norris:

On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we regretfully inform you of our “Oppose” position on AB 564, which codifies Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-82-20 and further restricts public agencies from taking actions that would be inconsistent with the strategies identified to achieve the Order. We believe AB 564 is premature in seeking to codify the Executive Order and vastly expands on the Governor’s EO in an overly broad and undefined manner related to local and public agency actions, and as such at this time we cannot support your bill.

Our coalition has always supported efforts to conserve biodiversity, including providing much of the funding for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to implement conservation efforts through landing taxes, license sales and excise taxes on our gear. However, just as we opposed AB 3030, this bill raises similar concerns relative to the lack of definition surrounding the word “protect” and “protection” and the potential for the bill to unnecessarily lead to restricted outdoor access on our lands, and fresh and saltwater environments.

As a result of our concerns, and those of other opponents, the Legislature held AB 3030 in Senate Appropriations last fall. In the follow up EO issued by the Governor, our organizations were encouraged to see hunting and fishing communities identified as active stakeholders in the collaborative process that is to be facilitated by the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA). We are looking forward to engaging in that process along with other stakeholders, to propose a pathway for this Administration and subsequent administrations to meet the objectives of 30x30, as outlined in the EO.

However, AB 564 greatly expands the scope of the EO by making it a “policy of this state that public agencies shall not approve projects as proposed that are inconsistent with or would impair the successful implementation of the strategies required” to meet the objectives of 30x30. The strategies that will develop from the EO process are over a year away from reaching the Governor’s desk. As such, this bill would tie the hands of local and state public

agencies in a decision-making process to requirements that would be unknown and undefined.

The undersigned members of the fishing and hunting communities support the principles outlined in the Executive Order on 30 by 30, including the goal of conserving and enhancing biodiversity in terrestrial, wetland, aquatic, and marine habitats by the year 2030. However, the support of our community is dependent on and in accord with the development and implementation of 30 by 30 policy proposals that include:

- Recognition of the positive role that fishing and hunting play in conservation;
- Protected area definitions that allow for well-managed and sustainable wildlife-dependent activities;
- Consideration of existing protected areas and conservation measures in measuring progress toward stated goals;
- Targeted, science-based conservation measures developed through a stakeholder-driven process to address biodiversity threats;
- Lands and waters currently available for wildlife-dependent recreation and commercial activities, including fishing and hunting, should remain open and available for participation in these activities unless reduced access is justified by science-based concerns for the conservation of species affected by that activity
- Clearly defined roles and authorities for the entities charged with carrying out the 30 by 30 initiative proposal.

The remainder of the 2021 year, and into 2022, will determine if the stakeholder collaborative process is fair, open minded, and truly dedicated to hearing the concerns of all interested parties in California on the 30x30 concept. Until that time, and until that process bears some fruit, we believe the codification of the EO, and the expansion AB 564 imposes on public agencies, is counterproductive and unnecessarily undermines the collaborative process the Administration is proposing to stand up.

For these reasons we oppose AB 564 and cannot support it moving forward in the legislative process.

Sincerely,

David Kennedy
BoatUS

Mike Conroy
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations

Gary Brennan
San Diego Wildlife Federation

Fred Harpster
The Black Brant Group

Lori Jacobs
California Houndsmen for Conservation

Jerry Desmond
Recreational Boaters of California

Jeff Angers
Center for Sportfishing Policy

Wayne Kotow
Coastal Conservation Association of California

Mark Hennelly

California Waterfowl Association

Keely Hopkins
Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation

David Dickerson
National Marine Manufacturers Association

James Stone
Northern California Guides and Sportsmens Association

Danielle Cloutier
American Sportfishing Association

Cc: Assemblywoman Lorena Gonzalez
Members, Assembly Accountability and Administrative Review Committee