**SAN FRANCISCO**

**CANNABIS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**Notice of Hearing & Agenda**

|  |
| --- |
| **Members of the public have two options for attending:**  **In-Person**  **This meeting can be attended in person at the following address:**  **49 South Van Ness, Room 196**  **San Francisco, CA 94103**  **Please speak with the attendants at the front desk if you have trouble finding the room.**  **Webex**   1. [**View the meeting**](https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/onstage/g.php?MTID=eed54bd8bb95405751203050bcdf840cc) **(access to a computer or smart mobile device required):** 2. <https://sfgov.webex.com/sfgov/j.php?MTID=m0a4b061875650be8a8455ec5e96ac7d0> 3. **Listen to the meeting by dialing: 1-415-655-0001 (Access Code: 2489 576 3958)**     1. **Meeting Password: MWmqTPS6S53 (69678776 when dialing from a phone or video system)**   **To Provide Public Comment: Dial 1-415-655-0001, input the access code above, the input the meeting password, and Press \*3 to raise your hand. Once prompted to do so, please press \*6 to unmute.** |

**October 9, 2024**

**1:00 PM - 3:00 PM**

**Regular Meeting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Committee Members:** | |
| **Voting Members** | | **Non-Voting Members** |
|  | * Drakari Donaldson * Shay Gilmore * Adam Hayes * Ali Jamalian * Antoinette Mobley * David Nogales Talley * Apollo Wallace | * Mohanned Malhi or rep. from SFPDH * Lieutenant Lange or rep. of SFPD * Steven Kwok or rep. of DBI * Mathew Chandler or rep. of SF Planning * Quarry Pak or rep. from SFUSD * Dylan Rice or rep. of SF Entertainment Commission * Victor Wong or rep. from SFFD |

**Meeting materials are available at:**

Website: [www.officeofcannabis.sfgov.org](http://www.officeofcannabis.sfgov.org/)

Disability and language accommodations available upon request to: [officeofcannabis@sfgov.org](mailto:officeofcannabis@sfgov.org) or 415-554-4420 at least 48 hours in advance, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4pm the previous Friday.

**Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance**

(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 409; phone (415) 554-7724; fax (415) 554- 7854; or e-mail at sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Library and on the City’s website at [www.sfbos.org/sunshine](http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine).

**Meeting Materials**

Any materials distributed to the members of the Committee within 72 hours of the meeting or after the agenda packet has been delivered to the members are available for inspection at the Office of Cannabis, 49 South Van Ness, 6th Fl., San Francisco, CA 94103, during regular office hours. Please note that this practice has been temporarily suspended as members of the Office of Cannabis are working remotely due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. This practice will resume after the OOC team transitions to the office.

**Ringing and Use of Cell Phones**

The ringing of use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. The Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person responsible for any ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

**Privacy Policy Personal**

Information that is provided in communications to the Office of Cannabis is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted.

Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Cannabis Oversight Committee. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Department regarding projects or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Department does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Office and its committee may appear on the Office’s website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

**San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 21.00-2.160] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; phone (415) 252-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; and online http://www.sfgov.org/ethics.

**Accessible Meeting Information**

Committee hearings are held in **49 South Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94103, Room 192 – 196.** The location is accessible to persons using wheelchairs and other assistive mobility devices.

**Disability Accommodations**: To request assistive listening devices, real time captioning, sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Office of Cannabis at www.officeofcannabis.sfgov.org or 415-554-4420 at least 72 hours in advance of the hearing to help ensure availability.

**Language Assistance**: To request an interpreter for a specific item during the hearing, contact the Office of Cannabis at www.officeofcannabis.sfgov.org or 415-554-4420 at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing.

**Allergies**: In order to assist the City in accommodating persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, please refrain from wearing scented products (e.g. perfume and scented lotions) to Committee hearings.

**SPANISH**: Agenda para la Oficina de Canabis. Si desea asistir a la audiencia, y quisiera obtener información en Español o solicitar un aparato para asistencia auditiva, llame al 415-554-4420. Por favor llame por lo menos 48 horas de anticipación a la audiencia.

**CHINESE:** 規劃委員會議程。聽證會上如需要語言協助或要求輔助設備，請致電415-554-4420 請在聽證會舉行之前的 至少48個小時提出要求。

**TAGALOG:** Adyenda ng Komisyon ng Pagpaplano. Para sa tulong sa lengguwahe o para humiling ng Pantulong na Kagamitan para sa Pagdinig (headset), mangyari lamang na tumawag sa 415-554-4420. Mangyaring tumawag nang maaga (kung maaari ay 48 oras) bago sa araw ng Pagdinig.

**RUSSIAN:** Повестка дня Комиссии по планированию. За помощью переводчика или за вспомогательным слуховым устройством на время слушаний обращайтесь по номеру 415-554-4420. Запросы должны делаться минимум за 48 часов до начала слушания.

**Regular Agenda:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Please note that public comment will be held during every agenda item. If a member of the public would like to comment on a topic that is not on the agenda but is within the jurisdiction of the Committee, they may do so during the “General Public Comment” portion of the meeting. | | | |
| **1.** | **Call to Order / Roll Call** |  | **5 min** |
| **2.** | **Land Acknowledgement** |  | **1 min** |
| **3.** | **General Public Comment** *Members of the public may address the Committee on topics that are not on the agenda but are within the jurisdiction of the Committee, for a maximum of 3 minutes per individual.*  Bram Goodwin: My name is Graham Goodwin I'm the media director of the San Francisco Brownie Mary Democratic Club and the first thing I wanted to mention was that the San Francisco Brownie Mary Democratic Club will be meeting tonight at 06:00 and if you're interested we'd love to have you. We're going to talk about many of the bills that the governor either signed your veto the election etcetera. If you go to Instagram BMSF415 BMSF415 that's our Instagram account and you'll see a post today has all the information our agenda etcetera. I want to mention that the newly signed Cannabis Cafe bill I heard that some of the city departments because of this are meeting or going to meet to talk about this. And I like to see members of the committee stakeholders cannabis stakeholders and people who have dispensary consumption lounges be part of the process at the start. So I encourage the committee I encourage the Office of Cannabis to make sure that as a thing develops that it better input up front so that the rules are reasonable. And I'd also like to mention please vote and mention that calnormal.org as a voting guide related to cannabis. So if you're wondering if any of the candidates or things in the state relay you may want to go there individually. So thank you.  Chris Callaway: Hello, I'm Chris Callaway equity dispensary owner in the city. And just a couple things I want to comment about. I guess I'll just follow up…and this would be a huge boom for us at my dispensary to be able to serve coffee that needs to pass this legislation. I just would ask the committee perhaps whatever you guys do to put some pressure on the Office of Cannabis and the Planning Department to create legislation on the pathway forward for us to be able to open a cafe in our dispensary as quickly as possible. You get mired down in back of these departments for months if not years on end and it can really Kill an opportunity. And obviously the industry is struggling San Francisco is struggling trying to reemerge and reinvent itself we need our city department to act quickly with a sense of urgency to enact this legislation. So I would just encourage you guys to make that happen. The other thing I want to do is give the oversight committee an update on the struggles that I've had in Hayes Valley to open dispensary which is now six years in the running I have a letter of determination appeal hearing coming up in October and it seems that through the back and forth between Office and Cannabis and Planning in regards to the 600 foot rule that it's essentially come down to Planning Department is saying that we can process multiple applications where there's a CU within 600ft but at this point the Office of Cannabis has really just not referred my application to Planning formally. So that was a little disheartening for me knowing that they have an ability to create an equitable opportunity for me in this space and others that are sitting in hold with their applications that are there’s dozens of people that have applications on hold in the system and unfortunately they're just sitting there playing ranks and waiting. I know the market is a little bit saturated for dispensaries but all of these businesses are going to have to reinvent themselves to some degree and the Office of Cannabis is going to have to come up with ways to process applications where there may be a CU existing within 600ft and not put an equity person through torture of five years permitting in that process. It seems like when we protect the CU we're really just protecting the landlords of San Francisco. That's not really the spirit of that program. So I think it's time to for the oversight committee to take note of that. Perhaps ask how many applications that we have in the queue still get an updated look at the cannabis retail map and decide whether or not we should be perhaps looking at the 600 foot rule to open up more applications what that fragment would look like so I just ask you guys to put that on your radar and thank you.  Hakeem Mashal: Golden Gate Cannabis Company I just wanted to bring to you guys attention. Obviously we know the governor signed the cafe bill I wanted to talk about it as well. We are really behind the curve here it's already October. They're saying this is live one one. We got to get going now now now, today today today. I really hope there's maybe some emergency action like there was during COVID you let us build inlets or something like that on the outside and we'll deal with the premise later something to that effect. I did also want to bring your attention. The way that it's written is a little vague and I hope there's some wiggle room there so if someone has a consumption permit that means people can consume on site I got that part but there are the majority of the retailers do not have allowed would they be excluded from selling other products? If they are this body would be leaving millions with an S on the table for sales tax and revenue for not only the business but also the city and the state. So I really hope there's some sort of compromise that can be made there if they're just going to let it go for everybody or if there's going to be a bifurcated license where there's still like the consumption part inside or if someone can have an off sale permit where they should sell you know products like you know on the go and you go here's your coffee or your orange juice or your soda along with your products and for us this new legislation is a life wrap for many many retailers that are suffering right now and it would be a huge boost if you guys helped us out with that. The other thing I want to bring on your radar is I heard from the grapevine that mushrooms will be deregulated next year and it is a non-cannabis product I was just wondering something worth talking about with you guys I don't think that it's fair to the smoke shop across the street is going to be slanging mushrooms without regulation and someone like me would not be able to sell it if it was the case. I really think it's something we need to take a hard long look at you know mushroom chocolates or something like that…packaged stuff you know there's already these so-called churches that you go up you know that we’re all dealing with at the moment but I just hope we get it…to be honest with you. And if it is going to open up I really want to know when I you know the rules are going to be for us that is the case. As far as the grants goes I know you guys are going to talk about it today. I reiterate my point I really think it should be based on income 10,000% threshold. For me personally I think if you do it over 5 million a year you don't really need the grant for paying your bills you’re fine. Thank you.   Tiffany: Hello everyone I have been the equity applicant for about five years going on since about a year and a half ago I signed a lease I was working with the permit office or the building office and I was told that my location was good to go I was right on the cusp of the 600 buffer but after further investigation I was told that I am within and then I was told that I was allowed delivery and then I was told that I wasn't. All that being said I have now been advised to lift my location and move elsewhere I'm a self funded company and I'm now in a place where it's been very difficult to just lift from my current lease and move. That being said I am proposing on getting behind the idea of expanding that 600 buffer ad also voicing that I am 5-8ft within that buffer. Again I am a five year equity applicant and I would like to propose some sort of you know or flexibility with certain outliers in the application model and to look at these applications on case by case analysis. |  | **15 min** |
| **4.** | **Review and Consideration of Regular Agenda**  *Committee members will review and amend the meeting agenda as necessary and vote to approve.*   * Vote * No Public Comment | Discussion, Action | **5 min** |
| **5.** | **Review and Approve Minutes from 9/4/2024 Meeting** *Committee members will review minutes from a previous Committee meeting, amending as necessary, and vote to approve.**Explanatory Document: SF-COC\_Meeting-Minutes-September-9*   * Vote * No Public Comment | Discussion, Action | **5 min** |
| **6.** | **Committee Discussion Regarding the Distribution of Grant Funding**  *This is a continuation of Agenda Item #10 from the 09/04/2024 Cannabis Oversight Committee meeting. The Committee will hear a presentation from the OOC regarding the next round of GoBiz grant funding (“Round 5”), and vote on recommendations for the disbursement of these grant funds.*   * Committee Member Question Discussion Continued:      * + Discussion Question #1:   Committee: I do also have a question in terms of I mean I think we all see that there's more money. It's under 50% of what we had last year. I gotta imagine all of us are wanting to spread that a little farther. What are the numbers for the 40% include with that?  Jeremy Schwartz, Office of Cannabis: If it was 40% and yes we prepared that figure. So to reiterate the question if eligibility included. If eligibility included not only 51 percenters and above but I believe what was discussed last time was 40 percenters with an approved permit then we're looking at about 60 grantees with an award of $24,000 each.  Committee: Do we have any concerns about spend down or any of the operators that are eligible to get this fund?  Jeremy Schwartz, Office of Cannabis: That's a good question. So as sort of a referee in this discussion it wouldn't offer judgment regarding my personal opinion on concerns but as far as the limitations around grant opportunities for the future applicants must spend down 80% of the award in the aggregate in order for San Francisco to be eligible for subsequent grant opportunities  Nikesh Patel, Office of Cannabis: We don't really get any of those opinions but if you are asking what we've learned in aspect administrations what we have generally learned is that more grantees you have the more challenging can be to hit those numbers because there's just more variables. We go from 20 variables you have more applications in the processing, more disagreements, more delay, so in general the numbers go up. That's the latest.  Jeremy Schwartz, Office of Cannabis: In our experience for the last grant round there were 23 eligible grantees who had hit a certain threshold. Of those 23 grantees 21 were able to hit their threshold.  Committee: If you can remind us if monies are not spent by certain entities is that money put back into a pool that can be dispersed?   Jeremy Schwartz, Office of Cannabis: About midway through the cycle there's actually a few variables to consider. About midway through the cycle we want a reallocation exercise where if certain folks don't hit a certain amount of expenditure that money gets put back into a pot that gets reallocated to folks who were able to hit those thresholds. One of the challenges we've experienced over time is that the grant term is relatively truncated and the city has requirements for legislative efforts to unlock this award meaning that the term to spend down the money is pretty truncated. We're looking at a few months for people to spend down money and if folks haven't endeavored through the city supplier process that is a pretty time intensive process which also eats away at people's terms.   * + Discussion Question #3:   Committee: On those three criteria, after about talking those three axes that we look at and he’s got the chart, I don’t remember us being decided on buildout vs. approved maybe it’s in the minutes but no actually I mentioned it but we didn’t vote on it right? I just have one question around does the last column 51% to 100% where you have the 14 that are approved? Those 14 are distinct from the 11 correct there’s no right yes there’s no crossover but it is inclusive of the eight if that makes sense.  Jeremy Schwartz, Office of Cannabis: Unlike the disbursement criteria, the technical assistance would be made available for all equity applicants.  Committee: I think we all agreed on the TA part of it. I think that all makes sense, and Angela was here. I mean, I definitely want to hear from the public.   * Public Comment   Chris Callaway: My name is Chris Callaway 100% equity owner so the grants are crucial for me and my business. I will say I kind of a question that I know you can't answer this directly but if you could kind of address this out of the 15 100% equity applicants those that are approved are any of those multiple projects owned by the same equity owner that would be able to get multiple rounds of grant I guess double dip essentially. It's my recollection that you can't do that but I just wanted to ask that question. The other thing I will say is the ability to use grant funds to purchase a property is a great thing because I think it goes a long way towards creating generational wealth for equity applicants again I have an opportunity to do that actually this year and so if you guys can create a nuanced approach to the permitting or the grant process where somebody who's 100% owner who can purchase their property may have access to a little bit more capital versus somebody who's a 40% owner who's in build out that has a multi-state operator funding that you know I think if you want to if you really want to show that this program has the ability to succeed and create generational wealth applicants we need to create a roadmap to property ownership and really the only way to do that I think at this point is through grants and so real estate's being so expensive in San Francisco getting 30 or 40 thousand dollars as helpful as that may be it doesn't go a long way to purchasing of property or that kind of makes the equity applicant back to go out to show funding maybe the amount of percent already right? So the true intent of the programs establish generational wealth with applicants try to take a nuanced approach to how we distribute these agreements and make sure that they're the utilized the most effective manner possible and I think that’s it thanks.  Hakeem Mashal: I want to reiterate kind of what I said in the last meeting I think the grant should be trauched out meaning a 40% owner gets this much 51% owner this much and the most should be to the even ones we call them the 100% owner I think it's the fairest way to do it. I think you guys saw the stats on the board we knocked 75% of the people off the board the second you change the rules. And again the essence of the program is to help those in need you really need to take a hard look at income I think income should be the determining factor if you get it or not if you're doing over 5 million a year as a retailer or whoever you are you're making money you’re doing fine you don’t need the money but if you do then you know I think again most should go to the 100 percenters you know little bit less goes to the 51 percenters and then you know something at least goes to the 40 percenters. I think that’s the fairest way to do it.  Tiffany: Reiterating on what I said earlier I'd like to voice and propose that there are different a different method of inspecting and deciding on outlier applications the build out and approved method currently and I am like a voice third addition which would be something like an arbitration framework that will allow applications to go into a cycle of review you call it arbitration you can call it review to serve the outlier applications that are so close to build out.  Shona: Access of Love SF my organization has requested for technical assistance and for the grant map to carve out for legacy compassion programs and spaces. For the last four years legacy has been wiped off the map t and these grants are part ohe f drug war reparations for those who helped build this I am both equity and legacy and have had an uphill battle getting the office to verify and work with legacy. I request a direct meeting with Director Patel to get the criteria ready for legacy plus equity carve out for this batch of equity grants is past its time.  Faison: My name is Faison I like to comment on the percentage of ownership last year was 51% and I was in a build out phase and I couldn't get it because I was 1% off and I am investing equity and that hit me really bad because for the past three years I've been investing in rent and this is supposed to actually help equity and this didn't help me and I am investing equity. There's a few investing equities out there they're putting their own money on the line and this is this grants are supposed to help all equity and I definitely encourage Office of Cannabis to change that 51 to at least 50 if not 40 but please consider 50% ownership because that 1% hit me really bad and again I am in construction I've been paying for the last three years and it's great to you know put your money towards the property but of course you know million dollar property is not going to help. But anyways again back to changing that 51 to 50 or down to 40% and another proposal I have is if you have two different applications and you're actually investing equity I actually want you guys to look into the investing equity. If you're in equity and you're investing in your own business this grant should be able to help you and I really want to emphasize that I know it's it might be causing a double dipping and whatnot but the process of establishing your business is very complicating and I've been at it since 2018 but for my for the reason why I've been at it for three years and I really encourage Office of Cannabis to drop that 51 down and look into the investing equity. If you're equity and you're investing in your business you should be able to qualify for these grants and that's my comment. Thank you, sir.  Ducan Ley: I am speaking on behalf of the San Francisco Cannabis retailers Alliance we've been discussing in great detail I think the concept of equity owned businesses that opted for the 40% ownership structure having some sort of endless capital solution is misguided and misunderstood. I think what a lot of us are upset about is the specifications of cannabis right? We've got these multi-state operators with very deep pockets, and some are going out of business regardless but that's what really what we're trying to protect against and not necessarily homegrown businesses that are also struggling I think there's a perception of capital access that is just misguided and so what we'd like to suggest is that all applicants equity applicants are available or have grant access but providing some limitations potentially we thought formula retail might be a solution but we said you would not see the too big a threshold and bring that down to no more than five locations anywhere in the country. To further make it more equitable see if that cuts out some of the bigger companies that really don't need this grant funding and what I can what I can say just as an equity owned business with a 40% structure is that the grant funding has thus far been tremendously helpful and we continue to use that to support the growth and the stability of our business so being carved out of that just because the ownership structure was set up in a particular way many years ago is does not seem like in the spirit of equity. So that is that would be a suggestion that we'd like to offer up from the San Francisco Cannabis Retail Alliance. Thank you.  Further discussion where a committee member highlights the issue of 40% owners being backed by large MSOs, which complicates the equity ownership classification, in which another committee member acknowledges the suggestion to revisit the issue in future grant rounds for more equitable solution. The committee members discusses the potential impact of including 40-51% owners in the grant pool, noting that it would increase the number of grantees and the total award amount.   * Vote * Public comment   Nate: CEO and Co-Founder of…cultivator here in the city I know that this equity thing is very importan so I don't think we'll be able to get two or three meetings ago until next year with the lounge bill passing the state level we should pursue I know in general the city for restaurants and bars, allowing on the street consumption of all these different stuff I know it's very complicated right now because we're limited by the DCC we can do stuff outdoors we have that defense security doesn't make it as expensive and then like one indoors but then we have the whole problem for the Department of Health where it’s very hard to allow smoking and we all know that cannabis events are gonna have people are gonna come to cannabis event there has to be a smoking component and edibles I go to I go to movie theaters for that so there's something for everyone to think about I know probably not going to get through it the next year but it’s a really good opportunity were all struggling and I really think events can really…because right now we're all chasing the same customers and by doing events at the state fair there was…over 100,000 people walked with a cannabis pavilion there was whole families from Japan with a little kid waiting in Sacramento for half an hour to get in there so definitely thirst for the mainstream and I think San Francisco is a leader alongside we should be the leader of making more accessible events are going towards thank you very much.  Letter: Your honorable committee members I address you as a legacy stakeholder a pioneer in California cannabis policy and the founder of the task force 2011 and an issuing of the first set of San Francisco City provisional permits my name was on an alternative state ballot which would have uplifted our small farmers and preserved compassion in the real social justice movement against the drug wars not even in many cannabis taxes to law enforcement to be strong arm of the illegal state monopoly many of you may not know my legacy because there is suppression of the actual history of cannabis community the only history of only the history of a set of well being mostly gay mostly white males…that is how far away we are from equity they alongside because of political inroads and contributions have selected quote unquote equity players to bring forward. Take a look at the lack of organic equity. It becomes blatant when you look at how nearly nobody organized against the de facto land of new equity permits. There are items that I would like to push forward during your meeting to right the wrongs of the current drug wars that have gone on San Francisco Cannabis first up not if any of the very money should get to anything from reparations for the legacy stakeholders facing the authentic leadership of and rooted deeply in compassion and attacked vividly by quote unquote big pot we are priority. We need restorative justice and to say that we are owed after building this is putting it like this. Grant must go to reopen the doors of access, of love SF cannabis harm reduction Community Center, and restore any other legacy programs with community criteria. Patients spaces have been heartlessly wiped off the map but the home of a quote unquote tourist economy instead of local health and safety prop 64 has available the San Francisco patients small businesses and local consumers and I request Committee of the Whole to do an impact report to interview every compassion based legacy storefront Legacy compassion projects which is no longer on the map and to report what their barriers entry were and it may need to be done with privacy attacking the levels of absolute corruption first order of business with grant funds must be reparations for legacy compassion and legacy small businesses equity is nothing. But I think you said when I can see when I can trace everyone to a set of elite stakeholders is tokenism. It's unfairly built without the real understanding of who pushed both racial and social equity forward before it was co-opted by day business which brings me to my second point. I request that this committee starts an inquiry at the average commission of the business entity spark without a doubt misuse of equity imperative intimidation harassment and targeting of authentic community based organizations in our city and county but also statewide. There are several levels of corruption by this group which has unbelievable inroads to the local and national Zionist democratic parties. They are illegal state monopoly builders but also have some of the most dangerous elements of any industry business including but not limited to a past president a former mayor who is serving a seven year prison term for sexual assaults of a minor under the age of 15. They will be investigated by other cities. They originated in San Francisco. It's time. It's past time to clean house, and I advise the city to initiate, to get ahead and do something to right the wrongs of the…wiping out so many compassion based cannabis projects in our city. -*Time Ended*-  No Name: I mean I don't even know if this even matters since the motion has passed 51 and I just wanted to make a comment regarding if we can look at the data from 40% to 49 and 50 to 100 and how much would be distributed to each equity and see if it's possible to do from 50% of and divided into 40 to 49 and 52 to 100 and that's the comment. | Discussion, Possible Action | **90 min** |
| **7.** | **Proposed Future Agenda Items**  *Committee members will propose future agenda items for the next committee meeting.*   * AB 1775 * Public Comment   Chris Callaway: Chris Callaway again basically to kind of talk about the cafe bill. I would love to see this the planning department or Department of Public Health or implement that I know that the next meeting you guys is going to have is not going to be implemented perhaps is that it's possible? It would just be nice if I imagine the city doing some like legwork some groundwork for that bill to be to go into effect like knowing that would be awesome I did also I would just really urge the committee to ask the Office of Cannabis to kind of create a framework for at least applications that are just construction right now and then. There's like 100 applications just total sitting on that map in various stages. There's businesses that are bankrupt holding applications blocking out other people. We have dozens and dozens of storefronts that are vacant that are either held types applications are in the process of doing that whether or not they move forward. You need kind of a framework that allows people to see what's active and we need to be able to put a shot clock on some of these businesses that are never going to move forward and it's blocking out other people like Tiffany that was here earlier when we suggest or we ask a status application update able to get that information. I think in timely manner is is really helpful but yeah just as far as the 600 foot rule of those things I think the Office of Cannabis needs to address some of the failures of the program that we've had. I think moving forward we have an oppotunity to reinvent the cannabis industry a little bit to the cafe bill. So looking at the successes and failures of programs our permitting process is really just people beating their head up against a bureaucracy wall between planning miles and cannabis and back and forth that needs to stop for an equitable access for everybody that's in the space. So we need to provide a roadmap for them for success and creating more legislative barriers in Bureaucracy to those people is I think trying to avoid at this point so we can address that in the future. Thanks so much.  Nate: … unfortunately it's going to pour some people out or we got to start working forward. Next year we have a big battle on the state level with the excise tax can up to 15% to 19% of the cultivation tax…they said that if the tax revenues dropped which it did two years in a row they can increase up to 19% so any retailer in here and any brand and say if you do like we’re hanging on the cliff I think that 4% will push us over. I know San Francisco keeps on pushing out…1% don't seem to pay too much different to make you payroll especially on retailers where they wanted to go up to 5% any other retail shop in San Francisco pays the fraction of that. We're not asking for special treatment. We just want to be treated like any other business city. So that was a little longer and I believe the tax is being pushed off for 2027 but two years is not that long. So and I you guys have…I like to start that discussion to get ahead especially if we do have the excise tax. Thank you.  Hakeem Mashal: I want to reiterate I respect everyone's decision. If it was me I would have done 45 35 20 something like something to look at in the future. But I do want to bring you guys attention is if you have access to our income which you guys absolutely should because everyone else does METRC something that you guys should use as an exclusionary tech. What I mean by that is the ghost story flying around is that…law firm guy got you know somehow approves an equity applicant. That guy gets $1 roll over my grave. It's ridiculous. He's worth $150 million I don't even know how we got to from there. The other thing I want to put out there is again with this cafe I know the governor signed it late. I really hope you guys at least put some kind of emergency addendum in front of the city where they say Look just go ahead and do it. Build your inlets. We'll deal with the permit later just like they did during covid. It really is the only way to get this rolled out by January 1. And again like I said I really hope you guys include non-consumption lounge with the off-cannabis sale products at least for off sale even if it's a separate you know off sale consumption you guys want on like I said you're leaving millions in sales tax off the board if you don’t.  No Name: Future agenda committee for impact report legacy wink wink nudge nudge. Future agenda move spark into Ethics Commission. Or have it come from other levels I have never steered the city wrong and huge overhaul on fake equity. Future agenda items fancy cafes versus community spaces following policy directives set as far backs 2005 to veto an AB 1111 and the fact the city focus group on small events does not include consumers nor prior companion events not okay more of the same future agenda items set aside a special meeting to hear from patient advocacy boards and how we were targeted by big business. | Discussion, Possible Action | **5 min** |
| **8.** | **Adjournment** |  |  |