

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
ADVISORY WORKING GROUP ON CANNABIS REGULATION

Mission: *To develop recommendations that will provide a framework for the development of regulations for commercial and personal-use cannabis in unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. These recommendations will provide guidance to County policymakers and may also be useful to cities and other counties throughout California that are studying cannabis regulations.*

SUMMARY OF MEETING SEVEN: Equity – August 24, 2017

- 1. Topic Areas:** Cannabis Retailers, Cannabis Cultivation, Cannabis Manufacturing, and Taxation and Economic Development (Final Recommendations); Equity (Overview)

- 2. Working Group Participants:** Donnie Anderson (*California Minority Alliance and Southern California Coalition*), Beth Burnam (*Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains*), Valerie Coachman-Moore (*Coachman-Moore & Associates*), Jonatan Cvetko (*Angeles Emeralds*), Matt Garland (*San Pedro Neighborhood Council*), Patricia Guerra (*Community Coalition*), Aaron Lachant (*Nelson Hardiman, LLP*), Lynne Lyman (*Drug Policy Alliance*), Javier Montes (*UCBA Trade Association*), Dr. Alisa Padon (*Public Health Institute*), Melahat Rafiei (*Progressive Solutions Consulting*), Dr. Avelardo Valdez (*University of Southern California*), Hon. Vivian Romero (*Mayor, City of Montebello*), Dr. Monica Sanchez (*Los Angeles County Office of Education*), Manuel Duran (*President, Maravilla Businesspersons Association*), and Dr. Rachel Gonzales-Castaneda (*Azusa Pacific University*)

- 3. Facilitators:** Joe Nicchitta (*Office of Cannabis Management, Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office*), Sheri Dunn Berry (*Community Partners*)

- 4. Process Note:** The group agreed to extend the hours final Advisory Working Group Meeting on August 31, 2017 from 9:00 am - 4:00 pm.

- 5. Decision Making:**

BEGIN Recommendations on Cannabis Retailers

Recommendation #1

The County should evaluate the feasibility of requiring cannabis licensees to include accurate, science-based warning labels on cannabis advertising, similar to those required in the context of alcohol and tobacco.

Recommendation #2 - Signage/Advertising

Part A

The County should restrict cannabis advertising at or sponsorship of events, including but not limited to concerts, fairs, festivals and sporting events at County owned or operated facilities, consistent with how alcohol and tobacco products are treated. Exemptions should be considered for health and wellness events.

Part B

The County should advocate for changes to state law to expand the restrictions in Business and Professions Code section 26151(b) to include advertising at or sponsorship of events, including but not limited to concerts, fairs, festivals and sporting events.

Recommendation #3 - Signage/Advertising - From August 17, 2017 Working Group Meeting

The County should evaluate the feasibility of prohibiting branded merchandise primarily marketed to and used by youth, including but not limited to toys, games, video game systems, and clothing.

Recommendation #4 - Retailers - From August 17, 2017 Working Group Meeting

Decision Note: The Advisory Working Group did not reach consensus on buffers between cannabis retailers and alcohol outlets, transit stops and colleges.

Part A

At a minimum, the County should require cannabis retailers to locate not less than 1,000 feet from schools (K-12), and 600 feet from daycare centers and youth centers.

Part B

The County should consider establishing 600 foot buffers between cannabis retailers from public parks, playgrounds, and libraries. The County should consider whether to establish minimum distances between cannabis retailers and licensed youth alcohol or drug abuse treatment facilities. The County should carefully study any buffering and minimum distance rules to ensure that such rules will not unreasonably eliminate the ability of cannabis businesses to establish in unincorporated County areas, incentivize the continued operation of the unlicensed cannabis market, or create other unintended consequences such as the inequitable distribution of cannabis businesses throughout the County.

Part C

The County should ensure a variance procedure is available to applicants seeking to establish a cannabis retail business.

Part D

The County should publish a map depicting where cannabis retailers can locate prior to adopting any buffering regulations.

- END Retailers -

- BEGIN Cannabis Cultivators, Manufacturers etc. Recommendations -

Recommendation #1 - Location Requirements

Decision Note: Consensus was not reached regarding cannabis cultivators, manufacturers, distributors being located solely in industrially zoned areas and buffered from residential zones.

Cultivators, Manufacturers, Distributors, Microbusinesses

Cannabis cultivators, manufacturers, distributors and microbusinesses should be required to obtain discretionary permits.

Testing Laboratories

Cannabis testing laboratories should be permitted through a ministerial approval process.

Recommendation #2 - Cultivators/Manufacturers

The County should require cannabis cultivators and manufacturers to submit for County review and approval prior to commencing operations, and in connection with any license renewal, an operating plan that addresses the following components to the satisfaction of the County:

- Odor control and mitigation, both within the facility and outside the facility;
- Energy conservation and sustainability;
- Water conservation and sustainability;
- Waste and wastewater disposal;
- The application and storage of pesticides, fertilizers and other hazardous chemicals;
- Environmental sanitation standards consistent with the production of food products; and
- Security.

Recommendation #3 - Cultivators

The County should conduct an analysis of the environmental impacts of indoor versus outdoor cultivation, and the differential effects in terms of revenue and regulatory and enforcement costs of allowing or prohibiting commercial outdoor cultivation.

Recommendation #4 - Cultivators

The County should evaluate whether offering a license type comparable to a State Type 1C-speciality cottage cultivation license could stimulate regenerative agriculture in urban areas and encourage small business operators.

Recommendation #5 - Cultivators

The County should require cultivators to allow the utility company to provide their monthly electricity usage for two years and then consider additional regulations for cannabis cultivation to make cultivation more energy efficient and offer incentives for efficient energy usage.

Recommendation #6

The County should adopt regulations to support the enforcement of state rules for cannabis product preparation and labeling.

6. Panel: Perspectives on Equity

- Cat Packer, Executive Director, Los Angeles Department of Cannabis Regulation
- Cynthia Harding, Chief Deputy Director, LA County Department of Public Health

7. Public Comments:

- Adam Vine, co-founder Cage Free Cannabis, wanted to put the discussion into context, given the presence of so many white men as presenters on various subjects. He noted that thousands of people of color have been arrested and incarcerated because of the War on Drugs, jobs, educational opportunities, and family members have been lost. He suggested the County has an obligation and opportunity to lead, innovate and repair the damage through equity.
- Eddie Torres, President, East LA Chamber of Commerce and long-term East LA resident noted that there are many dispensaries that are conducting illegal activities. He mentioned problems with parking and public use, and voiced concerns about exposure to youth. He wanted to make sure marijuana is regulated and urged the County to be responsible – to not go for profit when souls are at stake. He urged the group to consider the implications of drug use on youth and law enforcement in relation to increases in crime.
- Darrel Davenport, wanted to look at the issue from the perspective of jobs and economics, and suggested that California can be a good role model by reducing the demonization of cannabis. He noted that the group was making things very complicated and was concerned that if they didn't move to simplify regulations, they will thwart young people who want jobs. He does not want big businesses like Monsanto to win on this, suggesting "the last should come first."
- Anya Titova, cannabis dispensary worker and member of California Minority Alliance, urged that when talking about public use, the group should consider homeless and transient youth who do not have a residence or a safe place to smoke.

- Justin Andrew Marks, from the Liberty Hill Foundation, offered his contact information to those interested in partnership, collaboration or connection with community-based organizations that are dealing with community issues related to cannabis.
- Jackie Stubeck, cannabis and education advocate, suggested the County take the lead on integrating equity into the new cannabis regulations, because they have an opportunity to get this right.

Los Angeles County Advisory Working Group on Cannabis Regulation

AGENDA

Meeting 7: Thursday, August 24, 2017

- 9:00 AM** Welcome and review recommendations summary
- 9:10 AM** Finish workshopping recommendations tabled from August 10th and 17th
- Topics include: Public Health and Safety, Personal Cultivation, Cannabis Retailers, Cannabis Cultivation, Cannabis Manufacturing, and Taxation and Economic Development
- Facilitated group discussion to reach consensus on recommendations submitted by working group members
- 11:00 AM** Break
- 11:10 AM** Perspectives on Equity
- Social Equity and Cannabis
Cat Packer, Los Angeles Department of Cannabis Regulation
 - Health Equity and Cannabis
Cynthia Harding, MPH, LA County Department of Public Health
- 12:00 PM** Workshop recommendations on Taxation and Economic Development
- (Lunch will be provided for Advisory Working Group members during the afternoon recommendations discussion)
- 1:50 PM** Public Comments
- 2:00 PM** End