

SAN FRANCISCO CANNABIS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Notice of Hearing & Agenda

This Meeting Will be Hybrid

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 192

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 (access to a computer or smart mobile device required):
- 2) <https://sfgov.webex.com/sfgov/j.php?MTID=mf96c7b424acd6935b2d4180cfeb9e7e1>
- 3) Listen to the meeting by dialing: 1-415-655-0001 (2494 753 0648)

To Provide Public Comment: Dial 1-415-655-0001, input the access code above, and Press
*3 when prompted to do so

**September 13, 2023
1:00 PM-4:00 PM
Regular Meeting**

Committee Members:

Voting Members

- Ali Jamalian
- Adam Hayes
- Apollo Wallace
- Drakari Donaldson
- David Nogales Talley
- Shay Gilmore
- Antoinette Mobley

Non-Voting Members

- Mohammed Malhi or rep. from SFPDH
- Sgt. Sylvia Lange from SFPD
- Stephen Kwok or rep. of DBI
- Mathew Chandler or rep. of SF Planning
- *Superintendent* or rep. from SFUSD
- Dylan Rice or rep. of SF Entertainment Commission

Meeting materials are available at:

Website: www.officeofcannabis.sfgov.org

Disability and language accommodations available upon request to: 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.

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.

Ringling and Use of Cell Phones

The ringling 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 ringling 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 Cannabis. 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 Pagpapalano. 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:**1. Call to Order / Roll Call**

- Upon roll call, the following Committee Members were noted present [(v)= voting member]
 - Ali Jamalian (v)
 - Adam Hayes (v)
 - Apollo Wallace (v)
 - Drakari Donaldson (v)
 - David Nogales Talley (v)
 - Shay Gilmore (v)
 - Antoinette Mobley (v)
 - Mohammed Malhi, Department of Public Health
 - Stephen Kwok, Department of Building Inspection
 - Michael Christensen, Planning Department
 - Dylan Rice, Entertainment Commission (arrived at 1:36pm)
 - Sgt. Sylvia Lange, SF Police Department (left at 2:36pm)
- The following Committee Members were not present:
 - San Francisco Unified School District Representative
 - SF Fire Department

A quorum is established

2. Land Acknowledgement

- Scott Dennis (OOC Analyst) recognizes the origins and traditions of the land on which the OOC operates and on which the meeting and COC guests are.

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 Bram Goodwin from the Brownie Mary Democratic Club of San Francisco. I just wanted to thank you for being here and thanks for the agenda, especially on the public bank and also on the MMIC which is on the agenda, which I appreciate. I just wanted a comment that I came in on the [Muni] this morning and on the other track was another bus that had an ad that said, big letters, ‘Is cannabis completely safe?’ As many of us know, unfortunately, San Francisco Public Health has been doing this kind of thing for the last couple of years, periodically. They're getting money from the tobacco tax, basically, apparently, and use it. Well I would just like to mention, what is completely safe? That needs that kind of obvious tone of ‘it's not safe’ and I'd like to bring that out for your consideration to communicate to Public Health to please stop this. This has been going on for a long time. So my 2 minutes are probably up. I'll comment on the other things, but that just happened this morning and I'd like to bring it to your attention.”
- Ed Brown: “Hey this is Ed, one of the owners of Poncho Brotherz storefront retail. I've been trying to comment for a while, as you guys know. My first comment was really just the initial public comment was just something really for the Office of Cannabis to consider and maybe the Committee to come under. As you guys know, cannabis is being descheduled or potentially being descheduled, I think it should be taking off the federal scheduling thing anyway, but I was hoping to propose an idea to Nikesh and his Office to create some of marketing material that would inform business owners what the potentials of partnering with cannabis companies, you know to be able to do more marketing, more cross marketing, to where they felt

comfortable on being able to partner with us. We've tried pretty unsuccessfully to partner with schools, local hotels, and everybody's under this threat of federal persecution and I would just like to propose for Nikesh to create some wording that business owners could use to be able to feel a little more comfortable partnering with cannabis companies. Nikesh, probably as you know, there are amendments at the federal level, the Rohrabacher amendment, which allows you know some protection from us. It's not fully guaranteed but it does allow the Department of Justice to not have to use funds to go after legal states like California. So really that's just like an exploratory comment. I wanted to kind of propose that to see if the Office could make something that makes it easier to have a normal business contracts, right, limited contracts. I just read that Spotify and a large company, a multi-state operator did a deal together to do radio ads so you know it's out there and the things are there but just looking at us here in San Francisco, I would love to see more operations where we could make contracts together with local business operations. Whether they are gyms or saunas or art galleries and really just be able to promote our cannabis operations with each other."

4. Review and Consideration of Regular Agenda

Discussion,
Action

Committee members will review and amend the meeting agenda as necessary and vote to approve.

- There are no edits or requests for revisions from the Committee
- No public comment
- **Motion:** There is a motion to keep the agenda.
 - **Motion/Second:** Apollo Wallace/David Nogales Talley | **Motion Approved**
 - **Ayes:** 7 | **Nays:** 0 | **Abstentions:** 0 | **Absent:** 0

5. Review and Approve Minutes from 07/25/2023 Meeting

Discussion,
Action

Committee members will review minutes from the previous Committee meeting, amending as necessary, and vote to approve. Explanatory Document: SF-COC_Meeting-Minutes-July-25.

- There are no edits or requests for revisions from the Committee
- No public comment
- **Motion:** There is a motion to keep the agenda.
 - **Motion/Second:** Shay Gilmore/David Nogales Talley | **Motion Approved**
 - **Ayes:** 7 | **Nays:** 0 | **Abstentions:** 0 | **Absent:** 0

6. Office of Cannabis Update

Discussion

The Office of Cannabis will provide a general update on the status of their work within the cannabis community.

- Director Patel shares the intention to provide updates to the COC on a more regular basis in the future
- Director Patel shares the total number of permits issued in 2019: (2 permits), 2020 (12 permits), 2021 (8 permits), 2022 (14 permits).
- Director Patel shares that so far in 2023, 10 permits have already been issued and the OOC is on trajectory to increase the total number of permits issued compared to prior years.
- Director Patel shares that to date 46 permits have been issued in total.

- Director Patel shares that of the 10 permits issued in 2023, 9 were Verified Equity Applicants (VEAs) and 1 provisional permit was converted.
- Director Patel reports that the OOC has started implementing “the shot clock” to review applications with delays and is responding or removing those from the queue; the shot clock is working and will improve over time.
- Director Patel shares that temporary permit holders are working with the Fire Department to respond to corrective action plans.
- Director Patel shares that permitting fees are \$5,000 per year, but for equity applicants the first year is free until the annual renewal. The OOC made a change this year to align the payment processes with the Treasurer and Tax Collector Office and providing universal bills.
- Director Patel shares that the number of compliance inspections is 41 to date this year while enforcement has 87.
- Director Patel shares that the OOC receives an allotment from the state and has made distributions based on the COC recommendations. To date, about \$10.5 million has been disbursed to equity applicants and remaining funds will be disbursed in the second round.
- Director Patel shares that 45 out of 47 grantees spent down 70% or more of funds, leading to eligibility for reallocation.
- Member Mobley asks if all applicants are given a temporary permit while waiting.
- Director Patel clarifies the historical reasons why temporary permits were required during the transitional period before Proposition 64.
- Chair Jamalian asks to clarify the number of inspections for operators with licenses and the number of enforcement actions for illicit operators.
- Director Patel clarifies that most inspections are complaint driven and that inspections are for licenses.
- Member Gilmore asks to receive updated facts in written form and Director Patel responds that they can be made available.

- Public Comment – Bram Goodwin: “Bram Goodwin. A couple of items. One - I want to emphasize about our legacy medical cannabis retailers because many of us, I’m one of us, have used them from the start and I just want to emphasize that it's within the legal bounds that they deserve to be processed. I'd like to see some real traction on it. You know, people can come up with whatever they mean, that's one thing, I would really like to see some emphasis on this to clear this out. And make them the [inaudible]. The other thing I wanted to mention and, I don't know if this is the right time, as everybody knows the possibility of the schedule from one to three has been out there and everyone have different opinions, which is great. I'd like to see some possible discussion today where appropriate in the item to talk about this. We had a Brownie Mary meeting last night. We had a very big discussion, lawyers and others about it, and I'd be curious whether, and it would all be speculation, whether our state would be a regulation to give back, or whether our Office of Cannabis would be affected in this kind of thing. So I also wanted to bring that up and I'll probably bring it up again in another more appropriate point in the agenda but I'd like to see those 33 get to 16. Thank you.”

7. Annual Cannabis Report

Discussion

The Office of Cannabis will provide the first portion of a two-part presentation on the state of the cannabis industry in 2022.

- OOC Analyst Dennis provides overview of permitting process for medicinal permits, temporary permits, and Article 16 permits.
- OOC Analyst Dennis discusses the common terminology used in cannabis permits: Medical Cannabis Dispensary (MCDs), TMPs, and Permanent permits.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the different activities for which permits can be used.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews data on permanent business permits issued in 2022: 14 permits for 12 businesses which is an increase in permits since 2019. Of the total 46 permits issued since 2019, 45 are VEAs and 1 is MCD transitioned to permanent.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews all business permits data: 145 permits issued by the end of 2022 for 116 businesses.
- Member Mobley asked to clarify the definition of “adult use.”
- OOC Analyst Dennis responds this is typically meant as recreational use, and is usually identified with some age requirements.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the timeline for permitting and highlights it is a collaboration between departments.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the process: OOC Intake, Planning Department, Department of Building Inspections, OOC Operational Plan Review, and then Permit gets issued.
- Member Gilmore asks when LPA (Labor Peace Agreements and negotiations) occur, and OOC Analyst Dennis confirmed during the final operational plan review.
- Director Patel confirms OOC works with WOED for LPAs.
- OOC Analyst Dennis confirmed that DBI inspection and OOC operational plan can happen simultaneously.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews data on the shortest and longest times of permitting with an example from 2022.
- Director Patel clarifies that the time between submission and assigning to an analyst is variable because when the application is submitted, there are periods of time the OOC cannot process the application because of the legislative order (tier) system. Additionally, the OOC was previously understaffed. The OOC expects the timeline decrease now that it can be assigned to an analyst almost instantly.
- Chair Jamalian mentions the timeline ranges from 18 to 36 months.
- Director Patel shares that some applications were slowed down due to complexity of the project, unresponsiveness from applicants, business changes during the process, and/or availability of funding.
- OOC Analyst Dennis mentions that as staff has increased, resources are more available and there is higher response time on applications, shortening the permitting timeline.
- Member Hayes asks if there is a way of fast tracking the process when an applicant does not complete the full permitting process and another potential business/operator is interested in using an empty building.
- Director Patel responds that it is highly dependable on the application, but could possibly be done with continued communication with the office, however it is not universally possible.
- Chair Jamalian mentions that there was a discussion last year about the Fire Departments cooperation with notices of violation but he does not feel there was any cooperation. He expresses that changing codes and CO2 requirements would be too expensive and is a reason why buildings are available. Chair Jamalian suggests a discussion on how to lower barriers to entry to improve the efficiency of the process.
- Director Patel points out there is possible background and reason for buildings to be “abandoned” and barriers may persist.

- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the number of months in operation for Article 16 cannabis businesses in 2022, which mostly is a result of when they received their permit; the data shared does not reflect business closure.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the number of months in operation for cannabis businesses with TMPs in 2022 and mentions that the variance in timeline is due to permit lapses, surrendering their permits, or business closures, and occasionally it is due to moving to a new location.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the timeline operation of cannabis businesses with MCD permits and mentions the variance is mainly due to businesses closing, being suspended, or surrendering licenses.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the OOC budget which covers all employees in the OOC, and that time spent on permitting is variable across roles.
- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews other core services in the budget for OOC staff.
- Chair Jamalain asks about the grants for which the OOC is applies.
- Director Patel responds that they do apply for other grants but that the grant opportunities are limited and so the OOC works for more city dollars to cover staffing needs.
- Chair Jamalain asks about the strategy to get as many grant dollars as possible, in regards to permit and temporary permit numbers, and discusses conversations that may need to be had with the State.
- Chair Jamalain asks for the number of applications that are VEAs.
- Director Patel responds that 450 VEAs in total were verified and of those 150 have moved forwards with an application and the other 300 are verified but haven't moved forward with the application process.
- Members discuss the relative pros and cons of the VEA verification process in terms of the cost to the OOC, the effects on the timeline of the permitting process, and the benefits to VEAs. Members discuss ideas for potential changes to the re-verification process and an expiration date as well as potential unintended consequences of increasing the time/cost of re-verification.
- Member Donaldson asks for the data on grant distribution to cannabis businesses by share of ownership of the VEA businesses because the state and city have different requirements.
- Director Patel responds that more than half of applications are for 40% VEA ownership and therefore if the state changes the grant distribution thresholds, it will affect the amount of money for which San Francisco is eligible.
- Public Comment- Ed Brown: "The second comment I wanted to make was, I just wanted to applaud to you guys as an office for all the data and the research that you guys have done to really make informed decisions. I feel that we have the best regulatory body in the country. You guys have been solid since the start going way back to Nicole Elliott's time, and you guys have just been solid, I'm glad you kept Ray on the Office of Cannabis, he's been really consistent. People like Evelyn and Princess, you guys have done really good. Jorge, I see you out there. You know you guys have been putting in really good people and just really making it easier for us as operators to stay in business. I just completed my renewal, it was a really easy process. I just want to thank your office again for all the hard work you guys do. And you guys really don't get enough credit, as you guys should be, as being a really strong, public government body. So that was the other comment."

----- BREAK -----

8. Review of Previous Committee's Recommendations on Medical Cannabis Card Program

Discussion,
Action

Committee members will discuss and possibly vote on the recommendations put forward by

the previous Committee regarding medicinal regulations. Explanatory Document: SF-COC_Recommendations_Compassionate_Care

- Chair Jamalian reviewed the recommendations put forward by the previous Committee regarding medicinal regulations.
- Public comment - Bram Goodwin: “I want to represent the Brownie Mary Democratic club and we've been working on these issues for a significant amount of time. I think it's a real chicken and egg thing with the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Their feedback to us has been that their hours were limited, everything is limited, because there aren't that many people who request service. The truth is if you make it very difficult, people aren't going to come. It's as simple as that, or they don't know about it which is a key thing. I didn't read all the recommendations but I think among the other ones was a general outreach by Public Health to the citizens of San Francisco to indicate to them what cannabis medical services are available, what they would gain by having the MMIC cards, such as not having to pay state sales tax. So one thing I'd love to see, again, with all words due respect to Public Health, they basically have stonewalled in any kind of interaction with them over this issue, so that's another thing. I'd love to see maybe open up some kind of dialogue where we get to meet with them, where it's not a black box situation, where we just get turned down. We need a real dialogue where representatives from our community, our medical community, meet with them. I'm just disturbed by it. We want to trust Public Health, yet they're not acting in our views, in a real responsive way where we can trust them. So, I appreciate the recommendations. I'd like to see some follow-up with the Board of Supervisors too, so they are really aware of this and hopefully we'll go take some action and make the system work. Medical patients deserve attention, cannabis medical patients deserve it. They're the basis, everything in that budget that we saw out there, that doesn't exist without medical patients and this goes back to the early '90s and the '80s. I want to see more emphasis for them and they are, by the way, the bedrock of our consumers. The great majority come from that world, even if they don't identify directly with MMIC. Thank you for allowing me to give my comments”
- Public comment - Ed Brown: “The third comment I wanted to make was around the medical cannabis, I also think the City can make marketing material around just public notice that there are medical options for people to be able to get their medical ID card and then be able to support that legislation. If I'm not mistaken, maybe you guys might know, but I believe there is a sunset date on the medical marijuana at the state level, so at some point either that might be renewed or might be taken away from patients. So I would love to see the city just keep continuing to create new dialogue in the Office of Cannabis. I know I saw your workload with permitting and I know where you guys are at on that workload, but I would love to see a shift in and you guys being an Office to make public statements and being able to let the consumers and people know in San Francisco who we are. No different than SF Travel or some other organizations in the city who make public statements. I would love to see you guys be able to do that and to really move from not just being a regulatory body but also more of like an outspoken body, for just us as cannabis here in San Francisco. I heard there was a comment about, you guys are working on the event, some new ordinance or new legislation around the events. I think the pilot program has been long enough, I think it's time to open that up to new events. As you guys know, only existing is-”
- **Motion:** There is a motion to pass on the recommendations from the previous COC, as written.
 - **Motion/Second:** Shay Gilmore/Apollo Wallace | **Motion Approved**

○ **Ayes:** 7 | **Nays:** 0 | **Abstentions:** 0 | **Absent:** 0

9. Approval of Bylaws Amendment

Discussion,
Action

The committee will vote on accepting the language for the Bylaws amendment proposed during the 07/25/2023 meeting to add “legacy operators” to the mission statement. Explanatory Document: SF-COC_Bylaws_Amendment

- **Motion:** There is a motion to approve the Bylaws
 - **Motion/Second:** Apollo Wallace/Drakari Donaldson | **Motion Approved**
 - **Ayes:** 7 | **Nays:** 0 | **Abstentions:** 0 | **Absent:** 0

10. Election of Racial Equity Lead

Discussion,
Action

Committee members will vote to elect a Racial Equity Lead, a role outlined in the Committee Bylaws.

- OOC Analyst Dennis reviews the voting and discussion process.
- Chair Jamalain nominates Antoinette Mobley for racial Equity Lead.
- Member Nogales-Talley seconds the nomination.
- No Public Comment
- **Motion:** There is a motion to elect Antoinette Mobley for racial Equity Lead
 - **Motion/Second:** Ali Jamalain/David Nogales Talley | **Motion Approved**
 - **Ayes:** 7 | **Nays:** 0 | **Abstentions:** 0 | **Absent:** 0

11. Public Banking Recommendations

Discussion,
Action

The Committee will discuss potential recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor’s Office to create and fund an equitable public bank or credit union for cannabis operators in San Francisco.

- Chair Jamalain states there should be an investment for a bank specifically for cannabis because although there is a current public banking movement, it will be lengthy process. Chair Jamalain shares that many other counties around the country, including Marin County in CA, have already done this and that given the number of social equity licenses, a bank for cannabis operators with priority to legacy operators and equity members would lower barriers. Chair Jamalain suggests this is an opportunity for San Francisco to be a leader for other cannabis businesses to do banking in San Francisco, much like Delaware for corporations.
- Chair Jamalain reads a written recommendation and invites members to provide feedback:
 - “The City of San Francisco Shall accept and fund the Public Cannabis Bank in accordance with the California Public Bank Act which allows municipalities to establish public banks that will use the deposit to make loans that directly benefit local communities. Priorities should be given to social equity and legacy businesses. However, in the spirit of promoting, we should also allow cannabis licensed voters nationwide to participate as long as they rent a minimum amount of space in San Francisco and employ San Francisco residents. We recommend a minimum threshold of 1200 square feet and two full-time employees for out-of-town cannabis companies to qualify for San Francisco Public Defense Bank. We recommend the City of San Francisco work closely with the Cannabis Oversight Committee to define the eligibility criteria of community benefits and funding for such bank. The San Francisco Cannabis Bank shall render all services traditionally offered to small businesses in accordance with the regulations

set forward by the California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation. These services shall include but not be limited to business checking with interest, merchant services, treasury management, money and marketing accounts, business credit cards, automated clearinghouse access, online banking account software integration, payroll services, retirement, and health savings.”

- Member Gilmore confirms the recommendation is to establish an San Francisco Public Cannabis Bank and that San Francisco would be the first municipality to do this.
- Chair Jamalian mentions he engaged in previous conversations as a business operator with the San Francisco Fire Credit Union, who used to do some cannabis banking but when the CEO, there was an internal decision to not continue with cannabis banking.
- Member Gilmore asks to understand what would fund from the bank.
- Chair Jamalian responds that initial funding would likely come from the City budget and describes revenue data is currently incomplete but gives his estimate of the significant revenue that would be flowing through the bank to make it successful.
- Member Gilmore suggests the Committee could initiate discussions with other stakeholders involved in public banking conversations, such as the California Public Banking Alliance, that have similar ideas and experience.
- Chair Jamalian agrees this could be beneficial.
- Member Gilmore mentions the importance of including data to support the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.
- Member Wallace asks about why the current public banking initiative is not beneficial to cannabis.
- Chair Jamalian clarifies that the current public banking initiative will be a long process before it launches and is focused on marginalized populations, home ownership, and individual-level investments. This will lead to banks not wanting to work with cannabis businesses due to the stigma around cannabis.
- Member Hayes shares his experiences of challenges with the restrictions and constraints of banking for cannabis business and raises a concern about the feasibility for this effort, though emphasizes support for the need for public banking.
- Chair Jamalian highlights the importance of advocacy and past successful efforts of the Committee to make a business-case to the Board of Supervisors.
- Member Gilmore suggests adding a request for the Board of Supervisors to support changes at the federal-level.
- Chair Jamalian suggest that the recommendation stay focused on local issues and actions rather than federal.
- Chair Jamalian underscores this issue is about providing banking services to healthy businesses that are succeeding despite barriers to business operation. In contrast, there is a potential risk that if federal restrictions change then it will put local cannabis in competition with big agriculture and big pharmaceutical companies which would create a major cash influx in the market. By preparing, San Francisco can support local businesses before those changes and risks take place.
- Member Gilmore highlights opportunities to gather input from other experts (e.g., credit unions) and suggests changes to the recommendation to include a timeline and to ask for reports from the Board of Supervisors’ actions.
- Director Patel clarifies the timeline of moving a recommendation forward to Board of Supervisors, whether it is expedited or not.
- Chair Jamalian mentions that there may be additional conversations with Members of the Board of Supervisors to educate them after the initial recommendation is made.
- Member Mobley encourage the Committee to put the recommendation through to get the process started and create a working group.

- Director Patel confirms that given the by-laws, the Committee can identify up to two representatives of the COC to have conversations with Supervisors as long as it remains within compliance of the Brown Act.
- Public Comment- Bram Goodwin: “I totally support the public bank. FYI, I had a conversation with Dean Preston who has been, I guess the lead person on this, specifically about the Cannabis Bank possibility and he seemed open to it. Just an FYI, Dean Preston will be at our Brownie Mary meeting on October 11 next month and that the public bank was definitely one of the conversations that I informed him that we want to talk about. I do need a clarification from Ali, which I haven't heard about before, for a separate bank. I would think politically it may make more sense we would be folded into the bigger bank, where we would be one little piece rather than asking for something specific where I think we'd get a lot of attacks from people saying ‘these are drug dealers’ etc. but if we were one piece of a much bigger thing, then from a political standpoint it would eventually be easier to pay. But, I totally support and am impressed by Ali's outline. I think the big thing is the dialogue with the supervisors. I think there is an appetite if we bring the facts. I think Ali really put his finger on something important, which is that dollar signs are what counts and everything. I think bringing that to bear to what this total is of what's significant. It could be significant as far as the bigger bank. I would love to hear a discussion strategy wise, whether separate is better, or maybe as hard as the ask part as part of the bigger Public Bank.”
- **Motion:** There is a motion to adapt the recommendations.
 - **Motion/Second:** Shay Gilmore/David Nogales Talley | **Motion Approved**
 - **Ayes:** 7 | **Nays:** 0 | **Abstentions:** 0 | **Absent:** 0

12. Scheduling Next Meeting and Proposed Future Agenda Items

Discussion

Committee members will discuss their preferred next meeting date, and propose future agenda items for the next committee meeting.

- Members discuss keeping schedule as-is.
- No Public Comment

13. Adjournment

- 4:00 PM PST