

San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force – Year II
Social Justice DRAFT Task Force Recommendations

Workforce Development

Notes for Task Force Member consideration are italicized.

Strategies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Francisco should ensure existing workforce protections are extended to the cannabis industry, including the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Regulations regarding the employment of contractors and employees (e.g., per IRS and City guidelines) b) Ensure that employees receive a living wage, have safe workforce conditions, and receive benefits for which they are eligible (e.g., worker’s compensation, SSDI) c) Provide a grievance process through the Office of Cannabis d) Participation in employment reviews (e.g., as in Berkeley ordinance).* <i>(Provide additional clarification for d).</i> 2. To ensure equitable employment opportunities, San Francisco should create employment pathways and ensure protections for people to be hired within the licensed cannabis industry who were convicted as a result of working in the unlicensed industry. Such strategies would necessarily include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Educate employees and employers about San Francisco’s Fair Chance Ordinance and work within existing city pathways to encourage the hiring of employees with a prior criminal record b) Providing financial incentives for hiring impacted populations (e.g., fee discounts and tax breaks, e.g. Enterprise zone tax credit, payroll/gross receipt tax) c) The Office of Cannabis should provide a current and comprehensive list of resources for businesses of varying sizes (e.g., small, medium, and large) to achieve social justice workforce hiring objectives d) Investing in outreach and workforce development activities for the cannabis industry (e.g., incubator, job fairs, networking opportunities).* <p><i>(Clarify types of workforce hiring resources referenced in c. Clarify which, if any, strategies from the following list should be included in the above recommendation.)</i></p>
-------------------	--

San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force – Year II

Social Justice **DRAFT** Task Force Recommendations

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Incentivize employer recruitment from re-entry programs;b) Engage with the adult probation department, San Francisco re-entry council, other re-entry diversion programs, and the community at large to ensure that jobs in the cannabis industry are accessible;c) Require that some portion (e.g. 25%) of the employees of licensing applicants that have a certain total number of employees (e.g. 15 and above) have a conviction history. *
<i>(Workgroup noted a possible need to adjust item c) above according to business size, and to discuss “what voices need to be included in this conversation?”)</i> |
|--|---|

-END-

San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force – Year II

Social Justice **DRAFT** Task Force Recommendations

Business Ownership

Notes for Task Force Member consideration are italicized.

Strategies	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><p>1. To reduce barriers to business ownership among populations disproportionately impacted by War on Drugs police activity (i.e. “equity populations”), San Francisco should reserve an amount (e.g. 50%) of new cannabis licenses for equity populations for a period of time (e.g. for the first several years). Equity populations are defined as:</p><ol style="list-style-type: none">a) People who have lived in neighborhoods disproportionately impacted by War on Drugs police activity (e.g., Mission, Tenderloin, Southern, Bayview, Ingleside, Outer Mission, Portola, Fillmore police districts) for 5 years since 1996 (i.e., post- Prop 215 enactment)b) People who have been charged with or convicted of Proposition 64 crimes (e.g., those now eligible for sentence reduction or expungement) in any jurisdiction.c) In addition, equity incubators should also qualify for equity licenses. Equity incubators are defined as a business (not otherwise within the equity population) that agrees to offer free rent and on premise security services to an equity applicant for a period of time (e.g. three years).*<p><i>(Task Force workgroup to also consider which, if any, criteria would render someone ineligible for equity program, determine specification for additional eligibility criteria (e.g., income. Consider whether there is a data point that would serve as a proxy for identifying the neighborhoods listed above).</i></p><p>2. San Francisco should support equity applicants by providing the following forms of technical assistance:</p><ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Waive license and application fees for the first yearb) The Office of Small Business should provide pre-application consultation.<p><i>(Clarify which, if any, strategies from the following list should be included in the above recommendation.)</i></p>

San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force – Year II

Social Justice **DRAFT** Task Force Recommendations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Pair an equity applicant with a general applicant to facilitate the process whereby existing businesses support equity applicants (e.g., to provide assistance with elements of the application that require “social capital” or procedural knowledge). b) Provide technical assistance, including adding a navigator role to city staff to provide business navigation services, as the Entertainment Commission currently does. c) To provide startup capital, the City should establish a zero-interest revolving loan fund for equity applicants.
<p>Social Justice Revenue Allocation</p>	<p>3. To support business ownership and entrepreneurship initiatives, San Francisco should allocate cannabis tax revenue towards:*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and student expenses • Community College of San Francisco programs and workshops • Loans for small businesses • Nonprofits providing education • RFP/RFQ • Apply to own buildings or workforce development <p><i>(Add additional detail to clarify each area that should be funded (e.g., type of education provided by nonprofits, types of student expenses, RFP/RFQ, etc. Workgroup noted a need to “discuss impact on neighborhoods.” Consider whether any of the above ideas should be prioritized and if there are any locations in the City where these funds should be targeted.)</i></p> <p>4. Stakeholders who should be involved in the process of making funding allocation decisions include nonprofits and city agencies, e.g., OEWD and Office of Small Business.</p>
<p>Data Collection</p>	<p>5. Data that would enable the City to assess success could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in poverty, improved health, and economic stability • Number/percentage of permits issued to priority demographics • Educational attainment and job placements

San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force – Year II

Social Justice **DRAFT** Task Force Recommendations

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <p>6. Data collection efforts should include qualitative and quantitative methods, reflect target demographics (race, ethnicity, conviction history, income, gender), and may involve community liaisons in the data collection process. Data sources may include public housing, unions, planning permits (though no demographics are collected), CCSF education and internships/job placements, Office of Cannabis, and other city data sources (e.g., agriculture, DPH, and Office of Small Business Administration).
<i>(Clarify “planning permits (though no demographics are collected)” language.)</i></p> |
|--|---|

-END-