



# SAN FRANCISCO CANNABIS STATE LEGALIZATION TASK FORCE

## TASK FORCE MEETING : PUBLIC SAFETY AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Meeting 4

May 11, 2016

# **Agenda Item 1:**

## **Welcome and Agenda Review**

# **Agenda Item 2**

## **Presentation**

### **Recommendation Drafting Process**

# Cannabis Task Force

4

Established by BOS via Ordinance 115-15

## **Purpose**

Advise policymakers on matters relating to the potential legalization of cannabis in California

# Task Force Meeting Topics – YEAR 1

5

- **Public Safety and Social Environment**
- **Land Use**
- **Regulation and City Agency Framework**

# Meeting Structure


6

## INFORMATION

## DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

### SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

1. Issue Brief and Research
2. Spotlight Panel
3. Personal experiences and knowledge



### FULL MEETING

1. Group workshop
2. Discussion
3. Consensus-building

# Recommendation Drafting Process

7


## Task Force Full Meeting:

- Small Workgroups to **DRAFT** Recommendations
  - Spotlight Panelists from Subcommittee Meeting to Facilitate
  
- Full Task Force to **FINALIZE** Recommendations

# Recommendation Drafting Process

8

## Public Safety and Social Environment





# Recommendation Drafting Process

9

Each workgroup has 45 minutes to:

- **Identify** group members to (1) take notes, (2) keep time and (3) report out on recommendations
- Discuss and **draft** recommendations
- **Review** recommendations
- **Write** on flip chart sheet

# Recommendation Drafting Tools

10

## Document A

### Meeting and Recommendation Drafting Instructions

Cannabis State Legalization Task Force

**DOCUMENT A**  
**Meeting and Recommendation Drafting Instructions**

**1. General Process**

The San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force was created as an advisory body for the City's policymakers should adult cannabis use become legalized in the future. The Task Force Subcommittee and Full Task Force meetings are therefore designed to complement each other and lead the Task Force towards fulfilling this goal—i.e. the development of recommendations on important cannabis adult use legalization issues.

**A. Subcommittee Meetings:** During these meetings, Task Force Members will have in-depth discussions in each major topic area, i.e. (1) public safety and social environment, (2) land use, and (3) regulation and city agency framework. These discussions allow important issues and ideas to surface, and these will then be used to create the recommendation development tools and process for the subsequent Full Task Force Meeting.

**B. Full Task Force Meetings:** During Full Meetings of the Task Force, the Task Force will develop recommendations related to one of the above topic areas. With regard to Public Safety and Social Environment, the upcoming Full Meeting will be divided into two main activities:

- o Small workgroups will **DRAFT** recommendations
- o Full Task Force will **FINALIZE** recommendations via consensus

**2. Recommendation Drafting Process**

**A. Small workgroups will DRAFT Recommendations:** During the first half of the Full Meeting, Task Force Members will be randomly assigned into three workgroups to develop recommendations in one of the below areas. Spotlight Panelists from the Public Safety and Social Environment Subcommittee Meeting will serve as facilitators for each workgroup.

The main discussion areas for each workgroup are as follows:

**Workgroup 1: Public Safety**

- a. Driving Under the Influence
- b. Neighborhood Safety
- c. SFPD Enforcement and Training Priorities

**Workgroup 2: Public Consumption**

- a. Meaning of the word "public"
- b. On-site consumption per AUMA
- c. Overconsumption and encouraging safe and responsible use

**Workgroup 3: Youth Access and Exposure**

- a. Education
- b. Preventing Sales to Minors
- c. Advertising
- d. Diversion Programs and Decriminalization Options for Youth

Pg. 1 (of 6)

# Recommendation Drafting Tools

## Document B

# Recommendation Framework Document

Cannabis State Legalization Task Force		
DOCUMENT B Recommendations Framework		
Public Safety	Public Consumption	Youth Access and Exposure
<p><b>1. Driving Under the Influence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is there a need for further policy guidance on this at the local level?</li> <li>b. If so, what is the purpose and outcome of such guidance?</li> <li>c. Who is the audience?</li> <li>d. What stakeholders should be involved in developing this guidance?</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Neighborhood Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What does it mean for a cannabis business to be a "good neighbor"?</li> <li>b. What tools would ensure this "good neighbor" standard? e.g. policy, guidelines, protocols</li> <li>c. What are 3-5 important considerations and/or topic areas that these tools should include?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. For example, standards relating to security, lighting, signage, windows, cash-only operations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>3. SFPD Enforcement and Training Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What are 3-5 top considerations for the San Francisco Police Department when it is developing its criminal enforcement and training strategies?</li> </ul>	<p><b>1. Meaning of the word "public"</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When does a "public" space become privatized?</li> <li>b. What would we call such spaces?</li> <li>c. Should there be policy pathways created for consumption in such places?</li> <li>d. In developing recommendations, note these overarching considerations:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reducing secondhand smoke exposure</li> <li>ii. Existing public consumption laws</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>2. On-site consumption per AUMA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Should the City allow on-site consumption at retail locations?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. As part of the recommendation for or against, state the advantages and concerns associated with this AUMA provision.</li> <li>b. If so, consider the three minimum AUMA requirements for on-site consumption at retail locations. If the City does allow on-site consumption, should there be additional requirements or considerations at the local level?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>3. Overconsumption and encouraging safe and responsible use across the City</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Should the City design an approach towards</li> </ul>	<p><b>1. Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Should the Task Force consider the City's education system as a participant in developing cannabis education for schools?</li> <li>b. Are there new or existing models and principles that would be helpful in developing an educational curriculum?</li> <li>c. In developing a curriculum and educational tools, should there be varying approaches for different age groups? Should there be a parental or family-based component to these educational tools?</li> <li>d. What stakeholders should be involved in developing these educational tools?</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Preventing Sales to Minors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Should the City have additional guidelines, rules or requirements designed to prevent sales to minors?</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Advertising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Should the City have additional guidelines, rules or requirements for cannabis-related advertising on public transit or within printed materials?</li> </ul>

# Recommendation Drafting Tools

12

## Document C

## AUMA Provisions Table

Cannabis State Legalization Task Force

### DOCUMENT C

#### Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA) Public Safety and Social Environment Provisions Table

#### General

Cross-cutting Issues	AUMA - related provisions
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$10 million annual disbursement (FY 2019 – FY 2029) to California public university (or universities) to research and evaluate that effects of the AUMA and make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature regarding possible amendments. Universities required to publish reports on their findings every two years (at minimum). Research topics include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ impacts on public health</li><li>○ effectiveness of labeling requirements and advertising and marketing restrictions on preventing underage access and use</li><li>○ health-related effects among users of varying potency levels of cannabis and cannabis products</li></ul></li></ul> <p>(pgs. 46 – 47 - Tax and Revenue Sec. 34019)</p>

# Recommendation Drafting Tools

## Document D

### Recommendation Grid(s)

- Public Safety
- Public Consumption
- Youth Access and Exposure

Cannabis State Legalization Task Force					
DOCUMENT D					
Recommendation Grid – Public Safety					
RECOMMENDATIONS TOPIC: Public Safety					
ISSUE	Local Policy and Legal <small>[policymaking guidance: e.g. new or changes to existing law policies, protocols, guidelines, etc.]</small>	Programmatic <small>[new or changes to existing programs, programmatic structures, funding streams and levels]</small>	Future Research Needed <small>[research needed to develop effective cannabis policies, guidelines or protocols]</small>	Future Collaborations <small>[agencies, groups and/or stakeholders in SF or elsewhere that would be helpful to policymakers in developing this issue]</small>	Future Considerations <small>[possible areas of realignment within the AUMA to tailor law to SF culture, climate and current practice]</small>
	+ RATIONALE	+ RATIONALE	+ RATIONALE	+ RATIONALE	+ RATIONALE
1. Driving Under the Influence					
2. Neighborhood Safety					
CONSENSUS PRINCIPLES					
Evidence-based approach		2. Youth Protection		3. Secondhand smoke protections	

# Recommendation Drafting Tools

Document	Description	Purpose
<b>I</b> <b>DOCUMENT A</b>	<b>Instructions</b> – explains the process for making recommendations	Refer to it for critical information about the process and tools
<b>II</b> <b>DOCUMENT B</b>	<b>Recommendation Framework</b> - organizes Task Force Members' thoughts and ideas from the Subcommittee Meeting into discrete areas for recommendation development	Use this document: - to organize discussion around the issues - as a checklist to ensure that all issue areas have been discussed
<b>III</b> <b>DOCUMENT C</b>	<b>AUMA Provisions Table</b> – outlines relevant Public Safety and Social Environment AUMA provisions	Use as a reference tool
<b>IV</b> <b>DOCUMENT D</b>	<b>Recommendation Grid</b> - outlines possible recommendation types and prompts Members to think about a particular issue in different ways	Use as personal brainstorming tool

# Recommendation Drafting Guidelines

15

- **Consensus-building** – seeks consent of all Members and reaching a resolution, even if it is not the preferred option of each individual
  
- **Consensus principles**
  - Evidence-based approach
  - Youth protection
  - Secondhand smoke protections
  
- **Rationale** – why is this recommendation important?
  
- **AUMA provisions** as foundation
  
- Parking Lot issues: fit into future meeting schedule
  
- Note: Meeting schedule provides another opportunity to finalize recommendations

# Agenda Item 3:

## Draft Recommendations - Workgroups

### Public Safety

**Dave Falzon, Barbara Fugate**

Lourdes Russell

Liam McCarthy

Sara Payan

Terrance Alan

### Public Consumption

**Duncan Ley and Jocelyn Kane**

Tomas Aragon

Dan Sider

Jesse Stout

Erich Pearson

Sarah Shrader

### Youth Access and Exposure

**Daisy Ozim, Tom McElroy**

Fenicia Jacks – SFUSD

Tim Morland

Michelle Aldrich

Thea Selby

Jennifer Garcia



# **Agenda Item 4:**

# **Break**

**Agenda Item 5:**

**Guided Discussion:**

**Workgroups to Present Recommendations**

# **Agenda Item 6:**

# **Public Comment**

## **Agenda Item 7:**

**Guest Speaker – Jordan Wellington, Esq.**

**Welcome!**

# Agenda Item 8:

## Wrap-up and Next Steps

### NEXT MEETING

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
<b>June 8, 2016 Subcommittee Meeting– Land Use</b>	<b>1PM – 4PM</b>	<b>25 Van Ness, Rm. 610 San Francisco, CA 94102</b>