SAN FRANCISCO CANNABIS STATE LEGALIZATION TASK FORCE

FULL MEETING:
LAND USE, SOCIAL JUSTICE, AND TOURISM
Agenda Item 1:

Welcome and Agenda Review
Agenda Item 2:

Framing Presentation:

Recommendation Drafting Process
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

- Public Safety and Social Environment
- Land Use, Tourism/Hospitality, Social Justice/Workforce Development
- Regulation and City Agency Framework
Meeting Structure

INFORMATION

6/8 and 7/14 Task Force Meetings
1. Issue Brief and Research
2. Spotlight Panel
3. Planning Department presentation
4. Personal experiences and knowledge

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

FULL MEETING
1. Group workshop
2. Discussion
3. Consensus-building
Recommendation Drafting Process

Task Force Full Meeting:

- Small Workgroups to **DRAFT** Recommendations
  - Spotlight Panelists from previous meeting to facilitate

- Full Task Force to **FINALIZE** Recommendations
  - Today: DRAFT Recommendations
  - 9/14: PRELIMINARY Recommendations
  - 11/9: FINAL Recommendations
Recommendation Drafting Process

Land Use, Social Justice, and Tourism

Workgroups

Land Use

Social Justice/Workforce Development

Tourism/Hospitality
Each workgroup has 75 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
Document A

Meeting and Recommendation Drafting Instructions

Cannabis State Legalization Task Force

1. General Process
   The San Francisco Cannabis State Legalization Task Force was created as an advisory body for the City’s policymakers and adult community use become legalized in the future. The Task Force Subcommittees and Full Task Force meetings are therefore designed to complement each other and lead the Task Force towards drafting the goal—i.e., the development of recommendations on important cannabis-related policy implications.

   a. Subcommittee Meetings: During these meetings, Task Force Members will have in-depth discussions on each major topic area, i.e., (1) public health and social environment, (2) (3) enforcement and public safety, and (4) regulatory and city agency framework. These discussions allow important issues to be identified and issues that may be used to create the recommendations 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 discuss 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:
      - Small workgroups will DRAFT recommendations.
      - 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. Oversight Delegated 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. Drivers Under the Influence
        b. Misuse/Abuse
        c. Of Public Health
      - Workgroup 2: Public Consumption
        a. Consumption of the worst "public"
        b. On-site consumption per AUMA
        c. Overconsumption and encouraging use and responsible use
      - Workgroup 3: Youth Access and Exposure
        a. Education
        b. Preventing Sales to Minors
        c. Advertising
        d. Diversification Programs and Discrimination Options for Youth
Recommendation Drafting Tools

Recommendation Framework Document

Cannabis State Legalization Task Force

DOCUMENT B
Recommendations Framework: Land Use, Social Justice and Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism/Hospitality</th>
<th>Social Justice/Workforce Development</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco Cannabis Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How should the City think about cannabis within the tourism/hospitality industry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What types of tourists should San Francisco expect to have with regard to adult cannabis use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What expectations might these different types of tourists have with respect to cannabis culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What strategies should the City consider in order to address these expectations and achieve the right balance of discretion and visibility of cannabis culture in San Francisco?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. What stakeholders should be involved to ensure that the City achieves the appropriate balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourist and Resident Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Safety (health and personal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What does “safe cannabis use” mean for tourists? Would this definition be different for residents? If so, how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What kind of safe access education is needed for tourists? Would this education be different for residents? If so, how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. How might the look and feel of a cannabis business make tourists feel more or less safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Successful Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What are the characteristics of a successful cannabis workforce from both the employee and employer points of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What types of programs are needed to ensure these outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What data should the City collect to monitor the success of these programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What entities/collaborations (existing or newly created) are needed to develop and maintain these programs and data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Is there a need for the City to create policies aimed at keeping workers informed as the industry moves from prohibition to legalization? What information and City support will be needed for that transition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Entrepreneurship Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What barriers to cannabis business ownership currently exist or may develop post-legalization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What strategies and new/existing models would reduce these barriers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What collaborations are needed to ensure that cannabis entrepreneurship opportunities exist and are accessible to everyone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Non-Retail Uses |
| a. Should the City allow non-retail cannabis uses (such as cultivation, manufacturing, and distribution)? |
| b. Should the Task Force move forward in formally recommending that the existing Planning Code be used as a basis to establish land use guidelines for non-retail uses? |
| 2. Retail Uses |
| a. Should the City develop findings that the Planning Department and/or other departments could use to make retail use retail location decisions? |
| b. If so, what should these findings include? Some examples from previous discussions/permutations: |
| o Balancing community and business interests |
| o Balancing neighborhood input and citywide objectives |
| o Youth access and exposure issues: |
| • What should the City consider in thinking about cannabis business proximity to schools? |
| • How should the City define think about sensitive uses? |
| o Childproof: |
| • How should the City think about and/or define childproof?
**Recommendation Drafting Tools**

### Document C

**AUMA Provisions Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-cutting Issues</th>
<th>AUMA-related provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $50 million annual dividend (FY 2019 - FY 2019) to California public university (or universities) to research and evaluate the 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:  
  - Impacts on public health  
  - Effectiveness of labeling requirements and advertising and marketing restrictions on preventing underage access and use  
  - Health-related effects among users of various potency levels of cannabis and cannabis products  
  (PP. 46–47 - Tax and Revenue Sec. 14015) |
## Recommendation Drafting Tools

### Document D

**Recommendation Grid(s)**

- Land Use
- Social Justice/Workforce Development
- Tourism/Hospitality

### Cannabis State Legalization Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>Local Policy and Legal [policymaking guidance, e.g., new or changes to existing laws, policies, protocols, guidelines, etc.] + RATIONALE</th>
<th>Programmatic [new or changes to existing programs, programmatic structures, funding streams and levels] + RATIONALE</th>
<th>Future Research Needed [research needed to develop effective cannabis policies, guidelines or protocols] + RATIONALE</th>
<th>Future Collaborations [agencies, groups and stakeholders in SF or elsewhere that would be helpful to policymakers in developing this issue] + RATIONALE</th>
<th>Future Considerations [possible areas of residuum within the AUMA to tailor law to SF culture, climate and current practice] + RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco Cannabis Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourist and Resident Experiences a. Safety (health and personal) b. Public Consumption c. Immigration Status and Legal Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consensus Principles**

1. Create recommendations regarding tourist use
# Recommendation Drafting Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENT A</td>
<td><strong>Instructions</strong> – explains the process for making recommendations</td>
<td>Refer to it for critical information about the process and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENT B</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation Framework</strong> - organizes Task Force Members’ thoughts and ideas from previous meetings into discrete areas for recommendation development</td>
<td>Use this document: - to organize discussion around the issues - as a checklist to ensure that all issue areas have been discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENT C</td>
<td><strong>AUMA Provisions Table</strong> – outlines relevant Land Use, Tourism and Social Justice AUMA provisions</td>
<td>Use as a reference tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENT D</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation Grid</strong> - outlines possible recommendation types and prompts Members to think about a particular issue in different ways</td>
<td>Use as personal brainstorming tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation Drafting Guidelines

- **Consensus-building** – seeks consent of all Members and reaching a resolution, even if it is not the preferred option of each individual

- **Consensus principles**
  - **Land Use**
    - Develop guidelines to inform land use decision-making
    - City-wide policies for non-retail and retail use
    - Use existing planning code as foundation for non-retail use
  - **Social Justice/Workforce Development**
    - Evidence-based approach
    - Address social justice
    - Incentivize workforce development
  - **Tourism/Hospitality**
    - Create recommendations regarding tourist use
Recommendation Drafting Guidelines

- **Rationale** – why is this recommendation important?

- **AUMA provisions** as foundation

- Parking Lot issues: fit into future meeting schedule: Regulation and City Agency Framework

- Multiple opportunities to review, discuss and finalize recommendations:
  - 8/10 Meeting – DRAFT recommendations
  - 9/14 Meeting – PRELIMINARY recommendations
  - 11/9 Meeting – FINAL recommendations
Agenda Item 3:

Draft Recommendations - (1) Land Use, (2) Social Justice/Workforce Development, and (3) Hospitality/Tourism
Each workgroup has 75 minutes to:

1) Discuss thoughts, ideas, and questions in assigned topic area

2) Designate one member to take notes

3) Designate one member to report out
Agenda Item 4:

10-min Break
Agenda Item 5:

Large Group Presentation and Guided Discussion: Present and discuss draft recommendations
Agenda Item 6:

Public Comment
Agenda Item 7:

Wrap-up and Next Steps

NEXT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 14, 2016</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>25 Van Ness Avenue Room 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Meeting – Finalize Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations and Discuss Regulatory &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Agency Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>