

# ATTACHMENT

For Item

31

TUESDAY  
April 30, 2024

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION RECEIVED BY THE  
CLERK OF THE BOARD

DISTRIBUTED 04/26/2024.

**Valdivia, Janely**

---

**From:** henkinp@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 25, 2024 5:38 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim; Anderson, Joel; MontgomerySteppe, Monica; Vargas, Nora (BOS);  
Lawson-Remer, Terra  
**Cc:** FGG, Public Comment  
**Subject:** [External] CANNABIS SOCIAL EQUITY PROGRAM (PLEASE INCLUDE WITH DOCUMENTS FOR AGENDA #31)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi Supervisors,

More equity garbage.

When the report says "End cannabis criminalization and open opportunity for directly impacted by expanding expungement efforts, investing in diversion and restorative justice and non-carceral regulation enforcement," I am reminded of San Francisco or Oakland's struggles with crime. Please do not let it happen here.

With a depleted police force and an invasion of immigrants, we can ill afford to decriminalize activities we know are harmful to society at large.

That being said, much of the research seem to be very scholarly although I don't agree with all of its conclusions. Moreover, it seems to be based on somewhat limited data (SANDAG at it again.)

I object to your setting up tiers and then saying "may receive additional benefits that may be determined at a later time" before you even set up the tiers. And it seems that you are pitting people against each other based on when they were arrested or convicted. And I don't know how someone could be "Deported or convicted for arrest in San Diego County crime."

The Matrix: You want to impose a license ceiling for cannabis storefront retailers only, do not impose a license ceiling for all other cannabis business types (manufacturing, distribution, delivery, cultivation, testing.) This will result in a bottleneck, a glut of services and supplies with nowhere to go - bad for business.

You want to reserve Minimum 50% of storefront retail licenses for social equity applicants - Process to award licenses will be determined at a later date - Storefront license cannot be sold or transferred for social equity for a three-year timeframe. Sounds like you are restricting the availability of licenses. Suppose you can't get 50%?

And then the matrix says the Board has discretion to change all these things, so to me, it's pretty meaningless.

Finally, the resolution: Section 1 says "Members 1-5 shall be nominated by a Board of Supervisor" Do you mean "one of the Supervisors" or "the Board as a whole"? Later on, it says "Vacancies shall be filled by the applicable nominating or appointing authority specified in Section 2." There is no Section 2. This is the second time in a few months I have noticed grammatical errors in County legal documents which leave them open to interpretation. Please correct and proofread more carefully.

This whole thing seems to have been cobbled together at the last minute. I urge you to reject and redo this resolution.

Regards,

Paul Henkin