

From: [Eddie Lugan](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Cc: sdnormlegalize@gmail.com; info@lc.projectcannabis.org; [Honey, Megan](#); [Long Range Planning, PDS](#); king@sanidiego.gov; aking@sanidiego.gov; info@safeaccessnow.org; shelby.huffaker@gmail.com; ellen@canorml.org; norml@norml.org
Subject: [External] Social Equity Program Hearing 1/14/26
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 7:42:44 AM

Dear San Diego County Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing you this email because unfortunately I won't be able to attend the hearing in person on 1/14/26 for the Social Equity Cannabis Program, but I would like my voice/opinion to be heard. I'm a tax paying, property owner, constituent in district 5.

Not only am I a citizen, but also a cannabis patient. I'm a qualified Social Equity participant due to the fact that I helped provide safe access to Cannabis during a time (2005) when there wasn't safe access for patients in North County. Now, with this program, you are directly helping provide that much needed Safe Access to patients in the North County region.

I ask that you please consider moving this program forward, not only in the name of patient safety, but also in what it can provide for the rest of our County with its tax revenue basis. This program will help provide sales tax that will not only cover the program itself, but will also help provide for other much needed areas of service within our community.

I'm sure some people will hold an antiquated stigma against Cannabis, but I assure you this is erroneous. Please do some unbiased research before casting judgment upon this program. Those of us in favor of this program also fought for a legal means of regulation to help make Medical Cannabis Legal. Patients need a safe resource that is well regulated so they aren't buying unknown medication from the illicit market that could be potentially compromised and laced with fentanyl.

Please help push this program forward. I've spent over a year away from my Family, along with many others, jumping through the hoops of this program to meet its eligibility requirements. Don't let this unnecessarily drag on any longer.

I thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Edward P. Lugan (Eddie)

From: henkinp@earthlink.net
To: [Desmond, Jim](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#); [La Prensa San Diego](#); [San Diego UT Senior Editor](#); [San Diego UT Community Op Ed](#); [Times of San Diego](#); [Voice of San Diego](#)
Subject: [External] DISCUSS/REHASH THE DRAFT SOCIALLY EQUITABLE CANNABIS PROGRAM (Please include with Land Use Agenda #3 docs.)
Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 5:55:41 PM

3. NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING:

REPORT BACK AND SEEK DIRECTION ON AND RELATED CEQA EXEMPTION

Not sure why the Draft Socially Equitable Cannabis Program (SECP) is in the Land Use session, with all of the social implications this has, rather than the regular session – so people who have to work or have kids are less likely to be here both sessions?

I am offended that you are presenting this with 7 options still after 4 years. You asked the Committee for recommendations, not options. Isn't recommendations what we pay taxes for?

Jury's still out on whether cannabis boosts crime. LA is undergoing serial robberies at cannabis stores. There was recently a stabbing behind our own National City cannabis lounge. There is no conclusive law enforcement study but private studies seem to show a 4.8% increase in crime.

Another huge concern is the twisty and sometimes poorly maintained roads in Tribal areas and East County which impede access for law enforcement or emergency services if there is an urgent need.

Decisionpoint 1: Given the above concerns, you need some alternative to allowing "ALL indoor facility types" in the SECP. And you sure don't want it in a residential care facility with all the side effects of the smoke. Not sure why the committee didn't look for alternatives itself. Although 'decisionpoint' does sound decisive.

Decisionpoint2: in the SECP, you do need to regulate temporary cannabis events and onsite consumption.

Decisionpoint3: No Community Equity Contribution Program. Sounds like a scam and you need all the tax money first, not a giveaway of our tax money based on estimates.

To sum up, it sounds like more piss-poor planning. A waste of time and effort, and our taxpayer dollars.

Regards,

Paul Henkin