

# Nevada Cannabis Advisory Commission – Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

## Meeting Minutes October 18, 2021, at 1:00pm

The Nevada Cannabis Advisory Commission's Subcommittee on Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion held in-person meeting at the Grant Sawyer Building 555 E. Washington Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89101 on October 18, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

### **Public Safety Subcommittee Members Present:**

A'Esha Goins, Chair

Kema Ogden

Bryan Scott

Tina Ulman

### **Chair Goins 00:01**

Good afternoon. It is Monday, October 18. And this is the Subcommittee on Social Equity Diversity and Inclusion. And we are calling to order. I am Chair Goins. We are calling this meeting to order. I want to read a land acknowledgement. we wish to acknowledge and honor the indigenous communities of this region and recognize that we are situated on traditional homelands of the Nuwuvi Southern Paiute people. We offer gratitude to the land itself for those who have stewarded it for the generations and for the opportunity to study, learn, work and be in community with this land. We encourage everyone in this space to engage in continued learning about the indigenous people who work and live on this land since time and immemorial, including the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe and the Moapa Band of Paiutes, and about the historical and present realities of colonialism.

**Chair Goins took roll.** Member Scott was present in Las Vegas. Member Ogden and Member Ulman were present via Zoom. Member Harris was not present.

### **Chair Goins**

I want to open the floor for public comment. We're going to ask you to come to the mic. Please limit your comments to two minutes. State your name you can come to the podium here and public if you have public comments. Yes, sir. Public comment.

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

**Paul Michael Burgess 02:15**

Thank you very much for this inclusion and open an opportunity with community, we really appreciate it on all sides. My name is Paul Michael Burgess. I'm a business owner here in the state of Nevada. And I would just give a public comment to bringing awareness that another opportunity for a license is available to the CCB. To start, that would not expand over the table. If a business was the open up market, by opening a market in this business, you would allow a lot of the social equity and applicants of Las Vegas residents that are not able to get or have the money to open their own business, and will be able to use these food courts marketplaces, as a way to get into the industry also take part in understanding how this operation works. It would be state taxes to the CCB. It would also be new licenses as far as to the state for new LLCs. And so, he would be able to keep just get one license, that owner would open a marketplace. And in that marketplace. We did like a coop court where there could be 50. Other we live in a state. I'm also a chef. We live in a state where there's a whole lot of cooks, chefs, sous chefs that are in this industry of cannabis that are coming up with their own ideas. This would give that opportunity for them to take part in this and open the business up of the cannabis industry for the social equity at a larger mass. And then you can use that as like a training program. So, anybody that's inside that marketplace under that consumption license, they will learn the ways they learned the rules, the regulations, and the guidelines. So, when it was time for more licensees to open up, they will be able to they will be first in line like an accelerator. They will be first in line to go and open their own establishment already know the rules and regulations guidelines, the CCB, the state of Nevada and also whether the county city statement. Thank you for your time.

**Chair Goins 04:21**

Thank you for your comment. This is a time for public comment. If there are no other public comments, I'm going to move to approval item to approval for I'll put my glasses on. Oh, there's the word approval of recommendation for the cannabis Advisory Commission. So, we have a couple of things that we have discussed as a committee and I just want to openly commend everyone for the day dictation to this issue for their time because I know that we're all professionals we all have lives in, you know, it took a lot for us to arrange our schedules to be present in this moment. During this time. I've gotten a lot of feedback from the committee community on how well we've done, how people have completely enjoyed the process and how transparent we have been in our conversation. So, I thank all the members for their time. And so, what we're going to do today is just kind of review the things that we've discussed, put it to a vote. And this is more of a still internal vote because what we're saying is we like these things. And we're going to ask the Cannabis Advisory Commission to move these forward to the Cannabis Compliance Board. And so, with that, one of the things I want to start with is the reduction of application fees. So, what we discussed on the floor in this board, in this committee is reducing the application fees. Two ways, one way we were we decided that we should do 75% reduction for social equity applicants, and then a scale for those persons who were immediate family members of those social equity applicants. Do we still feel that way? Right now? So, our suggestion is from this committee is that 75% Should be reduced, reduced for social equity advocates and 50% for those immediate family members.

**All committee members are in agreement.**

**Member Ulman 07:04**

Wow, look at us rolling.

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

**Chair Goins** 07:06

Subsection B is process for determining social equity, equity applicants' eligibility, there was a lot of conversation about this. And I want to acknowledge that, you know, went up I don't think I think I'll be able to order if I do this. But we did receive some public comments. And then at the end, I'll say those public comments, the people who gave us public comments at the end of this committee, I'll read them to keep myself in order. But we did receive some comments. And I think we were still along the lines of what the comments suggested that they would like to see. And so, I'm just going to read that. I want to make sure that we all understand that we're not wanting someone to be 10 years prior to a non-violent misdemeanor cannabis related offense. We would like all persons who had a non-violent or misdemeanor cannabis offense, it's just that the state statute doesn't allow them to not be past ten years. And so that's the reason why we're using that as the point. So, they we wanted them to be 10 years from a non-violent misdemeanor cannabis related offense, actually 10 years from prior to a non-violent felony cannabis offense, the misdemeanor cannabis related offenses should be able to be sealed and so any of those offenses. So, we all agree on that. Right? And just so you know, as I'm going along, if you disagree, guests say it is. I think that's probably a better process.

**Member Scott** 08:53

Did we over determine whether or not the persons who have the offenses should have either had the record sealed or have gone through the expungement process? And we made that determination?

**Chair Goins** 09:04

We didn't and I think we left it open because ultimately, according to the state, it should be okay. Because most of these persons were supposed to be pardoned by the governor. The pardon should already be on the record. However, the unfortunate part about that is even though it's pardoned it you would still have to have a seal not to be seen, but if the governor pardoned, you'd actually make you okay for the state should be. The other thing is five years resident in a zip code with 75% of the children participate in the Federal Free Lunch Program. Current high-risk area and or 25% of the persons receive SNAP.

**All committee members are in agreement**

**Chair Goins**

I should stick to the line here. The residency we said is the zip code was identified as disproportionately affected by past cannabis laws are higher risk. They needed to be five years and one of those residents, is that correct?

**All committee members are in agreement.**

**Chair Goins**

All right. Um, we talked about history, consider criminal history. So, we still agree that a sister, brother, mom, dad, son, or daughter can apply as long as they meet all the other criteria. Right? They lived in a five-year resident and zip code in this area.

**All committee members are in agreement**

The minimum profit for social equity applicant is 51%. We agree on that.

**Member Scott** 11:00

That's, that's, yes.

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

**Chair Goins** 11:03

Yes. 51% ownership. Yeah, go ahead.

**Member Scott** 11:08

I was just going to say, again, you know, we talked about the fact that these are going to be private agreements between these two persons or this person in this group, whether or not we'll be able to dictate to the persons who are putting forth maybe the majority of the money, the profit allocation, that's going to be a little harder, and I don't, I think you'll get groups that may shy away from partnering with these social equity applicants, because if they don't think that they have the ability to come up with a fair allocation of profits, it's not going to work for them. So, I think we're going to really have some issue with people considering that these agreements should be private, and they should be able to reach their own profit settlements.

**Chair Goins** 11:52

I agree. But what we're discussing specifically is the LLC itself. And so, if that social equity applicant is applying what we're saying is the owner on that, no matter if it's three, four, or five, it needs to be 51%. Of those persons are social equity applicant. Right.

**Member Scott** 12:10

I thought we talked about the problems that we talked to profit participants know

**Chair Goins** 12:13

My apologies. And I probably said that that didn't mean to say okay, okay, so 51% ownership percentage. We all agree with that.

**All members are in agreement.**

**Member Ulman** 12:30

Yes. Chair Goins. I had a quick question going back. For clarification, does the applicant have to meet all three requirements? Or is it two out of three? Or is it just one, as far as have a non-violent cannabis related charge? Live in one of the zip codes and be a five-year resident?

**Chair Goins** 12:55

So, they have to have been a five-year resident? Period? And then after that, they would only have to meet one of those criteria. Okay.

**Member Ulman** 13:07

That's what I thought just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

**Chair Goins** 13:13

And thank you for that clarification. So minimum profit participation in this is too what Member Scott is discussing, we decided as a group that we didn't want to get involved in the ownership. A great management agreements. However, what I what I did say is I still think there is a space to require having that agreement, be a part of the application process. I do think that those agreements should be reviewed. I don't want to nickel and dime that. But I

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

do think that those management agreements should be reviewed by the CCB. Just keep people on board above board. Go ahead.

**Member Scott** 14:01

Chair the only issue I don't know if with those agreements be in place prior to the time that the person was established as being a social equity applicant, or that that was a successful social equity applicants to get one of the spots, I don't know how far in advance someone would be willing to have this agreement may not be a full-fledged written agreement, maybe they have some kind of understanding, or there's some kind of letter of memorandum of understanding or something that if you are a successful social equity applicant, I'd be willing to partner with you for X amount of dollars. So, I don't know if we can get a full agreement until somebody knows that this person is going to be a successful applicant.

**Chair Goins** 14:41

And I agree with you, but I think as a part of an application process, we should require at least at minimum, an MOU Yeah, I agree. So, do you guys all agree with that?

**Member Ulman** 14:51

Yeah, I see what you're saying Member Scott. Like if they set up agreements after the fact. After getting the initial license, some will already have those investors and venture capitalist, that they could definitely say, here's how we're operating. But I do think that is just another checks and balances to make sure that you know, people are operating well. And you know, no one's getting the short end of the stick. And maybe that's on the on the applicant to, you know, after everything's said and done, submit that, so that they have all their Is dotted and Ts crossed. Yep, I agree.

**Chair Goins** 15:30

Yeah, I agree. I definitely want the MOU and at minimum, okay, before the application is, you know, completed. Are that what the CCB? No, I think that's in full transparent, so we want them to know, go ahead. Member I'm

**Member Ogden** 15:46

sorry, chair. But a lot of them, instead of MOU, they they'll use an operating agreement on the back end. So, wording? Well, I

**Member Scott** 15:55

guess, I guess what I'm saying is that we just need something to prove that they have some type of relationship with somebody else that's going to be

**Chair Goins** 16:04

Yeah, I don't disagree I'm using so I could say, here's how we get. Here's how we get caught up in how people manipulate right? If I say MOU, then they'll do an operation agreement. If I say operation agreement, then they'll do an MOU. Do you know what I mean? So, what I would say is, we did have something in writing for any agreements regarding that social equity applicant and a second person, second party. How's that?

**Member Scott** 16:37

If they're going to have a second party equity applicants that on their own could do this?

**Chair Goins** 16:42

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

Yeah, no, absolutely. Okay. I agree. So, if there is a second party, we want that. And I think that the SEC applicant should have to sign an affidavit to if they're not going to have a person because this way, we're keeping everyone above board. So that's what I'm going to suggest. We want a written agreement. If there is a second party, third party, whatever we want that in writing as part of the application, or we want to affidavit saying that the social equity applicant is not, you know, is not interested in having a second party as a partner. And in this way, anything that happens the CCB is involved in and we're you know, if there's a transparent process.

**Member Scott** 17:26

Chair, I would go even further to note at the bottom, normally, when we the city does our applications, it says at the bottom that all the information provided was true and correct. So just so that they can have some skin in the game that they are telling the truth.

**Chair Goins** 17:40

Absolutely. I just also, I agree with you a Member Scott and I do know that the application does say that. But what we're specifically talking about is because that's a gray area, we're specifically saying this social equity applicant is reaching out to get partnership to complete this. We wanted to, because I think there should be a vetting there will be a vetting out process. But the CCB definitely should be fully engaged in that. Do we all agree with that?

**All members are in agreement.**

**Chair Goins**

All right. Moving right along. So that's the profit participation. I'm not saying what the number has to be the same it needs to be in writing if there is an issue. Sub-item D prohibition on application stacking. I want to be very clear what I'm saying right now. I realize that this isn't a conversation about people can't partner to be in the application process. What I am saying is you can't start five different LLCs with your name, and then apply for a social equity application application that we do not want. We want a fair transparent process. And in doing that, we want to make sure that everyone gets the one opportunity that they should get to be a part of this process. So, do we agree that we do not want application stacking?

**Member Ulman** 19:37

I have a question Chair Goins. Will we allow social equity applicants to apply for both pools?

**Chair Goins** 19:47

I am only talking about the social equity application. If a person wants to be part of the independent licensing, I don't think there's any particular anything to prohibit them from doing that. So, we're specifically talking about the SE components of it.

**Member Ulman** 20:06

Yes, I don't know, I just wasn't sure if we ever clarified that if a social equity applicant could actually apply for both pools, and they would be the only applicant to be able to do that. Because they would technically qualify for both possibly. Just not sure if we ever solidified that.

**Chair Goins** 20:28

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

So, if we're talking about that. Didn't we'd have to say that? I would say no. I'm going to say no. And the reason why I mean, we can all decide that the reason why I'm going to say no is because I imagine that the CCB processes, you put in an application, and then when you put the application in there saying this is SE independent, this is independent.

**Member Scott** 20:54

I was thinking I was thought I thought they could cheer. And I understand your rationale, but you know, they'd be paying full price for the application. That's nonrefundable. 75% for the one, that's the social equity applicant,

**Chair Goins** 21:08

but that's stacking because when you're because they're not having a separate application process for social equity applicants, there's one process and they will there's let's just say there's a pass fail for all applicants, you're going through the process, and you're saying, this is an independent, this is an independent, they check social equity, that's a social equity, this is an independent

**Member Scott** 21:33

So, they need to choose whether they're going to be social equity, or independent, and then Chair, with regard to that the entities that are behind that may be behind these social equity applicants, do they just have the one shot? Or they only go to that one social equity applicant? They couldn't sponsor a number of them? How would you do that?

**Chair Goins** 21:54

That's a great question.

**Member Scott** 21:57

You're not a successful social equity applicant, and she is I can go with you or her or him or you don't mean, so if I don't, maybe it's not stacking for the people that are going to be the people behind the social equity applicant. So, we may not want to touch that. But it just seems like if you have a group that's willing to sponsor several social equity applicants, that stacking with regard to them but not have to be right,

**Chair Goins** 22:22

right, yeah. Not as the applicant. Yeah. So

**Member Scott** 22:26

somebody will probably want to hedge their bets. Yeah. And we go behind several people's Yeah, we might.

**Chair Goins** 22:32

Yeah, I'm sure. But that's, but the applicant itself would still be independent? Yeah, gotcha. So, I don't think the process allows, you know, if we certainly fair across the board, right, go ahead.

**Member Ulman** 22:49

Well, and what I was going to say is, if we did consider that it would increase the probability of having a more diverse and diverse applicant pool, which we definitely want to increase the business owners that have licenses, you know, and have more diversity all around. So, I'm just thought that might be a one more chance for a social equity applicant to win. And if they have the means to do that, that will give them a just a small advantage. So that's kind of the thought process behind that. But no. But what it doesn't do is, yeah, like you mentioned, have a bunch of investors behind people who those investors are really trying to get more, that's what we want to negate. Instead, we want to,

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

you know, increase the probability of just having a more diverse ownership in this market, because we know there isn't much.

**Chair Goins** 23:52

I agree with you, I guess, you know, what do you think Member Ogden?

**Member Ogden** 23:57

I actually am more concerned about what Member Ulman saying, I agree with her, the more, the bigger concern is the stacking on people who do come back on the back end and try to just invest in a sense and put the social equity person in the forefront and then have those operating agreements on the back end. And so, I think stacking should go across the board for the applicant, whoever's on the application, all the way across the board. I think that will protect a lot of people from big companies coming in and really just trying to use them as a face and then take off and then and then suddenly, they have their hands on 10 licenses because they just put money behind everybody and really have the control. So, if you I think the stacking should, should go across the board. If you're on an application, or your company or corporations on an application, you know, you should only be able to apply for what We said they should be able to apply for one or two, whatever percentage that is.

**Chair Goins** 25:07

I think that that keeps it fair and neutral. So, I agree. It sounds like we're split in this idea, though.

**Member Scott**

I think we're okay.

**Chair Goins**

Okay. No, okay.

**Member Scott** 25:19

Understand the rationale because, again, you pick the person who you think's going to be most successful for the social equity out getting you back that person, not back 10 people? And I'm okay with that. No, no second across the board. And then we know that it's fair for everyone.

**Chair Goins** 25:36

I agree. It's funny how, what a difference glasses. Licensing and limitations and fees. I have my notes that says what this is, what we're talking about is tiered discount of fees for current licensees that contract with SE applicants. I don't know if they can't or can't, can't do this. But I just want it on the record, we have suggested that there be some kind of tiered discounted licensing fees for those persons that are doing business with social equity applicant, I think that it's important to offer some kind of probability, you know, because we're always taking from licensees, and I'm always in apologizer, about the industry. So yeah, that's what do you guys feel about that?

**Member Scott** 26:37

Chair? Well, that only be at the state level, or the local level? Because I asked this question, and you'll know Darcy would, you know, you know, Darcy, so she's our business licensing officer, because we use some of these feels the need enforce the laws and the rules, you know, we have to, you know, we have employees that are going out and some of those costs we need to recoup. So, is that only licensing read deductions at the state level, and let the locals make a determination as to whether or not they would like to do that?

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

**Chair Goins 27:05**

It's absolutely only at the state level because we're, you know, we're representing the governor's board right now. But what I will say is, I don't even know if the CCB could do it. This is just, you know, some suggestions that I'm making, you know, with, we discussed it, it's on the list, you know, what do you guys think?

**Member Ulman 27:29**

I can't specifically think of any incentives that we would give a current operator or vendor to partner with these social equity applicants, I think they, ultimately, they're all going to increase their sale of cannabis. And there's going to be, everyone's going to want to be the person who is sending the deliverables to the consumption lounges. So, I think if anything, you know, the ball will be in the consumption, lounge owners court, with everyone wanting to be their delivery person. So personally, I just can't think of any specific things at this time. But they're all going to be selling more cannabis. And that's the benefit for them is they now have more outlets to sell from. And hopefully, they make sure that they operate with that social equity applicant just as well as they would with an independent license.

**Chair Goins 28:35**

Yeah, I think that I hear you Member Ulman. Professionally, there's never a reason for one business to choose another business over another. And what I really was trying to do was incentivize that the social equity applicants are a more favorable business versus independent lounge, or the current business retail licensing that they will already have. And so, what I was trying to do is, you know, show the relationship to be a larger value to those current licensees. I do realize that, you know, some of the licensees will see this as a marketing probability, but then there are those licensees that will see this as it may be a hindrance to their business and how they do business well, so that was the thinking behind offering an incentive. However, if we don't agree, that's okay. We can absolutely just move past it and move on to the next item.

**Member Ogden 29:42**

So, we're basically just requesting that they're that they do give an incentive, we're not saying what the incentive would be. Is that correct?

**Chair Goins 29:53**

We could do that. I was saying a reduction in fees, making a suggestion, but we could just say, you know, For the record, we could say we'd like them to consider an incentive for the current licensees, and they can figure out what that incentive looked like. That's a better way to go. Member Ogden because at least we're on the record saying, we just want to consider and consider.

**Member Ogden 30:16**

I would agree with you on, I think that we should, there should be consideration because like you said, I mean, and Member Ulman, and I understand what she's saying, she in a perfect world, that would be ideal. And you're right. That's how it should be. But unfortunately, there is bias out there. And that's what we're trying to avoid. Because we have minority cannabis growers right now that can't get contracts, and things like that. So, in the industry, we know how that works, unfortunately. So, if, if I would read that there should be some incentive, even if it's a small incentive something for people to, to utilize social equity operators, if possible.

**Chair Goins 31:03**

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

And to you know, Member Ogden, I appreciate you bringing light to how difficult it is for these mom-and-pop minority owned businesses, because we do have one that is going out of business based on that. So, you know, I do think we're thinking, you know, in the grand scheme of things, we want to incentivize, we want to give them the best opportunity to win. We want sustainability. That's, you know, what's the point in having program if it's not sustainable? So, yes, I'm just going to go on the record saying, we would like to have some incentives considered for those social equity applicants to the current licensees to do business with them. We agree on that.

**All members are in agreement.**

**Member Scott** 31:42

It's almost like there's almost like the incentive they gave for medical versus recreate. Absolutely reduce it. A little offense, medical versus recreational. So, I would agree with it..

**Chair Goins** 31:55

And they, you know, there's also incentives when big corporations do RFPs to minority owned women owned businesses, they get incentives and tax breaks. It's the same idealism. Um, we are on a sub item G. Diversity applicant certification. Okay. So, I love this part of what we want to happen is for those diversity applicants to be given special consideration in the independent licensing process. And diversity would be defined as women owned businesses, minority owned businesses and veterans. And they would have to be certified as such. Now I, you know, one of the things that I want to point out is, you know, the great staff here at the Cannabis Compliance Board, are directors, Director Klimas is hiring some, just phenomenal people who have done great work, I appreciate their assistance. And what it has, what has come across my desk is, even in the cannabis business, there are certifications specifically, that will certify women, minorities, for business. So, we can in good faith, say we want special consideration for those persons in the independent marketplace. And we know that they can get licensed, excuse me get certified as women owned businesses, minority owned businesses, and, you know, the veteran status. So, we still agree on this, right?

**Member Scott** 33:47

Sure. Did we talk about disabled or no, I know we had disabled.

**Chair Goins** 33:50

Yes. And I'm glad that you said that didn't have a written down. But yes, thank you very much. Diversity defined as women, minorities, veterans and disabled. We agree on that.

**All members are in agreement.**

**Member Ulman** 34:24

Chair, just a quick question. We didn't talk about, you mentioned they would have special consideration. Or how would that look like what does that look like?

**Chair Goins** 34:36

So, what it could possibly look like, and I want to just, the pot, what it could look like is in the independent process, they could go first. They could have extra opportunities. They could, you know, extra opportunities to win in one, I don't want to put on the Cannabis Compliance Board, what that consideration is because I don't know what their

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

process is going to look like. But what we are asking is for them to give these persons a higher chance to get an application.

**Member Scott** 35:20

It could be additional points or something,

**Chair Goins** 35:24

It could be additional points it could be the, you know, there is talk that there will be a lottery, it could be an extra lottery thing it could you know it, but the point is, I don't know what the process is going to look like, I don't want to speak to that. But what we're asking is that we want a more diverse market, and we want these persons to have special consideration have a better chance at being in the pool overall,

**Member Ulman** 35:51

are we supposed to suggest how they should get a better chance? Or that's not really in our wheelhouse?

**Chair Goins** 35:59

Now we can if you want to suggest it, you can Oh, I believe more to leave it leave it open. Because what I don't want to do is find as suggesting a process and maybe like, yeah, that's a good process, when everything is something completely different, right? So, I want to leave it open and let the CCB I want to put the ownership on them to, I know that our Director is really focused on diversity and inclusion. I know that, you know, that is his mindset, if you know, even his staff shows that and congratulations to him for that. So, I know that me asking this is not going to go unseen. So, if this subcommittee says this is what we want, they're going to take special interest in that and figure it out. And I can guarantee and be as fair as they can be without being sued.

**Member Scott** 37:01

But I imagine the process isn't going to be the same process they utilize for the dispensaries and the other is now a completely different process. So, I'm with you in favor of leaving it open. Yeah. Determine what that looks like.

**Chair Goins** 37:17

Yeah. That's the ultimate. That's the key.

**Member Ulman** That's the key

**Member Scott** 37:24

job security for me.

**Chair Goins** 37:27

We want a very transparent palm base forward application process. And so yes, if we all agree on that, then we're good.

**All members are in agreemen**

**Chair Goins**

you know, this has been a great process, I have been stopped on the street phone calls, you know, asked to come into the offices to talk about this particular process and how we have handled the conversation this has been a very

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

difficult conversations to have. And especially because DE&I is something that people across the nation are taking a special look at, and what the ideas of that these conversations that we have had have sparked conversation and other people's businesses and corporations, and how they are looking at their diversity, equity inclusion and how they are going to move forward and how they, you know, introduce inclusion. I don't take any conversation that we've had here lightly, and the argument, any disagreement, any debate, I appreciate everyone's focus and time and your studying and knowledge and wisdom and history that you brought to the table. It was important, it was needed, it was necessary. And this will go in history, as you know, one of the things that when they're talking about the cannabis marketplace, one of the things that happened to change the face of cannabis in Nevada, and so I just want to commend you all, for being here and for your expertise. And this isn't the last meeting. It's just the last meeting and this particular licensing, there's so much more to discuss as relates to the cannabis marketplace in Nevada, and how that looks in broad scope. There will be new licensing this, you know, we're talking about the consumption lounge license today, but that's just the first of many. I believe, also, as the gentleman has said when he gave his comment that there is a space to open this marketplace in unique ways. And I'm hoping to see that happen. And I think that as the Cannabis Compliance Board builds their team and their team gets more functional, they'll be open to expanding it with the proper oversight that is necessary to keep the values marketplace solid. And so, you know, I'm actually moving to public comment.

**Member Scott 40:28**

And I'm sure the public will be interested in what's the timeline? Because I know this is our last minute for the subcommittee. So, what do you think the timeline is for moving this to the CAC or the CCB? What does that look like?

**Chair Goins 40:38**

So, this was actually, this meeting was fast track because the CAC is meeting so. So, the Cannabis Advisory Commission, which is where these recommendations will go to will be meeting within the next few weeks, and there'll be voting on all of the items from all of the subcommittees and what they advise to move to the Cannabis Compliance Board. And then I know that, you know, we're all reading articles, and I read an article that said that, you know, they're looking to have licensing be made available by spring, you know, and that's even I think people believe that that's not fast enough. But regulations take time. And making sure that you have the proper staffing takes time. And I you know, when we're talking about all the things that have to happen, this consumption lounge, it's his new to the state, this is new to the CCB as it is to the state, they're going to be required to put it together and flow it out and make sure that everyone is compliant. Just like the persons putting the buildings together. We want to make sure that this you know, Nevada stays one of the leading marketplaces just a little more diverse. Little more equitable, a little more inclusion. But so that will be the next process. They're going to put CAC will meet. CCB will finalize the regulations. And then they'll I believe that they're going to allow retail licenses first, and then independent sandocial equity applicants out there after

**Member Scott 42:27**

and then so after that process, the locals that will have to put their rules and regs together,

**Chair Goins 42:32**

yes. Well, I hope they're working on that now.

**Member Scott 42:39**

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

Well, we will be similar things at least pass their cannabis consumption loans ordinance in 2019. And legislature said, hold on, we want to make a more reasonable approach. But then those entities will still have to vote on these rules in their own independent out to write them. So, it'll be a little bit of time. But we're having to get

**Chair Goins** 43:03

any other questions from the board? For the members? No. All right, with I've already talked about future meetings. So, we're moving on to item four. And I want to acknowledge some public comments. So, we're moving into public comment. And during this time, if you have a public comment, we're going to ask her to come make your way here, you get your will allow two minutes for you to make your public comment, state your name, I will at your 30 second mark, I will tell you that you're getting to your 30 second mark, please take that time to make your final comments. I do want to read a public, so we received a public comment via email from minorities for medical marijuana. It was like six pages. So, I just want to acknowledge that we received the comment and I appreciate the information. It was very informative. Everyone got the public comments, right. I got Yes.

**Member Scott** 44:09

Was it a small sampling of it? Was that the entire comment

**Chair Goins** 44:13

,Yeah, I'll make sure that Sara gets it to you. Yes. I think Sara's already put it to record. Oh, yeah. But I'll make sure that you get a copy. And then we received public comment from Paul Michael Burgess. And I'm going to read it for the record. Thank you for taking my public comment today. And for an opening inclusive process. residency requirement comments a social equity applicant must have lived five years in Nevada within the last 10 years. This would target the social equity citizens business owners that have interest invested in Nevada early. It would prevent companies with big money from traveling the state's get into social equity programs. applicants that have lived in Nevada have a connection I'm stumbling because I can't see. applicants that have lived in Nevada have a connection to the community and plans to serve and data shows that these applicants are more likely to hire and make their team members out of citizens that have lived in Nevada for 15 plus years. Consideration of criminal history for applicants immediately family members, applicants or immediate family with a criminal history must be three years removed from conviction of felony and drugs if the conviction is a crime of violence applicant or immediate family member must be seven years removed from conviction convictions of murder, hate crime, sex crimes, crimes against children or crimes of violence, causing great bodily harm will not be considered for social equity. Thank you for your time. And thank you for your comment. Mr. Paul, Michael Burgess.

**Rachel Lee** 45:46

Thank you. Thank you. I'm Rachel Lee. Thank you for this opportunity. Thank you. To all the members for the meeting. I just have a couple of things that I wanted to say. So according to the necessities, I would hopefully qualify, I wanted to find out a little bit more if you can, in the next meeting about the pre-qualification checklist before people begin to try to put their money up. Because application is nonrefundable. She also wasn't going to be as the plan with a license. So, your foot will be a plant for starting a company, which is called some point professional company. While I work for the state of Nevada, I noticed that the kids are in the foster care system, they get a lot of medication, that my company wants to be able to get a hold of one of these license, I wanted to start a start a nonprofit called celebrate St. Mary's will be responsible for taking getting these kids the opportunity to play football, basketball, whatever extracurricular activity they want to do, whether in the street messengers and foster care, a short story, I was in the middle of researching a kid who was having a behavior. And I said, hey, let's play football. I don't want to play football. And when he jumped up and ran outside to play football, that showed me that while he's going to his

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

treatment center, he should have an opportunity to play football. So, if someone is going to get a license, maybe in the application, which is saying what are you going to do with your license? What are you going to do with the money, you can prove all you want to prove but if you're not going to do anything to reach out, what's the use, if this is a social equity program, and if they want to get in the community, there should be some type of cause behind them also getting this so called golden ticket and the ownerships that are taking place right now with a lot of companies. There's a particular company that I looked up all the licenses for, he seems like they hold a lot of ties to applications. I can't say the name, I don't want to say the name. But what's the what's the use of current ownership continuing people that have license already continuing to be able to get money off of minorities? Am I almost there?

**Chair Goins** 48:17

Yes, ma'am. You have 30 seconds

**Rachel** 48:18

Okay, thank you. Also, if I was to be approved, my reason would be because of the monetary disease of Alzheimer's disease. And I do, at one point have an investor that I speak back and forth with a by the name of Al Harrington. And his cause is because his mother has glaucoma, and so they decided they wanted to get into that. So, if there's not a reason, what's the purpose? That's all I have? Thank you. My name is Rachel. I represent Sunflower Compassion Company. Thank you very much for your comment.

**Katrina Saunders** 49:12

Hello, my name is Katre Saunders. For the record. I've been a longtime patient advocate and victim of the drug war at the state level and federal level. I've worked with A'Esha at CEIC. I've worked with last preserves project Americans for Safe Access. I've dedicated more than half my life to being compassionate to those who need medical cannabis. I've also caught a federal case here in Las Vegas, State of Nevada under Operation chronic problem while they are helping over 800 patients get on the Nevada state registry. I've also helped grand open Source Nevada, helped grand open a dispensary that I've worked at Silver Sage, Glossy Edibles. I've worked at multiple locations in the industry as well as help make people millions of dollars at this late to be allocating just for simple access to work in the industry. In regards to residency requirements, I've been displaced over the past few years, my kids live in other states, I have to travel back and forth because my kid's father took him there when he was displaced from the drug war, asking for residency requirements leaves me out as well as the tenure clause from having a felony, because my felony is only seven and a half years out, I shouldn't have to keep on getting penalized for nonviolent cannabis convictions when things are supposed to be legal. When you guys are supposed to be discussion, social equity, language, and ownership, you guys are really addressing social equity, and social justice, that class should be removed, I shouldn't have to still keep struggling and begging you guys with a deaf ear. When I come to these meetings, when I'm still advocating for prisoners' rights, for people who have been disenfranchised by the war on drugs, they definitely deserve ownership. And it shouldn't be this difficult to have a pathway to do so. And with that, I just am asking for a special session for you guys to really take a look. Because I'm the voice for the voiceless. I only speak because I have a platform to do. So, there's other people in my position that probably don't even know these meetings exists, because when they post them, you're posted on Twitter, who in the black community is on Twitter CCB. Or their meetings aren't posted at places where they should be toward black people would even know that these things are going on. So, moving forward, I think that you guys also need to be reaching out and doing more community work so that people know that these meetings exist, because you know, they really don't have anywhere I asked people do they know about social equity? And in Las Vegas, they told me no, they really haven't heard about it. Or it's just really unfortunate that I'm still having to advocate for my rights as well as rights of others at this late date. So, you guys can fix this situation would be greatly appreciated. Thanks for your time.

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

**J. Christopher Stokes** 52:04

Oh, thank you. My name is J. Christopher Stokes. And I actually wanted to address one of the issues being 51% of the company is not always 51% of profits. And that's what we're here to address. So staffing, staffing, kind of stuff, stacking, stacking, unless we're stacking the profits, just putting different things on a different station. The five-year residency room, I want to match your high school will fix the other way. And I've lived back and forth. But five years seems to be a little restrictive. I'm 53 years old. So, I've lived in Las Vegas off and on over the past four years. So, I would say that is kind of restrictive. Please address that 15% of the company through operating agreements. backdoor deals, does not equal 51%.

**Chair Goins** 53:21

Thank you for your comment. Is there any other public comment?

**Paul Michael Burgess** 53:41

I'll just cut this opportunity for more public comment to help out some of the social equity. So, if you have a business in Nevada, and you're a farmer, this will be the perfect opportunity for those farmers to directly work with the social equity businesses, if they're going to be a situation where you're having to supply, they have a form, they'll come up with certain businesses ways to supply the social equity. That way you can come up with a system to where they're both the farm and the social equity is getting a bonus out, there'll be able to sell their product in place to be able to sell the product. As a business owner they should come up with ways to make that connection that will benefit both social equity and the black farmers but also going to be social equity applicants that are winners for the licenses so just a great way to start this process if you're going to be starting a business in today's age you need a pitch deck. A pitch deck will be the perfect way for business to put in their business plans within 10 pages present to the whatever board meeting or commissions together to identify that this is a good business that this, this applicant has done their research they know about Tam, they know about so and so the CCB automatically understands, okay, what this applicant wants to do? What's their idea? Do they know how to work this business? Do they know the staffing table, the banking, all those situations? Because banking, there's going to be a big situation this situation, money having burst, but also what type of business on consumption loans? Are you running knowing that you can't put this money? You can't transactions on credit cards because it's still illegal. So there has to be an understanding and system that they're going to know how to be directly working with the banks. Also, a pitch deck is what you're going to need for an investor, if you're going to another business is going to invest what you they're going to want to see what you have on the table. Does it make sense? Does it make dollars and cents? Is there any benefit to them? If you're a cannabis company that's going on right now, you don't need no discounts, you're making money over hand over fist. So that situation is you got to present something that's way beneficial to them. One of the things that CC final 30 seconds says has done this, there's really well there's the discounting on the licenses in the in the VC world in the hedge fund world, this discount on the license, the license over here is \$100,000. And social equity license is \$10,000. In the VC world, that's \$100,000. Because you to max that. So, you're allowing the social equity applicants to already present themselves to VCs and headed fundraisers or financial angel investors with Hey, I'm already bringing 150,000 or \$200,000, because my license isn't the same as this other company.

**Chair Goins** 56:47

Thank you for your comment.

**Rachel Lee** 56:51

I promise you this is the last time

\*This meeting was transcribed using AI software. If there are any questions about the content in this transcript, a video of this meeting can be viewed on the following website: <https://ccb.nv.gov/public-meetings/#public-meetings-1>

**Chair Goins** 56:58

Rachel, I'm going to give you one more minute, because you gave me your public comment. But out of courtesy, I'm going to give you one minute. All right, go ahead.

**Rachel Lee** 57:05

It's really about the war on drugs, then I really believe that in these essays, that little plant behind these applicants should be something that's linked up. What I noticed that drugs is still taking place. And so, here's this application that I happen to be able to get back to a program, especially specifically for people that are getting that credit should have a monetary counseling. Because what I've noticed lately that a lot of tears that are people are coming out of prison, on jobs, that weren't able to oh, they're experts. So it's about drugs, these programs, these people without medication should be able to have something that's going to be able to give back to help people that are still in prison, that are going to prison, and it's not getting counseling before being released, and then go back in that vicious cycle of getting returned back to prison, because they're coming out on drugs, with no counseling on how to get back into the community on a short rope. Like I had a friend that just now. That's retired. Thank you.

**Chair Goins** 58:18

Thank you for your comment. Any other public comments?

**Member Scott** 58:26

I like to just say thank you Chair for running a really good meeting, the last three meetings and we appreciate all your dedication to this to this process, because it's difficult, and you did a great job.

**Chair Goins** 58:36

Thank you very much. It has been my pleasure. I always say I don't have to do this work. I get to do this work. I think people think that I say that as just like a call card. It has become a call car. But I do a whole lot of work. I don't get paid to do. You know, community service is just that serving your community. They tell me what to do. And I tried to execute it the best way I know how, but it's always my pleasure. One thing that I do that I love to do without with that being said, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you all for your time.